

DEMAND NO. 17—NAGA HILLS—TUENSANG AREA

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,41,53,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area'."

DEMAND NO. 18—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,22,77,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 19—STATE OF PONDICHERRY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,95,80,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'."

DEMAND NO. 20—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,99,86,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of

payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 113—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 80,96,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to place before the House the Demands on behalf of the Ministry of External Affairs. At this stage, I shall endeavour only to make some preliminary remarks. Perhaps, at a later stage, I shall be in a better position to deal with remarks or criticisms of hon. Members.

15.42 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The External Affairs Ministry is a Ministry which not only deals in a sense with the world at large, in so far as India is concerned, and as such it is inevitably involved in many of the world problems, and it is involved during a period when the dynamic of change and history is working at an unusually fast pace. The burden on the External Affairs Ministry, not merely of carrying on the routine administration of a great department of this Government but of facing novel problems, is very considerable. I should like that fact to be kept in mind by hon. Members not in excuse of any error, but because, to understand the problems that face us, some kind of a wide and large-scale view

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

has to be taken. Naturally, there may be much in the working of the Ministry which may be criticised; errors may have been committed, but the big picture has to be seen to understand it in its full context.

The Ministry's work has grown considerably and it goes on growing. It grows because of various reasons. One, of course, is that more and more countries become independent—it is a happy development—and we have to face the problems of our representation there and their representation here, more particularly, from the countries of Africa newly independent, but it grows more especially because the problems facing the world become more intricate and more difficult.

The biggest problem of all that we have in the world today is that of disarmament, and it affects us chiefly because it affects the world, not because it directly affects us so much. And also, merely because of our size and various reasons which make our country rather important, relatively speaking, we have to play a part in many matters which otherwise perhaps we might not have played.

I should like, therefore, first of all, this House to consider and keep in mind this larger scheme of things in the world in which the External Affairs Ministry is functioning, and judge of our broad policy accordingly, whether it is correct or not, whether it has succeeded or has not measured up to what we hoped for it.

Speaking for myself—I may be partial, perhaps, to something with which I have been connected for so long.—I think that in spite of the great difficulties which the world has faced, and which we have faced, the broad policy followed by us in external affairs has justified itself to a tremendous degree. In fact, even those, many of those, who criticised it have begun to appreciate its rightness and its justification. By a mere

test of numbers, at the time when we talked about our being a non-aligned nation and not lining up with military blocs and powers, when we began saying so, there was hardly any other country which said so, or which acted on those lines; today, I could not exactly give the number, but I think it goes into the twenties or perhaps more, and what is more so is that the great countries which themselves are aligned or are parts of military blocks themselves appreciate,—and say so,—the value of a country like India being unaligned.

Here is a simple case, topical case in point. There is Laos, which is one of the problems of today, and where difficulties have arisen in the past few years because of pressures exercised on the Government of Laos to throw its weight on the side of one military bloc or alliance and not to remain totally unaligned, or neutral, if you like. Today, every party recognises including the very people who are leaders of those big blocs that the only future for Laos is as a neutral country, and it is because of that recognition that it may be said that there is some hope of the question of Laos being settled in a peaceful way; I only say, hope; nobody can be certain yet, because there are so many hurdles in the way. So, generally speaking, not only has this broad policy which India has followed met with recognition and appreciation, but there is a feeling even among those who follow different policies that this serves the world in many ways, and it is peculiarly fitted for India. That is the broad approach to this problem.

Then, if we look at the actual state of the world, we have to realise two or three things. First of all, that in external affairs, we have to deal with not only a changing concept, but with, if I may say so, history being written or acted, which will be written later. It is a dynamic process

that is going on all over the world. Of course, even in our internal affairs, that phrase may be used, but more so in our external world. That is happening and it is happening at a stage when it is difficult, more difficult than perhaps previously, to forecast the future. New forces are at play, and a new dynamic is in action. Who could have said even twelve months ago or two years ago of the changes in Africa, tremendously rapid changes in Africa? Who can say what the new developments in nuclear weapons may bring, war or peace, or what the result may be? All these are factors which bring in not only a measure of uncertainty, great uncertainty, but at the same time consequences which may be extreme in their character. So even though we may look ahead and try to forecast the future, as one always tries to do, the actual facts which help one to forecast it are very limited and the uncertain factors are far more.

