

COUNCIL OF STATES

Wednesday, 23rd September 1953

The Council met at a quarter past eight of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that the following letter has been received from Shri Alladi Krishnaswami:

"Owing to illness I am still confined to bed and I am not in a position to attend this session of the Council of States. I therefore request you to place this letter before the Council and obtain permission of the House for me to be absent from the meetings of the House during this session."

Is it the pleasure of the Council that permission be granted to Shri Alladi Krishnaswami to remain absent from all meetings of the Council during its current session?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

Permission to remain absent granted.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENT SHOWING ACTION TAKEN ON ASSURANCES, PROMISES AND UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY GOVERNMENT DURING THE SESSIONS.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI C. C. BISWAS): Sir, on behalf of Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given during the sessions shown against each:—

- (i) Statement No. V, Second Session, 1952, of the Council of States.

- (ii) Supplementary Statement No. IV, Third Session, 1953, of the Council of States.

[See Appendix V, annexure Nos. 121 and 122.]

MOTION ON FOREIGN POLICY

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Almost in every session of this House some such motion is brought forward at the instance and desire of many Members. I am happy that this should be so, and this House should give some of its time to the consideration of international problems, because ultimately the responsibility for carrying out any policy rests on Parliament. While we discuss this matter from time to time in this House and in the other House, almost always, in the course of discussion, some hon. Members say that we waste time or we waste energy in getting entangled in international affairs. We have got great problems in India. Why not concentrate on them rather than look abroad for adventures? We have got the tremendous problem of unemployment, of raising standards and all that. Now, nobody doubts that we have these great domestic problems. Nobody doubts that these domestic problems for us are ultimately of far greater importance than any international problem, because the international problem, or any part that we may play in it, ultimately depends upon our internal situation, upon our internal strength, upon our internal cohesion and all that. There is no conflict between following a domestic policy and an international policy. They react on

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

each other. And in fact, as I said, the basic thing is the domestic policy that a country follows, and, to some extent, the foreign policy is a reflex of that. Foreign policy—of course we may use that phrase—is not one solid or simple thing. It is, to some extent, motivated no doubt by the ideals and objectives that a country has. It is, to put it very briefly, to begin with, protecting one's own country, i.e., protecting the sovereignty and the integrity of one's own country, and taking such steps as help to that end. It is that protection which may take place, if unfortunately such occasion arises, by the use of the armed forces. Our policy of course is hardly to use the armed forces. Foreign policy is therefore trying to help create conditions of friendship and co-operation which lessen the dangers to any country and which enlarge the sphere of friendly co-operation for that country. That is in the narrowest sense. But in the wider sense, in the world today, where things are so interrelated and where an explosion in any one part of the world may very well affect another, may very well reach our own country, we are interested in such explosions rather not taking place. So we function in the United Nations and we function in various chancellories of the world and keep in touch with other countries, try to develop friendly relations with them to promote so far as we can, our own interests and the interests which are tied up with our larger ideals and objectives, i.e., peace and world co-operation, etc.

Therefore, I should like to make it perfectly clear to all those who may have some lingering doubt about it that taking an interest in foreign policy does not mean, in the slightest, trying to push out domestic policy or making it appear that domestic policy is less important. It is probably the most important policy for any country. There is an idea in some that foreign policy is some

mysterious thing, which is understood in terms of deep intrigue, secrecy and all that. Anything which is hidden from the public view becomes mysterious, and where nations deal with each other—and normally of course they deal with each other in secret and private—it does produce an impression of mystery but as a matter of fact there is no greater mystery in foreign policy than in any other policy, more especially in so far as we are concerned. I do venture to think that our policy is a simple and straightforward one. We may make mistakes, petty errors here and there, but in the main it is a simple and straightforward policy which any person in this country can understand, appreciate, or if you like, not agree with. Now, it is true that, while our general approach to foreign policy is a simple and straightforward one, it is one which naturally arises from our past thinking and actions even before we attained independence; it is one which obviously also derives from the present conditions of our country, geographical, etc., after independence, but at the same time it has to be related to the changing circumstances. It is obvious that conditions change in the world; they are changing. Now, unless a policy keeps fully aware of the dynamic content of world affairs today, it cannot be a live policy, but it becomes a dead policy. I venture to say that, when hon. Members deal with this policy in praise or in criticism of it, I would beg of them to consider it in terms of this changing world and not offer some criticism or praise of some static thing in a static world, because there is no static world today. I venture to say that in the course of these debates normally I find Members criticising things in the same old way, as if there is no change in the world, as if there is no new problem when we talk of, let us say, anything, about the foreign pockets in India for example. We hear of one criticism which is sometimes advanced and which goes on being advanced regard-

less of the fact that there is no foundation for it, and that is that our foreign policy as such has no friends but there are only critics of it. Normally those who criticise it in this way have probably not had any personal acquaintance with any other part of the world, except perhaps for a small group in which they might function. They don't realize what effect on the world it has especially. I would say that there is one small thing today and it is this that a vast number of countries in the world, whether they are very friendly to us or less friendly to us, realize, if I may say so, the honesty and integrity of India's policy. Whether they agree or not, they do realize that in the main. This has produced effect. It is not by virtue of military power or financial strength or anything involved in it, but merely by the fact that it has pursued calmly, dispassionately, a policy keeping always certain objects in view. Now I referred just now to the foreign pockets in India. In regard to these foreign pockets, these foreign establishments in India, obviously there are no two opinions here or in this country. There may be two opinions as to how we should deal with this problem but there are no two opinions, if I may put it so, about the fact that the political movement and the political struggle which the country had waged for generations in order to achieve the independence of India had succeeded; but there is a tiny bit left over and it has not succeeded 100 per cent. It will not have fulfilled itself completely till we have put an end to these vestiges of foreign rule in India. Now that is common ground. How to do it, in what context—about this there may be difference of opinion because then, we have to think of other questions like reactions of that, and whether it is not desirable to pursue a way, a peaceful way, which may not bring dramatic results quickly, but some other way which might entangle us and create difficulties in the larger sphere of functioning. So this approach

applies to all the other problems that we have to face. We cannot take any single problem out of this context of world affairs of what might happen. This large context of a world continually faces the prospects of some upheaval, explosion, war, etc.

Now, at the present moment, the House knows that perhaps the most important question, taking the world as a whole, is what happens in Korea. What happens in Korea is at the present moment being discussed in New York in the United Nations, and thus far, there has been no decision which might bring about a solution of the difficulties that have arisen. It is rather difficult for me, speaking here, to put forward any positive proposals or indeed to say much about these matters that are in debate in the United Nations at the present moment because it could serve little purpose if I said something which did not help. We want to help, not to hinder. It may sometimes satisfy us to criticise others for what we consider their shortcomings or their mistakes but the objective is not to have the pleasure of criticism like others who criticise too, but rather to help, and therefore I would prefer not to say much because this matter is under debate in the United Nations. The matter is simple enough, as the House knows. The question is how this political conference for Korea should be constituted. The question has become a limited one, limited to that. After a long debate and many deadlocks, there was the armistice in Korea, an armistice between the two Commands, the United Nations Command on the one side and the Chinese and North Korean Command on the other. One of the terms of the armistice was the constitution of a Political Conference which would deal with a number of questions, first the question of prisoners i.e., if the question of prisoners of war has not been disposed of by then according to the procedure laid down, the Political Conference would consider

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

that question. Secondly there is the other question relating to Korea, the question of foreign troops in Korea and so on and so forth.

All these lead us on, to the whole problem of the Far East which is a very big problem. But for the moment it is, I think, the desire of the principal parties concerned, to limit the activities of this Conference to these first few questions relating to Korea. It may be, of course, that later on the Conference might take up the larger questions of the Far East; and till these questions are taken up and solved there cannot be any peaceful settlement of Far Eastern problems.

Now the question before the United Nations is the constitution of this Conference. One would have thought that that is not a very difficult question, because in a conference of this kind decisions do not go by voting—by a majority of the votes. They have to go by a measure of unanimity, by general consent. It does not very much matter whether there are extra persons—one, two or three—sitting round the table. Nevertheless, there has been this dispute and behind the dispute lie different approaches to this problem which are sometimes exemplified by people talking about a round table and a square table. It does not matter what the shape of the table is. But what does matter is the approach to this question.

The United Nations passed a Resolution—the Political Committee passed it in the last session—which was more or less tantamount to confining this Conference to the belligerent parties on both sides. On the other side it was proposed, or rather in the U.N. it was proposed that there should be some neutral countries, and the Chinese and North Korean side has laid great stress on this and even mentioned a number of neutral countries of Asia which they think, should

be added on to the other countries at this Conference. The question, therefore, before the United Nations, is a limited one, whether they should add on some more countries to the belligerent countries for the purpose of this Political Conference or not. The position taken up by India is fairly wellknown and I need not go into it. In this matter, as in others, it has been, if I may say so, our consistent desire to be less and less entangled, not to push ourselves forward. But we cannot disentangle ourselves from the course of events. One cannot disentangle oneself from certain consequences which flow from one step leading to another. Thus, when about a year ago, we put forward a Resolution before the United Nations trying to solve the deadlock that had arisen on the prisoners of war issue, that Resolution had nothing to do with India being in any conference or not. It was just a suggestion carefully thought out after much consultation with the parties concerned, trying to meet their viewpoints as far as possible; and that Resolution was accepted. It was not immediately given effect to; but later, after some months, the Chinese Government and the North Koreans put forward something which was extraordinarily like that Resolution. In fact, one might say, though not absolutely in so many words, it was, in fact, an acceptance of that Resolution. Now, immediately because we had been instrumental in putting forward that Resolution we were tied up with it and its consequence is that we are tied up with the next stage when that comes up, and so whether we wish it or not we become entangled. Our name was put forward and we made it clear that we were not anxious; we made all that clear. Certainly we felt not that India should be in it but that it would serve the cause of peace if, besides the belligerent parties, some neutral nations were there. That has been our view. Also, if I may say so, in these matters which are no doubt matters of world

importance and in which every country of the world is entitled to take interest, nevertheless, geographically and otherwise, many of these matters relate to a part of Asia and it does not seem becoming to me that problems which affect Asia and which are happening in Asia should be disposed of largely by ignoring Asia. That seems to me to be a wrong approach and that approach is one which will produce results less and less as time goes on. Even now, it is becoming a rather difficult approach; tomorrow and the day after it will become still more difficult till it becomes quite impossible. It is not proper that these vital problems of Asia should now be disposed of as if the countries of Asia do not count very much. Now, our approach has been and is that if we can help we are willing to do so; if some responsibility is cast upon us which we cannot evade without endangering that very help that we are trying to give, then we cannot evade that responsibility. It was in pursuance of this that we accepted certain heavy responsibilities in Korea. We accepted the membership and the Chairmanship of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. We accepted the other responsibility of guarding the prisoners of war by sending our own forces to that end and the further responsibility of some Red Cross work there.

May I, in this connection, remind the House of a rather unique thing and that is—speaking from my imperfect knowledge of history—I am not aware and I cannot think of any occasion when one country has sent its army or part of its army or troops to another country on a peaceful mission of this kind previously, and it makes me happy to think that the first time that the Indian Army with the Indian Flag has gone abroad, it has gone on this peaceful mission.

Although they go to guard the prisoners of war and it may appear to be a simple undertaking yet per-

haps hon. Members who follow the news may have gathered that this work is not quite so simple as it appears on the face of it and indeed difficulties have arisen and are arising. A few days ago, because of these difficulties, our representatives there informed us that they would like to have more troops, and we have agreed because it is for them to judge and we are sending—maybe in the course of a day or two—some more troops by air to Korea.

I should like to draw the attention of the House to the way our troops have been functioning in Korea. Though there is a great deal of difference of opinion and conflict of viewpoints in Korea between the contending parties, I gather that there is a large measure of unanimity on one thing, unanimity in praise for the way the Indian forces are functioning there. So I am sure that every Member of this House would like to appreciate the work of our young men there and our officers there.

