

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1555

1:56

## LOK SABHA

Tuesday, 31st July, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

#### PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

BOOKLET ON INITIAL CONSTITUTION OF INDIAN FOREIGN SERVICE BRANCH 'B'

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the booklet on the initial constitution of the Indian Foreign Service Branch 'B'. [Placed in Library. See No. S-275/56].

#### MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

"I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 30th July, 1956, has passed the following motion.

#### MOTION

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to copyright be instructed to report on or before the 16th August, 1956."

Mr. Speaker: B. G. Mehta to present the Minutes of the Estimates Committee. Not present.

#### STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE AND HIS VISIT ABROAD.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Finance (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): A number of questions which refer to the recent meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers and my visit abroad have been submitted to you, Sir, and you have been pleased to suggest that I make a brief statement on these matters to the House.

The conference and conversations on which I was engaged, cover a wide range of topics of common interest and of world affairs, and were largely in the way of exchange of views and clarification of positions. Where possible, we also tried to seek and find similarities of views and approach to such problems. As a rule, such exchanges of views are not about specific problems that may be subsisting as between the participants in such conferences or talks.

Conferences of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, or other Ministers, take place at intervals, at times and places arranged by consultation among Commonwealth States.

At the recent meeting of Prime Ministers in London, the Prime Ministers exchanged views on matters of common interest to all of them, more particularly problems relating to current developments in international affairs. The Communiqué issued at the end of the Conference has been published in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the Press and is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 63].

The House will note that the communique states "that the common understanding reached by the Prime Ministers will form a valuable background which will assist each Government in the formulation and pursuit of its national policies.

This truly sets out the character of the discussions and their general purpose. These conferences are forums for exchange and understanding, whether it be of agreements or differences. They enrich the experience of the participants and serve to inform them of both similarities and divergences of views, but they do not seek to condition, much less formulate, national decisions. These latter are matters within the exclusive competence of each country, its Government and Parliament.

I might, however, draw the attention of the House to some of these common understandings. The direction of policies to the promotion of peace, the importance of the search for a comprehensive Disarmament Agreement, the determination to strive for progressive improvement in the standards of life of their peoples, the recognition of parliamentary government as a common heritage, the respect for the aspirations of people to freedom and self-government, the furtherance of their own economic development and of rendering assistance to and co-operation with other countries in their development, are among those initially set out in the communique.

Personal contacts and exchange of views, resulted in our reaching a helpful, reasonable and realistic appreciation of the developments in the Soviet Union in their different aspects. These developments were regarded as "Significant" and were welcomed. It was

recognised that the improvement in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the other Great Powers would help to remove the fear of war and further peace. There was also the common appreciation of the significance of Asia in the world of today, and of the situation in the Middle East and Far East. There was the recognition that a peaceful settlement of the problem of the Formosa area was imperative to stability and to removing the dangers of conflict which would frustrate the hopes of peace. I would also invite reference to the paragraph which refers to the part played by certain Commonwealth countries in seeking to maintain peace in Indo-China.

Ceylon's intention to become a Republic and her desire to remain in the Commonwealth was agreed to which we, in this country, welcome most heartily.

It is not the practice, nor would it be helpful, to discuss at these conferences problems of direct concern to two or more Commonwealth States. A Commonwealth Conference does not seek to arbitrate, much less decide by Resolutions or votes, the solution to such problems. Nonetheless, the occasion of their being in the same capital at these gatherings presents opportunities to Prime Ministers, if they so wish, to have talks with one another. Such talks, whether it be of groups of countries who have certain common problems, e.g., Defence arrangements, etc., are, however, not part of the Conference proceedings.

The Conference has been a useful one. The general approach to world problems has been realistic and constructive. It is my belief that the common understandings as set out in the communique will make some useful impact not only on the thinking and approach of the participating countries, but also on other countries and nations. I would add that these Commonwealth Conferences with their diverse composition and the divergences of outlooks and backgrounds and yet displaying a capacity for tolerance and

for reaching common understandings, are a good thing for the world, beset as it is by the sectional outlook and much intolerance—ideological, racial and other. The date and venue of the next meeting of this conference was not considered.

