

Thursday, 7th December, 1950

Par B. II. V. 50 (1)

840



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

Volume V, 1950

(15th November to 22nd December, 1950)



THIRD SESSION (FIRST PART)

of the

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

(1950)

Price Rs. 2 or 3h.

CONTENTS

Volume V.—15th November to 22nd December, 1950.

	Columns		Columns
Wednesday, 15th November, 1950—			
Members sworn	I		
Oral Answers to Questions	1—28		
Written Answers to Questions	28—50		
Thursday, 16th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	51—76		
Written Answers to Questions	76—90		
Friday, 17th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	91—120		
Written Answers to Questions	120—30		
Monday, 20th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	131—56		
Written Answers to Questions	156—74		
Tuesday, 21st November, 1950—			
Member sworn	175		
Oral Answers to Questions	175—99		
Written Answers to Questions	199—224		
Wednesday, 22nd November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	225—51		
Written Answers to Questions	252—66		
Thursday, 23rd November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	267—94		
Written Answers to Questions	294—308		
Saturday, 25th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	309—39		
Written Answers to Questions	339—52		
Monday, 27th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	353—81		
Written Answers to Questions	381—90		
Tuesday, 28th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	391—418		
Written Answers to Questions	418—36		
Wednesday, 29th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	437—63		
Written Answers to Questions	463—78		
Thursday, 30th November, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	479—511		
Written Answers to Questions	511—18		
Friday, 1st December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	519—47		
Written Answers to Questions	547—60		
Monday, 4th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	561—98		
Written Answers to Questions	598—610		
Tuesday, 5th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	611—45		
Written Answers to Questions	645—52		
Wednesday, 6th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	653—81		
Written Answers to Questions	681—702		
Thursday, 7th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	703—31		
Written Answers to Questions	731—38		
Friday, 8th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	739—67		
Written Answers to Questions	767—72		
Monday, 11th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	773—801		
Written Answers to Questions	801—12		
Tuesday, 12th December, 1950—			
Oral Answers to Questions	813—43		
Written Answers to Questions	843—46		

CONTENTS

	Columns
Wednesday, 13th December, 1950—	
Oral Answers to Questions	847—79
Written Answers to Questions	879—86
Thursday, 14th December, 1950—	
Oral Answer to Questions	887—912
Written Answers to Questions	912—26
Monday, 18th December, 1950—	
Oral Answers to Questions	927—63
Written Answers to Questions	963—1016
Tuesday, 19th December, 1950—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1017—45
Written Answers to Questions	1045—70
Wednesday, 20th December, 1950—	
Member sworn	1071
Oral Answers to Questions	1071—97
Written Answers to Questions	1097—1124
Thursday, 21st December, 1950—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1125—32
Friday, 22nd December, 1950—	
Oral Answers to Questions	1133—36

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

703

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA
Thursday, 7th December, 1950

*The House met at a Quarter to Eleven
of the Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

REFRIGERATORS AND AIR-CONDITIONING
UNITS

*727. **Shri Tyagi:** (a) Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state the amount spent last year on the supply and maintenance of refrigerators and air-conditioning units in the residences, and offices of the Ministers of the Union and Government Officers in Delhi and in other stations under the Central Government?

(b) Have Government ordered for more such appliances this year from abroad, and if so, at what cost?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Buragohain): (a) A statement showing the information is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 27].

(b) Yes. An order has been placed on the Director General, Industries and Supplies for the purchase of Air Conditioning units and Desert Coolers for Rs. 2,69,268 and Rs. 48,600 respectively.

Shri Tyagi: May I know if these coolers have been purchased or whether only the order was placed?

Shri Buragohain: I require notice.

Shri Tyagi: May I know what was the average spent annually on the exodus to Simla previously?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): These desert coolers and air-conditioning arrangements became necessary when the Government of India abandoned the

704

plan of going to Simla, which on an average cost about Rs. 30 lakhs every year.

Shri Tyagi: May I know whether this sum of Rs. 2,69,268 was spent on refrigerators and air-conditioning units supplied at the residences of officers? How does this add to the efficiency of officials?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Tyagi: May I know whether this expenditure is realised from the officials?

Mr. Speaker: There should be no argument. He may ask for information.

Shri Tyagi: Sir, I want to know whether any rent is realised on these refrigerators. That is the information I want.

Mr. Speaker: He may put that question straight.

Shri Buragohain: Rent is realised.

Shri Tyagi: What was the total income realised?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us go to the next question.

ROLLING STOCK (PURCHASE)

*728. **Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state whether the Financial Commissioner for Railways has been deputed to proceed to Europe to purchase rolling stock and other equipments for railways?

(b) If so, what kind of orders have been placed and with whom and what is the total amount of such orders placed?

(c) Were tenders invited and were the lowest prices accepted?

The Minister of Transport and Railways (Shri Gopaldaswami): (a) The Financial Commissioner for Railways, along with a senior Mechanical Engineer of the Railway Board, was deputed to negotiate orders for rolling

stock to complete the first phase of the rehabilitation programme of Indian Railways. The Director General, India Stores Department, London, was associated with them throughout in the negotiations leading to procurement.

He was not deputed to purchase any other equipment for Railways.

(b) The Financial Commissioner placed orders for wagons, petrol tanks and coaches, the value of the total orders aggregating approximately to Rs. 8.14 crores (Rs. 8,13,62,200). The names of the firms on which orders were placed are given in the first of the two statements which are placed on the Table of the House for its information. Subsequent to his return, orders for locomotives based on his discussions have also been placed to the value of Rs. 4.83 crores, particulars regarding which are in the second statement placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 28].

(c) Global tenders for certain categories of rolling stock had been invited a few months before the Financial Commissioner proceeded to Europe but neither the prices nor the delivery dates were satisfactory. Fresh quotations were therefore invited from the U.K. and Continental firms as a basis for negotiations. As a result of a series of negotiations, conducted by the Financial Commissioner, orders have now been placed at prices below those quoted against the global tenders.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether any tenders were received from Switzerland and Austria in connection with carriages and wagons and also locomotives?

Shri Gopalaswami: I think as regards carriages and wagons, quotations were received from Austria as well as, I think, from Switzerland. If the hon. Member will refer to the statement, he will see with which firm in Austria orders had been placed.

Shri Sidhva: I find from the statement that the order placed with Austria is only for £2,37,500/-. May I know whether tenders were invited or only quotations were received, and if so, whether these are the lowest tenders or whether any special concession has been made for accepting higher tenders against the lower ones?

Shri Gopalaswami: This order was placed with reference to quotations that were received. And my information is that the quotations were lower than the global tenders which had been received previously.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether any efforts were made to place orders with Indian manufacturers, e.g., our Hindustan Aircraft Factory, and what was the result of the orders that were placed by the Government in the past for construction of wagons and coaches?

Shri Gopalaswami: We have placed orders with the wagon building firms in India to the full extent of their capacity, and the orders for wagons placed abroad are for stock which we require over and above what the Indian firms could manufacture and supply.

Shri Sidhva: From the statement on locomotives, I find that 217 new locomotives are being ordered at a cost of Rs. 4.83 crores. May I know whether these are over and above the number that was recently received? If not, may I know why they have been ordered and whether Switzerland and the Netherlands which also manufacture locomotives had been approached for this purpose?

Shri Gopalaswami: These 217 locomotives are over and above the number of locomotives which we have received already. These orders were placed because we have got to replace something like 200 locomotives every year. That is our requirement annually. For the current year we have not placed orders—for supply in the current year we have not placed new orders to an extent which would come anywhere near this 200. For the four year programme which we have evolved for the purpose of rehabilitation we require somewhere about 200 locomotives per annum and the orders placed here were in implementation of that programme.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether it is a fact that some of the locomotives have to be replaced on account of the fact that some of the recently imported locomotives have proved to be failures?

Shri Gopalaswami: No, Sir.

SUGAR ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

***729. Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Sugar Enquiry Committee appointed by Government has completed its work and submitted its report?