Now referring to the United Nations, some of us may feel critical of the United Nations and even—if I may say so—feel sarcastic about it. I do not think that helps us very much. It is very easy to point out the failings of the United Nations or the difficulties which it has to face or the deadlocks that continually come its way. The United Nations is after all a reflection of the world as it is, of the sovereign nations as they are today. You may as well blame the world in its present context as blame the United Nations. It just represents what we are in India and the other sixty or seventy countries which are put together in all kinds and shapes. Certainly let us try to think of how to facilitate the working of the United Nations so that it may be able to fulfil what has been laid down so well in the Charter in such noble language. Let us do that. Let us—if you like—vary its constitution if by doing that it will help us or help the world. But ultimately it is not a question of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
 varying that constitution but of dealing with the problems of the world which are reflected in the United Nations. It would be wishful thinking on our part that everything can be settled quickly although it is our earnest desire to solve every problem in this world. Well, that does not help us much unless we go in the right way and with our best efforts. There are many people in this world, many excellent people, who work for what is called a world body, a world federation, a one-world movement and all that. I for my part am in entire sympathy with their objective and their ideal. But I also wonder how one world is going to be established or a world federation or confederation by holding conferences occasionally. Of course conferences are good in so far as they train people's minds, as they make people think on the right lines, but if you have got to solve the problems of the world we have to tackle them not by saying: "Let us all be good and sit together." If we are good of course we sit together and discuss these matters, but unfortunately this kind of thing does not help always in solving any problem. So let us not condemn the United Nations. Let us not just turn it down, because it is struggling with very great problems; it is struggling with human nature, and what is worse, the nature of independent States, independent national States none of which wants to give up any of its sovereign powers. And so long as you have that you will have to face all kinds of difficulties.

After the second World War a large number of upsets happened, that is, the centres of gravity of power have changed and they go on changing, I mean military power, financial power and all kinds of things. Colonialism faded off—not completely of course, because it still exists in many places but nevertheless it faded off—and new countries have come on the scene with the result that those old

centres of gravity have shifted and are continually shifting.

I do not know how many people, apart from those who pay particular attention to these matters take these factors into consideration. Take the simple thing which you and I may be aware of but which perhaps most people in Europe and America are not aware of. Well, today we are in Asia, we are aware of it; of course, to some extent, everybody is aware of it, whether he is in America or in Europe or wherever he may live. Nevertheless I sometimes think that they are not fully aware of it, because if they were fully aware of it, why do they again and again forget Asia and imagine that they can dispose of Asia at some council table or small meeting or big meeting, without reference to Asia? Obviously, any person who would apply his mind and intelligence to this problem must realise that they cannot dispose of Asia or any part of Asia without the goodwill and co-operation of Asia.

Now, I do not want any future development in the world to be, shall I say, Asia *vs.* Europe or Asia *vs.* America. I do not want that. I do not wish to think or to act in terms of one country against another, one continent against another, one race against another. To some extent I have to face these problems. There is this problem of, let us say, racialism—domination of one race. We are against it; we want to fight against it, but nevertheless just because others do it, let us not think in terms of one continent against another or Asia *vs.* Europe and so on. That is merely doing something in the reverse way, doing something wrong—in reverse to what is being done by others. Therefore when I talk about Asia so much I do not mean to put up Asia as a kind of rival of another continent, but only to point out certain facts of life as they exist today in the international sphere. Those facts of life and those facts of geography cannot be ignored and it is

absurd to go on thinking in terms of, well, the 19th century or the early 20th century because those early conditions no longer exist.

The United Nations was started six, seven or eight years ago—I forget—I think it was eight years ago, with a very noble Charter and with a recognition of certain inherent difficulties. That is, they recognised to some extent the fact of power being, if you like, rather concentrated in the hands of a few countries—five great Powers they called them—and gave them permanent seats on the Security Council. Well, all the five of them were not quite equal. In fact, there were only two very great Powers and there was at least one which was no Power at all, great or small, which came in there for other reasons. Now, let us look at the constitution—or the composition rather—of the Security Council at present. I am saying this merely to point out how some of the features of the United Nations themselves, conventional or constitutional, do not keep pace with changing events. Let me make it perfectly clear that India does not seek a seat in the Security Council. We are not standing for it, we do not wish to come in the way of others who are anxious for it, and so we are not standing for it. Now, we do not know what we will do in the future. It is not from the point of view of India that I mention this matter but, if we look at the composition of the Security Council, there are five permanent members, among the five being the Government of Formosa misnamed China—obviously it is not China whatever else it is—and the other members represent countries in Europe, Eastern Europe and Western Europe, North America, South America, all spread out there. Where exactly does Asia come into the picture? At the present moment it so happens that Pakistan is a member; well and good. But very soon Pakistan will be out of it, having

completed its term. So, probably, in the new Security Council which is soon coming in a month or two, Asia will be represented by the Government of Formosa and by Lebanon—Lebanon has been elected. Lebanon is an excellent country, it is a small country but a fine country. But, nevertheless, it does seem odd that in this great Security Council, deciding the fate of the world, this great continent of Asia should be represented, as it is likely to be, after a month or two, by the Government of Formosa and the Government of Lebanon only. We might leave out Formosa for the time being because, obviously, that Government does not represent any other part of Asia except the Island of Formosa—how much of it it represents, I do not know.

Now, Lebanon. We welcome Lebanon there. But, it is casting rather a big burden on Lebanon for us to consider it to represent all this great continent in ferment, in turmoil, with all those kinds of urges that Asia represents. I am merely putting it to the House not in a spirit of complaint, nor of making any demand or anything of that kind—as I have said we have decided not to stand for membership of the Security Council—but merely to point out that it is going to be less and less feasible in future for any world organisation to leave Asia out of account or to consider Asia as only a playground for their politics or for their conflicts. Inevitably, Asia is not going to listen to this kind of treatment.

Now, as the House knows, we have followed a policy, what is variously described by many as one of 'neutrality' and the rest of it. Personally, I do not like the word 'neutrality' and I do not understand why we should be compelled to use that word or allow anyone to use it in peacetime. I can understand 'neutral' in war. The mere fact that this word is often used signifies that those who use it live in a mental state of war. A neutral is only talked about when

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

there are two belligerents. You don't in peace-time, talk about 'neutrals'. So, it is this mental state of war that prevails in a great part of the world. We see no reason why we should allow our minds to be deformed by continuous thought of war. If there should be 'neutrals' we are neutrals. But, as a matter of fact, we simply carry on in our own way our policy—in whatever way we think is the best for us; and, in doing so, we support any particular policies put forth by any nation if we approve of them, we don't, if we do not approve of them. It is this policy that some of our friends describe as one not pleasing anybody at all in the world. That has been our basic policy and I think it has borne results, obvious results, in so far as our country has not only risen in the estimation of others, but played a fairly important part—I do not wish to put it very high, but a fairly important part—in helping in the solution of some of the problems that have arisen. I wish always to be careful, and I wish the House also to be careful, not to exaggerate the part that India plays in world affairs or anywhere else. If we play an important part, well and good. It is not by talking too much about it that we enhance our own importance. Now, that has been the basic policy that we have pursued, and that is the policy which I believe, as I said, flows from our past history and past thinking. I believe it is a policy which is not merely a policy of a party or a group, although the party which I have the honour to represent is a very, very big party, but it is a national policy with which practically every person in India generally agrees. They may differ in degree and emphasis here and there, but basically, I think, it is the only policy which, if I may say so, any Government in India would have to follow, if they have any responsibility for framing such a policy.

Now, I think any person looking at the Indian scene today would be

forced to admit this reaction of India to the general international policy that has been pursued. There are some people who seem to imagine that it would be good for India to be tied up to some other country and thereby to be able to say: "Lo and behold, we have got a friend to shelter us and to protect us in case of need." Now, if we do that, what does it mean? It means that we have no policy. That is no policy. It is others' policy, not ours at all. It means that. If we align ourselves with the groups that exist today—they may be excellent groups, I am not criticising them—but I do say that alignment means giving up any policy that we may independently seek to pursue and that means giving up our independence, in so far as that matter is concerned. It means others telling you what policy to pursue. It means not functioning as an independent country but as a dependent and a satellite country. Well, we are not prepared to do that. Well, we may, judging each issue as it arises, support such policies of other countries as we think we ought to support. In fact, on the whole we refrain from criticising even the policies that we do not like unless they hate us, because why should we be crusaders? And, Sir, we try in our little way to produce an atmosphere of friendly talk and friendly co-operation that we wish to have, whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere, and I think that that approach does succeed remarkably. That is to say, it may not solve a problem, but it succeeds in our discussing these problems when gradually the world is being driven to a state when people cannot discuss anything or talk to each other, because basically after all, the people of the world, whatever country they may belong to, want peace and co-operation.

9 A.M.

Because there is that basic desire, anything done to help that is appreciated. Now, as I said in the begin-

ning, the foreign policy of a country will most naturally, protect the national interests of that country. The national interests of a country are primarily the protection of its sovereignty and integrity; secondly, the promotion of its trade and commerce and cultural contacts with other countries, all this in the wider context, of course, of the world, world peace, or world co-operation, if that is the objective of that country. I do submit to this House that we in India at the present moment are less afraid of any other country, whatever it may be, than many countries of the world which are much more powerful in terms of military strength, etc. Somehow, as in the case of people who possess a great deal of the world's good things being constantly afraid of thieves and robbers coming to attack them, so it is that the bigger and more powerful a country today is, the more afraid they become that something would happen to affect their position. We are neither big, except in a geographical sense, nor powerful, but I do claim that we are not afraid as a country. Some individuals may be; I do not know. Some individuals always tell us, "We are so weak. Let us seek shelter under somebody else's roof or house." Well, that is not the policy that we have been trained to follow during the last thirty or forty years of our existence, and we propose to keep in our own house and look after ourselves, being friendly with our neighbours and with others. Sometimes—not often, I am glad to say—some exuberant or perhaps misguided people organise some demonstration or other against friendly countries. They may organise some demonstration against what they call American imperialism. I am not talking of their discussions; I am talking of their demonstrations. Being a gallant band of three or four they demonstrate their wishes in this manner. Sometimes they demonstrate; at any rate they did a few days ago, against what they did not like, against the Chinese Government.

Now, it is a trivial matter, but I mention it in this House because a Member of this hon. House apparently, I believe, associated himself with this matter.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore):
Who is it?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar):
Everybody knows.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:
They proclaimed a Tibet Day.

Why anyone should proclaim a Tibet Day passes my comprehension, more especially at this juncture. *Who the genius was who suggested it or whose bright idea it was I don't know.* But anyhow here was this Tibet Day about ten days ago—nobody has noticed it—but a dozen or two dozen persons marched through the streets of Delhi to proclaim their love of Tibet and marched to the Chinese Embassy and demonstrated in front of it with loud cries. Well, it is rather childish, all this, and rather extraordinary that grown up persons should behave in this way and show up, because if a couple of dozen persons do this, it does not indicate, if I may say so, that they represent any powerful body of opinion. In fact it indicates their own smallness and folly. I mention this because it is perfectly ridiculous. I don't mind if anybody thinks so and wants to oppose us in our general policy and oppose us not in argument or debate but even in the public streets. Well, if he goes beyond a certain limit, any Government will have to take action. We don't take any action normally speaking. We have not, but what I want this House to consider is the extreme, well, I use the word 'folly', of such activities. Members of this House don't attach any importance to it, I know. But there is the rest of the world which exaggerates and which may be interested in exaggerating these incidents which come at a moment when we seek help in delicate matters in developing a spirit of friendly co-operation, and tries to create trouble. Take

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

China and Tibet. Our relations with the Chinese Government have been, right from the day of the new Government's coming into existence, friendly. They are very friendly today. That does not mean that the Chinese Government likes everything that we do or that we like everything that the Chinese Government does in their country. We carry on in our own way, trying to learn, if we can, from China, or Russia or America and if they want to learn anything from us they may, or they may not; it is up to them. But keeping our internal sovereignty secure, we co-operate with other countries in a friendly way. In Tibet there were a number of relatively minor problems which arose after the change-over. Right from the beginning, our attitude has been that all these problems should be settled in the normal, peaceful, diplomatic way, and one or two have been disposed of. In fact our representative in Lhasa is now our Consul-General. The Chinese Government have a Consul-General in Bombay. Mostly our interests in Tibet are cultural, trade, pilgrim traffic and the rest, and some things that flow from them. All these are petty matters. By petty, I mean that they can be easily resolved, and the Chinese Government and the Foreign Minister of China told us a year or more ago that on all these matters, as soon as both our countries had leisure to deal with them, we could sit with them and solve them easily, and till then matters may continue as they are. So that was the position. I have, in fact, only recently invited the Chinese Government for a discussion of these matters, either in Delhi or in Peking, whichever may be more convenient, we do not mind, because we have to dispose of these matters. As between the Chinese Government and us, there are no territorial questions which have arisen. The questions are, as I said, relating to trade, relating to certain cultural matters, relating to some Post and Telegraph arrange-

ments that we have, and other like matters. Obviously, we have no desire to have any kind of claim, we do not claim any position in Tibet which may not be in keeping with the full sovereignty of China. We only desire to maintain and continue, in co-operation with China, the trade, commerce etc. and other traffic that we have with Tibet. Sometimes petty incidents occur which are rather irritating and it is because of this reason that we have asked the Chinese Government for conversations to settle all these pending small problems so that the local officials may know exactly how things stand.