My visit to the German Federal Republic impressed me greatly. This nation, or part of it, after the most crushing defeat and destruction in war, and stricken prior to that by the crushing of the human spirit and values under the Nazis, has resurrected itself. It is truly remarkable that West Germany is today a highly successful industrial nation. She has rebuilt much of the ravages of war. The capacity for hard work and the inventiveness of these people is impressive.

The problem of German unity remains. It is the main and understandable obsession of the German people, of the West and the East. In my talks with the Chancellor Adenauer I expressed my understanding of, and sympathy with, the desire of the German people for the peaceful achievement of their unity which would be facilitated by a lessening of tensions and which would contribute to the improvement of both the European and the World situation.

The German Federal Republic expressed its implicit faith in the economic future of India and its desire for co-operation in the technical, scientific and cultural spheres, which I reciprocated. The Federal Government offered to establish, in co-operation with the Government of India, a technological institute in some part of this country, and a large number of students have been offered scholarships for technical studies in West Germany. I gratefully accepted these offers.

The Chancellor and I issued a joint communique at the end of my visit, a copy of which is laid on the Table of the House [See Appendix III, annexure No. 64]. This communique reaffirms the faith of our two countries in democracy and individual freedom and that the approach to each other and

other countries should be that of friendly and peacefully co-operation, respect for national independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of others. The basic aims of preserving and strengthening peace were emphasised. Two days after the date of our communique, the Chancellor issued a statement, in the course of which he said: "We reject energetically every war and share in regard to this the view point of the Indian Prime Minister, which he has laid down in five political basic principles".

My brief stay in Paris enabled me to meet French leaders, including the President, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. We did not issue a communique, but I am able to tell the House that these talks have helped to further the relations between our two countries and for mutual appreciation of our problems and outlooks.

At Brioni in Yugoslavia, where I went to pay a call on Marshal Tito, opportunity for joint talks with him and President Nasser occur. President Nasser was paying an official visit to Yugoslavia and my arrival there coincided with the last days of his stay with President Tito.

Our tripartite talks there were again on matters of common interest and World affairs. A communique issued by the three of us as Heads of our Governments is placed on the Table of the House [See Appendix III, annexure No. 65]. We expressed our common understandings on the growing desire for peaceful and active co-existence, on the division of the World today into blocs based on fears, the imperative need for progressive disarmament, and the immediate suspension of nuclear explosions. We declared our common belief that the co-operation of the People's Republic of China was imperative for the solution of problems relating to the Far East, and also expressed our support towards finding a just and peaceful solution of the problems of Algeria and the cessation of violent conflicts there.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

The House will notice that in this communique the ten principles of the Bandung Conference have been reiterated.

On my way back home I halted at Cairo and also visited Beirut, the capital of Lebanon. I had previously been to Damascus, the capital of Syria. I had the opportunity to talk with the Presidents and Prime Ministers and others in Syria and Lebanon. We have much in common with these countries of West Asia, who like ourselves have recently established their national freedom and sovereignty.

At Cairo, President Nasser and his Ministers and I had further opportunities of talks, more particularly on our common problems in Asia and developments in the Middle East, such as the Baghdad Pact, as also on colonial problems. These discussions did not relate to the Suez Canal or any aspect of Anglo-Egyptian relations. The recent decision of the Egyptian Government in regard to the Suez Canal first came to my knowledge from the reports in the Press after my return to Delhi.

I had a happy and brief stay in Ireland with which country we have much in common in respect of the background of our struggle for our national freedoms.

Sir, I was out of India for a full month during which, despite a crowded programme of receptions, visits, conversations and conferences, India, a modest sense of pride in her, in our own endeavours and our achievements in the creation of the New India, as well as an overwhelming although invigorating sense of the tasks ahead, has always been with me.

