

owners, Bengal Coal Company Limited, Survey Department Drawing No. 2281, Tracer: Pradip Biswanath, Chibba, date: 17-7-1958.

I would request you to ask the Deputy Minister, Shri Abid Ali, to correct his statement made not once but three times,—and that too in spite of our trying to correct him,—saying that the plan was a plan submitted by a union, whilst it was a plan of the owners. As such, I request him to correct his incorrect statement, which in fairness should not be made again.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): He should correct it three times.

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): The question casualties was gone into by the Court of Enquiry in great detail in its report. After considering the various documents and also the plans exhibited before it, the Court came to the conclusion that the casualties could not have been less than 115 and more than 176, and were probably a few more than 155, which was the number of cap lamps and oil lamps other than those supplied to the supervisory staff found underground on re-entry.

During the debate on the 16th February, 1959, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty claimed that she had before her a plan which was submitted before the Court of Enquiry which showed that at least 216 bodies were there in the colliery. She referred to this plan again on the 18th February. I had gone through the Report of the Court of Enquiry and I could see no reference to any plan submitted by the management which showed a total casualty of 216. It, therefore, appeared to me that the trade union had a plan of their own which indicated the number of dead bodies to be 216. Hence my reference to this plan. However, now it has been ascertained that no such plan was submitted by the union before the Court.

The plan submitted by the management shows a total of 170 dead bodies.

12.09 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, just before the House rose last evening, I ventured to point out that the debate had largely dealt with wider matters of policy and not so much with the organisation of the Foreign Service or the Ministry of External Affairs, except for a few remarks made here and there. I shall, therefore, deal presently with some of these wider aspects which were referred to by hon. Members.

But, before that, I should just like to say a few words about our foreign service. I pointed out in my initial remarks in opening the debate that the Demand under the head of External Affairs includes really many items which, normally, have nothing to do with External Affairs, also many items which are fixed, items which we cannot touch, the fixed items being large sums of money which we pay to the United Nations as our annual contribution, some subsidies which we pay to governments, neighbouring governments, and the other items being like the Teung Sang, Naga Hills Division, NEFA and the State of Pondicherry. These are really, to a large extent, in the domain of my colleague the Home Minister; but, for a variety of reasons it is decided to include them in the External Affairs Ministry. In fact, the sums include, I believe, considerable sums of money for the Assam Rifles, so that these sums swell up in this way. The actual sums spent on the external services of India are—I have not got the exact figure, but I think it is—in the region of between Rs. 6 and 7 crores.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

While we should always try to economise and we continue to do so, I should like to point out that it compares very favourably with the expenditures of other countries—I am not talking of very big countries like the United States or the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom—of even other countries.

The work of the foreign office and the foreign services can be judged broadly by the way it serves the country's interests and the interests of the cause the country has at heart and abroad. Our publicity is criticised. Sometimes people make certain rather remarkable statements which are as far removed from the truth as anything can be. For instance the statements that we have no friend in the world and all countries are against us and so on and so forth, are perfectly remarkable and show an amazing capacity for not knowing what is happening in the world and what the world is thinking about India. I do not pretend—and I cannot pretend—to say that we do not make mistakes. We make mistakes so often enough. Our publicity, certainly is not ideal, and can be improved. Nevertheless the basic fact remains that—whether it is publicity, whether it is some other work of our Ministry or of the Government of India—the basic fact remains that the name of India stands high in the world; and that is, after all, the test.

The *bona fides* of India stand high. The respect for India stands high because of its policy, because of what we have done. The criticism about our publicity, as I said, may be justified as all these criticisms are partly justified because improvement can take place. But the reaction of a country to another country's policy does not depend so much on the publicity that is done.

There are plenty of foreign news paper correspondents in India reporting about India. They mould the opinion in their countries, probably,

more than any official work that we may do. But the real thing is whether the policy we pursue fits in with the outlook and the mentality of the other country or not. If it does not, then, all the publicity that we may do will not help much.

What is happening in our case is that originally there was always a certain respect for India, I am glad to say, but a certain amount of resentment and a certain feeling in foreign countries that because we consider ourselves rather above the milling crowd and adopt a high and pious attitude of not being with this or that—we, really, under cover of that exploit the situation to our advantage, that it is not a high moral attitude but something much lower than that—and that we took shelter under high moral phrases.