Now, I do not wish to take the time of the House dealing with many other matters which may be considered part of the international scene. One question that must be of interest to this House is the question of Kashmir and our relations with Pakistan. In so far as the question of Kashmir is concerned, after the succession of events and various developments there, the House might have read, recently a big convention was held in Srinagar of representatives—three to four thousand of them—from all over the State. Now, that is a rather remarkable gathering and it shows that the present regime in Kashmir, headed by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad has obviously got, first of all, the strong and almost unanimous support of the National Conference which is an organisation which has built up the State and the movement there and which stood behind the Government there all these days, in fact that was the sanction behind the Government. That, as I said, was sufficiently demonstrated, and as a consequence of that this Government has a very wide body of popular support there. Obviously, I do not wish to exaggerate the picture. But I might say, in a measure, after all these changes, the picture is clearing up now and a measure of normality has returned to Kashmir after the last five weeks of tense events and in any event, that is a desirable thing and we welcome it.

As for our relations with Pakistan, there has been some correspondence with the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He came here, as the House knows, and after that also we exchanged correspondence. And in spite of the fact that the Pakistan Press has functioned in an exceedingly irresponsible way in the last few weeks, we have not allowed that exhibitionism and tirade of that Press to come in the way of our trying to deal with this problem in a calm and dispassionate way.

I would beg of this House, and through this House, the others outside, that in dealing with this question of our relations with Pakistan we should never allow ourselves to be swept away or excited at something which may appear in some newspapers on the other side or on this side because, I do not claim all the virtue on this side; I think sometimes on our side—whether it is some newspaper or others—also err, more especially the communal organisations on this side have a perfectly simple habit of almost invariably doing the wrong thing. It is an extraordinary thing that they do not even accidentally do the right thing. All these Kashmir developments, this House knows, have been due to many causes, they were economic, political and others but the immediate crisis that arose can be traced definitely to the activities, those unfortunate activities, of the Praja Parishad there and the Jan Sangh elsewhere, which created powerful reactions all over the valley of Kashmir. I want that to be remembered because I find that those organisations are still thinking along wrong lines and if one thinks long enough probably one will act wrongly too; in fact, they issued all kinds of threats generally. Therefore, we must remember that in dealing with these large problems anywhere we cannot deal with them in the manner of these communal organisations. In regard to Pakistan we must remember certain unalterable facts and fact number one is

geography. Pakistan is our neighbour, apart from past associations with Pakistan, historical, cultural and all that, it is our neighbour country. We have a frontier which I believe is round about 2,000 miles and it is of the utmost importance to us what our relations with Pakistan are today, tomorrow and the day after. In this matter, we have to protect our own interests and whether it is Pakistan or whether it is China or whether it is any other country or whether it is a European country or whether it is such countries as have their pockets here, our first duty is to preserve our national sovereignty and integrity and we shall not tolerate any person daring to step Indian territory in a hostile manner. Having said that, our attitude should always be a friendly one, a co-operative one, an attitude of winning over the people on the other side, whether it is Pakistan or any other country. We have been trying to pursue that policy; we shall continue to do that and I have little doubt that whether it is sooner or later that policy *vis-à-vis* Pakistan will succeed and we will succeed in arriving at a solution of the various problems that we have.

MR CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Sir, I move.

"That in the motion, for the words 'and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration' the following be substituted, namely:—

'be taken into consideration and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be approved.'

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Sir, I move:

"That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"and having considered the same the Council approves of this policy".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahanty is absent.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, I move:

"That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House

(i) regrets that the policy of the Government of India directly and actively accepts the policy of spheres of influence on which the Constitution of the U.N. and the foreign policies of big powers are based;

(ii) urges the Government to project and pursue a policy of Third Force, as a step towards the preservation of peace, promotion and protection of freedom of all peoples, and the development of economy of the under-developed areas, by concluding joint economic and military security pacts with Asian and other like-minded nations;

(iii) urges the Government to pursue a National policy in regard to Kashmir and to create conditions for the full integration of the mind and area of Kashmir with India."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The three amendments and the Motion are before the House.

I should like you to content yourselves with making really constructive and relevant suggestions and asking for elucidation of any points; but do not go into other things because we have no time. The maximum limit is fifteen minutes.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): May I suggest, Sir, that those who have proposed amendments may be allowed to speak first so that we may know their points of view more fully than is indicated by the short amendments of which they have given notice?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we welcome the noble sentiments and ideals which our Prime Minister has just now placed before the House and that our foreign policy is to be such that our independence and integrity should be safeguarded against everybody who steps in with hostile intentions into our country. We support in this connection the forthright and candid way in which our Government has taken these steps with regard to Chinese representation in the U.N.O. and our relations with China. We also support the Government in its moves in Korea to bring about peace and agreement. But while welcoming all these steps we would like to point out to the Government of India and our Prime Minister certain things and would ask him to carefully consider how far those things are in consonance with the noble ideals, with the correct principles which he has laid down as our guide in regard to our foreign policy.

Sir, I take the question of the foreign pockets in our country. We are one with the Prime Minister when he says that we will not allow the foreign pockets to be utilised as war bases if war breaks out and ultimately these foreign pockets—the sooner the better—have to be merged with the mother country, India, and the foreign rule which has lasted there for centuries should be wiped out, as we have been able to do to a great extent in the other parts of our country. In this connection I may say that the French Imperialists have been making war in Viet Nam for so many years and they have been utilising the French pockets in India, Pondicherry and other places, as

their sea and air bases to send their reinforcements to Viet Nam. What steps does the Government propose to take to stop this? Similarly we see in the Press that in Marmagao—it is the Portuguese who occupy that territory—the American Imperialists are making arrangements to have their bases there. They have re-modelled the Port and they are creating more and more air bases there. What steps does the Government propose to take to stop these things on our own territory?

Similarly the question of Malaya comes in. There may be differences with regard to the methods the various parties there are adopting to achieve their own independence but why should we allow the same old British Imperialists who had been ruling us for so many years and against whom we fought and whom we have driven out from our country, to utilise our own country and our own bases to bomb and butcher the Malayan people who are fighting for their independence? Earlier we had been allowing them the facility of recruitment of Gurkha soldiers on our soil and now we are allowing them facilities to tranship these Gurkha soldiers across our country to bomb the Malayan people. Not only that. The British Government not only use the Gurkha soldiers in Malaya but they have recently sent a Gurkha battalion to Hong Kong itself. That means they are utilising the facilities which we have granted to them to garrison their imperialist outposts there. It is because of the transport facilities which we have given to the British Imperialists that they have been able to get the Gurkha soldiers and to get further reinforcements to carry on their racial and colonial policy even in Africa.

They are butchering people in Kenya. Our Prime Minister has rightly in many of the speeches condemned this butchery, condemned the

racial policy both in East Africa as well as in South Africa, but if we allow the British Imperialists facilities to recruit soldiers in our neighbour country, Nepal, and allow them transport facilities, is it not in one way abetting the British Imperialists in their crimes against humanity, against the independence of colonial people?

Similarly, Sir, we have got reports, and a question was also asked in the other House about the Nicobar Islands—a part of our own country—being utilised as an air base by the British. Even today there is an RAF platoon there. They are developing that base and quite often the RAF platoon flies to and fro from Nicobar Islands to Singapore. Sir, are all these consistent with our declared policy that we will not allow our country to be used as a base to carry on this kind of aggressive action?

I would like also to know in this connection why it is that our Government hesitates to take definite and strong steps whenever the interests of the British Imperialists are concerned. I will just mention a few instances. Sir, in Iran when the Iranian Government nationalised the oil industry, the Iranian Government offered to sell their crude oil to us but we refused to take advantage of the offer. Now that Iranian Government has been overthrown by the British and American Imperialists together because they wanted to protect their own interests. Similarly in Egypt, the British are sticking to the Suez Canal and the Egyptian people and the Egyptian Government want them to vacate unconditionally. But we have not come out so far categorically that the British Imperialists must quit the Suez Canal. In fact, the Press reports giving some of the speeches of our own Prime Minister with regard to these things seem to us to compromise on this stand that the British must quit Egypt so that Egypt will enjoy full independence.

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

Sir, I would also like to know how it is consistent with our full sovereignty and integrity to continue to be in the British Commonwealth and accept Queen Elizabeth as Head of the Commonwealth. What is there common between us and the British Commonwealth—euphemistically British Commonwealth, but in reality the British Empire—who want to dominate over the colonies, who want to continue their exploitation by practising racialism and colonialism as in South Africa and Kenya? Why should we continue to be there? Not only this, even now, we are having, after six years of our independence, British officers and advisers in our defence services and all our arms come from Britain. We are entirely dependent upon the British for it. How can we tell by the continuation of these things that our independence is going to be guaranteed? Not only this, we flew the Union Jack, the symbol and flag of the British Imperialists, on the day of Queen Elizabeth's Coronation. We had it flying on our own offices. Our Prime Minister defended this by saying that it was only a question of courtesy. Then I would like to ask: Has the British Government ever flown our national flag on our Independence Day on the British Government offices? If they do not extend that courtesy, why should we extend this courtesy to them which is symbolic of our dependence?

Sir, we agree with the Prime Minister when he says that it is the internal situation, the internal strength, the internal economic strength that ultimately decides our foreign policy and here we again bring it to the notice of the Government and ask how along with the British Imperialist economy, dominating our own Indian economy, we hope to achieve a full-fledged independent policy? We agree with the Prime Minister when he says that we cannot be a satellite of any country. Nobody wants it; from our side we never demanded that.

When we say we want to develop friendly relations with our great neighbour, the Soviet Union, we do not mean that we should be a satellite of that country. But, certainly, as the Prime Minister says, our foreign policy has to be independent in the interests of our own sovereignty, to safeguard our own independence and integrity and develop friendly trade and cultural relations with all our neighbours. We accept these things, but as our own Prime Minister argues, ultimately, our foreign policy will derive its own strength from our internal strength. If we agree with it, how does the Prime Minister hope to achieve this if he lets the British capitalists dominate our country? We are not aware whether he proposes to take any steps against the foreign capital so that the huge profit that they are taking away may be curbed and our economy itself may be independent. When he is prepared to take those steps, our country may have to be prepared to face the same kind of assassinations, machinations, the same manoeuvres, the same intrigues which the foreign and British Imperialists are practising in the Middle East and Iran. We assure the Prime Minister and the Government of India that whatever our differences may be, if the Government proposes to take early steps and wipe off the British stranglehold, the whole nation will be with the Prime Minister and the Government in whatever steps he takes in this matter.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to commend the Indian foreign policy for the approval of this House. I am perfectly convinced that this policy has the approval of a vast majority of the Members in both the Houses, and the vast majority of our people at large as well as the people abroad. It is with some sense of self-consciousness and reluctance that I rise to say anything with regard to our foreign policy in the presence of one who is the architect of that policy. This is

overcome somewhat by the confidence that our people have in that policy. I shall, therefore, confine myself to a few remarks of a general nature and say two or three things specifically about Korea where I had the privilege of representing the Government of India.

The first thing, Sir, that I would like to draw the attention of the House to about India's foreign policy is that it is nothing new nor has it been improvised by any one, including the Prime Minister, to meet the changing circumstances. Of course we have to seek solutions of the problems as they come, but, as the Prime Minister himself has often said, it is a projection and a continuation of the policy that India and particularly the Indian National Congress had pursued from 1921. I am sure that this House is fully aware that there are certain basic principles to which the Indian National Congress subscribed. I may detail some of them here; self-determination for all people, opposition to any kind of aggression anywhere, non-alignment with any power bloc, and opposition to racial discrimination. And, I think, you will agree with me, Sir, that when we look around today at India's foreign policy, we are simply implementing what the Indian National Congress has stood for throughout these years.

Another thing that I would like to observe is that we have heard a great deal about India's importance in the international world today, but I think we are likely to forget, or we tend to forget, the part that India played even as a subject nation, on account of its geographic situation. We did exercise a great deal of influence, not for our own purpose, but primarily I think for the British. We used our man-power and material resources for the benefit of our taskmaster of the day. The change today is that since 1947 we are masters in our own house. We formulate the policy and we try to implement it. And I think it will

be worth while noting, Sir, the distance that we have marched since 1947, or rather 1945, when my mind goes back to the U. N. Conference in San Francisco, Mrs. Pandit happened to be in America at that time. And I recall that we were not even able to get a house on rent for some time unless we made strenuous efforts and pulled wires, because Mrs. Pandit was then looked upon as a rebel from India, as all the Indian leaders then were. Neither she nor we could get near the U. N. Conference. But we did try to make some noise from outside. And today after eight years she is elected to the most exalted position as President of the United Nations.