(b) If so, what are the recommendations?

(c) What steps have Government taken in that direction?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) No; the Committee is expected to

complete its work by the 31st December, 1950.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: May I know since when this Committee has been working and whether there are permanent and paid people appointed on this Committee?

Shri Thirumala Rao: The Committee was expected to conclude its labour by the end of September but the time has been extended a little further and we hope it will complete its labour by the end of this month.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: My question has been since when it has been working and whether there are permanent and paid people on it.

Shri Thirumala Rao: The Committee consists of only one member who is an ex-Judge of a High Court. I think some allowance is paid to him for the work done.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: Sir, my question is since when it is working.

Shri Thirumala Rao: Since July, 1950.

Shri Tyagi: What are the terms of reference of this Committee?

Mr. Speaker: I think he may refer to the terms—it is a matter of record.

Shri Tyagi: I want to know exactly the points which are to be enquired into by this Committee.

Shri Thirumala Rao: The purpose for which this Committee was set up was to enquire as to why there was scarcity of sugar in the closing months of last year, and who was responsible for that difficulty.

Shri Sidhva: Does this include the sugar muddle also?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He need not describe it as 'muddle'. The Committee is enquiring into it at present.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I know whether it includes an enquiry into the working of the Railways also?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is about sugar.

Shri Hussain Imam: I want to know whether it will enquire into how wagons are made available. Is this included in the enquiry?

Shri Thirumala Rao: It is open to the officer in charge to summon all the witnesses he requires in this connection.

RAILWAY STATIONS (ELECTRIFICATION)

*730. **Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state how many railway stations during the period 1st January 1950 up-to-date were fitted with electric lights?

(b) What is the amount so far spent on various railways for the period from 1st February 1950 up-to-date from Betterment Fund?

The Minister of Transport and Railways (Shri Gopaldaswami): (a) 113 stations.

(b) A sum of Rs. 1,26,07,000 was spent from the Betterment Fund from 1st February 1950 upto 31st March 1950. Thereafter the Betterment Fund was abolished and all expenditure on passenger amenities charged to the Development Fund. A sum of Rs. 80-57 lakhs has been spent from the Development Fund on passenger amenities from 1st April to 30th September, 1950.

Shri Sidhva: What are the principal amenities on which this amount has been spent?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The usual passenger amenities. If he wants a list of them, I can give him one. I have given that list several times already in this House.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether this includes the extension of railway stations or any offices for administrative purposes?

Shri Gopaldaswami: No.

Shri Hussain Imam: May I know whether there is any proposal to electrify stations on the Western U.P. lines where electricity is available from the Government plants?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The programme is to electrify practically all, but it will take some time to complete the programme.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Is there any scheme to electrify certain fixed number of stations every year?

Shri Gopaldaswami: As a matter of fact, we leave it to the individual Railway Administrations to select the stations which should be electrified every year and we place the amount at their disposal.

Shri Deogirikar: May I know how many stations in Bombay State were electrified this year?

Shri Gopaldaswami: Stations which had been fitted with electric lights

during the year were four. It is hoped that eight more will be electrified.

Shri Alagesan: Since it is proposed to spend not less than three crores on amenities, and as only less than one-third of it has been spent so far, may I enquire whether Government have got any schemes to spend the rest of the amount?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The expenditure figure that I gave was for the two months February and March 1950. In the current year, we have provided an allotment of Rs. 3.16 crores for amenities, out of which Rs. 80 lakhs and odd have been spent already and the rest, I expect, will be spent before the end of the year.

Shri T. N. Singh: Out of these Rs. 80 lakhs, may I know how much has gone towards providing amenities and other benefits to the workers on the Railways?

Shri Gopaldaswami: This is for passenger amenities.

WESTERN COURT AND CONSTITUTION HOUSE (RENTS)

*731. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that rents for suites in Western Court are fixed separately on a daily and a monthly basis, but the monthly basis does not obtain in Constitution House; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Buragohain):

(a) Yes. The daily rate in the Western Court is fixed at 1/20th of the monthly rate while in the Constitution House the rent is charged on the basis of daily rates.

(b) The higher daily rate is adopted for Western Court in order to avoid loss for suites remaining vacant.

Shri Kamath: The question refers to the monthly rate also. No mention is made about it in the answer. What about the monthly rate?

Shri Buragohain: Under Fundamental Rules the monthly rate is fixed on the capital cost and the daily rate is fixed at one-twentieth of the monthly rate. That is the basis adopted for Western Court. With regard to the other Government Hostels, the rates are fixed on an *ad hoc* basis, and the whole question is under the consideration of Government.

Shri Kamath: Is it not a fact that the House Committee of Parliament

made a proposal in this regard as far back as nine or ten months ago, and may I know why a decision in this matter has been delayed?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): It is because it involves questions of great importance, and hon. Members will naturally expect that proper consideration must be given.

Shri Kamath: Is the hon. Minister aware that a Member of Parliament has to pay as high a rent as Rs. 180 per mensem for two rooms in Constitution House?

Shri Buragohain: That is so.

Mr. Speaker: We are now entering into arguments. The question is not asking for information.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether additional rent is charged for the separate kitchen attached to the suites in Constitution House?

Shri Buragohain: I have not got the information at present.

Shri Kamath: What are the reasons for having an *ad hoc* basis for other Government Hostels and a fixed basis for Western Court?

Shri Gadgil: Western Court has been in existence pretty long and therefore there were some traditions to be followed... (Interruption).

An Hon. Member: What are they?

Mr. Speaker: We shall now go to the next question.

'ALL-UP' POSTAL SCHEME

*732. **Shri E. Khan:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the annual expenditure incurred on conveyance of mails by air on account of the 'All-Up' scheme;

(b) whether there has been a corresponding reduction in expenditure on conveyance of mails by surface route;

(c) if so, to what extent;

(d) whether it is a fact that expenditure on conveyance of mails by rail has increased due to establishing subsidiary services on rail-route in connection with air-mail services; and

(e) if so, what is the annual expenditure on such services?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): (a) About Rs. 47.04 lakhs.

(b) and (c). There has been no appreciable reduction in the conveyance charges for mails conveyed by surface routes as a result of the introduction of the 'All Up' Scheme.

(d) and (e). The additional expenditure entailed by the opening of new subsidiary mail services by rail in connection with the air services is very small, being less than Rs. 200/- per month.

Shri Kamath: What percentage of the mails is now carried by air under this scheme?

Shri Khurshed Lal: About 27 per cent. of the first-class mail is carried by air. The all-up scheme applies only to first-class mail.

Shri Kamath: Is there any proposal before Government to reduce the postage rate on envelopes to the former rate and levy a charge for airlift?

Shri Khurshed Lal: No.

Shri Tyagi: May I know what is first-class mail?

Mr. Speaker: He may enquire.

Shri Sidhva: As against the Rs. 47 lakhs that we spend, may I know what was the expenditure in the previous year?

Shri Khurshed Lal: This sum of Rs. 47 lakhs includes a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs which had to be paid to the Air India Ltd., as the minimum guarantee under the terms of an agreement entered into about ten years back. On actual weight charges for mail carried by them come to about Rs. 6 lakhs. Last year, before the introduction of the all-up mail scheme, a sum of Rs. 26 lakhs and over was paid to the Air Companies including the Rs. 10 lakhs to Air India.

Shri Kamath: Have representations been made to Government from several urban centres which are not connected by air and also from rural centres that this all-up scheme has not benefited them at all?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

CONSERVATION OF INDIAN FISH

*733. **Dr. M. M. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Director of Zoological Survey of India has recommended for the re-enactment of certain laws for the conservation of Indian fish, which were passed by Emperor Asoka about 2500 years ago?

(b) If so, have Government considered this recommendation?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know, Sir, what was the law that was passed by Emperor Asoka for the conservation of fish?