I do not wish to seek any shelter under high moral phrases. I am not a person who is at all conditioned to speak in high moral terms. But, what we have sought to do is to follow a policy which seems to us to be correct, both in regard to our own interests, short-range and long-range, but also which helps, somewhat, in serving the broad cause we have in the world, the cause of peace etc.

And, so what happened was this. Originally there was this doubt that the way India functioned was somewhat different from the way other countries functioned not because we did not join these big military blocks—other countries also did not join military blocks—but because there was a slight but significant difference in our approach to problems or rather in the way we expressed ourselves in regard to problems, a difference which was no great virtue in us but which came to us because we had rather inherited it to some extent in the course of our national movement for freedom etc; how we even dealt with the British in India whom we were opposing, how we dealt with them courteously, politely and with the door open and all that, though we did not bend

before them. All that was conditioned by ourselves not only on this side of the House but the hon. Members on every side of the House. And there was this basic difference which did not affect other people and people talking about neutrality. I do not like the word 'neutrality' in this connection, but non-alignment and the like. There are many other countries in the world but the other countries did not fight all through with that experience. Therefore, it is because of this that people are taken aback when we talk about a purer than thou attitude. It is all wrong; it is not a question of purer than thou attitude or high morality.

We know our faults very well and we know the virtues of others, sometimes even those whom we criticise. But, gradually, in the course of years, people came to realise that we were not posing that we were not moralising but that we were following a certain policy in all good faith and that policy while being one deliberately of friendship to other countries was yet one not only of non-alignment as such but something deeper than that, of doing something that we thought right, in the circumstances, of course.

I am perfectly prepared to admit that it is not easy for any government as for any individual to follow a 100 per cent policy of rightness because it is conditioned by factors, by other countries' policies. But, broadly speaking, we followed our policy even though it was displeasing to others. And, it is this realisation of other countries that we endeavour to the best of our ability to follow a policy, an independent policy without trying to displease others that has gradually brought in a certain respect for what we do; even though there is a difference of opinion.

There can be no doubt—and I try to submit that with all humility—that India's voice and India herself is looked upon with very considerable respect in international assemblies, wherever you may go in the

wide world and among great nations and small nations alike, although we have no military power which is supposed to be the principal reason why countries are respected, nor do we have any financial power. That is to say, we try to look at things through our own eyes, even though, sometimes, our eyes may be rather dim. We do not try to look through other people's eyes or minds or through coloured classes which affect our own sight and sometimes distort or colour the vision.

I should like this House to judge our activities from that point of view, certainly not refraining from criticism but always thinking of this basic thing, the basic approach, which is not even that of policy, although policy is important, but the basic approach of how to interpret a policy, how to approach the other countries and how to deal with any problem.

Hon. Members sometimes accuse, as indeed the hon. lady Member did yesterday, about our complacency in regard to the US-Pakistan Pact, that we have toned down our opposition to these things and broadly hinted that this might be due to our desire to get American dollars for our development and not to say or do any thing which might perhaps come in the way of that. Well, we have not been ashamed to get help from the United States, from the Soviet Union and we propose to get that help from any country which gives aid on fair terms and expressly on terms that has nothing to do with our policy. I am really grieved at this idea being put out that our policy is governed by the lure of dollars or whatever it may be. We are liable to error but one thing, I think, might be taken for granted. That is where the honour and interests of India are concerned, we are not going to give in whatever the consequences may be in terms of financial help, even other consequences.

In the old days when in the United Nations or elsewhere we adopted an

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

attitude in support of some proposition, if that proposition was, let us say, supported also by the Soviet group, then it was suggested: 'these people under cover of their non-alignment and the so-called neutrality are secretly assisting the Soviet Group'. If we voted for the other group led by the United States then it was said: 'There you are, in search of dollars; they are doing this in search of something else'. People did not seem to realise that a country can act just on the merits of a question and not under pressures and fears. I do believe that in spite of our numerous problems and numerous difficulties, India is a country today in the wide world which is least afraid of the other countries, whatever they may be. Certainly today the greatest and the biggest powers are the most afraid just like the man of property is afraid lest some thieves might steal it. So, the bigger the power, the bigger the interests it has to protect, the more the apprehension of somebody else overtopping that strength and creating difficulties. I do not know what will happen to us when India becomes much more prosperous, whether we would also, with prosperity, begin to be afraid. I hope not. It is an odd thing that fear has nothing to do with weakness; it comes with strength. It is almost an extra-ordinary proposition I am putting forward because then there is the antagonism of various strengths going against each other. However, the position is this, that our approach has all along been, apart from policies, not to condemn as far as possible, not to irritate as far as possible any country, not to say any word which comes in the way of a calm consideration of the problem, or which comes in the way of moving towards a peaceful settlement of any problem. I do not say that we have always been able to act up to this. We lose our tempers; we get angry. That may be so. But anyhow the attempt is to do this because in the world today the most painful thing is not the real difficulty of the problems—they are very difficult—but the manner of approach which is full