Of course, in the ultimate analysis so far as any country's future is concerned, it depends principally on itself, on its own strength and ability, and partly on the rest of the world. Both factors play their role. Therefore, whether they are external affairs or internal matters, the first thing we have to think of is to build up our own nation, build up its economy, build up the general condition of its people, so that it may meet any problem with confidence. That, of course, is always the basic position. But even in building that up, much depends on what one does, apart from the economic aspect which will now come before the House again and again—our Five Year Plans and the rest—how one does it and what kind of relations it develops with the rest of the world. Does it develop friendly relations, broadly speaking, or at any rate, does it succeed in avoiding hostilities and enmities with other countries—which is important, because they come in the way? We may well say that at the present moment, in many ways we are peculiarly for-

tunate in having the goodwill and the friendship of many of the countries of the world, certainly of the two super Powers, as they are called, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. I think I can say with confidence that our relations are not merely correct, as they are, but friendly, which is perhaps surprising to many people, because these two great countries themselves have not been in the past at all friendly to each other; in fact, they are the heads of great coalitions and great power blocs.

And so it is no mean achievement to carry on our policy, our independent policy, and at the same time have the goodwill and understanding of these two great countries, not agreeing with them always in what they do. But both our integrity of purpose and the means that we employ in carrying it out have impressed these countries, and therefore, what we say—they may accept it or not—carries weight with them. They consider it fully.

That applies to other countries too. In fact, the only two countries to which that does not fully apply are the great People's Republic of China and Pakistan. So far as Pakistan is concerned, again our troubles are not new ones. I believe that as between the people of India and the people of Pakistan, there is very little ill-will left. But it is true that on the governmental level, there are problems which have not been solved and they create friction from time to time.

So far as China is concerned, the House knows well how recent developments have created a gulf, a wide gulf, between our relations. We have felt strongly about it and the House has also felt strongly about it. Nevertheless, we have tried to avoid, in so far as we can, taking any steps which may create unbridgeable chasms between these two countries. We have to look as I said in this dynamic of history not only to the to the present but to the future; and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

the future of the two countries who are neighbours to each other like India and China, two countries with vast populations, is of the highest importance to both these countries and to the world.

So we have tried to steer a middle course between our strong resentment and the steps we actually take in this connection, and not allow ourselves merely in anger to do something which may create further problems and difficulties. Broadly speaking, our attitude has been to strengthen ourselves to prepare for any contingency and not in the slightest to give in in any matter which we consider important.

Some hon. Members have sometimes criticised us, because they feel strongly about these matters, and asked why we have not taken stronger action. The answer to them would be, first of all, that one takes strong action when other actions are all precluded, and when one is prepared for the strong action. It would not be wise to talk about strong action where one cannot take it with any effect. But the further answer to them would be that when the consequences are so vast and far-reaching, one does not jump into that type of action unless there is absolutely no other way left.

What other actions that we have taken in regard to this matter—for instance, the reference of this to officials who produced an official report which was distributed here—were first of all in the nature of strengthening our position before everybody, before the world, certainly before the Chinese Government and people also, and preventing anything from happening which might weaken our position, holding on, because the mere holding on is a matter of strength—it is not a question of weakness—and it creates results. To think that you can only create results or achieve something by pure warfare is not correct. Warfare, of course, does produce results, good or bad, but the

mere holding on of a position strongly without giving in, a right position, produces a certain continuing result; and I do not rule it out, although it may seem difficult today, that the strength and correctness of our position may dawn on the Chinese Government's mind. I certainly do not rule it out. If so, I am going to try my best and see that it is appreciated by them and they realise that they have done a wrong thing from which they should withdraw.

The report that our officials have produced which many Members may have read—and many have complimented them—is itself a sign of patient, hard work on behalf of some of our officials, more especially the historical section of the External Affairs Ministry.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): It could have been done long ago.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry our people are not quite so capable of doing these things as the hon. Member who made this interjection. Some other people who are very eminent in history and other things have complimented them, in doing it as they have done it and when they have done it. It is a matter in which I do not wish to enter into an argument.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): He also appreciates it in his heart of hearts.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It required a tremendous deal of research. Of course, it might have been done long ago. As I said on another occasion, even what we have produced now is the result of years of research, before this Chinese trouble came. Therefore, it was not suddenly done; it was being done throughout these years, not at this pace of course; the pace became faster afterwards. But all this time our historical section since it was founded has, in fact, been preparing these innumerable notes that have been exchanged for

the last ten years, plenty of notes on this very issue as to what might come. But then it had to function with greater speed when this occurred.