Then again, another dramatic change that comes to my mind is the one to which the Prime Minister has already made a reference, namely, the presence of our soldiers in Korea. Till now they were being sent abroad unfortunately as mercenaries under the British, but today, they are called upon by the united nations of the world to go on a peace mission. And I think these are just one or two references that I make merely to draw the attention of the House to the distance that we have travelled since our independence. A good deal has been said both here and outside that we are doing something at the sacrifice of our homefront. It is quite possible that there are many things that we should do and to which perhaps the Prime Minister could pay more attention, if he were not occupied with the foreign affairs. But, I for one, who have keenly watched the developments at home from abroad, think that our record is very impressive and I need not catalogue all these things. Our friends and critics abroad, both in America and Europe—I say it from my personal knowledge—are very much impressed by the fact that in spite of the preoccupations and the problems that the Prime Minister has had to face at home, he has been able to pursue a policy which has earned the goodwill and the appreciation of the

[Dr. Anup Singh.] world at large. And even those very delegates who often find it very difficult to vote on the side on which India has voted, will tell you privately, without a moment's hesitation, that they are fully convinced about the intrinsic merit of India's approach, but for one reason or the other, they are not able to go along with India. And I think another measure of the success of India's foreign policy is the goodwill that we have earned in Asia. A reference has been made to the fact that the present Government is not as vociferous as it ought to be against the perpetuation of British imperialism. I think, Sir, that that criticism is not at all fair. The Indian Government has made it clear on more than one occasion, whenever there was any suitable opportunity, that India stands committed to the principle of self-determination for all people. And as the Prime Minister has explained on many occasions, it does not behove us as a responsible nation to go on a crusade and interfere with everybody's affairs. We can certainly extend our moral support, and I am sure the people in those areas are fully aware of the fact as to where our sympathies lie.

I would like to make, Sir, one or two references to Korea and I shall speak with the utmost sense of responsibility and shall refrain from saying anything that might appear as unwarranted criticism of any individual or any country. I am personally somewhat disturbed about the composition of the Political Conference. And I fully agree with the Prime Minister when he said that perhaps the neutrals could help. And I think that stands to reason. Those people have been fighting a bloody war for the last three years and they are not very likely to come in a frame of mind amenable or conducive to any kind of negotiation. Things have already been said and are being said which might jeopardise the chances of peace in Korea. I

also feel that the observation which Mr. Dulles has made, saying that if there was no agreement within three months, then America would walk out of the Peace Conference, is also not very helpful. I do not think that at this stage any stipulations or pre-conditions should be laid down because they are likely to hurt the cause of peace rather than help it.

As for President Syngman Rhee, a great deal has been said and a great deal has been written. I would like to say one or two things from my personal knowledge. Somehow or other, Dr. Syngman Rhee looks upon himself as a crusader against Communism. As a matter of fact, he has said publicly on several occasions that he would rather be an ordinary soldier against Communism in a crusade than be the President of the South Korean Republic. And he thinks, rightly or wrongly, that those countries which are pitted against Russia and China at the present time have his full sympathies and that they would back him up. Another basic claim made by him was that he declared, immediately after the establishment of the South Korean Republic, that his Government represented the whole of Korea. Now that claim was not valid. There was no constitutional or juristic argument in favour of it. His claim that he represented the whole of Korea had not been accepted by the U. N. and had not been accepted by any other country. But he keeps on repeating that claim. He still claims that the U. N. came there to help him extend the jurisdiction of his Government over the whole of Korea and that is what he still is hoping will be accomplished. As for India, I regret to say that he has piled up a number of grievances. The first was that India was the only country that did not extend recognition to his Government. And I personally think that India's approach was perfectly correct. Otherwise, the chances of unification in Korea would have been jeopardised.

Then, after the war broke out, India gave a friendly warning that the crossing of the 38th Parallel might bring the Chinese in. That again irritated Dr. Syngman Rhee. But I can say, Sir, from my experience that the people of Korea, without any exception, unless they happen to be in some political circles, are more than friendly to India. I found that in almost every home they had Mahatma Gandhi's picture and they had an immense respect for our Prime Minister.

Finally, Sir, I would like to say that India's attitude towards the participation of China in the United Nations is again something which has to be commended. In this connection I mentioned once before and I may make a passing reference to it that in 1791 when the thirteen American colonies became a free Republic in America, they sent one of their representatives, Francis Denner, to Russia who waited there for three years. Catherine would not meet him and he finally came back. It took Russia 26 years before she would recognise America. Catherine thought that the people who produced Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin were dangerous rebels. When America's own turn came, she refused to recognise Russia for ten or twelve years. I am afraid the same policy, the same blind attitude, is being pursued with respect to China. India's stand over China will be more than vindicated as I personally think that her stand has been vindicated in Korea.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I rise to support the foreign policy of our Government. I would like to take this House to that memorable day in recent history when the Asian Relations Conference was held in Delhi. I remember the presentation to our Prime Minister of their national costume by the representatives of Uzbekistan and our Prime Minister was robed in that resplendent costume.

I cannot forget that night. It was the night that we became Asia-conscious. Before that we looked to the West. We were West-conscious. We were America-conscious. On that day there was a consciousness that we were Asians. Since then we got our independence and we have consistently and continually over the last several years given proof of our Asian sentiment. We have assisted and advised our neighbours, in Ceylon, in Burma, in Indonesia, in Iran, in Afghanistan and wherever the need was felt. We are respected and liked for that. In the economic sphere, we had the Colombo Plan. We are poor but we shared our poverty or riches with our neighbours. More than that, there is a great League, the Arab League, which is very friendly to us. There was an idea of having a Pan-Islamic League. Pakistan, in its over-zealousness, broached the idea of a Pan-Islamic League but it was still-born. It was never born. This success was like a rose-bud, shall I say, in the button-hole of our Prime Minister. It was because of his policy of friendliness that the Pan-Islamic League was still-born, and we have very friendly relations with the Arab League. In Asia today there is great affection for us, great respect for us. We are, Sir, a trusted nation, perhaps the most trusted nation in Asia, if not outside Asia as well. So we are a great Asian State. More than that, we are a great neutral. We are not an isolationist State. We do not want to be isolationists. That was the luxury indulged in by America, separated from others by two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific, with a great sub-continent with enormous natural resources. Having neutralised South America by the Monroe Doctrine, she is now striding across continents, trying to dominate over Europe and trying even to dominate Asia. Sir, that cannot be. That brings us to the fact that today in the world we cannot remain an isolationist State. We have got some place, a definite place,

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]
 a positive place, in world affairs. We are a great neutral. Today in Asia what we find is that two great powers, the leaders of two great blocs, America and Russia, have come face to face and they want to contain each other, irrespective of what happens to Asia or to the world. America has always looked to the West, to the Pacific, to Philippines, to China. Today America has a foothold not only in Alaska, but in the Aleutian Islands, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, etc. That is the strategic frontier for America. There is Russia on the other side. This terrific thing has happened after the last great war. These two great powers have come face to face in Asia. Sir, can we remain neutral in these conditions? Can we remain passive and inactive? Sir, there is a great difference of opinion today between the United Kingdom and America on the issue of what should be done in Korea. England has to safeguard and protect itself first, next the Mediterranean and the Suez, next India and then the Far East. England to Korea is a far cry. China is a very far cry, so far as England is concerned, and so there is this difference of opinion which has now come to the surface, which has come to the international plane today and which cannot any longer be hidden. The difference is there and Russia is watching the situation. Mr. Sundarayya notwithstanding, Russia is very shrewd, it is very cunning. It is going slow in Europe but not in Asia. It is watching Asia very closely. The U.S.A. and the United Kingdom differ considerably in their outlook on China and this difference of theirs cannot any longer be suppressed, Russia looks to the East and America looks to the West. One always looked to the East and the other always looked to the West. There is trouble brewing. Are we to look on silently? Our great Prime Minister has given his views over the proposed conference on Korea. He has supported round table talks

and the shape of the table has become the table talk of nations. But table or no table, we are here and we cannot be ignored. I am not very sorry that we are not in the political conference. Who knows it may be our good fortune that we are not there? There was a military Pan Mun Jon. There is perhaps in the political conference a political Pan Mun Jon. In a sense, perhaps, from here we can use our influence which we perhaps could never have been able to use sitting in that political conference. And this brings us to another matter which we forget very often. India is great not because she has power, or wealth or money or men. It is great because we have a great legacy, the legacy of the moral law. Our policy has a purpose, a high purpose, a moral law that guides it. May I say with all humility that we have the greatest representative of this moral law in the person of our Prime Minister, if I can say that without flattering him. It is because he represents the great moral law, the great moral law of means and ends which was established in India by the Buddha, that he is respected in India, in Asia and abroad. And may I hope that this moral law of righteousness will rule over not only Asia but also other parts of the world. It is because we stand for this moral law that people everywhere have affection for us, and not because we are in a strategic position or we are big in this or that.

That brings me to the question of Kashmir and Pakistan. I am a displaced person myself and I cannot help thinking of Kashmir and Pakistan, though I try hard to forget Pakistan. The test of our morality, of our righteousness will be proved in Kashmir and in our relations with Pakistan. I cannot help saying this and we have got to be aware of or mindful about how we act towards Kashmir. Today Pakistan is in a very chastened mood. Formerly Pakistan waved its fist at us but today I think they give us their

hand right or left to shake and we have to shake it. We saw only a few days back when Mr. Mohammad Ali, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, came here and we were at the airport and we Members here were asked by our own Prime Minister to stand in a row. He then asked us to sit down on the ground and not move but when the plane came, like little children, forgetting ourselves we rushed at the Pakistan Prime Minister as if to embrace him. It was a great popular gesture which must have overwhelmed him as perhaps our own Prime Minister must have felt the same overwhelming affection when he went to Pakistan. That is the atmosphere among the people of India and Pakistan. I met there another man—a Sindhi—who did not even know me and who works in the High Commissioner's office, and he said: 'Prof. Malkani, how are you?' He gave me such a hearty hug that I felt like giving him a kiss in return. He talked to me in Sindhi and he was a Muslim Sindhi and it was so very refreshing. That was that. Today we are having direct negotiations with Pakistan for which we yearned, for which we prayed and we cannot have better negotiators than our Prime Minister here and the Prime Minister there. I do feel that we have a greater chance for coming together now and that chance should not be lost. It must not be lost by any indiscreet gesture or word in India. Sir, time passes and I must proceed.....

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I am a displaced person and I want some more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are well placed here.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Nowadays, we are talking of plebiscite in Kashmir and it does pain me or hurts me when people are talking loosely about it. Some say "we don't think this plebiscite is coming. We don't think

it is necessary, etc." What hurts me most is people saying: 'The Prime Minister does not really mean it though he has often said about it'. It makes me open my eyes wide and stare, because I do claim that our Prime Minister is a man of righteousness and says what he means. He will not tell one thing in his Cabinet or in his parlour and do another in public. I don't want to think for a moment like that about our great Prime Minister. What he says he means and he means a real and free plebiscite. Sir, what is happening today in Kashmir? On the one hand we have been spending lakhs of rupees and shedding blood. On the other hand we find that the Kashmiris themselves must be feeling enormously unhappy and they are despondent. In despondency they may say "To hell with India or Pakistan. We want to be free of both." There must be a spirit of despondency there and here we cannot sit quietly. In Pakistan they swear by the plebiscite, they swear by Kashmir, they feel humiliated over the fate of Kashmir and they say Kashmir cannot be forgotten. So I say that unless this Kashmir problem is solved, others cannot be solved. Therefore I say an atmosphere must be created for a free plebiscite and everybody must be told that we mean that plebiscite and that plebiscite will take place soon.

10 A.M.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, the hon. Prime Minister during his introductory speech has tried to make out that the policy that the Government is following has the universal approval of all the people in the country. I do not know whether the Prime Minister has a secret device to find out each and every individual's or group's opinion in this country. Whatever the position may be, I should like to repeat again what I stated in my very first speech in this Council last year. I said the foreign policy of this country is not only not bi-partisan, it is not only not the policy

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

of the Party which is in power, I feel that it is a policy which is but an extension of the personal attitude of a single individual. I regret to say this very much but I feel that whatever decisions have been taken, whatever policy has been adumbrated and whatever has been implemented on the strength of that policy has been decided, has been implemented at the sole discretion and on the sole responsibility of the Prime Minister and none else.