of abuses and condemnation of the other party. Now, there are plenty of things happening in the world today which, according to our judgment, and probably the judgment of this House, ought to be condemned. But surely it is not wise always to throw about your weight condemning people. There are plenty of things that are happening in India which can equally be condemned by others outside. It is a bad habit; it does not help you to reach the other person's mind. This habit of condemnation and vituperation simply closes the door to any possibility of real discussion. Ultimately it may come of course. Especially when the danger is so great, the danger of war, everybody knows what a war means today and one has to be particularly careful, persons in responsible position in Governments are not worthy of the job they do unless they can restrain their language and sometimes restrain their actions.

Today there are many problems. Yet from the world point of view the biggest problem, judged from the point of view of war or peace, is still the problem of Berlin in Germany. I am not going into that and I have always avoided going into that because one cannot make oneself responsible for the big problems of the world. Naturally, because it is an important problem, we have given thought to it; we have discussed it with other people; we have in our own way made some minor suggestions as to what should be done. But all those, even the suggestions that we have made are also not on what policies should be pursued but that any policy should be pursued with a measure of gentleness and not abuse. That, I submit, is a slightly distinctive feature of India, not from today but certainly from Buddha and Asoka's time and right down to Gandhi's time and it makes all the difference how you do a thing. If you do a right thing with abuse that right thing becomes a wrong thing and it does not lead to results while even a wrong thing may become a right

thing if it is done gently and in a friendly way. Please judge our actions from that point of view and condemn us if we fall and lose our temper and do not praise us for wielding the big stick or showing our fists to other countries and saying how brave we are. It is easy to show big fists from here to another country and for the other country to show the big fist. Nothing happens to the man who shows the big fist; he is quite safe there. But by that he creates an atmosphere which is bad at any time and more so in the world today.

I said about Berlin and Germany. It is a very big problem, a tremendous problem. On that depends the future war and peace—may be this very year, maybe six months or three months' time. What is the good of my sitting down and according to my thinking logically, condemning this person or that nation? Maybe everybody is wrong. Nobody can say that everybody is right; then everything would happen rightly. But here we sit on the verge of a precipice all the time and we get used to it because the thing is a continuing affair. But you never know when the world may topple over the abyss.

Therefore, when we have met the representatives of one side over this problem or the other and it has been our privilege to discuss with both, we have found, and I say so quite honestly, good valid arguments advanced by either party or both parties, both based essentially and ultimately on the fear of the other. It is fear that is the worst companion. We have agreed with them largely because we try to understand them. We do not abuse them or shut our minds to them. And we have ventured to suggest that the matter should be proceeded with by friendly consultations even though they might differ completely from each other. It is not for us to suggest that you should do this or that, you should give in or not give in. It is not for us to do so. It would be presumptuous on our part to do so. But all that we could suggest was that we should pursue the

path of consultation and discussion as much as possible, because it is realised by every responsible and even irresponsible man in the world that war must be avoided.

I think that in spite of our unhappy utterances from time to time we are moving in that direction of consultation—'we' meaning not India, but those great countries—and attempts are being made to find some way out.

I am glad to learn, only this morning that President Eisenhower has accepted the idea of having a summit conference; that is to say, he has suggested, I believe, first of all, that a meeting of foreign ministers might take place and later a summit conference this summer—that is, in the next two or three months. So I do think that the pressure of events and the general feeling among people in all countries is driving governments and the leaders of countries towards this approach of consultation. I do not know what the result would be when this take place, because it becomes so tied up with people's passions, prejudices and fears, and yet there is the other overwhelming fear of possibility of war. So, between the two fears some kind of a course is followed. Let us hope it will take them out of this dangerous zone.