16 hrs.

What I am veturing to place before the House in a few words is, I want the House to consider this question in this broad scope in this world which is ever near to war and tries to avoid it. It is in this scope I should like them to consider the other refugees. It is not normally a problem which is in a somewhat different level and yet which has dogged our foot-steps all these years; or our sending forces to the Congo; or our getting entangled perhaps in the Laos situation—we were entangled long ago, it is not a new thing. Of course, these are different facets of this ever-changing world and difficult world.

Even the greatest powers in the world like the United States or the Soviet Union are constantly considering what action they should take in regard to a particular matter. Not even the greatest power can control or issue commands to the rest of the world: they have to adapt themselves to circumstances. And surely even if we are capable of doing so, which we are not, of ordering the world about, it would be an unfortunate day when any country aims at ordering the world about.

Now, Sir, sometimes it is said today, some people feel that lately we have perhaps been changing our broad policy. I should like them to examine this matter a little more deeply and they will find that the changes have often come in the policy of other countries, not ours. Not that this is a virtue, but I am merely stating that there has been a consistency in the broad policies we have pursued, and we have not changed basically. We have adapted them to circumstances. There have been changes in the policies of other countries which sometimes have brought them nearer to us.

If I may say so with all respect, take the policy of the United States of America. Undoubtedly, under the new administration there has been a marked change, a change which, if I may say so with all respect, we appreciate greatly and which has brought their policies nearer to our policies.

I would not object to changing my policy if it is for the good. But broadly speaking, it is our policy which is being accepted by other countries as the correct policy.

So, far the present I do not wish to say anything more except to point out that we in the External Affairs Ministry are constantly dealing with this dynamic of history in a changing world and in a changing India and in circumstances which are without parallel in history. And we do not get much help from the past in trying to unravel the future. The Ministry has had all kinds of new duties assigned to it, new problems. We deal with the problem of Tibetan refugees. It is not normally a problem of external affairs, but we do deal with that problem. We deal with other problems also which are not external affairs exactly. But they have been connected by historical process, and we shall continue to deal with them. And I hope that this House will individually and severally give its approval to these broad policies that we have been pursuing and which have met, I suggest with all respect, with very considerable success in this difficult world of ours.

We cannot have it all our way; nor is it very fitting for us all the time, because the world does not go our way, to sit down like spoilt children and cry about it. It is not suitable for a grown up or mature nation: it is rather an act of immaturity. That does not mean that we do not make mistakes. Of course, and we shall be happy for those mistakes to be pointed out, so that we may correct them.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I commend these Demands for the acceptance of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat) rose—

Mr. Speaker: We are not sitting up to 7 o'clock. So, why not we start off with non-official business immediately? The hon. Member may speak on Monday.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Yes.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTY-FIRST REPORT

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 29th March, 1961."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 29th March, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

16.06 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. DEVNAGARI AS COMMON SCRIPT FOR ALL REGIONAL LANGUAGES—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now sume further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri on the 17th March, 1961, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that Devnagari be adopted as a common script for all regional languages in order to bring them closer to each other."

Out of 1 hour and 45 minutes allotted for the discussion of this Resolution, 1 hour and 30 minutes have already been taken up. Shri E. V. K. Sampath may continue his speech.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear hon. Members one by one. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

श्री पद्म देव (बन्वा) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस पर एक घंटे का समय बढ़ा दिया जाय।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (गढ़गांव) : मैं भी मांग करता हूँ कि कम से कम एक घंटे का समय बढ़ा दिया जाय। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय ने भी कहा था कि अगर बहुत से लोग इस पर वाकने के लिए इच्छुक होंगे तो इसका समय बढ़ा दिया जायगा।

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Sir, I want to submit now that the Members of Parliament are practically getting tired of sitting up to 7 o'clock. It is really very hard. Whether you extend the time or not, you may take this also into account that to sit up to 7 o'clock is not possible.

Mr. Speaker: We are not sitting up to 7 o'clock today. That is why I started non-official business immediately after the Prime Minister's speech. We will conclude at 6:30.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): The time for this resolution may be extended.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the desire of the House that the time for this Resolution be extended by one hour?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): We have always been demanding that the time of Private Members should not be curtailed. Normally, we would have started at 3:30 and would have continued for 2½ hours.