

Mr. Speaker: We are going to discuss it now. It was a long statement I would have permitted it to be laid on the Table only. But I agreed to its being read because we are taking up the Demands of the Home Ministry today.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): It should be circulated.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. There are some statements placed on the Table along with this statement. Therefore, hon. Members may just go through those statements.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): We can seek a clarification even without seeing those statements, because the matter is so well known to us.

Mr. Speaker: That would be off the mark.

I will get the statement circulated to all Members.

Shri Hem Barua: May we seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: During the debate that we are going to have. The hon. Member should realise that we are going to discuss it today.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs and the cut motions moved thereon.

The hon. Prime Minister to reply.

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I speak sitting, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this debate on External Affairs and I have specially

welcomed the criticisms made by the Opposition.

Apart from the criticisms of administration, there has, however, hardly been much said constructively about the present policies pursued. My hon. colleague, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, has dealt with many of these criticisms. I propose to refer only to some major policy matters.

We have to face today difficult questions. Many new problems have arisen in the international sphere: The more difficult the problems we face, the more it is necessary that we should view them calmly and dispassionately and arrive at specific conclusions. It does not help much merely to get excited about them, and to deal with them in an agitated way.

Acharya Kripalani's speech showed that he is still tied up with the old happenings about Chinese attack on Tibet and our attitude to it. These matters have been repeatedly discussed here, and I do not wish to go back to them at this stage. The position in the world has changed considerably in recent months, and we have to face the situation as it is.

Acharya Kripalani's chief proposal appears to have been aimed at our giving up non-alignment. Non-alignment is not a basic policy of ours or of any country. It is our reaction to events, and more particularly, our desire to maintain our independence of thought and action. It arose chiefly because of the two Power blocs headed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and our desire not to get entangled with them. To some extent that continues, but many changes have taken place in these alignments.

The USA and the Soviet Union are not so bitterly opposed to each other as they were, and they are growing closer to each another. Among the two Power blocs, internal differences have arisen, and in some cases they amount almost to a split. Thus, the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Soviet Union and China, the two Communist Powers, have practically separated from each other, and are bitterly opposed to each other. In the Western bloc, some differences have also arisen. Meanwhile a large number of newly independent countries have come into existence, and most of them adhere to the policy of non-alignment.

From any point of view, it would appear that non-alignment has not only succeeded in the past, but is even more desirable today. It surprises me, therefore, that Acharya Kripalani should at this stage oppose it.

Non-alignment is not merely not joining a military bloc, but it affects economic and other policies. It is especially psychological. We are on friendly terms with the leaders of these blocs, and are receiving substantial aid from them. To align ourselves would be to tie ourselves with many of their policies, with which we may not agree. It would mean also some kind of a break with our relations with the other group. That would be utterly wrong.

In addition, we have to remember that a large number of new countries as well as old ones are tied to this policy of non-alignment. It would mean our cutting ourselves adrift from the main trends of world opinion.

As the House knows, it has been decided to hold a conference of non-aligned countries later this year. This is a desirable development, and we are wholly associated with it.

Recently, the rift between the Soviet Union and China has grown greatly, and the Soviets have criticised the Chinese invasion of India and China's policies.

Shri Nath Pai has spoken vehemently against our foreign policy, but his vehemence has been directed more

to our administration and other matters. He has spoken like a prima donna. I might add that he has criticised the Annual Report of our Ministry. I must confess that this Report leaves much to be desired. Shri Nath Pai has laid great stress on the Report referring to the visit of our hockey team to Kabul. I may inform him that the visit of the hockey team at the Jashan time in Afghanistan was greatly appreciated by the Afghans, and has therefore considerable importance.

We are always concerned with the progress or otherwise of the conference on disarmament, as this is of vital consequence to the world. For the present, however, our chief concern is about our two neighbours China and Pakistan. Some Members of the Opposition have accused us frequently of surrender and appeasement both to China and Pakistan. I am most surprised to hear these charges. Strength does not lie in strong language and shouting, but in other matters. It is perfectly true that we want peaceful settlements of our troubles with China and Pakistan, and we shall endeavour to realise them, however difficult they may seem today. Taking a long distance view it is essential that we should exist peacefully with these two neighbours of ours, more particularly with Pakistan. We can not live in conflict for a long time to come. I hope a time may come when India and Pakistan might draw closer to each other; there is no other way. To talk of exchange of population is, I think, utterly wrong. Not only would it be an extraordinarily difficult undertaking but it will not solve our problems. The two countries would face each other as bitter enemies, threatening each other's existence. I do not know what the leaders of Pakistan have in view apart from their present aims. I have a feeling that both Pakistan and China have larger objectives in view in regard to India. I do not think that either of them will be able

to achieve these objectives and we shall have to be prepared for all attempts on their part and to gain them. It is clear that peaceful settlements of these conflicts would be desirable but such settlements must be in keeping with the honour and integrity of India. That is an essential aspects to be borne in mind always. Keeping that in mind we should always strive for peaceful settlements.