Now, take another. In the last month or two, or more perhaps, the developments in the Middle-Eastern region have been unfortunate. Conflicts and, again, recriminations are going on between the new Iraq Republic and the United Arab Republic. These things have been unfortunate and most deplorable. I am not going into those things. I have my views but I do not want to express those views unless I can be helpful. What is the point in burdening myself like some superior person and airing my views on the world at large and say who is in the right and who is in the wrong? First of all, I do not think I am competent to do so, and even if I was competent to do so it would be the uttermost folly for me to endeavour to do so. It is my business as a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Foreign Minister to win people, to win countries and leaders to our side, not to estrange them still further. I can say that I am distressed with the developments that are happening in the Middle East amongst our own friends.

Then, take Africa. Africa stands on a somewhat separate footing, or, rather, the countries which are not free, which are still under colonial domination, they do stand on a separate footing from other type of countries. We are committed by our history, by our thinking, for a generation past or more, by our policy, by our sentiments, everything, towards sympathising with the countries under colonial domination seeking for freedom. That, indeed, is supposed to be the policy of the United Nations. The United Nations has this in its Charter. But for us it is not only an intellectual exercise of policy, but there is an emotional feeling too about it; because having gone through the same mill we react constantly to same thing happening elsewhere.

In the last several years much has happened in Africa which has been very painful, much has happened recently in Africa which has been full of hope and we have seen several countries of Africa gaining freedom and independent status. And, we have congratulated the United Kingdom because of following a policy which has led to this progressive widening of the sphere of freedom in Africa—may be, we thought that the process should be faster; anyhow, it was in the right direction.

Now, of course, even so there was always that amazing survival in the realm of, well, policy and administration,—that is, the Union of South Africa—a survival, I say, from a remote past with all kinds of atavistic emotion and feeling which has no place today, and it can only lead to utmost disaster in Africa and elsewhere. We have come pretty near

to that disaster, unless policies are changed, the policies of racial suppression and racial discrimination.

The House knows how in the United Nations, as matters come up again and again, the South African Union has ignored the advice and the resolutions of the United Nations. The only good aspect of it is that progressively, in spite of all kinds of pressures, the countries in the United Nations, barring a very few, have come round to dissociating themselves in various ways from South African policy. I am sorry that when in spite of other associations some countries of the Commonwealth have voted in the United Nations against South African policies, I regret, the United Kingdom did not do so—I do not mean that they agree with that policy, but for some pressures and pulls they could not do so—because it would make a difference if the United Kingdom also functioned in accordance with its own declared policy in this matter as in others. Of course, when they did so they always said that they did not always vote on the merits of the question but for some other reason like the question of jurisdiction. However, the United Kingdom has followed a policy, broadly speaking, in the last two or three years which has resulted in the freedom of Ghana, which will result in the freedom of Nigeria, and there are movements afoot in the Eastern Africa also in that direction.

Now, we have outburst in Nyasaland and, to some extent, in the entire Central African Federation. Well, it need not be said by any of us here in this House that all our sympathies are with the people of Nyasaland in this matter, and I trust that in spite of the fact that the Africans there in their excitement have looted a number of Indian shops and done them considerable damage, in property I mean, nevertheless, I hope that the Indians there will always remember the policy that we have pursued and the advice that we have always given. And that advice

is that they must, if they live these, naturally, sympathise with the legitimate demands of the people. They must play friends with them and in fact they must only remain friends with them. We do not wish to impose our will on others; at this rather very difficult moment when the people of Nayasaland and other parts of the Central African Federation are facing a crisis, it is particularly necessary that Indians should not do anything which is against the interests of the feelings of the African people.

Every person who is at all watching the Development of the African situation will have seen that the whole continent is in a ferment. I have repeatedly said in this House and elsewhere that unless this matter is dealt with with some foresight now we might have to face a most terrible catastrophe, a catastrophe not of a colonial war but racial war and the bitterness that comes out of long suppression suddenly finding an outlet and violence and then the suppression of violence. We are always near this kind of thing and unless great care is taken, we might overshoot the mark and that will be a terrible tragedy for Africa, just when the people were coming on the verge of freedom to have to face this conflict.

But I have no doubt that it is too late for any power to suppress these feelings that are passing through Africa. One bright spot recently has been the agreement about Cyprus. Again, it is not for me to sit down and examine the agreement and say "Oh, this might be better, or worse". It is rather an odd agreement, I might say, but the point is that the people concerned have agreed to it and got out of that terrible mess in which they were and in which they had suffered so much.