Sir, in every country we have, so far as foreign policy is concerned, a policy which presents the attitude of the whole nation, because we cannot afford to have a partisan foreign policy, because whatever opposition there may be in regard to the internal policies of the country, one cannot afford to be divided so far as foreign relations of a country are concerned. I regret very much that in this country we unfortunately do not have such a policy and therefore the Opposition sometimes is placed in a very embarrassing position of taking up an attitude which normally it ought not to. But the choice is not ours. The choice has been forced on us by the Prime Minister himself.

Sir, not only in that House but also here until I got up, the hon. Prime Minister has received almost universal encomium for his policy. I regret that I cannot join in this chorus.

HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Shame or otherwise, I have the courage to stand here and say that I don't, I shall not join this chorus, which I think he does not deserve.

We have been told that so far as the basic principles of the foreign policy are concerned, everyone is agreed. Now, may I ask what are the basic principles? Opposition to war, anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-

exploitation of any kind whatever—these things are the basic principles which every country swears by. How can anybody have anything against the basic principles of any country whether it be Britain or America or even Russia. They say they stand by these basic principles. Therefore, whatever approval or condemnation we may have of any country's foreign policy it can only be over the implementation of that policy in the country. On this test, I regret to say that the policy of this country miserably and signally fails. Because whatever we have done in this regard except in a very few honourable and excellent exceptions, which I have already listed on previous occasions, whatever action we have taken in the implementation of these so-called basic principles we have not tried to solve the basic problems that face the world and our own country.

Sir, I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister at least today has agreed that it is necessary perhaps to change the constitution of the United Nations. I have drawn attention to the fact that the United Nations today is not the reflected will of the nations of the world. It is the reflected will of only five nations, whether all nations have Membership or not in the Security Council; because of certain constitutional provisions, it is only those five so-called Big Powers that control the policies of the world and try to control the conflict that arises. We see that these five countries have been put on the permanent seats of the Security Council because the countries which were responsible for the creation of the United Nations accepted the policy of the spheres of influence. They cut up the world whether, it was at Tehran or Potsdam or Yalta, they cut up the world into spheres of influence, and this policy of spheres of influence, I regret, our country has been accepting. I should very much like the hon. Prime Minister to give us a categorical assurance that so far as this country

is concerned, it does not subscribe to that infamous policy of spheres of influence on which the constitution of the United Nations and also the foreign policies of the Big Powers are based.

I was very much distressed to find only recently in "The Manchester Guardian" a suggestion that India should replace China for the permanent seat in the Security Council. I would be even more distressed indeed if India in the hope of becoming bigger than what she is, accepted any suggestion of that type. I say this because as soon as we accept a seat of that type, it means we accept that some nations are bigger, greater and more powerful and have the right to dominate the world. I should be ashamed indeed if my country were to join that select group of four or five nations. Therefore, even here, I should like the hon. the Prime Minister to give us the assurance that we will not accept a seat there.

I have, again and again stated that so far as the foreign policy of this country is concerned, it may be with the best of motives, it may be from a mistaken notion that we are going to get something done immediately or later on, we have always tried to follow some sort of a ding-dong policy, without any particular positive attitude, on any issue whatever—without a fundamental policy. Sir, I should like to go further and say that I am very much distressed to see that we are slowly being reduced to the position of a satellite of a satellite.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Hon. Members may cry "Oh, oh", but it is going to come true in a very few years, if we follow such a policy. It is already coming to pass.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Yes, never, I hope it will never be and I am here to see that it never will be. But I am only saying that we are proceeding in that direction. Today, whatever policy we follow in Asia, somehow it dovetails with the British foreign policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I should not like to put it crudely and say that we take orders from the British Foreign Office, or the Colonial Office. I would not say that. But as you know, there are ways and means of influencing the foreign policy of other countries, and the British are arch diplomats. They are so subtle that they know how to get the things they want, even without your knowing it. That is the position whether it is the Korean question or any other question. So far as Korea is concerned, we have directly contributed towards the British foreign policy.

I should like to ask how many times, on how many occasions the Prime Minister has taken up the same great attitude towards the colonies, in the case of Malaya, in the case of Iran, in the case of Egypt? Surely Britain is no less an imperialist power than France, if anything, she is an even greater imperialist power than France. It may be said that it has developed accidentally. But I find that on every subject, more especially in so far as Far Eastern affairs are concerned, we somehow seem to be toeing the British line, and I feel that if we go further in this direction, we will be reduced to a position from where we will not be able to get out.

Sir, is there any way of stopping the clock?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: That is the only way of stopping the hon. Member.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: So far as Britain is concerned, her sphere of influence extends right from Cairo up

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

to Jakarta and beyond, and she is seeing to it that no arrangement for any unity of purpose among these nations is achieved in this belt or sphere of her influence. And Sir, we are doing nothing about it, to try to cement this great belt so that it may be a bulwark against British imperialism and British intrigues in this area. Can the Prime Minister deny that the British have been intriguing and have been exploiting this vast belt? We ourselves were included in this belt until a few years ago. What is the stand that the hon. the Prime Minister has taken in this regard?

When we propose a belt to be constituted by joint military and economic pacts, the Prime Minister brightly asks the question, "Which are the nations?" Sir, there are nations and nations, and there are governments and governments. And we must also make a difference between the governments and the people. I can say this, that although in the Middle East, many of the governments are but tools of British imperialism, there are the people there, whom I can vouch for as being extremely friendly and who look to us, to India, for leadership, for a lead, so that they may come together. They want to come together because they want to fight this evil.

What are the steps that have been adopted by the Government in this regard? Does not the hon. the Prime Minister agree with me when I say that you can only guarantee against the exploitation of this area by standing together? However great we may be, however big we may be, however strategic we may be, we cannot stand alone; we cannot fight this alone. But together, however small the nations may be that go to make this belt, they can stand as a bulwark for peace, prosperity and progress.

Lastly, I come down to Kashmir.

AN HON. MEMBER: You go up to Kashmir.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Well, I may go up or down. One never knows so far as Kashmir is concerned. I have already said that so far as the Prime Minister's policy in the field of foreign affairs is concerned, it is a personal policy and it is not even the policy of the Party that rules the country today.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): It is the policy of the Party.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I think so far as Kashmir is concerned, it is a significant example of this policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which policy?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Never during the last six years has any consultation taken place, any advice asked for or given, nor any conference convened over the complicated problem of Kashmir. For everything that has happened I hold the Prime Minister solely and completely responsible. He cannot escape that responsibility because he was the maker of that policy. He was the one who decided every issue and today he cannot blame even the Jan Sangh. I partly blame the Jan Sangh for the mess that has happened in Kashmir; but he cannot blame it, because every decision that he has taken during the last six years has been his own and the responsibility must squarely and weightily—however weighty it may be—fall on his shoulders.

Sir, what has happened has happened. But hereafter at least, we must see that our policy so far as Kashmir is concerned, must be a policy which has the universal approval and the universal support of all the people in this country. It is unfair to ask the Opposition to answer the question that he posed during the session last July. I recall Sir, and the House will recall the commendable speech that my leader Acharya Narendra Deva made in this regard in July last year, which the Prime Minister used. With commendable restraint he conducted himself because we were in an embarrassing situation, in not being able to say

the truth or accuse the Government of certain lapses, because we felt that in that situation, we had to stand together. But this, I feel, is a kind of blackmail which cannot be continued and we cannot tolerate it. Unless you give us responsibility, unless you share your confidence with us, it will not be possible for us, for the Opposition, and it is not right that you should expect it either, to support the Government on each and every occasion. So far as Kashmir is concerned, for the last six years every development that has taken place, has taken place in spite of him

Sir, the gentlemen to my right, the Communist Party, we know in 1952, propagated the idea of Independent Kashmir.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: No, no, we did not.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Yes, we know Mr. Jacob Malik in the Security Council in 1952 put forward this idea and that is a fact, though my hon. friends may now turn round and say no. I can lay Mr. Malik's speech on the Table of the House and I challenge my hon. friend to disprove what I say.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, I am prepared to take up the challenge.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: The Communists wanted an independent Kashmir; but when America also came in to.....

(Time bell rings.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri P. M. Khan.

SHRI P. M. KHAN (Jammu and Kashmir):

شری پی - ایم - خان (جموں اور کشمیر): جناب چیئرمین صاحب! میں گورنمنٹ کی "فاران پالیسی" (foreign policy) کی تائید کرتے ہوئے کشمیر کے متعلق کچھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں - جس

وقت کشمیر میں چینج آف گورنمنٹ (change of government) ہوا تھا میرے وہیں پر تھا اور دو چار دن وہاں کچھ ٹریپ ہوئی تھی جس کی وجہ یہ تھی کہ انٹر سرکل (inner circle) کے باہر لوگوں کو یہ پتہ نہیں تھا کہ شیخ صاحب نے کیا نیا راستہ تبدیل کیا ہے - اور پھر جب لوگوں کو پتہ لگ گیا کہ شیخ صاحب نے اپنا مقررہ راستہ تبدیل کر دیا ہے تو انہیں تسلی ہو گئی اور وہ نئی گورنمنٹ کے ساتھ ہو گئے - اور پھر ایک ہفتہ کے بعد وہاں کوئی گورنمنٹ کے آثار نہیں تھے - اس کے بعد ایک کنونشن (convention) بلایا گیا - جس میں یہ چیز ٹھیک طرح سے ظاہر ہو گئی کہ لوگ کس پارٹی کی طرف ہیں اور میجرٹری (majority) کس کے ساتھ ہیں - البتہ ہاؤس آف پیورٹیل میں کشمیر کی طرف سے جو ایک ممبر مولانا سعید ہیں انہوں نے کچھ تقریر کی تھی جس میں انہوں نے یہ مطالبہ کیا تھا کہ یہ جو چینج آف گورنمنٹ ہوئی اس کے متعلق جو واقعات کشمیر میں ہوئے ان کی تحقیقات کرائی جائے - ان کو یہ اچھی طرح سے معلوم ہے کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا تحقیقات نہیں کریگی وہ اپنے اس کہے کی پابندی سے کہ وہ کشمیر کے اندرونی معاملوں میں دخل نہ دیگی - جیسا کہ اس

[Shri P. M. Khan.]

نے پرچا پیشد کے مومینٹ (movement) کے سلسلہ میں جو آٹھ مہینے کشمیر میں جاری رہا باوجود پرچا پیشد کی طرف سے تحقیقات کرانے کی مانگ کے کوئی تحقیقات نہیں کرائی - اصل میں میرے دوست کا تحقیقات کرانے کا کوئی خاص مطالبہ تو نہیں تھا - صرف موجودہ گورنمنٹ کے متعلق کچھ شبہات پیدا کرنے کے اور کسی حد تک اسے بدنام کرنا تھا - گورنمنٹ اپنے برے پ بھلے کاموں سے نیک نام یا بدنام ہو سکتی ہے نہ کہ ان فضول کی باتوں سے - یہ ملک کی حبش قسمتی ہے کہ بخشی صاحب جیسا انسان موجود تھا جس نے آڑے وقت میں اپنے ملک کی نازک حالت کو سنبھال لیا - اور یہ ایک حیران کن بات ہے کہ ایک دوست ایسے بھی ہیں جو نہ تو پارٹی ڈسپلین (party discipline) کی پروا کرتے ہیں اور نہ اپنے ملک کی پروا کرتے ہیں اور نہ اپنی گورنمنٹ کی پروا کرتے ہیں بلکہ اس قسم کی باتیں ایوان میں کہتے ہیں جو انہیں نہیں کہنی چاہئے - اس کے علاوہ بقول انکے وہ سری نگر گئے اور چیمنج آف گورنمنٹ کی بابت بخشی صاحب سے ملے اور ان سے کچھ بات چیت کی - بخشی صاحب نے اجازت دی کہ تم شیخ صاحب سے ملو - بعد میں کچھ واقعات