In regard to China we have made it clear—and Parliament has approved of it—that if the Colombo proposals are accepted by China, we shall be prepared to discuss with them our conflict and disputes. In this matter I should like to make clear one development which took place some time ago. This was referred to by Mrs. Bandaranaike; in one of her recent letters to us we are asked that if the Chinese vacated all their posts in the demilitarised area in Ladak would we consider this a fulfilment of the Colombo proposals. This was first mentioned to me by two representatives of Lord Russell who came to me last summer. To them, I answered that we might be prepared consider this proposal if China made it. Since then no such proposal has been made by China. In the Colombo proposals it was stated that in this demilitarised area of Ladak both parties should have by agreement an equal number of posts. It was possible to consider that this was satisfied if both parties by agreement decided to have no posts at all in this area. I had clearly stated to Lord Russell's representatives and later to Mrs. Bandaranaike that this could be considered by us if a proper approach was made to us by China. No such approach has been made and, therefore, the position remains the same as before.

In regard to Jakarta Conference which is now being held, Acharya Ranga has taken strong objection to our participation in this Conference because China would also be there. I am wholly unable to accept this

argument. It would mean cutting ourselves away from important international conferences because China may happen to be there. It would mean some kind of discourtesy to the many other nations that went there and took part in it. Shri Nath Pai, has, I think, said that we had decided not to go to it and at the last moment sent one of our Ministers to it. That is quite untrue. I do not think that at any time I had said that we would not attend the conference. What I had probably said was that I personally would not go there. It was our intention to send our team under the leadership of Deputy Minister of External Affairs. A few days before the Conference, we decided to send the Minister of Food and Agriculture, Sardar Swaran Singh, as the leader of our team, and I am glad that he agreed to go. There was thus no question of our not going there, but only as to who should go. The Jakarta Conference is being attended by a large number of representatives of countries, and Sardar Swaran Singh is taking a leading part in it.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): You told Parliament many times and last time also you said that you did not think that it would be useful for us to go or that any purpose would be served by our attending that Conference.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not got the words I used. I may have said at that time that it was not decided to hold it. It was decided long after that. When it was decided recently to hold that conference and we knew a large number countries will go, we had no choice. We felt we ought to go and put forward our point of view.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): The Prime Minister has often said that he prefers a Belgrade type of conference to a Bandung type of conference. He has never favoured a Bandung type of conference.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is one thing not to favour it; but it is another thing to boycott it.

There was no question, thus, of our not going there. We should go there and Sardar Swaran Singh is taking a leading part in it. Not to go there for us would have been to miss an important opportunity to put forth our view and to some extent influence the conference.

In regard to Pakistan, it has been a big grief to me that ill-will and conflict should continue between India and Pakistan, in spite of our efforts. We had hoped that this background will gradually disappear and we would be able to live at peace with each other. Unfortunately, it has continued all these years and I do not know when we shall be able to live normal and peaceful lives. Kashmir has been one of the causes. But I am convinced the causes must lie deeper, and probably this conflict will continue unless we can succeed in somehow removing that hatred and fear complex.

With the coming of China as more or less an ally of Pakistan, Pakistan has become even more aggressive. I do now know what secret understanding they have come to with each other, but such understanding cannot be of advantage to India. It is extraordinary that even in these circumstances, some of the western powers incline towards Pakistan and help it in regard to Kashmir. The Kashmir issue would have been solved long ago but for this western help to Pakistan.

So far as we are concerned, our position in regard to Kashmir has been repeatedly and clearly stated recently in the Security Council by my colleague, the Minister of Education. We stand by that position.

Sheikh Abdullah, who has recently been released, has made some statements, which I consider, are unfortunate. I am told that some of the Press reports of these statements are

not correct. However, I will not deal with these Press reports, as I hope to see him soon and discuss these matters.