In talking about Africa, I think the hon. lady Member spoke at some length about the Cameroons. I shall just briefly say that the policy we

have adopted in the Cameroons has been, according to our thinking, the policy that the people of the Cameroons want, the great majority of them want. And what is more, that is a policy which has been accepted by a very large majority in the United Nations, in fact including most of the Asia-African countries and others. I have a vague idea, though I speak with some diffidence—I do not quite remember—that at one stage or part of this voting, practically nobody was against; only some abstained. So, it is rather difficult for any country like us to go about throwing our weight in another country. On general principles, yes, but when the representatives of that country, a great majority of them—their neighbours and others—wants something done, for us to say, "No, you must not do it", it is very difficult. Also, according to our thinking, if this psychological moment in the Cameroons had not been taken advantage of, there was a danger of its slipping away and the independence of the Cameroons would have been postponed and one does not know what might have happened. The whole argument has been about the plebiscite or something in the nature of a plebiscite before independence. Now, it is admitted that elections must take place and will take place before or after. It is admitted that there should be an open, free voting; that the people imprisoned, etc., should be released and no suppression. It is also admitted that although there have been no elections there has been a Commission which has gone over the Cameroons, eliciting public opinion, and it has reported in favour of that policy. It is suggested that we must reject all this, the present demand of the great majority of the Cameroons people and insist on election, not realising that if we did that,—the election is going to take place and probably I imagine and I think it is better if it takes place in a free country than before—that would be at the risk of endangering the

{Shri Jawaharlal Nehru}

coming of independence, because other countries are involved, France is involved, and other countries are involved. We cannot control them and then we can later sit down and merely condemn other countries, saying, "Oh, you have done this thing and that, or miss an opportunity"!

Shrimati Benu Chakaravartty (Basirhat): I want to know whether this independence will be within the French union and whether it will be guided by the French Constitution, because we were worried because of the Algerian election.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It has nothing to do with the Algerian example. I cannot go into the details. It is going to be, as far as I know, full independence. It may have certain associations with France like the French language; let us say, like Ghana, as the English language; it may be some other thing, maybe some laws. But Algeria is completely different. As the House knows, there is a big conflict going on and all kinds of restrictions. But here, as far as I know, it is going to be as complete an independence as any of the African countries possess.

Some brief reference from various parts of the House has been made about Tibet. I have seldom referred to Tibet except in answer to some criticism. Again, it is rather embarrassing to discuss events happening in a neighbouring country about which we know something of course, but naturally what we know is limited. It is not easy to get a full picture, and something which by our expression of opinion might really make a difficult position more difficult,— criticism of this and that.

Right from the beginning, eight or nine years ago, when a kind of change came over the Tibetan scene by the Chinese Government exercising its authority there, and coming to an agreement with the leaders of Tibet including the Dalai Lama. Maybe it was that the agree-

ment itself was under stress of circumstances, but there was an agreement. Even previous to that, we had always, not only our Government but the previous Governments in the world, you might say, recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet. That had varied; when the Chinese Government was strong it exercised it and when weak it did not exercise it. That was for the last several hundred years. But so far as I know, no country had ever recognised the independence of Tibet. We certainly had not; and it was inevitable, therefore, for us to recognise the suzerainty; call it suzerainty, call it sovereignty—these things are fine distinctions and they depend on the power of the State how far it goes.

Now, I think that agreement was a 17-point agreement which basically was an agreement for the autonomy of Tibet, for the maintenance of its religion, institutions, etc., under the broad umbrella of the Chinese State. There have been difficulties and conflicts, sometimes on a small scale and sometimes on a somewhat bigger scale. They are continuing, and creating new situations. I do not know that it will help at all for me to go into the details—such details as we know at present—except to say that the situation is a difficult one. I do not mean to say that at present there is no large scale violence there—here and there, there has been—but it is a difficult situation. It is more a clash of wills than, at present, a clash of arms or a clash of physical bodies.

In this connection, I believe, some reference was made to a newspaper correspondent of the name of Paterson who lives in Kalimpong or Darjeeling—I forget exactly where—and we had to issue a warning to him. That is a kind of thing which we hesitate to do. The House knows very well the kind of stuff that has so often been written about India, about our neighbours, from India to outside

countries. By the kind of stuff I do not mean the opinions but the false sense expressed. Yet, we have put up with them, because we do firmly believe that it is better to put up with the wrong statements, even the mischievous statements, than to suppress the freedom of the press. But the only thing is that if only we were concerned, we might put up with a very great deal, as we have done, but where the activities of a certain individual may tend to worsen the situation than we have to consider it again. Now, Mr. Paterson sent a number of messages which were to full of exaggerations, no doubt honest messages, because possibly he believed them, but he accepted every hazard and rumour and put them in his message as a fact with the result that we were astounded to see some of the messages which are likely to create a great deal of misunderstanding. So we had to tell him and we told him even then—send good, factual messages, we will not come in the way; this kind of sensational messages without any factual basis, only on bazar basis, is not good.