Mr. Speaker: I think it is a question of historical research.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know, Sir, whether the law that was passed by Emperor Asoka had sound biological knowledge as their basis?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: What is the quantity of fish available per year for human consumption in India?

Shri Thirumala Rao: I want notice of that question.

Sardar B. S. Man: I want to know whether only big fish will be conserved, or small fish also.

HINDI TELEGRAM SERVICE

*734. **Dr. M. M. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government are contemplating to impose restrictions upon the sending of Telegrams in English in Hindi Telegraph Service Stations like Kanpur, Allahabad, Jubblepore and others, to prevent a break-down of the Hindi Telegram Service?

(b) Is it a fact that the daily average of Hindi Telegrams in Kanpur is only ten, whereas that of English per day is 900?

(c) What is the total expenditure incurred by Government up-to-date for Hindi Telegram Service?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): (a) No.

(b) Yes.

(c) Rs. 44,000 on account of training telegraphists in Hindi Morse Code (pay and allowances of trainees and instructor) and Rs. 200 incidental on account of working the service.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether Government has set up separate counters and appointed separate staff for Hindi telegrams in Kanpur?

Shri Khurshed Lal: No, Sir.

Dr. M. M. Das: Am I to understand the hon. Minister to say that there has

been no break-down of Hindi telegrams?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I do not understand what the hon. Member means; telegrams are going all right.

Dr. M. M. Das: The hon. Minister admitted the fact that only ten telegrams per day are in Hindi, while the number of English telegrams are about nine hundred per day?

Shri Khurshed Lal: It is a fact that the number of Hindi telegrams which are being sent from Kanpur is very disappointing, but Government hope that it will improve.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether Government propose to take some steps for increasing the number of telegrams in Hindi?

Shri Khurshed Lal: We are giving all possible publicity to the facilities we are providing.

Dr. M. M. Das: Do Government intend to decrease the rates of Hindi telegrams in comparison with the rates charged for English telegrams?

Mr. Speaker: These are all suggestions for action.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Do Government propose to extend this service to other stations and if so to what stations?

Shri Khurshed Lal: There is a proposal to extend the service to other stations. I am afraid I cannot give the names of stations where it is proposed to be extended.

Dr. R. S. Singh: Is it a fact that telegrams in Hindi are accepted for a limited number of hours where as telegrams in English are accepted throughout the day?

Shri Khurshed Lal: That is so.

PURCHASE OF WHEAT

*735. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Food be pleased to state what quantities of wheat were purchased from dollar areas during January-June, 1950?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): Nil.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Has any additional acreage been brought under cultivation this year?

Mr. Speaker: How does it arise out of this question?

Prof. Ranga: Do Government intend to make any purchases in any of the dollar areas, either Canada or America, or anywhere else?

Shri Thirumala Rao: Yes, Sir. We are getting from July to November 1950, 3,000 tons of wheat from United States. We are expecting another 43,000 tons by the end of December 1950 from U.S.A., and 19,000 tons from Canada.

CULTIVABLE RAILWAY LAND

*736. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** (a) Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to refer to the answer given to my starred question No. 935 asked on the 17th March, 1950, regarding railway plots for 'Grow More Food' and state the total area of surplus cultivable railway land that has already been utilised for 'Grow More Food'?

(b) Have complete lists of surplus cultivable railway lands been sent to all State Governments concerned and if not, what are the reasons for the delay?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao):

(a) About 9,675 acres have been leased out to private individuals (mostly railway staff) and another 9,424 acres to the State Governments for 'Grow More Food' purposes.

(b) Except in case of lands belonging to B.N., G.I.P. and Assam Railways, complete lists have been furnished to the State Governments concerned. Delay in the former cases is due to large number of small areas involved.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, what kind of crops are being grown on these lands?

Shri Thirumala Rao: In delta areas through which our railway lines run, rice and wheat are grown; in dry areas millets are grown.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the Railways directly lease these lands, or it is done through the State Governments?

Shri Thirumala Rao: Mostly the responsibility rests with the State Governments while the Railways reserve the right of entering into those lands for their own purposes.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know separately the area under cultivation in the B.N. and E.I. Railway lands?

Shri Thirumala Rao: In B. N. Railway the total area of land leased out to State Governments is 2,243 acres; and on the E.I. Railway 2,091 acres.

Prof. Ranga: Is it not a fact that there are lakhs of acres of such railway land which can be used for growing more food, and only a very small

percentage of it is now being made available for this purpose? What steps are being taken by Government to increase the acreage for cultivation?

Shri Thirumala Rao: State Governments are concerned with this matter and if they take more interest, more land can be brought under cultivation.

ACCIDENTS FROM EXPLOSIVES

*737. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing:

(a) the number of serious accidents that occurred in the country in connection with explosives, inflammable substances, dangerous goods etc., during the year 1949;

(b) how many of these occurred in (i) Government factories, (ii) private factories, and (iii) private or public places;

(c) how many were killed and how many injured; and

(d) whether any compensation was granted to the dependants of the killed or to the injured, and if so, in how many cases and how much?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Buragohain): (a) to (d). A statement giving the available information is laid on the Table. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 29.] It covers only accidents covered by the Explosives and Petroleum Acts—other information is not available and could only be collected through an elaborate enquiry. As regards compensation to dependants information is not readily available. However compensation would generally be payable under the Workmen's Compensation Act administered by the State Governments.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, how many persons were convicted for using unlicensed dangerous goods?

Shri Buragohain: I require notice of that question. Moreover, it does not directly arise out of this question.

Shri Kamath: During the last year (1949) how many reports were received by Government from the inspection staff about safety devices and measures prescribed under the Factories Act not being adopted in these factories?

Shri Buragohain: I have not got the information with me just now.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Of the explosives mentioned in the statement which are licensed and which are not?

Shri Buragohain: They are all licensed.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, if all these things are licensed, whether action has been taken against private persons who have used them without license?

Shri Buragohain: They will be liable under the Act.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN RICE

*738. **Prof. Ranga:** Will the Minister of Food be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is the Government's policy to make India self-sufficient in rice and if so, by what means and in how many years; and

(b) if not, whether they have formulated any policy regarding the imports of rice from Burma, Siam, Indonesia during the next five years?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) Overall self-sufficiency in food-grains by March 1952 is the policy of Government but not in any particular foodgrain.

(b) Negotiations for the purchase of rice from Burma and Thailand are in hand. To the best of our knowledge Indonesia during the next five years?

Prof. Ranga: What quantities of rice, Sir, are Government negotiating for import from Burma and Thailand?

Shri Thirumala Rao: The total figure cannot be arrived at until the Food Ministers' Conference which is going to meet soon concludes.

Prof. Ranga: What percentage of the imports of rice has been received from Burma and Siam during the last two years, or even this year?

Shri Thirumala Rao: I want notice of that question.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: What is the estimated quantity of rice which is required to make India self-sufficient in rice and how much of it is being produced at present?

Shri Thirumala Rao: According to our estimates we are in deficit of about 2.4 million tons for the whole country.

Ch. Rambir Singh: What incentives are afforded to the agriculturists to grow more rice?

Shri Thirumala Rao: Supplying of good seeds, manures and good marketing facilities.

Shri Sidhva: In reply to part (b) of the question the hon. Minister replied that negotiations for the purchase of rice from Burma and Thailand are in hand. In view of Government's policy of stopping imports after 1952, do Government still contemplate negotiating for a five-year programme?

Shri Thirumala Rao: I would refer the hon. Member to the statement made on this subject during the food debate.

Shri Sidhva: Do Government stick to the policy of not importing any food-grains?

Mr. Speaker: That statement was made in the absence of the hon. Member.

Shri Raj Bahadur: In view of the declared policy of the Government not to import foodgrains after March, 1952, is it a fact that a great amount of anxiety and nervousness has been expressed by people in Burma and Siam from where we have been importing rice?

Shri Thirumala Rao: As I have made it clear in my statement, under three conditions we will have to continue our import programme. If we do not attain self-sufficiency, if there is drought or if there are natural causes that demand imports, the Government will not hesitate to import.