I think Shri Mukerjee was very angry at the fact that President Aref of Iraq came here in a Pakistani plane. I might tell him that this made us unhappy too, but we could not help it. That is to say, we offered him our plane to come here. A reply came from him that he has already accepted Pakistan's offer to bring him here in their plane and he could not get behind it. We still pressed him to come in our plane, which we offered to send, but he said he could not go behind his promise to Pakistan.

Shri Nath Pai: Your offer must have gone so late that by that time he had accepted Pakistan's offer.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is true; that is what he said. Our offer went several days before he was to come here. He was in Pakistan before he came to India, as you know and we and could not offer him our plane long before in Iraq itself; the question did not arise. As soon as he got there, apparently he fixed it up.

Kripalaniji said the other day that the Colombo proposals are absolutely dishonourable to India. How they are so is more than I can understand. Acharya Kripalani seems to think that we cannot deal with China by ourselves and therefore, we must allow other countries to deal with her, in other words, give up our independence of action. I do not wish to discuss our capacity to deal with China, but I think Acharya Kripalani is underestimating it very much when he thinks that we must hand over the defence of India to somebody else; and, certainly, handing over means giving up our independence, in so far as that is concerned. It is apparently more honourable to him than any other method of settling the matter ourselves. If Acharya Kripalani has read some of the comments on our

Sino-Indian conflict in America and England he would probably think differently.

There is one thing I would like to mention. There has been an account in the press about the Seventh Fleet of the United States coming into the Indian Ocean. This was referred to in this House in answer to questions previously and we had said that we have not been told or it has not been referred to us. Anyhow, they are not coming to any of our territorial waters or ports. This time it appears that they are coming nowhere near India, not to any of our ports or territorial waters but probably going to Africa. I can only express my regret that a cruiser which is equipped with nuclear weapons went about the Indian Ocean.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, on a previous occasion he gave us the impression that whenever the Seventh Fleet of the United States wants to enter the Indian Ocean our Government shall be informed. In this particular case, we are not informed but they are coming with nuclear weapons.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is so that we are not informed. But, according to the report in the press, they are not coming anywhere near India.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Are we sending any protest against it?

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Why should we?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The question of sending a protest will arise...

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If they are here, according to the press reports, and they are carrying nuclear weapons, what are you going to do about it? They might be in the Indian Ocean somewhere.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Indian Ocean is a very big thing.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Even so, are we reconciled to the nuclear weapons floating all over the place, somewhere near India, within the reach of India?

Shri Ranga: They are coming here as friends. Is it not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They are not coming here at all.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is only three miles of territorial water and it does not matter in this instance.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Territorial water, it may not be important, but they are not coming, so far as I know within hundreds of miles of India. We do not like nuclear weapons coming anywhere near India. We have said so.

Now, we have to face a terrible problem of the exodus from East Bengal. We must receive all those who come here and try to rehabilitate them. I hope that soon we shall put up a special Ministry to deal with this problem. May I, in this matter, repeat that terribly bad as this problem is, all kinds of stories are sometimes given publicity in the press, which have little basis in fact, and they do much harm? The other day there was some story of some girls from East Bengal being carried to Arab countries for sale there. On the face of it, it was an absurd and fantastic story. Yet, I suppose some people believed it because it appeared in print. We have received information from our representatives that they can find no trace of any truth in it, it is foreign to them and it is utterly baseless.

But I should like to point out the effect of these things. Somehow this story reached some of the Arab countries and there has been great indignation in the Arab countries that any one in India should presume or should say that abducted girls are being sent there for sale. So, the House will notice how these stories spread and create impressions which are not good for us.

Shri Nath Pai: It is because the Government functions slowly and haltingly. If only the Government had promptly issued a contradiction after it was repeated and reproduced in two or three papers, this rumour could have been stopped once and for all. Yet, Government failed to act promptly in this very delicate and explosive matter.

Shri Hem Barua: Even though it was in the newspapers, it took government sixteen days to enquire into the matter. That is how you function.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member will realise that just because a news item has appeared in the press.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : इससे जाहिर होता है कि सरकार ने खुद इसको हवा देने की कोशिश की, वरना वह पहले ही इस खबर की तरदीद कर देती ।

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Why should the Arab countries feel disheartened by this news item? Even if such things take place, these activities are carried on by nefarious people and not at governmental level.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The thing is so absurd, absurd in every way that it is difficult to deny even.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indians): Your own Ministers circulate such stories. Your Minister of Information and Broadcasting, to my horror, circulated an utterly gruesome story to us. I tackled him "why do you regale us with this sort of thing?" and he was justifying it by saying "competition in barbarism". He is your chief story-teller.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Minister of Rehabilitation said "no woman or child is safe in Pakistan"—these were his exact words.