I have referred to various matters, but the debate yesterday was largely concerned with one matter, and that was the United States Pact of mutual aid with Pakistan. Almost every Member of the House, whatever side or party he belonged to, referred to it, and referred to it in one way, although the stress or emphasis was different, that is, referred to it with disapproval, with concern. That itself indicates the amount of concern and disapproval that that arrangement has elicited throughout the country.

The hon lady Member thought we were trying to play down. I do not know why she thought so. Because we have not used strong language, because we have not, according to her, condemned the United States of America? I started by saying that we do not think condemnation is the right approach. I do believe that the United States of America has the friendliest feelings for us, by and

large. It may be that its policies, moved by other considerations, push it in other directions; that it a different matter; just as I do believe that the Soviet Union has the friendliest feelings for us. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that we can follow a policy, a policy which I say is a straightforward policy, which yet gets to us friendly feelings from great and small countries which are hostile and antagonistic to each other. And this is not due to any cleverness on our part or any sleight of hands or any wonderful feat of diplomacy. It is due basically, as I said right at the beginning, to that little touch a very little touch, I am sorry to say, but still a touch—of the Gandhian in us that still functions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that from the point of view of any pact these military alliance pacts we disapprove of them. We think they do not bring security; they bring insecurity

You could not think of a more vivid example of this than the consequences of the Baghdad Pact in Western Asia during the last few years. Ever since that Pact has come it has been a symbol of disturbance, insecurity, disunity and trouble. It is patent. It does not matter what the other views may be, but this fact is patent. All those countries there have become disunited and troubled. SEATO has not become so obvious because SEATO has not functioned very much, though it has been on paper very much. Therefore, when I saw this it surprised me that in spite of this a certain policy of military pacts and alliances should be followed. That is a general consideration

So far as this particular matter is concerned, this bilateral pact, naturally we have other considerations also, because it affects India. It affects India, even though the United States Government does not want it to affect India. I believe, honestly, I believe, that they do not want it to affect India, for other reasons. But

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

though they do not want it to affect India, it does affect India. It is a fact that it does affect India because in the nature of things such a development has to affect India, because of Indo-Pakistan relations, because of Pakistan being our neighbour country and not being in very good terms with us; apart from the nature of things, the declarations of the Pakistan leaders. They go on repeating this that they are going to use this against India. But apart from the actual use, the fact is that the type of mentality which we have had to face in Pakistan during well, ever since partition practically, that type of mentality has come in the way of every peaceful settlement. And I would add rather emphatically, that I do not think we are pure and guileless and blameless in these matters. We have committed errors, we have made mistakes, we have become angry. But, by and large, we have tried to settle disputes with them peacefully. We are interested in devoting ourselves to the development of our country and not getting entangled in border troubles and other troubles. Therefore, by and large, we have been conditioned by other factors which have not conditioned the leaders of Pakistan. But in spite of every effort which has been criticised by some hon. Members in this House or outside the House as some measure of appeasement with Pakistan or something like that, nevertheless we have followed that policy, and we have met rebuff after rebuff and naturally we are very unhappy about it

Now, with all this background of this mentality which faces us in Pakistan, any help of the type given by the United States, military help tends, inevitably tends, whatever the belief or wishes of the United States might be, to increase the intransigence of the Pakistan Government. That is an automatic consequence and thereby it comes in the way of the solution of Indo-Pakistan problems. That is a fact, and we have

said that repeatedly in mild, friendly but firm language; of course, because that is a statement of fact. I do believe that this is well appreciated, this aspect by many people in the United States of America, even the leaders. But they have got themselves into this tangle of alliances and they find it very difficult to get out of this tangle.

The Baghdad Pact failing, practically ceasing to function soon after the revolution of Iraq, assurances were given that something else will take its place' and now it is this that has taken place. Now, I do not understand; the hon. lady Member said we have been quiet and we have not done this. I do not understand what we are supposed to do about this. Deliver fiery speeches in this House or in the market place or send aggressive notes to other countries? I hope, not. Firmness, there should always be. But, if we are at all true to what we have inherited, there should be friendliness, politeness and a certain faith in the other people's *bona fides*. It is a little difficult, perhaps, to balance all these things. But, it has to be done, if you want to live in this complicated world and play a friendly role of bringing people together rather than separating them

13 hrs.