The friendly and enthusiastic reception which my daughter and I and our party received not only from Governments and at official gatherings but also from peoples everywhere was a constant reminder to me of the tasks ahead of us and of the vast and deep expectations that this country of ours, in the short period of her freedom, has

aroused in the peoples of the World. It is a happy feeling to be aware of this, but it is even more an overwhelming one. The enthusiasm of peoples, their desire for understanding and friendship, their responses to our approach to the problem of peace and co-operation, the prevailing recognition of a resurgent Asia—all this was exhilarating. It helped me to realise more and more how shrunken the world has become and how much nations and peoples really must belong to each other.

The onward march of history has brought continents together: and yet the sharp struggles and conflicts divide them. The overwhelming weight of deadly weapons and the menace of atomic destruction have rendered peaceful co-existence the only way of survival in the immediate future. This was borne in on me by my talks with people and Governments during my travels, and I have come to realise that this is our imperative need today. For this, we need goodwill and tolerance as between nations. We can make our best contribution by our example and by our persistent endeavours to promote peace and co-operation.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): May I submit to you, Sir, that in view of the fact that we are deeply interested in the affairs of Egypt and the Suez Canal and in view of the fact that even during the Commonwealth Conference the stability of the Middle East and the question of non-interference in the affairs of other nations came up, we would like to know if the Prime Minister could enlighten us as to our attitude towards this conflict in the light of England and France freezing the assets of Egypt?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that after a statement is made, no questions are put and no debate takes place. Hon. Members will read the statement at their leisure. There are some questions which have been pending and in view of the absence of the Prime Minister I had kept

them all together—they were addressed to him—and I requested him to make a comprehensive statement. If still there are any points which the hon. Members want to be clarified, they may inform me, and by way of questions, any other matters also may be taken up in due course.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East): Could I make a submission? If we are having an opportunity of discussing an important statement of this sort, it is a different matter, but if not,—and it does not seem likely that this session perhaps we shall have time to discuss this statement—could we have a clarification on one or two points? There is one point which, with your permission, I wish to place before you.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to go into it. I am also surprised at this request—not that I am surprised at the request, but let me consider. I do not want to make an innovation for the first time. There may be opportunities for hon. Members. If there is no opportunity they may put some questions of vital importance. I will consider the admission of those questions and give notice to the Prime Minister. He may also consider it at a later stage if there are any particular points which require clarification.

I will proceed to the next item on the agenda. Pandit Pant.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** (Eluru): You promised to give me some chance.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member will kindly look into the agenda paper.

#### SITUATION IN NAGA HILLS

**The Minister of Home Affairs** (Pandit G. B. Pant): The House will recall that on the 30th May, 1956 the Prime Minister made a statement on the situation in the Naga Hills. Since then I have myself visited the Assam State and utilised the opportunity to discuss the situation with the Governor of Assam, the Chief Minister, the Army Commander and others.

For some time past, a misguided section of the Nagas has been claim-

ing an independent Naga State. It was made clear to them that no such claim could possibly be recognised, but that we were always prepared to consider any legitimate proposals. It is our declared policy to encourage distinctive cultures in our land and not to interfere with the traditional ways of life of the people in any part of the country. It was indeed with this aim in view that some special provisions were made in the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution of India.

The agitation in the Naga Hills was carried on through the Naga National Council and was, till some months ago, comparatively peaceful. These methods however, did not suit Zapu Phizo, the President of the Council, who on finding that the more responsible and sensible members were opposed to the course of action on which he was bent, dissolved the Council and thereupon entered upon a campaign of violence and bloodshed. Shri Sakrie, a respected Naga leader and an ex-General Secretary of the Naga National Council, was murdered in a most gruesome and brutal manner. He was tortured, tied to a tree and then shot. Since then the misguided elements amongst the Nagas have been committing acts of violence and terrorising the innocent and simple inhabitants of the Naga Hills District. In some cases it has been reported that the soles of innocent victims have been skinned and nails driven into them before the men were finally done to death. In others, people have been decapitated. It is a matter of grief and distress that under the intimidating and coercive influence of these criminal and misguided elements the peace of this area should have been disturbed.

The responsibility for the maintenance of law and order in this District has been that of the State Government of Assam. The resources of the State Government are, however, limited and the terrain is extremely difficult consisting chiefly of hills and dense woods. The State Government asked for aid from the Centre and we sent our military forces to the