بخشی صاحب نے نوٹس (notice) میں آئے ہونگے جس کی وجہ پر انہوں نے یہ اجازت کیلنسل (cancel) کر دی وہ اپنے ملک کے امن کے ذمہ دار تھے - حالانکہ اس میں ناراضگی پیدا کرنے والی کوئی بات نہ تھی - کیونکہ پارٹی کے اندر یہ بات ہوئی تھی اور بخشی صاحب نے اگر پرمٹ (permit) کیلنسل کر دیا تو بھی اسے پریس (press) میں اچھا فے کی ضرورت بالکل نہیں تھی - ان چیزوں سے معلوم ہوا ہے کہ ہمارے دوست اب نہ نو پارٹی کے ساتھ ہیں نہ گورنمنٹ کے ساتھ ہیں اور نہ ملک کے ساتھ ہیں اور عین ممکن ہے کہ اگلے سیشن (session) میں جب ہم یہاں آئیں تو انہیں اپوزیشن بینچیز (opposition benches) پر بیٹھا ہوا پائیں - میرے دوست نیشنل کانفرنس (National Conference) کی طرف سے یہاں ممبر ہو کر آئے ہیں اور اس کانفرنس (Conference) کی میچاؤٹی (majority) نے ہی وہاں ایک گورنمنٹ قائم کی ہے - بخشی صاحب نیشنل کانفرنس کے لیڈر اس گورنمنٹ کے ہیڈ (head) ہیں اور یہ حیثیت ایک نیشنل کانفرنس کے ممبر ہونے سے میرے دوست کو پارٹی ڈسپلین کا پابند ہونا چاہئے تھا - میں ایک بات اور بھی عرض کر دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب پرچا پیشد کا ایجنڈا تیشن (agitation)

ہو رہا تھا تو یہ صاحب ان سے کہا کرتے تھے کہ اب ایسی کوئی بات نہ کریں یا ایسی کوئی تقریر نہ کریں جس سے کہ مخالف کو فائدہ پہنچے۔ اب میرے مستخدم دوست خود یہ سوچیں کہ ان کا یہ تحقیقات کا مطالعہ یا اس قسم کے پریس میں بیان دینے سے کیا کشمیر گورنمنٹ کو فائدہ پہنچ رہا ہے۔ کیا کشمیر کی عوام جدا کو فائدہ پہنچ رہا ہے۔ کیا کشمیر نیشنل کانفرنس کو فائدہ پہنچ رہا ہے یا اس سے مخالفوں کو فائدہ پہنچ رہا ہے؟ انہوں نے انے جو الزام برج پریشد والوں کو دیا تھا اب خود اس پر ہی عمل کرنے لگے۔ یہ چیزیں شاید انکو گول (goal) کے نزدیک کریںگی۔

کشمیر میں بخشی غلام محمد کی سرکار نے نہوڑے سے عرصہ میں عوام کی ترقی کے لئے جو قدم اٹھائے ہیں وہ سب ہاؤس کے ممبران کو اچھی طرح سے معلوم ہیں۔ بخشی سرکار نے عوام کے لئے تعلیم مدت کر دی ہے۔ اناج کی قیمت میں خریدنے والوں کے لئے دو روپیہ فی من کی کمی کر دی ہے۔ اور کسانوں سے خریدنے میں ایک روپیہ من زیادہ کر دیا ہے تاکہ کسانوں کو فائدہ ہو۔ جبری اناج کی پروکورمنٹ (procurement)

بلد کی۔ اسی طرح کسٹم (custom) میں بھی بہت کمی کر دی گئی ہے اور وہاں کے ملازمین کی تنخواہوں کا بھی اسکیل (scale) ریویژ (revise) کیا جا رہا ہے۔ اسی طرح جو عوام کی ترقی اور بہبودی اور آگے لیجانے والی باتیں ہیں وہ سب بخشی سرکار کر رہی ہے۔ تو میں یہ چلند باتیں کہنا چاہتا تھا اور اپنے دوست سے میں پھر کہنا کہ اگر وہ پارٹی میں رہتے ہیں تو انہیں پارٹی کے تقاضوں کا پابند رہنا چاہئے اور اگر وہ ایسی باتیں کرتے ہیں جو ملک کو فائدہ پہنچانے والی نہیں ہیں تو یہ ان کی خوشی ہے اور یہ ان کی ذاتی رائے ہوگی۔ اور وہ ہی ان کے ذمہ وار ہیں۔

[For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No. 123.]

DR. KALIDAS NAG (Nominated).
Mr. Chairman, this very soothing Hindustani speech, I hope, has brought some equilibrium into this hectic atmosphere. I find, Sir, that there is a tendency, though we are in this Upper House, just to fling aspersions and attacks even on the responsible officers of our National Government. A party is necessary in the running of every Government, but that does not warrant us to believe or to try to make us believe that our Prime Minister in his personal capacity, as it were, is framing and pursuing the policy of the whole nation. It is a very serious charge, Sir, I would say, and I would never accept that position; because, so far as I remember, under the Constitution that has been adopted, the Prime Minister or the Minister of Foreign Affairs certainly is not framing the policy of the whole nation simply in his individual capacity. I do not understand then the history of your Constituent Assembly; I do not under-

[Dr. Kalidas Nag.]

stand, Sir, how you decorate this great Chair. I know that you represent, Sir, a tradition of constitutional history, not only of the Occident but also of the great spiritual tradition of India. When the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister entered this room, he brought back to my mind the history of the Golden Age of Greece, the Mother of Democracy; and with a little modification in chronology I would request the House to believe as if our Indian Pericles is walking into the Academy of the Indian Plato.

I would, therefore, say this thing, Sir, that the Indian Constitution is being re-framed and the Indian Constitution is being re-interpreted not only from the point of view of our own national history but of the whole history of the dispossessed nations of the world who are looking up to our Indian Pericles, Jawaharlal Nehru. The statutes of this Indian Constitution, therefore, and every detail of its working must be studied with a spirit of equanimity, tolerance and balance of judgment worthy of our destiny.

I return, as you know, Sir, after a recent review of the post-war world. I have seen this world before the war several times; and after thirty years of my career as a "Globe-Trotter", I come back to my country and its Parliament. I tell you, Sir, that there are many people who criticise our Prime Minister. Surely I will not hide that fact before this House, and I may have a lot of things to criticise, later on, on behalf of the Democratic Party which I have the privilege to represent. But I find that there is some flaw in the approach to and discussion of our problems, that we come unprepared or over-prepared! By 'over-prepared' I mean that we come already prejudiced and we want only to propagate our doctrines and theories! You can do it after fifty years but not in this formative stage.

We have got to realize that there must be some serious flaw in the communication between this Upper House and the real sources of all information

about our Government, about our Constitution, about our foreign policy and other matters relating to the portfolio of the Prime Minister and to the Department of Foreign Affairs. This External Affairs Department, I would say—though I am supporting the policy of our Prime Minister—is defective on its technical and procedural side. We want to come prepared and want a liaison officer who would supply us with the main heads of discussion and if possible an advance copy of the speech which the Prime Minister would deliver extempore but not improvised. If we start discussing world problems so unprepared with only parliamentary levity and ready wits at our command, ignoring documents and records, we will degrade the dignity of the House. I feel, Sir, that data-papers should be circulated and information supplied by the External Affairs Department specially on such important topics as will come up, so that the Members will take full responsibility for the statements which they would be making. No such procedure is available here. I follow closely everything that the learned Prime Minister—not only as Prime Minister but as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—has been communicating to us for the last twenty years. He is fully known also through his publications and statements in the Press and in Parliament. He has contributed not only to the solution of many problems of India but of the whole of Asia, nay some serious problems of the contemporary world. Therefore he has got a grand status. We may differ from him but we have got to remember the symbolic role which he plays today. However, I must point out the defects, Sir, and I would suggest that this External Affairs Department may arrange—through some liaison officer—to furnish us with advance copies of speeches or—if the speech is delivered extempore—with an outline of the subjects of discussion. Let the Parliamentarians not take it for granted that this is a college debating society. We are all adult representatives of the people, forming this Parliament under the Indian Constitution. I want, there-

fore, Sir, that dependable documents and materials should be furnished in any form you like. I was thankful to the Secretary of this House for giving a brief summary of the Address on Foreign Affairs delivered previously in the other House. I found a lot of new things being discussed here and new points have been raised by our Prime Minister this morning in the Upper House. How are we to co-ordinate all these things? An unco-ordinated brain degenerates into an acrimonious one. That can lead to no effective solution. It can only entertain immature minds. I think, Sir, that a lot of time is being wasted here and you should not tolerate that.

I feel also, Sir, that we should remove some lurking inferiority complex from our mind that we are pondering over the problems of India alone. For the last thirty years I have been trying to widen and enlarge our historical vision through our movement of Greater India. When Pandit Nehru took charge of our Government the ideas of Indian freedom inspired the seventy-five million people of Indonesia to agitate for their freedom and thus to become independent. Having travelled from country to country during the last thirty years I can say that many of the dispossessed nations have benefited by this great independence movement of India, starting with the career of our Great Father of Independence, Mahatma Gandhi. Our people should be made to know the history of Indian freedom in its world context, for it has a great educative value. Very few know that twenty-one years of Mahatma Gandhi's life and work were spent outside India—in South Africa—and when he settled down in India it was after 21 years of persecution and humiliation at the hands of the Christian Africans and white African authorities. The foundation of the *Satyagraha* movement, started by him for the liberation of India, was thus laid by him and built up by him in far off Africa. Therefore Indian politics is not simply Indian from the standpoint of geopolitics. It is Greater Asian politics and world

politics at the same time. From Asia it is gradually embracing Africa and other backward zones of humanity. We need not ever worry about the subtle diplomatic moves from the West; for our ageless East is coming forward to take its due place in the world. Great deeds and thoughts have come and are coming from the East; and I am sure that our Oriental leaders, in spite of their many handicaps and defects in the manipulation of men and things, will affirm that peace—not war—is the fundamental question of mankind today. The 2500th anniversary of the Buddha is coming to be celebrated soon. Japan is inviting us; Burma, Cambodia, Siam, Ceylon and other countries are inviting us. May our foreign policy be inspired accordingly. On this solemn occasion I beg to remind this House of the deathless message of Lord Buddha:

"Na hi verena verani sammantidha kadachana

A-verena hi sammanti esha Dhammo Sanantano".

Not by hatred can you conquer hatred. It is certainly by *ahimsa* and love that you may conquer enmity

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has explained to us the manner in which he looks at world problems in an admirable way. The broad way in which he looks at the world and his approach to international questions are, I think, highly commendable. I wish that it had borne greater fruit.

To refer only to one current problem, namely, that of the Far East, it must be a great regret to him that the future of the Far East is being considered in a spirit that does not promise a complete or early solution of those difficulties on which peace in that part of the world and perhaps in the rest of the world depends. America, I am sorry to say, has in connection with the Korean problem taken many steps that we cannot approve of. The United Nations mainly with the support of the United

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

States have preserved the independence of South Korea. It has done a great work. But for the help that it gave to South Korea our efforts at mediation would have proved completely fruitless. In fact there would have been left nothing to mediate about. No nation can ask us for ever to remember some great thing that it has done. The world is changing and every nation must therefore be prepared to take one big step after another in order to settle important world questions. America has unfortunately persuaded itself that those who differ from it in any important respect are against it. This is highly regrettable and it is not easy to come to an understanding with a country that is labouring under so tragic a mistake. But we have laboured continuously and hard in order to arrive at a friendly understanding with other countries and we have succeeded in a large measure. I hope therefore that the question of Indo-American understanding will not be dealt with in a spirit of pride or annoyance but in that large way in which our Prime Minister has looked at other questions. I refer particularly, Sir, to this question because Indian policy has somehow or other come to be looked upon in many parts of the world as a tussle between India and America. I am certain, Sir, that such an appreciation of the Indian policy is completely wrong but it should be taken note of and we should show by the manner in which we deal with this question that we propose to persevere in our attempts to bring about a complete understanding so that all international questions might be dealt with in a proper atmosphere.

Sir, the next question that I should like to refer to is a very important one for those who are concerned not merely with the whole world but also especially with Asia. The Prime Minister has always laid great stress on the future of the Asian countries. He wants that these countries should have a say in the settlement of world questions. He wants that colonialism

should disappear from our continent. He must therefore be aware of the painful fact that we cannot get full and free information about practically half of this great continent. There is a sizable part of Europe too about which we cannot know anything with certainty, but since the Prime Minister has laid great stress on the creation of an atmosphere in which Asia will be able to contribute to the peace of the world, I think this serious problem deserves his attention. One of the things that makes the world uneasy is the fact that over a substantial portion of the world there hangs a curtain beyond which nobody can see. I hope that he will use his good offices as far as he can to remove this barrier to international understanding. Sir, however much two people may differ from one another, if they know that there is nothing relating to one that is a secret from the other, they can come to an understanding; but where there is a continual feeling that there is something hidden, that it might be terrible and that a surprise might be sprung on those nations that call themselves peace-loving, it is very difficult to induce the world and particularly the bigger countries to change the mood in which they are dealing with world questions at present. The cause of suspicion should be removed and if this is done, I am sure it will materially strengthen those factors on which the peaceful solution of all questions and international progress depend.