I need not refer to the border troubles because we have spoken about them on several occasions in this House. It is a part of that mentality of Pakistan that goes on leading to these border troubles. We have to face it, I entirely agree, by taking every step to protect our border and give security to our people. Here we live in this rather dangerous world with dangerous problems. But, I hope that, in spite of that, we shall not forget that approach to these questions, that calm, peaceful and pacific approach, that friendly approach, a friendly approach even to a deliberately hostile country to us, and that we

shall avoid saying things which add to the already large fund of bitterness and ill-will in this world.

Before I finish, I should just like to say a few words that I intended to say at the beginning, about our Foreign Service. Something was said on this. It is always easy to criticise any service. I can myself criticise some things that happened in our Foreign Service. But, knowing many of them myself and their work, and also through other people who have known them from their reports, I can say that our Foreign Service, by and large, is a fine service and it can compare very favourably with any Foreign Service of any country in the world. It has been in existence now for, well, 10 years or so. It has gradually spread, becoming bigger and wider. It has had to face many difficult problems, many difficult situations all over the world and it is largely due to the activities of that Foreign Service as well as our own policies that this respect for India has grown in all the countries. An Ambassador of ours or a Minister of ours is frequently approached by other countries for advice just because he is considered to represent, in a little degree, what is said to be the wisdom of India.

It was stated by one hon. Member that there is discontent in the Foreign Service because they are not promoted rapidly enough—there may be something in it, not much—and also that non-Foreign Service men are imported into the Service either from public life or from other services. Such persons are normally in service as Heads of Missions because other people are not brought in.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I do not believe in the rules and orders of seniority in any service. Seniority cannot be ignored. But, this kind of automatic preferment because a person is senior, the sooner it is done away with, the better. I am afraid, not having ever been in service of that type myself, I am totally

unable to comprehend the service mind. I can understand, of course, security and all that. Let us take this. In the Army, if your Commander in Chief and your principal officers at the top automatically came to their posts by virtue of seniority you will have a dud army, I can tell you. It becomes essential that this rule of seniority should be tempered as soon as you reach a certain stage—in the lower stages it does not matter—by merit. At a little higher stage, it should be given up altogether, completely, 100 per cent. and only merit should prevail. I know, the difficulty of this is that when you talk about merit, merit may often have the cover of nepotism or nepotism may be covered by the so-called merit. True, that is so. We will avoid it. But, to talk about automatic preferment to higher posts in any service is only bringing that service down to the level of mediocrity. Obviously, the mediocre survives in a rule of seniority. Of course, all these matters have to be considered.

I think that in the Embassies, as the Heads of Missions, we should have, we shall continue to have, some public men, and we will. Some places may be very important; some places may be less important. We should balance these things. Sometimes, some senior men in other Services have been made Heads of Missions: not many; a few have been made.

Somebody referred to our Foreign Office Inspectors' reports and demanded why they should not be placed on the Table of the House. If I may respectfully say so, that was a most remarkable demand. The moment we did that, these reports would cease to have the slightest value in them.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Does it mean that all reports which are placed on the Table of the House have no merit?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Is that the inference? That is a curious inference.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's mind is too quick to catch facts. The moment you place confidential talks or reports and opinions of one member of the Service about another, senior member about others, the result will be, there will be no confidential talks, no confidential opinions expressed, but some bald statements, just bald reports. Of course, if there is some major misdemeanour, that would be noted. But, these reports have seldom major misdemeanours. They refer to all kinds of idiosyncracies of the person concerned, his temperament, his virtues, his failings. These things are not even seen by every member, by all the people in my Ministry. I do not know—let us venture to say, if it is decided to appoint a Committee to inspect the lives of all our Members here and we wanted the reports to be placed on the Table of the House, it would be rather an embarrassing position. That, of course, has no meaning. In fact, so far as these inspection reports are concerned, I have a feeling that these inspections tended to become rather inquisitorial, petty things, petty matters and rather exasperating to some of our senior Ambassadors. We have now, in fact, lessened somewhat the inquisitorial nature of these inspections.