Shri Rathnaswamy: Is any agreement likely to be entered into with China for the supply of rice on a long-term basis?

Shri Thirumala Rao: No, Sir.

Prof. Ranga: Is it part of the self-sufficiency policy of the Government that in regard to rice also we should become self-sufficient by 1952 March?

Shri Thirumala Rao: With regard to the steps that are being taken in the matter of the Grow More Food campaign, all the rice-growing areas are also receiving equal attention as the wheat-growing areas.

Prof. Ranga: That is not my question.

Shri Thirumala Rao: I will explain it. The policy of the Government is to make up the 4.8 million ton deficit in the country composed of 0.6 million of wheat, 2.4 million of rice, and 1.8 million of millets.

Prof. Ranga: With reference to the answer given by my hon. friend to the question of incentives, is not the payment of remunerative prices to the rice-growers also one of the points?

Shri Thirumala Rao: That was never disputed.

FOOD BONUS

*739. **Shri Poonacha:** Will the Minister of Food be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of 'Food Bonus' earned by Coorg so far;

(b) in what manner this amount is going to be spent; and

(c) whether the Coorg Administration has submitted any scheme for utilising this bonus amount?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) The Coorg Administration has claimed a sum of Rs. 5,87,992 as food bonus earned during the period commencing from 1st January 1948 and ending 31st December 1949.

(b) 75 per cent. of the bonus sanctioned would be utilized by the Administration in financing its Grow More Food Schemes and 25 per cent. would be spent on the Schemes resulting in increased procurement of locally produced foodgrains.

(c) A list of the Schemes which have already been undertaken by the State and which are to be financed out of the bonus earned by them is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 30].

Shri Poonacha: Have any instructions been issued by the Central Government to the Coorg Administration as to how the amount of the food bonus is to be spent?

Shri Thirumala Rao: The various items for which that amount has to be spent have to be submitted by the Coorg Administration to the Central Government for approval, and it is being done from time to time.

Shri Poonacha: Is it not a fact that special emphasis was laid by the Central Government that this bonus amount should be spent towards schemes connected with the growing of more food?

Shri Thirumala Rao: Yes, Sir.

Shri Poonacha: Is it not a fact that the Government of India has already sanctioned an expenditure of about Rs. 48,000 for additional staff in connection with the tightening up of crop procurement work?

Shri Thirumala Rao: I want notice of that question.

Prof. Ranga: Is this food bonus being given to all the States?

Shri Thirumala Rao: Yes, Sir.

Shri Poonacha: I find that the Government of India has already agreed to the Coorg Administration spending about Rs. 48,000 for tightening up procurement and I wonder how the hon. Minister says.....

Shri Thirumala Rao: The point is that with regard to the scheme for tightening up of procurement, the money spent on it has to be spent out of this amount, and it will be a self-paying proposition.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: How is this food bonus earned? Has U. P. also earned it, and if so, how much?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is restricted to Coorg. Let us not enlarge it to the whole of India.

IRRIGATION WORKS IN COORG

*740. **Shri Poonacha:** Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to state:

(a) the number of irrigational works completed in Coorg under the 'Grow More Food' campaign since 1947;

(b) whether any survey has been made in Coorg about the possibilities of tapping river waters to irrigate paddy fields by constructing small bunds;

(c) whether any experiments have been made in Coorg to lift water by Oil Engine Pump Sets;

(d) if so, in how many places such experiments were conducted and with what results;

(e) what amount has been spent in this respect by the Coorg Administration;

(f) what acreage of paddy fields have now been brought under permanent irrigation under the "Grow More Food" campaign in Coorg since 1947;

(g) how many requests or prayers were received by the Coorg Administration for constructing small dams costing below Rs. 10,000 wherein the beneficiaries had volunteered to contribute 50 per cent. of the costs; and

(h) how many of such requests have been conceded and works completed?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) 342 including improvement works.

(b) No.

(c) Yes.

(d) In several villages in Ponnampet and Fraserpet circles, 86 acres of lands were irrigated and an additional yield of 49.5 tons of paddy harvested.

(e) Rs. 13,852 including the grants from the Government of India.

(f) Approximately 2,100 acres.

(g) Not available as records in this respect are not maintained.

(h) 95 requests were conceded and works have been completed in all the 95 cases.

Shri Poonacha: Have the Government ever looked into the qualifications and merits of the staff that is engaged in the matter of the Grow More Food campaign in Coorg?

Shri Thirumala Rao: The Head of the Administration is charged with the responsibility of looking into these things.

Mr. Speaker: Have the Government of India looked into this? That is his question.

Shri Thirumala Rao: If there is any discrepancy or mistake in this direction to which the hon. Member will draw the attention of Government, they will look into it.

Shri Poonacha: I want to know whether the Government is satisfied with the progress made so far as the Grow More Food campaign is concerned in Coorg.

Mr. Speaker: It is more or less a question of opinion.

Prof. Ranga: With regard to part (b) of the question my hon. friend answered 'No'. I want to know whether Government propose to make any survey at all, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister himself has stated in his answer that there are more than 300 schemes affording possibilities of further irrigation in Coorg.

Shri Thirumala Rao: Yes, there will be greater attention paid to Coorg with regard to these matters.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Arising out of the answer to part (a) of the question, may I know what is the increase in the total production of foodgrains as a result of these irrigational works?

Shri Thirumala Rao: That has to be assessed by the Economic Investigators of the Government.

CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS IN COORG

*741. **Shri Poonacha:** (a) Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state whether the

schemes to construct dams across the Laxmanatheertha and Harangi Rivers in Coorg are on the approved list of irrigational schemes of the Government of India?

(b) When were these schemes approved?

(c) Who will be in charge of the construction works of these dams, State Government or the Government of India?

(d) What action has so far been taken to take up the construction of these projects?

(e) What were the original estimated costs when these schemes were first drawn up?

(f) What are the latest estimated costs for each of these projects?

(g) When is the actual construction of these dams likely to be taken up?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Buragohain): (a) Yes, but only so far as preliminary investigations are concerned.

(b) The investigation was sanctioned in March 1949.

(c) This question will be considered if and when it is decided to take up actual construction.

(d) The investigations of the schemes are being carried out.

(e) The cost of the Laxmanatheertha Project as estimated by the Coorg Administration in 1943 was Rs. 3.25 lakhs and that of the Harangi Project as estimated by the same Administration in 1946 was Rs. 23.40 lakhs.

(f) No estimates have yet been made as the investigations have not yet been completed.

(g) This will be considered when investigations are finished.

Shri Poonacha: Have the Government received any report from the staff that was sent to carry on the preliminary investigation in this respect?

Shri Buragohain: Yes, periodical reports are received.

Shri Poonacha: Is it a fact that because certain objections were raised by the States of Mysore and Madras, these are going to be held over?

Shri Buragohain: In fact the scheme to construct a dam across the Laxmanatheertha has not progressed very far owing to lack of agreement between the Governments of Coorg, Mysore and Madras.

Shri Poonacha: Is it a fact that some time in 1948 in a conference that was held in Krishnarajasagar the Governments of Mysore and Madras had actually agreed to allow Coorg 17 cusecs of water so far as the Laxmanatheertha river dam was concerned?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): A conference was held on the 18th June 1950 and a certain agreement has now been reached.

Shri Chattopadhyay: May I know what acreage will come under irrigation?

Shri Buragohain: I require notice of this question.

Shri Poonacha: May I know what steps are proposed to be taken for the early construction of this Dam in Harangi?

Shri Buragohain: That will depend upon the finding of a suitable site for it. Unless a suitable site is found, the scheme may have to be dropped.

Shri Poonacha: Is it a fact that the entire scheme has now been changed to construct a reservoir instead of a dam across the Laxmanatheertha River?