Sir, I refer to these questions because if they are settled, I am sure that, apart from other things, one great result will flow from them. We know how terrible colour and race prejudices are. We know the ugly forms that they have taken in many countries, particularly in Africa. I have been interested in Africa even more than I am in Asia for many many years and when I see the exploitation to which the people there are subjected and the connivance of the world at the actions of those nations that are responsible for this exploitation, I wonder, Sir, whether the

conditions that can make for world peace are present. If today people in general recognise that race and colour prejudices are undesirable in themselves and that they betoken a comparatively low standard of civilization, nobody is prepared, no important nation that counts is prepared to raise its voice against this attitude, because every country wants the help of those very countries that are mainly responsible for spreading this prejudice. If the bigger nations were to come to an understanding among themselves, I am sure that world conscience would then manifest itself and all such questions as those relating to North Africa, East Africa and South Africa would be much nearer solution than they are now

Sir, I find that I have only about three minutes more. But during this short period I should like to put two questions. One is about Indo-China. The French people claimed more than three years ago that they had promised full freedom to Indo-China, but the fact that the people there were not siding with them showed that their claim was not substantiated by facts. Recently, however, they seemed to have promised independence to Laos, Cambodia and Viet Nam, and to have parted or promised to part in the immediate future with a substantial degree of power. I do not know to what extent this information that has been published in the papers is correct, but in view of the importance of Indo-China to South East Asia and even to India, I should like the Prime Minister to throw some light on this question. He may have some information about it that we do not have.

Now, a word, Sir, about Kashmir. I hope that the conditions on which a fair and free plebiscite there depends will soon be fulfilled. I wish, Sir, and ardently wish, that this question was peacefully settled as early as possible. It is creating bad blood between us and our near neighbour Pakistan and it gives an easy opportunity to critical nations to throw doubts on the honesty

of our policy. I do not know, Sir, what the chances are, but I do hope that in the near future such an understanding, such an agreement will be arrived at between India and Pakistan in regard to the basic conditions on which the plebiscite depends so as to enable us to take effective steps to arrange for a free expression of the will of the people of Kashmir with regard to their future. And here I should like to ask whether the Delhi Agreement, the Agreement that was arrived at between the Prime Minister and Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah will soon be given effect to.

(Time bell rings.)

The memorandum of the three Ministers of the Abdullah Cabinet which has seen the light of the day makes it clear that the Cabinet as a whole was in favour of it and wanted that it should be ratified and given effect to in practice.

I hope that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad's Cabinet will now take early steps to give effect to it partly for its own sake and partly in order to bring about contentment in Jammu and Ladakh.

The Prime Minister has frequently harped on the communal character of the Praja Parishad. I do not quarrel with him there. But, may I ask him again, why he ignores the other factors? Is there no other factor to be considered there? Should he not as a statesman take into account all the influences working on the minds of the people there? Also, I am sure, Sir, that if the Delhi Agreement were fulfilled, it will help us a great deal in stemming the communal agitation that is going on. It will help us far more than any denunciation even though indulged in by the Head of the Indian State.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To enable the Prime Minister to deal even very briefly with the points raised, the two other speakers will limit themselves to five minutes. Sardar Budh Singh.

SARDAR BUDH SINGH (Jammu & Kashmir):

سردار بدھ سنگھ (جموں اور کشمیر):

جناب چیئرمین صاحب! گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی فارن پالیسی (foreign policy) کے متعلق بہت کچھ کہا گیا ہے۔ میں صرف اتنا ہی کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایک عظیم الشان ملک میں جسکی کہ تیرہ سو یا چودہ سو میل کی سرحد ہو اور جو کہ بڑے بڑے ملکوں سے گھرا ہوا ہو اور صدیوں سے غلام رہا ہو جس میں کہ اتنی زیادہ زبانیں بولی جاتی ہوں کہ کوئی انتہا نہیں۔ جس میں اتنے سارے مذہب ہوں اتنے تفرقے ہوں اتنے اختلافات لکھوں اور اتنی مصیبتیں ہوں کہ سیلاب آئے قحط پڑے اور کووں لوگ بے گھر ہو کر آجائیں ان سب کو سنبھالنا اجڑی ہوئی دنیا کو پھر سے بسانا کوئی آسان کام نہیں تھا یہ ہمارے جواہر لال جی کا دل اور دماغ ہے یہ اسی کا کام تھا ملک کو آگے لے گیا ہے اور مہاتما گاندھی کے شبہوں پر چلتے ہوئے کہ فارن پالیسی نہ صرف سیاست کے لحاظ سے بلکہ بلند اخلاق کے لحاظ سے بنانی چاہئے۔ میں تو سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ ایک بڑی بھاری ذمہ داری ہے جو کہ انہوں نے اپنے اوپر لی ہے کہ تمام ملکوں سے دوستانہ تعلقات رکھیں گے اور بھائی چارہ سے رہیں گے۔ تو اس اصول کو

کہ سب امن شانتی سے رہیں جواہر لال جی نے اچھی طرح سے سمجھ لیا ہے اور کہا ہے کہ دہزندہ دھو اور دھلے دروہ، جنگ باز طاقتوں جو ایٹم شکتیوں کو ایجاد کر رہی ہیں کے درمیان امن - صلح - شانتی کے لئے بازو پھیلائے کھڑا ہے۔ ایشیا اور تمام دنیا جانتی ہے کہ اس اصول کو کس طرح سے عمل میں لایا جا رہا ہے۔ میں اس کے متعلق اور کچھ زیادہ نہ کہتے ہوئے کشمیر کے متعلق صرف دو باتیں کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔

ہمارے ایک درست ہیں جن کے ساتھ مجھے بہت عرصہ سے کام کرنا ملا ہے اور میں ان کا بہت احترام کرتا ہوں۔ وہ مولانا سعید صاحب نیشنل کانفرنس (National Conference) کے روح رواں رہے ہیں اور جنرل سیکرٹری وہ ایک شخصیت کی وفاداری یا دوستی کی دو میں اتنے بہہ گئے ہیں کہ دیسپلن (discipline) اور نظم کو کشمیر کے مفاد کو اور ہندوستان اور کشمیر کے تعلقات کو اور یہاں اور وہاں کے حالات کو بالکل نظر انداز کر دیا۔ میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ شیخ عبداللہ کے دوستوں مدح خوانوں میں سے میں بھی سب سے بڑے کو تھا لیکن جب وہ راستہ چھوڑ دیتا ہے اور ٹیم (team) کو چھوڑ دیتا ہے۔ مختلف راستے پر چلنے لگتا ہے تو پھر کوئی دوسرا چارہ ہی نہیں تھا۔ انہوں نے کہا کہ وہ ہندوستان اور

پاکستان سے الگ ہو کر ایک تیسری آزاد اسٹیٹ بنانا چاہتے ہیں۔ ہم نے پوچھا کہ شمال و مغرب کی پانچ پانچ سو میل لمبی فرنٹ (front) کو سمجھانے کے لئے کہاں سے پولیس، آٹے کی اور کہاں سے فوج آئیگی اور روپیہ ڈیٹا۔ اس کے علاوہ ہندوستان کے اندر جو چار کروڑ مسلمان رہتے ہیں اور جنکے ساتھ رہنے کے لئے ہمیشہ شیخ عبداللہ نے قواں و قرار کیا، یتیم دلایا اور بھارت کے لوگوں نے اس کی جے کے نعرے لگائے ہیں وہ کیا کہیں گے اور دنیا کیا کہیگی۔ ہم نے جو وعدہ کیا ہے اس کا کیا ہوگا اور ہم کہاں دھینگے ہمارا کیا بنے گا۔ کافی بدنام اور رسوا ہونگے ہمیں کیا برجا پریشہ اور جن ملگھ کے سپرد آپ کرنا چاہتے ہیں یا اور کیا کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اور چار کروڑ مسلمانوں کے لئے کیا ہونیوالا ہے۔ اسے بھی جان لیا ہے ان کے ساتھ سارے ہندوستان کے ساتھ کیوں وشواس گھات کرتے ہیں۔ تو انہوں نے ایک نہیں سنا اور کوئی معقول جواب نہیں دیا۔ وہ ایک طرف یہاں ۲۸ مارچ سنہ ۱۹۵۱ء کو تقریر برڈکاسٹ (broadcast) کرتے ہیں کہ ہمارا جسم ہندوستان کے ساتھ ہے اور دوسری طرف بعد میں وہ تقریر کرتے ہیں کہ اب معاملہ کچھ ڈانڈول ہو گیا ہے اور ایسا معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ کچھ اخبار ہمارے برخلاف ہو گئے ہیں اور کچھ ایجی تیشن (agitation) کرنے والے ہیں۔

انہوں نے کہا کہ ان لوگوں کی فرقہ دارانہ جماعتیں وعدے کو توڑنا چاہتی ہیں۔ لیکن ان سے نو وعدہ ہوا نہیں تھا۔ وعدہ تو ہوا تھا جواہرلال جی سے اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے اور کانگریس کی حکومت سے ہوا ہے۔ انہوں نے نو کوئی کسی طرح کا وعدہ توڑا نہیں۔ وہ تو اب بھی اپنے وعدے پر قائم ہیں۔ پھر شیخ صاحب نے کہا کہ ہم اس وقت سوچا نہیں تھا کہ جس وقت کہ الحاق کیا تھا۔ یہ بڑے افسوس کا مقام ہے کہ ۲۸ مارچ سنہ ۱۹۵۱ء کو دنیا برڈکاسٹ میں شیخ صاحب کی آواز سنتی ہے کہ یہ معاہدہ خوشی سے کیا گیا ہے اور یہ ایک اٹھنی معاہدہ ہے اور یقینی طور پر جواہرلال سے اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے معاہدہ کیا گیا ہے۔ انہوں نے اس کی اچھی طرح سے پابندی کی ہے۔ خود مولانا صاحب کہتے ہیں کہ یہ نہایت خطرناک ہے کہ کشمیر ہندوستان یا پاکستان میں نہ ملے اور آزاد رہے۔ لیکن باوجود اس کے وہ کہتے ہیں کہ شیخ صاحب ایک آلترنٹو (alternative) پیش کرتے ہیں کہ یہ ہو سکتا ہے کہ جب یہ ناممکن و خطرناک ہے تو آلترنٹو پیش نہیں ہو سکتا۔

[For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No. 124.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

SHRI A. S. KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will be very

[Shri A. S. Khan.]

brief I fully support the statement made by the Prime Minister on the foreign policy of the Government of India. I think, Sir, it is not only a correct policy for a country like ours but it is the natural policy for one which became independent only a few years ago. We started with a clean slate, and wrote that we shall be friendly to all and hostile to none.

AN HON MEMBER: We are not able to hear you.

SHRI A. S. KHAN: If we had looked upon nations as belonging to two lists of nations—friendly and unfriendly nations—I am sure it would have been a great mistake. That policy has created such an atmosphere in the world that now our voice is heard throughout the world. I am sure, Sir, that the election of the leader of our delegation, Mrs. Pandit, as the President of the United Nations General Assembly is a concrete proof of the success of our foreign policy. Particularly when very important questions are going to be discussed in the U.N.O., a country like India can provide a President for the U.N.O. is a fact of great significance. I will request you, Sir, on behalf of all of us, to convey our own congratulations to her and also our sense of pride at her being elected by so many free, sovereign nations as the head of the U.N.O. This fact, that an Indian has been elected, is a definite proof that our foreign policy has succeeded, that the people of the world have begun to treat India with respect. I do not want to take up the time of the House any more.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, may I have your permission to lay on the Table of the House the Proceedings of the Security Council Official Records of 17th January 1952 which contain the speech of Mr. Jacob Malik regarding the status and constitutional position of Kashmir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no doubt that Members of Parliament will be

proud and delighted to know that a Member of our Parliament and the leader of our delegation has been elected President of the U.N.O.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Sir, I have listened with great interest and care to the speeches made by my hon. friends here. Most of them—nearly all of them—in varying degrees were good enough to approve of the general policy that we have been pursuing. Some of them went to approve of it in detail, if I may say so. Only one hon. Member, Mr. Reddy, appeared to disapprove of it wholly. I sympathise with him, because he stands, I think, not only in this House but in the country outside, in complete isolation and loneliness. Excepting him, any party in this country as a whole approves of this policy. I say

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: How does the hon. Minister find that out? A secret device?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Secret devices are not necessary to find out obvious facts, and if I may suggest it to the hon. Member, he may seek to find an answer to this question by going to the leaders of his own party. I will accept their verdict, not his.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Does he mean to suggest that I have said something which the leaders of my party do not approve? (*Interruption*) When I accept them as leaders, it is obvious that I consult them and I certainly express their views, however much the Prime Minister may think otherwise.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member said that he disapproved of our policy completely. I want him to consult the leaders of his party, Acharya Kripalani, Acharya Narendra Deva and Mr. Jaiprakash Narain and I shall abide by their general opinion on this subject.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Very well. That is also accepted.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I say the hon. Member stands in splendid isolation in regard to his views and in regard to many other things that he said. I hardly think it necessary for me to deal with those various matters that he referred to, because they do not bear any relation to the questions that we have to consider. The hon. Member had, I believe, been touring recently in some of the countries of Western Asia, and he has come back with greater knowledge but also with greater frustration in store for him. As some of his statements show, he does not seem to like anybody he has come across anywhere.