Shrimati Bena Chakravarty: What are the terms of reference of these inspection teams?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is not an official committee of enquiry with terms of reference, but of course, they have to go into all kinds of things, naturally into the general accounts, what is spent, how much, the relations of the people with each other, with the public there, with the Government there, what is the amount of entertainment given, what is spent—so many odd things, and when our inspectors go about asking for a detailed account of, let us say, every meal provided in the last six months, it is difficult; the poor Ambassador has to spend all his time in keeping

accounts of his meals, how many guests he has got, instead of doing his job. It is far better, after some enquiry, fixing a sum—spent so much on entertainment—then asking him an account for every meal, and how many courses he gave in every meal. An impossible situation. It was becoming that, and we stopped it, but the general inspections do good work, and do give us information. That will, of course, continue.

When we talk about the foreign service, the hon. Member who referred to this matter said that people were not so anxious, so keen, to go into the foreign service as they used to. That is partly true. I think that, although we cannot compare our terms with the big, rich countries, compared to other things in India, we pay them adequately. Even though it is adequate, sometimes it is enough,—it depends on the family, this, that and other of the Ambassador—sometimes it becomes very difficult for him to make both ends meet, in the lower grades especially.

Then again, the normal idea of an Embassy is sitting in a great city—London, Washington, Moscow, Paris—but out of the sixty-odd foreign missions that we have got, most of them are terribly dull places. Some of them are sitting in the middle of a desert almost, with no contacts or anything.

May I give you an example of a peculiarly difficult post, our post in Tibet—not in regard to the political situation, but just the physical difficulties of the place? And it requires a man, and even more so, a woman, of great courage to endure that life there. Either the woman herself is the head of the mission, or is the wife, and the wife has to suffer more.

My recent visit to Bhutan—and I spent a day at Yatung—gave me some insight into these conditions of our missions in Tibet. Of course, one thing has happened in Gyantse—the

Yantung mission is fairly well. In Gyantse, about four years back a tremendous flood came and it swept away the whole of our mission with 50 or 60 persons. That flood came because something broke down, some lake etc., some burst took place; it came overnight and 50 or 60 of our men died, and since then we have had no building there. Previously there was a building. There has been talk of putting up a building, but things move slowly. In order to put up a building, one has to think of putting up some kind of protective work, so that the river might not overflow. Things, I am afraid, move slowly in India, but sometimes—sometimes I say, not always—things move even more slowly in China. We have got our plans, we have sent our engineers, but we cannot get the requisite permission to build this or that from the Chinese Government. They are considering it. And meanwhile, it is a very hard life for our people.

It is a terrible climate, I mean to say terribly cold, and if you have no proper houses, proper heating, it can be an almost unbearable climate. It has an altitude of 11,000 feet, that itself is difficult enough. At that altitude, it is a terribly cold climate, huge, long, dark nights in the winter, no companionship, no social life; it really is a very hard life, and I am full of admiration for those people who work there, and even more so for their wives.

I am sorry I have taken up so much time. I beg to move these Demands be adopted.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Has the Prime Minister nothing to say about Goa?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, nothing new to say.

Mr. Speaker: Does any hon. Member wish me to put his cut motion to the House?

With the leave of the House all the cut motions are withdrawn.

All the cut motions were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1960, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. 16 to 20 and 111, relating to the Ministry of External Affairs.”

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced here—Ed.]

DEMAND No. 16—TRIBAL AREAS

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,98,32,000 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, 1960, in respect of ‘Tribal Areas’.”

DEMAND No. 17—NAGA HILLS—TUENSANG AREA

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,15,64,000 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, 1960, in respect of ‘Naga Hills—Tuensang Area’.”

DEMAND No. 18—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,94,81,000 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, 1960, in respect of ‘External Affairs’.”

DEMAND No. 19—STATE OF PONDICHERY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,52,13,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'."

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,29,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 111—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,63,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

Ministry of Education

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 110 relating to the Ministry of Education for which five hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving cut motions may kindly hand over at the Table, within 15 minutes, the number of the selected cut motions I shall treat them as moved if the Members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

DEMAND No. 13—MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,48,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'Ministry of Education'."

DEMAND No. 14—EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,54,02,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'Education'."

DEMAND No 15—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,16,69,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and other Expenditure under the Ministry of Education'."

DEMAND No. 110—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 63,84,000 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, 1960, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Education'."

Mr. Speaker: Seth Govind Das. He is the seniormost Member in the House today.