Shri Buragohain: To an extent it has been modified.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

*744. **Prof. K. T. Shah:** (a) Will the Minister of Transport be pleased to state what steps have been taken to implement the recommendations of the Road Congress for extending the National Highways in India, and their branch or feeder and linking roads?

(b) What has been the cost, since 1946, of such road construction, including bridges, tunnels, ferries etc., ancillary to the same?

(c) In what proportion has the cost of roads already constructed been met out of the Central and out of the States Budgets, respectively, since the advent of Independence?

(d) What is the present amount of the Roads Fund, and what are the present sources of replenishing or increasing the same?

The Minister of State for Transport and Railways (Shri Santhanam): (a) in accordance with the recommendations of the Nagpur Conference of Chief Engineers of 1943, the Central Government has taken upon itself the responsibility for the construction and maintenance of about

13,000 miles of roads provisionally accepted as national highways. These are described in Chapter VII of the Report for 1948-49 and Chapter VI of the Report for 1949-50 of the Ministry of Transport. These national highways were formerly maintained by the Provincial and State Governments and their being taken over by the Central Government has made more funds available for such Governments for extending and maintaining other roads.

(b) The cost since 1947 of construction, including bridges, tunnels, ferries, etc., of the national highways is about Rs. 4 crores.

(c) So far as national highways are concerned, the entire expenditure on construction and maintenance since responsibility was assumed in 1947 has been that of the Central Government.

(d) The annual receipts to the Road Fund obtained from a 2½ anna tax on petrol used in motor vehicles is about Rs. 3 crores. Out of the total credits to the Road Fund (including the estimated revenue for 1949-50) of about Rs. 33 crores, Rs. 25 crores have been distributed on approved works and the balance is in the process of distribution.

Prof. K. T. Shah: May I enquire whether in the total of the National Highways given by the hon. Minister any portion is in the Part C States?

Shri Santhanam: Yes, Sir. Parts of the National Highways are to be found in all the States.

Prof. K. T. Shah: May I enquire if there is in this total mileage any road included for connecting the major port of Kandla now developed in the State of Kutch linking it with the Frontier?

Shri Santhanam: The road from Kandla joining it with the National Highways across Rajasthan will be taken over when the Kandla port and railways are constructed.

Prof. K. T. Shah: I am asking about the road from the port to the frontier, connecting it with Pakistan through the State of Kutch.

Shri Santhanam: I would require notice of the question.

Shri Raj Bahadur: May I know whether the road from Agra to Jodhpur via Jaipur has been declared a national highway?

Shri Santhanam: It is a matter of detail and I have not got all the details.

Prof. K. T. Shah: May I know whether any portion of this proposed

construction is held up on account of the economy drive at any port?

Shri Santhanam: Owing to considerations of economy we are not able to expand the national highway system as much as we would like.

Prof. K. T. Shah: I want to know whether the road connecting Kandla Port with the Frontier was one of the schemes.

Shri Santhanam: I do not have particulars of all the 13,000 miles of roads.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know what is the proportion of money spent on feeder and branch roads and what is the mileage of the National Highways?

Mr. Speaker: It is a big question.

Shri J. N. Hazarika: May I know how many miles of these 13,000 miles recommended by the Committee fall within the State of Assam?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think we need go into the various provinces. There will be no end to it.

Dr. R. S. Singh: What is the total mileage of the National Highways and what is the total expenditure incurred on the maintenance and repairs last year?

Shri Santhanam: As I have already stated the total mileage is 13,000 miles. I have also said that the cost since 1947 of construction, including bridges, tunnels, ferries, etc. is about Rs. 4 crores. I have not got the actual figures for maintenance. If the hon. Member will kindly ask me, I will supply the figure.

Shri Kamath: In answer to part (a) of the question, the hon. Minister said that certain roads have been provisionally accepted as National Highways. Has the matter not been finalized at all?

Shri Santhanam: It can be finalized only when this Parliament passes the National Highways Bill, which will be introduced in due course.

Prof. Ranga: At what stage are the Government proposals to construct the bridges over the Godavari and Kistna in connection with the National Highways?

Shri Santhanam: I think the arrangements for building the Godavari bridge are fairly advanced and I would like to have notice about the Kistna Bridge.

MACHINERY FOR POSTAL WORK

*745. **Prof. K. T. Shah:** (a) Will the Minister of Communications be pleased?

to state in which places has power-driven modern machinery been introduced in the post offices of India for expediting collection, stamping, sorting, and distribution of letters and parcels, by the Indian Post Office?

(b) How many Adding machines, Tabulating machines, and Franking machines are working in the Post Offices in India, and how many automatic stamp vendors have been installed in India?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): (a) Excepting lifts for conveying loads from one floor to another installed in big Post Offices and Telegraph Offices and about 83 motor cycles used for delivery of telegrams, no machinery has yet been installed in the Post Offices of India, but several schemes for installation of power-driven conveyor bands, power-driven trolleys etc. are under examination and it is proposed to carry out experiments next year.

(b) The number of different machines in use is as follows:

(1) Adding machines	58
(2) Duplicating machines	416
(3) Franking machines	70
(4) Electric Stamp Cancelling machines	151

No automatic stamp vending machine has yet been installed, but a prototype machine manufactured by a British Firm which would vend post-cards and envelopes on the insertion of coins has been received and experiments will be soon made with it. If the experiments prove successful, a large supply will be ordered.

Shri Sidhva: The hon. Minister has not mentioned the number of stamping machines as required in part (a) of the question. May I know how many stamping machines are placed in the various post offices in India, if there are any?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I have given a list of all the machines that we are using and others we do not use.

Shri Sidhva: What is the answer to part (a)?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps in reply to part (b) he has given them.

Shri Khurshed Lal: I have said adding machines, duplicating machines, franking machines, electric stamp cancelling machines.

Shri Sidhva: My question is about part (a) of the question which my hon. friend has put. I want to know how many stamping machines there are in India?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Kidwai): That is equally a franking machine.

Shri Kamath: Is there any estimate as to how many workers will be thrown out of employment by the introduction of these automatic and other machines?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I have not got the figures of machines that we will be using but nobody will be thrown out of employment.

CIVIL AVIATION TRAINING CENTRE AT ALLAHABAD

*746. **Prof. S. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state whether there is a proposal to admit candidates for training in all branches of Civil Aviation at the Civil Aviation Training Centre at Allahabad?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): At present, the Civil Aviation Training Centre at Allahabad is equipped to provide training in flying, in Air Traffic Control and in Aeronautical Communications. The Centre is being developed to admit about 30 trainees in Ground Engineering also with immediate effect.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: May I know whether at any stage this scheme was opposed by the Flying Clubs and if so, for what reasons?

Shri Khurshed Lal: The Flying Clubs opposed *ab initio* the scheme in the Allahabad Training Centre. I called the representatives of the Flying Clubs here and we arrived at a very satisfactory settlement.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: May I know what steps are proposed to be taken to co-ordinate the training here and elsewhere?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I do not understand what is meant by "elsewhere".

Prof. S. N. Mishra: May I know what additional expenditure is expected to be incurred in this scheme?

Shri Khurshed Lal: In what part of the scheme? What we are going to spend is all given in the Budget figures.

Shri Jaipal Singh: While at the last Conference of Government about subsidised Flying Clubs in India, an assurance was given by the Ministry through their representative, the DGCA, that there would be no *ab initio* training at this Training Centre at Allahabad, what are the reasons that have made the Ministry to change its views?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I do not know of the Ministry having changed its views.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I know the reason why the Government Subsidised Flying Clubs' work has been taken away from these Flying Clubs?

Shri Khurshed Lal: It is not the intention to take away the work from the Flying Clubs.

Prof. Ranga: Is it a fact that some of the experts whom the Government have themselves got specially trained and employed here, have been obliged to leave this training institute because of unsatisfactory conditions of employment offered to them?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I do not know of any such case. If the hon. Member refers to any particular case, I will look into it.