The Minister of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): What I said in this House was—and I will repeat it outside—that

when I went to the Garo Hills and Mana, stories of this nature were reported to me. I have never made a statement of that nature... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We will bring it up later.

Shri Nath Pai: I hope the Government will show more alertness in future.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have every right to feel angered about what is happening in East Pakistan and do what we can to help the unfortunate refugees who are coming from there. But we must not forget that something very horrible has happened in India too, of which we should be thoroughly ashamed—in Orissa and Bihar and partly in Calcutta. By these things we are playing into the hands of Pakistan which wants such troubles to happen.

Shri Hem Barua: Because you failed to take precautionary measures earlier.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us hear the reply.

Shri Hem Barua: He has been repeating this over and over again—what has happened in India. I say it is because of Government's failure to take steps in advance this is happening.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What is he saying? I am sorry, I did not catch what Shri Hem Barua said. It does not matter.

I think in this matter it is more important that we should stop all such occurrences in India than anything else. This is vital because otherwise we fall into this trap, we play into the hands of Pakistan which wants us to do all these things, which wants us to give up our secular policy, our other policies and thereby justify its policies and its position.

I have often thought these days of Gandhiji, how he would have dealt with our existing problems, specially those with Pakistan. It is difficult to say what he would have advised, possibly, in the course of the last 15 or 16 years he might have devised some method or other to deal with them. But I am sure of one thing, namely, that having regard to our ultimate aim of peace and friendship with Pakistan, he would not have advised any action on our part which should come in the way of this.

Shri Hem Barua: He would have advised more.....(Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: May I draw the hon. Prime Minister's attention to the statement made by Gandhiji on the 26th September, 1947?

Mr. Speaker: No, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We must keep this ultimate aim in view and not be led away by momentary passions. It is true that at the present moment the fate of the minorities in East Pakistan bears down upon us terribly and we must do all we can to help them; but if we do something which adds to their troubles and misfortune, that will be neither good for the present nor for the future.

I would beg the House to distinguish between two things. One is that we have to take certain steps, however undesirable they may be and however they may burden us. That we have to do. But in taking them we must not do anything to create an atmosphere which comes in the way of any future arrangement between India and Pakistan. I would have hoped that India and Pakistan would be able to come together much closer, even constitutionally closer. I do not say so because this annoys Pakistan that we are trying to upset them. I do not wish to upset them; I wish them well, but there is no other way for India and Pakistan to live except to live at peace. It may

take years to achieve that; that is a different matter. But I believe a new generation is rising up in Pakistan which looks differently at this problem than the older generation. I believe, in East Pakistan specially, there are all kinds of movements which do not like these old methods. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that East Pakistan is a particularly weak spot in the Pakistan chain and possibly this is one of the reasons why the Pakistan authorities have made East Pakistan the special place where these atrocities have occurred so as to get East Pakistan tied up with these atrocities and to move their thinking away from the other trends of thought in East Pakistan.

I hope that this Home Ministers' Conference which has occurred papers of which have been placed before this House by our Home Minister will resume its meeting soon and will ultimately arrive at some conclusion which will remove or lessen this great tension that exists. I am sure that our Home Minister will agree with me that the Home Minister of Pakistan who came here struck me as being very earnest about it and trying his utmost to put an end to these troubles. Of course, he was tied up by various factors and he had to go back by a certain date. But I do hope, at the next meeting they will get over these difficulties and come to some arrangement and agreement.

I hope, the House will realise that however angry we may get—and we have enough reason to get angry—anger does not solve the problem of Pakistan and India. It will never solve it, whether it is today or a year hence or 10 or 20 years hence. It has to be solved on a basis of friends who have fallen out coming together, of not agreeing with each other, of disapproving of each other occasionally but nevertheless remaining friends and co-operating. That is the only way to solve this problem.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If they will not reciprocate, what shall be? That is the difficulty.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is completely right. We have been trying to do that; they do not reciprocate. In spite of their not reciprocating we have to do it and force them to this.