Now, I should like to make one thing clear. Mr. Reddy said something about spheres of influence. He criticised the United Nations and he said something about India not agreeing to its spheres of influence. I do not at all understand how India can agree or disagree on this question. While it is perfectly true that two or three major countries exercise a great deal of influence over world affairs, I venture to say that that is not because the United Nations has done anything or its constitution is lacking, but that is because today those two or three countries have that power and authority which they can enforce even at the risk of the destruction of the world. It is no good not recognising facts as they are. Let us change those facts if we like. But any organisation or any power must take into consideration facts and the facts today are that a large number of countries in this world—they may have a vote in the United Nations, they may raise their hand this way or that way—but a large number of them put together have very little influence, or have very little independence in policy. That is a factual matter. Many countries are marked as independent countries in the world, but so far as their policies are concerned, they are not strong enough, whatever reasons there may be.

88 C.S.D.

Therefore, one of the basic facts of today is the dominant position of some very few nations. He may not like that. But our liking or disliking a thing does not make much difference. We try to improve our economic position and our political position generally. That is not because we have to do that *vis-a-vis* any other country, but because we want to better the lot of our people.

11 A.M.

Then, Sir, the hon. Member referred, though in guarded language, to that remarkable fantasy which sometimes comes out about the Third Force. I just cannot understand how some countries of Asia—maybe elsewhere too—are going to stand up against those huge rival blocs and tell them to behave or else dire consequences will follow. I can say that my poor intelligence has not been able to understand how a number of halting and lame persons getting together can make much difference. And I say it deliberately that when you talk anything, you talk in terms of either military power, financial power or some other power. If you get together a number of countries which are weak—first of all you do not get them together because they are all afraid of getting together; secondly, if you do get them together—that does not make any difference from that point of view. When you are using the phrase “Third Force”, you are using it in terms of some kind of pressure. Therefore I say that this phrase “Third Force” lacks meaning, lacks sense, lacks logic and the sooner it is given up the better it would be. As I said on the last occasion in this House, I can understand our trying to find as large an area as we can, where countries and peoples will stand for peace, will refuse to be dragged into war at the bidding of any other country or any other group. That I can understand. And that is the policy which we have been pursuing throughout, and that is the policy in which we have attained some measure of success. Therefore, let us not talk

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru] about this Third Force and things like that because that confuses the issue and that makes people feel that they can exercise some influence in the domain of world affairs, which they cannot. We can defend ourselves and we will do that whatever happens. It does not matter if the whole world goes against us, but we will defend ourselves. That is a different matter, that is defensive, and that is trying to protect ourselves. But we do that not by making the world go against us, but by having friendly relations with the world and by trying to enlarge our sphere of co-operation.

Now, there were some things said by our hon friend Dr Kalidas Nag, and to which I listened with very great interest. But I did not quite understand whether he was accusing me of inferiority complex or was telling us that we were carrying on this debate with levity. I do not know whether he was referring to any novel procedure in this House. You, Sir, are the best judge to say that. I have occasionally the privilege of coming here—speaking and listening—but not all the time. But the hon Member, Dr Nag was somewhat worked up, if I may say so, at the many things we have done because he was not supplied, as he was previously accustomed to in other occupations of his life, with newspapers, books and papers so that he can study them before he comes here. Well he wanted apparently a kind of resume or synopsis of what I was going to say here so that he might study it beforehand. I regret I could not oblige him and I regret also that I will not oblige him in future either. That is not the way that our Parliamentary functions if I can be permitted to say so. Undoubtedly, as he himself said, he is a glob-trotter and he must have come across countries which function differently. Here speeches are not given in synopsis or otherwise, nor on a question like foreign affairs is a book going to be written for Dr Kalidas Nag's edification, so that he might understand the debate

that is going to take place here. Of course, if this House or the other House or any Member thereof, requires any information on any subject, we shall give it either in answer to a question or enquiry whatever it is. As a matter of fact, in so far as foreign affairs are concerned, there is that part of it which is said to be published in newspapers and it is difficult to keep pace with it. This morning's papers contained some information about certain developments in the United Nations which may mean the opening of a new door—I do not know. Tomorrow some new things may come. Dr Nag seems to think that this is a static world with static newspapers and people with static minds. It is not so.

Then it was Mr Reddy, I think, who went on repeating that our policy was not a bi-partisan policy. No doubt he read about that in some American magazine, because it has not any particular meaning here. I am not aware of any other country using this expression, except the USA.

SHRI C G K REDDY In Britain also

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU He must have read about it in some magazine or some report from the USA, where there are these two great Parties, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, which, I am told, have more or less a common foreign policy with some variations and with some slightly different emphasis, so that they can co-operate together in that policy. Which two Parties exactly was Mr Reddy referring to? Probably he was referring to the Government as one Party and Mr Reddy himself as the other Party. He should be consulted—I do not know. What exactly 'bi-partisan' means in this case is difficult to understand, but as a matter of fact, as I have always said, we shall continue to seek the co-operation of all groups in this House or in the other House.

We will inform them of our policies and seek their advice but the major policies, the basic policies, have not changed much during the last two or three years. Naturally on world problems and developments we consult them every time and we adapt our action accordingly. We welcome their co-operation. That is why I have always said that we welcome these debates in this House or the other House. But the hon. Member should know that, while we consult them in regard to our policy, the responsibility for that policy must inevitably remain with the Government.

There was some reference to Kashmir. I think it was Mr Reddy who said that in regard to Kashmir, I was the sole person responsible for that policy. May I say that, as Prime Minister, I accept responsibility for every single act of the Government, including every bad act, every act of nepotism, every act of corruption. I am responsible; I accept that position. I am not prepared to evade responsibility for any act of this Government. It is true that I cannot deal with every matter, but so far as the question of responsibility goes, as Prime Minister, I am completely responsible for every good act and every bad act that this Government may have done. That is both in theory and in practice. I accept that. To say that I am completely responsible for the Kashmir policy that our Government has followed is one thing, and it is a completely different thing to say that this policy or the various steps that we took have come out of my head and had nothing to do with other heads. If there is one matter in which there has been the most frequent consultation between all concerned, it is this matter, and possibly, if I may say so, the person who had most to do with this policy was the late Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar who, not only because we respected his advice because of his experience, but because of his close association with Kashmir over several years in various capacities, was inevitably our guide in regard to that policy.

There were others also. There is our respected friend, Maulana Azad. It was not just half a dozen persons or so but the entire Cabinet has been kept in close touch and it is with their approval that practically every major step has been taken. As a matter of fact, in regard to Kashmir, the House will remember that there have been negotiations with Dr. Graham and Mr. Dixon from the United Nations who came out here, and in most of these negotiations we had been represented by Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar and some others.

There are one or two matters about which Pandit Kunzru asked me, something about Indo China and how far independence is granted to Laos and Cambodia, etc. I cannot answer that question wholly because though the statements made on behalf of the French Government appear to go far in that respect, so far as the Governments of Laos and Cambodia are concerned, they do not agree that these statements would mean full independence for them. We have no details about these matters. Thus far it is obvious that they have not been implemented, nor are they clearly known, but the French Government has made certain statements which read well so far as they go. It is for the future, to show and for these countries, Laos, Cambodia, etc., to say to what extent they accept or agree with them.

Mr. Sundarayya referred to various matters which he had mentioned on previous occasions also. So, I will not take much of the time of the House over them, except to say, so far as the Commonwealth connection is concerned, that the experience of the last few years has shown to those who have given any thought to his matter that this connection has been of advantage to us in many ways and that undoubtedly the step that we took in this connection was a good one. I am quite convinced of that. It brings us no burden but it brings us certain advantages. If people think, if Mr Reddy thinks, that our policy is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
governed in any degree or in any measure by pressure from abroad, from Britain or any other country, it is not correct.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I never suggested that. I said that the British were capable of moving in various ways.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is true. But the hon. Member used the phrase that we are likely to become a satellite of a satellite, presuming that the U.K. is a satellite and we are a satellite of the U.K. Well that phrase will sound nice but has no particular significance. As a matter of fact each country tries to influence the other. Obviously that is the usual thing. It may be that the influence is for the good or for the bad. It is obvious that in some measure we want to influence them but we cannot influence them by force of arms or by financial pressure. We try to influence them by argument and by appealing to their mind, so that this business of influencing each other's policy is continuous. That is the function of the Ambassadors or Foreign Officers all the time. What is objectionable is influence backed up by threats and by the coercive apparatus of the State. That is objectionable.

(Time bell rings.)

About the Andaman and Nicobar Islands the hon. Member said something. This matter was once raised in the House and this was definitely gone into. The Nicobar Islands is a place from where navigational aid is being given to aircraft and by treaty we have allowed the British to deal with that as such on condition that we may take it from them at any moment. Now I would like this House to remember that whether we like a country or not, whether we like a country's policy or not, we continually come in contact with them in a hundred ways. Take the aircraft business. We cannot move out of India our aircraft without the aid of other countries. They have to fly over their territories.

We want to navigate and we wish to take help from them. Our Dakotas or other aircraft let us say, fly to England, as our civil aircraft or sometimes military aircraft go for practice. We do it because all the intervening countries allow us to do so by treaty with them and the like. Now if we get these aids and conveniences from other countries, we have to give aids and conveniences to those countries too. It is a mutual affair. We give them. That does not mean that we have in any way subordinated our interests or allowed other countries to exploit our position. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House

(i) regrets that the policy of the Government of India directly and actively accepts the policy of spheres of influence on which the Constitution of the U.N. and the foreign policies of big powers are based;

(ii) urges the Government to project and pursue a policy of Third Force, as a step towards the preservation of peace, promotion and protection of freedom of all peoples, and the development of economy of the under-developed areas, by concluding joint economic and military security pacts with Asian and other like-minded nations;

(iii) urges the Government to pursue a National policy in regard to Kashmir and to create conditions for the full integration of the mind and area of Kashmir with India."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Malkani, your amendment is comprehended by Mr. Anup Singh's amendment.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN. The question is:

"That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same the Council approves of this policy' "

The motion was adopted.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Resolution, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN. Now we take the Appropriation Bill.

[MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

THE APPROPRIATION (No 4) BILL,
1953

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time fixed for the Appropriation Bill is till 1-15.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M C. SHAH): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill provides for the withdrawal from the Consolidated Fund of India moneys required to meet grants voted by the House of the People and expenditure charged on that Fund. The figures in the Bill follow the provisions shown in the statement showing the Supplementary Demand for Grants for expenditure of the Central Government excluding Railways for the year 1953-54 already circulated to the hon Members of this House. The total gross expenditure amount to Rs 10.36 crores of which Rs. 3.11 crores pertain to the revenue portion and the balance of Rs. 7.28

crores to capital. On the capital side except for a total demand of Rs. 1,000 in respect of collieries, the entire amount is granted for the import of sugar and will be more than covered by sale proceeds. On the revenue side, three major items are involved. The first relates to a payment of Rs 2.10 crores to the sugar factories largely for compensation on account of reduction in control prices of 1951-52 season sugar crop. This compensation is merely to cover a throw-forward from the previous years of expenditure approved by Parliament through a Supplementary Demand in December 1952. The second is of Rs 60 lakhs in respect of expenditure on the despatch of the Custodian Force to Korea for the prisoners of war refusing to repatriate. The incidence of this expenditure is under consideration and it is likely that this expenditure may be recovered from the other nations concerned. The third item of Rs 38.30 lakhs is for the integrated publicity programme of the Five Year Plan. Full explanation of this item and the other smaller items are given in the footnotes to the Supplementary Demand statement and I will not take the time of the House in repeating the same. Sir, I move

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Motion moved:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal). Mr Deputy Chairman, I have only a few remarks to make in connection with the second item *i.e.*, the item of Rs 60 lakhs with regard to the despatch of troops to Korea. Without going into the merits and demerits of the political aspect of the question, might I ask if the Government of India have satisfied themselves that the amount of Rs. 60 lakhs