Shri T. N. Singh: In view of the large demand for training at this Allahabad Centre, has Government considered favourably the request of the Flying Club for increased subsidy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; I do not think that question can be allowed.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I know how the training cost at Allahabad Training Centre will compare with the average cost at the Flying Clubs as far as the A Licence is concerned?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I require notice of that question.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

AIR-LINK BETWEEN INDIA AND NEPAL

*747. **Prof. S. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an Air-link has been established between India and Nepal; and

(b) if so, the company which is running the service?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. Indian National Airways commenced operating a scheduled air service on the Calcutta-Patna-Katmandu route from the 12th October 1950. The service has however been suspended with effect from the 9th November 1950.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: May I know if the Company that is running the service is expected to sustain any loss, and if so whether Government propose to ask the Government of Nepal to make good the loss?

Shri Khurshed Lal: There is no question of asking the Government of Nepal to make good any loss. The Company is very eager to carry on the service and I understand they hope to make a profit.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: What is the procedure for granting a licence? Is the licence granted jointly by the Government of India and the Government of Nepal or is it granted by one Government alone?

Shri Khurshed Lal: In the case of foreign services, both the Governments have got reciprocal rights to allow their own national companies to fly. In the case of our companies, we grant the licence and the foreign governments grant licences to their own companies.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: What is the system for passport.....

Mr. Speaker: We need not go into those details.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Is there any proposal before Government that Muzaffarpur should also be included as one of the halting stations?

Shri Khurshed Lal: That is under consideration.

RADIO LINKS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES

*748. **Prof. S. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) the countries with which radio telegraph and radio telephone links have been established so far; and

(b) the capital costs involved thereby?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): (a) India has got direct radio telegraph links with United Kingdom, Australia, United States of America, China, Afghanistan, and Japan; and direct radio telephone links with United Kingdom, and Indonesia.

With most of the other important countries radio telegraph and telephone links are available through London.

(b) The total capital invested in the Overseas Communications service which operates the direct radio telegraph and telephone services and other foreign services is about rupees seventy-two lakhs. It is not possible to indicate the capital cost separately for each service as several services are worked on the same equipment.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: May I know what other countries are on the immediate list of the Government for the establishment of radio links?

Shri Khurshed Lal: Proposals for the establishment of circuits with Iran, Thailand and Moscow are under consideration.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: What is the estimated expenditure in regard to these lines?

Shri Khurshed Lal: I will require notice of that question.

Shri Kamath: Is this a part of any general plan for embracing the whole world by radio?

Shri Khurshed Lal: Yes.

NEW POST OFFICES IN BIHAR

*749. **Shri Ramraj Jajwara:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to lay on the Table of the House a list of names of all post offices opened this year in the State of Bihar?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): A statement showing the names of all post offices opened this year in the State of Bihar is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 31.]

Shri Ramraj Jajwara: What is the procedure for selecting suitable sites for these post offices?

Shri Khurshed Lal: The intention was to open post offices in all villages with a population of 2,000.

Shri Sidhva: What is the total number?

Shri Khurshed Lal: It is.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; that is given in the Statement. The hon. Minister need not look into it. Next question.

NEW RAILWAY PROJECTS

*750. **Maulvi Haneef:** Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state the decisions regarding new Railway Projects recently taken by the Central Board of Transport?

The Minister of Transport and Railways (Shri Gopaldaswami): The hon. Member is presumably referring to the last meeting of the Central Board of Transport which was held on the 29th August 1950. This meeting was primarily convened to consider the question of restoration of lines which were dismantled during the last War. Cases of 25 branch lines were examined, of which 12 were approved for

restoration spread over a three year period commencing from 1951-52, viz., Vasad-Kathana, Tinpahar-Rajmahal, Bhagalpur-Mandarhill, Madura-Bodinayakanur, Shoranur-Nilambur, Bobbili-Salur, Rohtak-Gohana-Panipat, Nagrota-Jogindernagar, Bijnor-Chandpur Siau, Utraita-Sultanpur-Zafarabad, Unao-Madhogani-Balamau, and Cambay Bunder Siding.

The Central Board of Transport also approved of surveys being carried out for a branch line from Herdagarh station to serve the collieries in the Kanhan Valley, and a line from Gop to Balwa or Katkola in Saurashtra.

Maulvi Haneef: May I know the policy in the light of which the Board reviewed the question of these railway projects?

Mr. Speaker: If I remember aright, this question was thoroughly gone into last week or the week before that. Various questions regarding various lines in different parts of India were put. Is there any other question which the hon. Member has to put?

Shri Dwivedi: May I know whether Government have any proposals for the construction of railway lines in those States which have been taken over and integrated in Part C States?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid he is enlarging the scope of the question.

Shri Dwivedi: These are new railway projects.

Mr. Speaker: May be; as the hon. Minister said, that presumably the question was with reference to lines which were previously dismantled. In view of that, this becomes a wider question.

Next question.

BARAKAR DAM SITE (DAMAGE)

*751. **Shri Jnani Ram:** Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of damages caused at the outbreak of the last monsoon at the Barakar dam site of the Damodar Valley Corporation; and

(b) what precautionary measures were taken to prevent the damages?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Buragohain): (a) and (b). A reference is invited to the reply given to parts (a) and (b) of starred question No. 494 asked by Shri Kshudiram Mahata on the 29th November 1950.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : में यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो क्षति हुई है उसके क्या कारण थे ?

[**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** I want to know what were the reasons for the loss?]

Shri Buragohain: There was silt which partially filled up the foundation excavation in the river in March 1950, and during the Monsoon.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : उसके लिये कौन कसूरवार था ?

[**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** Who was responsible for that?]

Shri Buragohain: It was the flood.

Shri B. K. Das: What has been the cost of repairing this?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): It will be negligible.

Shri A. C. Guha: Was any other part damaged during the monsoon?

Shri Buragohain: No, Sir.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

चावल का उत्पादन

*७४२ डा० बेबी सिंह : क्या कृषि मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस वर्ष भारत में चावल का कितना उत्पादन हुआ ?

PRODUCTION OF RICE

[*742. **Dr. Devi Singh:** Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to state the quantity of rice that has been produced in India this year?]

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): Quantitative estimates of rice production in 1950-51 have not yet been supplied by the States. A statement indicating the prospects of the paddy crop during 1950-51 in certain important paddy growing areas of India is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 32.]

यात्री डिब्बों की दशा में सुधार

*७४३ डा० बेबी सिंह : क्या रेल मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि बी० बी०

एण्ड सी० आई० रेलवे के यात्री डिब्बों के सुधारे जानें में कितना समय लग जाने की आशा है ?

PASSENGER BOGIES (RE-CONDITIONING)

[*743. **Dr. Devi Singh:** Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state how much time is expected to be taken in re-conditioning the passenger bogies of the B.B. and C.I. Railway?]

The Minister of Transport and Railways (Shri Gopalaswami): The time required for overtaking all arrears of maintenance and repairs to passenger coaches of the B.B. and C.I. Railway may extend to a couple of years.

PRE-CAST HOSPITAL BLOCKS

*752. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state:

(a) the terms and conditions of the agreement entered into by Government with the Reema Construction Company, Limited, for the construction of pre-cast hospital blocks; and

(b) what progress has been made in the work so far?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): (a) With a view to demonstrating the Reema patented method of construction in India, the Company have agreed to construct one single-storeyed and four double-storeyed hospital blocks in Delhi, on the condition that Government should pay to the Company the actual expenditure on materials and local labour and, in addition Rs. 2,66,000 towards overhead expenditure on foreign supervisory staff, plant and equipment. The plant and equipment will become the property of the Government on conclusion of the construction.

(b) Work on two double-storeyed and one single-storeyed blocks is nearing completion. Work on the remaining blocks has just been started.

FREE RAILWAY PASSES

*753. **Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** (a) Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Free Railway passes are still being issued to Salvation Army people?

(b) If so, what are the other institutions to whom such passes are issued?

