

*India's Non-attendance at San Francisco Peace Conference*

13 hrs.

**STATEMENT RE. INDIA'S NON-ATTENDANCE AT SAN FRANCISCO PEACE CONFERENCE—contd.**

**Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi):** Sir, I thank you for the opportunity you have given me to raise this question in this House regarding the Prime Minister's speech. In reply to the Indo-China relations debate on the 14th of this month, in page 2826 of the copy of the uncorrected debates, we find that this is what the Prime Minister says:

"Our non-attendance at the San Francisco Peace Conference—I think perhaps Shri Frank Anthony said it...."

**Shri Frank Anthony:** No, no.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry then; somebody else said it. Perhaps the gallant Maharaja said it. I do not know—our non-attendance at this conference had nothing to do with China, absolutely nothing."

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Two Maharajas spoke that day.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** Now, I would like to draw the attention of the House to page 2, of a booklet, *Leading Events in India-China Relations, 1947—1962*, there is the following entry:

"8 September. A Peace Treaty with Japan was signed at San Francisco by 49 nations. India declined to attend the Conference because, among other reasons, China was not a party to it."

I may submit that both these statements cannot be correct. I think it is important for the Prime Minister to make a statement in this House so that the actual picture could be known and misunderstandings could be cleared.

At the same time, I submit that in a serious debate like this the Prime Minister acting on wrong notions

should not have referred to the gallantry of an individual or to the ignorance of a party.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does he dispute that also, the word 'gallant'?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, no name has been mentioned; how can he take it that the word 'gallant Maharaja' refers to him... (*Interruptions*).

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, there can be no doubt, as the hon. Member has pointed out, that there is discrepancy between what I said and what is given in this pamphlet. The discrepancy may be big or small; that is not the matter. The pamphlet states that India did not attend the conference at San Francisco because, among other reasons, China was not a party to it. I, as he made out, said that China had nothing to do with it. Obviously, there is a discrepancy.

After I received the notice which you were good enough to send me, I had the papers looked up as to what the actual facts were. I spoke, naturally, from memory of events which happened eleven years ago, in 1951. I had these papers brought out and I discovered that among the arguments—they were not published that we considered was an argument that any peace in the Far-East must necessarily include in its scope Soviet Union and China; otherwise there may not be any peace; their being left out of the treaty would not be conducive to peace. That was the reason and therefore it was stated correctly in the pamphlet and what I said was incorrect to that extent; although there were many other reasons for not attending that Conference that was the reason put there. I am sorry that I made a statement which I found subsequently to be incorrect and I apologise to you, to the House and to the hon. Member.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** On behalf of the Swatantra Party, I express my sin-

[Shri P. K. Deo]

cere gratitude to the Prime Minister for having corrected his earlier statement—it speaks of his greatness. I thank you also for this opportunity.

**Mr. Speaker:** Now at least he is a gallant Maharaja.... (*Interruptions*). We take up the other business now

13.05 hrs.

**MOTION RE: REPORTS OF COMMISSIONER FOR LINGUISTIC MINORITIES—contd.**

**Shri Datar:** Sir, I was dealing with some complaints made during the discussion on the first report of the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner that Urdu was not treated properly and I pointed out that as early as 14th July, 1948 a circular was issued by the Government of India so far as the recognition of Urdu as a language of sizable minority was concerned and it laid down what was to be done in regard to Urdu language in the matter of educational institutions, recruitment to services, publication of Government material, etc. Hon. Members will find from the report that Urdu was receiving considerable attention from most of the States where Urdu speaking people were in a fairly large number. From the figures I find that Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra and U.P. are the four important States where their number is considerable and I am happy that in all these States they are taking special steps to see that these people suffer from no handicaps. Certain complaints were made about certain handicaps and now most of them have been duly removed. For instance, Urdu teachers are appointed, Urdu books and text books are being duly published and whenever new schools are opened, these facilities are extended if it is found that the children know Urdu or their mother tongue is Urdu. Here too, as in the case of the other minorities, it has been laid down that proper safeguards should be given. So far as my hon. friend's State, Punjab, is concerned,

the Punjab Government are giving due importance to Urdu. In U.P. a special officer was appointed to look after the interests of Urdu population and to give them whatever was due. During the last two or three years, a claim has been put forward on behalf of the Nepalese living in Darjeeling district. It was considered by the West Bengal Government and when they passed their Act about the official language of West Bengal they put a special provision so that in the three divisions of Darjeeling where there are a large number of Nepalese, Nepalese and Bengali, both, will be recognised. Oftentimes certain claims are put forward on behalf of Sindhi population. They are fairly large in numbers in Maharashtra, Gujarat as also in Rajasthan. I was happy to find that these States provided necessary facilities. There is some difference of opinion about the script. Sindhis have their own script which is more or less allied to Urdu or Persian. A suggestion was made that if possible they may accept the Devanagari script so that while learning their own language they may also have the facility of knowing Hindi which is one of the important languages in India. The Sindhi population have not yet seen their way to do so. All the same, we are trying, by providing them with necessary facilities, to persuade them, if possible, to take over to the Devanagari language so that they and other people in India can come into greater contact.

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur): Devanagari script.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Devanagari script.

**Shri Datar:** Yes; Devanagari script and Sindhi script and not Sindhi language. Sindhi language has to be provided for. As the House is aware, once a resolution was brought forward either in this House or in the other House that Sindhi should be recognised and noted in the Constitution itself. It was pointed out on behalf of the