Shri Hem Barua: How do you force them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Force them psychologically, by having goodwill, by showing how we function in our country, by putting an example before them and their people of good behaviour there.

Shri Hem Barua: They have refused to learn any lesson from us of good behaviour.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry, the hon. Member has very poor opinion of human beings and human nature.

Shri Hem Barua: But our unilateral goodness is interpreted as cowardice by Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us now set a good example.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know the people of Pakistan fairly well. I have known them in the past, not now. I have great respect for them. They are very decent folk. Of course, when you excite them with religious slogans, nobody remains decent; they become brutal. Everybody becomes brutal, whether it is the Hindu or the Muslim. We have seen what has happened in Rourkela and Jamshedpur. It is scandalous in the extreme that anybody should do what our people have done there. This kind of a thing does more disservice to India than anything that might happen across our borders and elsewhere because that is put in the balance as if this is happening on both sides and they are both pretty bad. I hope that the worst of this has passed and that we shall gradually—it will take a little time—get back to more normal behaviour.

As for China, that is a very difficult thing we have to face. We have to face it by strengthening ourselves, which we are doing and which we have done to a large extent, and by relying on ourselves more and more—certainly getting help from other people but relying ultimately on ourselves. The moment we give up that reliance we are lost. I do not know how Acharya Kripalani imagines that somebody else, however great the power may be, may defend us on our borders. Nobody can defend us; not the greatest power in the world can defend our borders except ourselves. It is well to remember this always and to keep our people to remember this so that they may not become weak and think of, what is called, the Maginot line or some such thing and that others will help them.

If I may say so with all respect and humility, we must not become too self-righteous. We think that every evil is being done by Pakistan and China and that we are completely free from any wrong doing. We are not free from wrongdoing. In the Question Hour many questions were asked about intrusions of air space. There was some excitement when my colleague, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, said that there have been more something or other.

An Hon. Member: Aggression.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As a matter of fact, the statement that there have been more on Pakistan side is completely correct, from the point of view of the United Nations. The United Nations have received complaints of our intrusions from Pakistan and from us about intrusions by Pakistan. They have got both and they are receiving them constantly about these intrusions. The big difference is that our intrusions into Pakistan do not give rise to questions in Parliament; the others do. The United Nations' observers give their judgment, although as far as I remember certainly the majority are in our favour, a minority is against us too.

namely, that we intruded in their territory. Those questions do not come here. Nobody is interested in them.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Prime Minister lay on the Table a statement giving those cases where it was against us? I can not believe it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: You do not believe what?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That there are instances when the United Nations' military observers' verdict went against us.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: You may not believe it, but I am telling you the fact that of all the charges made on most of them the judgment was in favour and against Pakistan. But there were a good number where the judgment was against us, in favour of Pakistan. I am talking about the United Nations' observers. Whether they were true or not is for me to say. But these things . . .

13.00 hrs.

Shri Hem Barua: We should have a statement about that. This is the first time that we are told about that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am afraid, we are growing very self-righteous and we imagine that we are completely in the right and others are in the wrong. That is not a good thing. We should always think of our wrong actions that we do. That is more important than the wrong actions that are committed against us. Wrong actions that we do betray our mentality, how we think, how we act, etc. They delude us. They do not delude the world. The world gets to know all these facts.

Our publicity is often criticised, and rightly so—I do not say it is good publicity—but our publicity abroad suffers very much from our self-righteous attitude. The result is that

even many of the truthful things that we say are sometimes not believed. They say, "These fellows are self-righteous."

Shri Hem Barua: Why don't you put it right?

Shri Ranga: Publicity is asleep.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If I may say so, it is Mr. Hem Barua's attitude that is the worst publicity for us, for India.

Sir, that is all. I am grateful to the House for the way in which they have dealt with this matter. It is a really difficult matter.

Mr. Speaker: Any specific cut motions that I have to put separately?

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): I did not interrupt the Prime Minister. But there are certain personal explanations which I may be allowed to submit after he has finished.

Mr. Speaker: Any specific cut motions that I am required to put separately?

Shri Nath Pai: My cut motion No. 77.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I may be allowed to give my personal explanation.

Mr. Speaker: If he gives that to me, then I will decide it. If he sends to me some statement, then alone I can decide.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Because I did not interrupt him, I should lose the right of giving personal explanation? I have to say only a few words.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I would only request the Prime Minister to read my speech a little more carefully. I said, we have made non-alignment as our principle, as our strategy, as