The Minister of State for Transport and Railways (Shri Santhanam): (a) and (b). Free passes are not being granted to the Salvation Army.

MANGANESE ORE

*754. **Shri Kishorimohan Tripathi:**
(a) Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state the average quantity of manganese ore mined in India annually?

(b) What percentage of the annual output is used in India?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): (a) and (b). A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table.

STATEMENT

The annual production of Manganese Ore and the amount consumed in India during the last 10 years.

Year	Annual production (Tons)	Quantity consumed in India (Tons)	Percentage of production consumed in India
1940	868,918	86,690	9
1941	791,141	103,146	13
1942	757,269	85,181	11
1943	595,366	47,858	8
1944	370,980	48,619	13
1946	210,583	54,807	26
1946	252,916	54,064	21
1947	451,034	78,106	17
1948	528,876	51,877	10
1949	645,825	79,264	12
Average for the last 10 years	547,291	68,961	12.6

MINING OF MANGANESE ORE

*755. **Shri Kishorimohan Tripathi:**
(a) Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a number of manganese ore miners in Madhya Pradesh have not been able to mine because necessary permission for the same has not been granted by the Government of India?

(b) What is the number of miners who applied for permission?

(c) When were the applications received in the Ministry of Industry and Supply?

(d) Why has permission been withheld so long?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): (a) to (d). Only three parties brought to the notice of the Government of India that, although the Government of Madhya Pradesh had agreed in principle to grant them certain mining leases, they were not being permitted to work the mines pending formal execution of the leases, which was awaiting the Central Government's approval to the form of lease to be prescribed. The letters from these three parties were received on the 10th October, 30th October and the 11th November 1950, respectively. The Central Government have agreed that these and other similar situated parties may be allowed to commence working the mines without waiting for the formal execution of leases in a letter dated 3rd November 1950 communicated to the Government of Madhya Pradesh.

TIMBER EXPLOITATION IN ANDAMANS

*756. **Shri Rathnaswamy:** (a) Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to state whether it is a fact that timber exploitation has been launched upon by the Government in Andaman island?

(b) What are the net proceeds which the Government expect out of this?

(c) Will the Displaced Persons who have settled there be given these contracts?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) The exploitation of the forests of the South Andamans has all along been done by the Government Forest Department. A scheme for the exploitation of the North Andamans forests by private enterprise on a royalty basis has been finalised and will be put in operation as early as possible.

(b) The net revenue of Government from the forests of the South and North Andamans is estimated at 70 lakhs of rupees per annum when the North Andamans forests are fully exploited in accordance with the scheme drawn up for the purpose.

(c) Yes. The claims of the displaced persons will be considered in regard to the South Andamans forests.

JOWAR AND RICE PRODUCTION IN HYDERABAD

*757. **Shri Abul Hasan:** (a) Will the Minister of Food be pleased to state what is the forecast of Jowar and Rice production of Rabi and Kharif Crops in Hyderabad State?

(b) Has the target fixed for levy been reached?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) According to the final forecast for 1949-50 the total production of *Jowar* and Rice in Hyderabad in that year amounted to 7,23,000 tons and 4,30,000 tons respectively.

(b) No, against a target of 2,46,000 tons for the year only about 1,26,000 tons upto 16th November, 1950 has been procured.

CATTLE FOR ASSAM

*758. **Shri R. K. Chaudhuri:** (a) Will the Minister of Agriculture be pleased to state whether it is a fact that there is a great dearth of plough cattle in Assam and that the Government of India have been approached for help by the State Government?

(b) If so, have the Government of India given any assistance to the State in this matter?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): (a) Assam is almost self-sufficient in plough cattle except in the areas affected by Earthquake where a shortage of approximately one thousand pairs is reported. The Government of Assam have not so far approached the Central Government for any help in the matter.

(b) Does not arise.

AIR FIELD IN KAHIKUCHI

*759. **Shri R. K. Chaudhuri:** (a) Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state when the air field in Kahikuchi is likely to be made ready for landing in all seasons and during nights?

(b) How many air crafts land and take off on a daily average during dry season from the present *cutch* field in Kahikuchi?

(c) Is it a fact that there is difficulty in landing and taking off during rains?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): (a) The existing temporary aerodrome at Kahikuchi which is covered with P.S. Sheets is fit for use during all seasons. Facilities for night landing in an emergency also exist there. The permanent aerodrome which is being constructed at a site adjacent to the present airfield and which will have a pucca runway is expected to be ready for operations early in 1952.

(b) On an average, eleven aircraft land and take off per day at the airfield.

(c) No, Sir, except after prolonged and heavy rains, when it becomes necessary sometimes to restrict the aircraft operations at the airfield to scheduled services.

VILLAGE POST OFFICES IN ASSAM

*760. **Shri R. K. Chaudhuri:** Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state how many village post offices have been newly opened and how many have been closed down in the State of Assam in the years 1948-49 and 1949-50?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): The number of village post offices newly opened and closed down in the State of Assam are:

	1948-49	1949-50
Opened	79	84
Closed	2	1

RENT CONTROL AND DELHI PREMISES ACT (WITHDRAWAL)

*761. **Shri Raj Kanwar:** Will the Minister of Works, Mines and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Delhi Improvement Trust Enquiry Committee set up by Government has since submitted an interim report recommending immediate withdrawal of operation of the Delhi-Ajmer Merwara Rent Control (Amendment) Act No. L of 1947 and the Delhi Premises (Requisition and Eviction) Act No. XLIX of 1947, from all new houses; and

(b) if the replies to part (a) above be in the affirmative, what steps have Government taken or propose to take in furtherance of the above recommendations with a view to relieve the acute shortage of housing accommodation and to encourage new Constructions in Delhi?

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): (a) Yes.

(b) This is under consideration.

STRIKE BALLOT BY RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

*762. **Shri Rathnaswamy:** (a) Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the General Council of the All India Railwaymen's Federation has instructed its working committee to arrange for a strike ballot?

(b) If so, what are the outstanding issues on which differences between the Government and Railwaymen's Federation have arisen?

The Minister of State for Transport and Railways (Shri Santhanam): (a) Yes, in certain circumstances.

(b) In the view of Government there are no outstanding issues which would justify any such action on the part of the All India Railwaymen's Federation. The demands are for the most part a reiteration of previous demands some of which have already been discussed with the leaders of the Federation and others concerned by Government and decisions announced.

PRICES OF WHEAT AND RICE

37. Shri Sidhva: Will the Minister of Food be pleased to lay on the Table a statement showing the prevailing rates for wheat and rice from June, 1950 upto date in the following towns:

Bombay	Ahmedabad
Poona	Belgaum
Allahabad	Bhopalpur
Banaras	Calcutta
Nellore	Masulipatam
Malabar	Goctacangund
Jaipur	Jodhpur
Patiala	Rohtak
Udaipur	Bhopal
Meerut	Lucknow
Jubbulpore	Cawnpore
Nagpur	Baroilly
Howrah	Madras
Bezwada	Vinagapatam
Hyderabad	Wangai
Jullundur	Amabala
Delhi	Ajmer
Baroda	Ahwar

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): Presumably the hon. Member has in mind the wholesale issue prices of rationed grain in the cities referred to by him. A statement is laid on the Table of the House containing information available in the Food Ministry. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 33.]

There is no rationing in some of the towns and hence no information is given in connection thereof.

NIGHT AIR MAIL SERVICE

38. Shri Sidhva: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state the total freight carried by Himalayan Aviation Service and Air-India Service together with the amounts paid to them for carrying mails from January 1950 upto date (Night air mail service only)?

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): M/s. Air India Ltd. commenced operation of their Bombay-Delhi night service on 1st March 1950.

The total weight of freight plus mails carried by the night air services of Himalayan Aviation and Air India upto the 31st October 1950 was 22,29,035 and 5,17,118 lbs. and the amounts paid or payable to them for the carriage of mails on these services upto the same date are Rs. 19,76,545 and Rs. 3,58,118 respectively.

I place on the Table a Statement showing the details [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 34.]

Thursday, 7th December, 1950

Volume VI

No. 1 — 19



Par. B. S. VI. 1. 50.
821

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

OFFICIAL REPORT

Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers.

CONTENTS

President's Address to Parliament [Cols. 1—16]

Price Five Annas

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

1313

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Thursday, 7th December, 1950

*The House met at a Quarter to Eleven
of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

11.45 A.M.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): Sir, I lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Reports:

(i) Annual Report of the Coal Mines Stowing Board for the year 1949-50. [Placed in Library. See No. R. 12a (17).]

(ii) Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Explosives for the year ending 31st March, 1950 [Placed in Library. See No. IV R. 4(1).]

(iii) Annual Report of the Petroleum Division for the year 1949-50. [Placed in Library. See No. IV R. 3(1).]

(iv) Annual Report of the Central Electricity Commission for the year 1949-50. [Placed in Library. See No. IV M. 31(2).]

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

**STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION**

ملسٹر آف ایجوکیشن (مولانا آزاد) :
جناب میں تجویز کرتا ہوں کہ یہ
هاوس، اس طریقہ سے جو آنیہل اسویکر
تھہرا دیں - ایک ممبر کو چلنے کی

1314

کارروائی انجام دے - یہ ممبر ایجوکیشن
ملسٹری کی اسٹیٹمنٹ، ایڈوائزری
کمیٹی میں اس کمی کو پورا کرے گا
جو ایک ممبر یعنی شری ایم ستیہ
نارائنا کے ریٹرنیشن سے پیدا ہو گئی
ہے

The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): I beg to move:

"That this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the Speaker may direct, one person from among their numbers to serve on the Standing Advisory Committee for the Ministry of Education, for the unexpired portion of the current financial year vice Shri M. Satyanarayana resigned".

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the Speaker may direct, one person from among their numbers to serve on the Standing Advisory Committee for the Ministry of Education, for the unexpired portion of the current financial year vice Shri M. Satyanarayana resigned."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform hon. Members that for the purpose of election by means of the single transferable vote of a Member to the Standing Committee for the Ministry of Education the programme of dates will be as follows:

1. Nominations to be filed in the Parliamentary Notice Office up to 12 Noon on Monday the 11th December.

2. Election, if necessary, will be held on Thursday, the 14th December, in the Assistant Secretary's room No. 21 in the Parliament House between the hours of 10-30 A.M. and 1 P.M.

JALLIANWALA BAGH NATIONAL
MEMORIAL BILL

The Minister of Works, Mines and Power (Shri Gadgil): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the erection and management of a National Memorial to perpetuate the memory of those killed or wounded on the 13th day of April, 1919, in Jallianwala Bagh.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the erection and management of a National Memorial to perpetuate the memory of those killed or wounded on the 13th day of April, 1919, in Jallianwala Bagh."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Gadgil: I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN INCOME-TAX (AMEND-
MENT) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922."

The motion was adopted.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I introduce the Bill.

TELEGRAPH WIRES (UNLAWFUL
POSSESSION) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Khurshed Lal): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to regulate the possession of telegraph wires and to provide for the punishment of the offence of unlawful possession thereof.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to regulate the possession of telegraph wires and to provide for the punishment of the offence of unlawful possession thereof."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Khurshed Lal: I introduce the Bill.

ESSENTIAL SUPPLIES (TEMPORARY
POWERS) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Thirumala Rao): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, 1946.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, 1946."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Thirumala Rao: I introduce the Bill.

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA
(AMENDMENT) BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF
REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, be extended up to Wednesday, the 13th December, 1950."

Sir, we had the first meeting of the Committee on the 4th. We could not fix an earlier date because it could not have suited the convenience of many of the Members. Since then we have had three meetings and we are more or less, completing the work. We are having another meeting tomorrow morning and we have every hope, therefore, to be able to present the report on the 13th December.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, be extended up to Wednesday, the 13th December, 1950."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION *re* INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru yesterday:

"That the present International situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Along with that, there are amendments also moved yesterday, and there are some further amendments of which notice has been received. I would like to know whether the hon. Members who have given notice of these amendments wish to move them. They may indicate their wish and I may take them as moved.

Shri Frank Anthony (Madhya Pradesh): I wish to move mine.

Dr. R. S. Singh (Bihar): I do not move my amendment.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, before resuming the debate, may I request that in view of the importance of the Motion before the House, this day may be wholly devoted to the discussion of the Motion and the amendments by hon. Members, and the Prime Minister may be called upon to reply tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, there are many important questions that are coming up before the House and if we are going to extend the session merely on the ground of the importance of the question, I am afraid we shall have to sit much longer. But if we must sit, we must. However, I will appeal to Members to be short and more to the point in their speeches. Yesterday the proposal was that the Prime Minister should be called upon to reply today and the debate may be completed by yesterday. Naturally, in view of the Members' wish expressed in this House, the Prime Minister was good enough to have the whole of today for this Motion. I made the suggestion and he accepted it and I made a declaration to the House that this debate may be allowed throughout the whole of today, inclusive of the Prime Minister's reply. Now, the suggestion is to prolong it even to tomorrow. If it is agreeable to the Prime Minister, I shall have no objection; but I think it makes the position rather embarrassing, to have to make such a request, which had better not be made. But if that is the wish of the House, I will have to do it.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I do not mind, if the House wants to sit for three or four hours more today, but it should all be over by today.

Mr. Speaker: I am not agreeable to extending the time. I have expressed myself so often against the idea of sitting longer hours. Let us decide to finish the thing today and cut short

our remarks, speaking more to the point.

Sardar B. S. Man (Punjab): Sir, on a point of information. Hitherto we were following a practice of rising in our seats and trying to catch your eye. I am not complaining, but I may be ignorant, and so I want to know whether there has been a departure from this practice, and whether now we have to catch the favour of the Chief Whip and have our names on the lucky paper?

Mr. Speaker: I have made it quite clear again and again that no one need place himself at the mercy of anybody, except perhaps at the mercy of the Speaker. The old procedure stands, and whatever names may be before me, I am not bound to follow those names. I am not following the names in the order I have got them. But I am calling persons on certain principles, I think, though sometimes it is difficult to settle what those principles are.

Shri Kamath: Sir, when the House has expressed its unanimous desire to have the debate for the whole day today, may I not request you and the hon. Prime Minister to come to some arrangement whereby we can be accommodated?

Mr. Speaker: I do not know how the Prime Minister figures in the picture now. I have already expressed myself and I am doubtful whether the whole House is unanimous in the desire.

Some Hon. Members: We all are.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members forget that there are other engagements fixed beyond five o'clock. There is an important meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Group today, where we meet our guests of the Indo-Swedish Society. There is a meeting of the Standing Finance Committee and all that. Merely to go on sitting for a longer hour is not the proper thing and would, to my mind, be ignoring other considerations. Whatever that may be the chapter is now closed.

Shri Kamath: Parliament work must have top priority, Sir.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Madras): The foreign policy of any country hitherto has been dictated by considerations of self-interest. But today the time

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

has come in the history of the world when the objective of foreign policy must be changed. No country in the world can stand all alone. The invention of the aeroplane has shortened both time and space. The East, the Middle East and the Far East—these are expressions of the past. Therefore the foreign policy of any country must be the maintenance of peace and security of all the nations of the world. No country in the world will be left alone, nor can it stand in isolation. If a fire breaks out in any corner of the world, immediately it will spread and a global conflagration will be the result unless its spreading is immediately stopped.

I am glad to say that the policy which our Government has been pursuing so long is one in the right direction. Our policy has been called one of neutrality but I would say it is one of active neutrality. I would even advocate a policy of watchfulness and vigilance in international affairs and a readiness to step in by way of intervention wherever there might be the threat of a conflict, before the conflict actually arose, by settling all disputes through the active co-operation of all peace-loving nations of the world through the agency of the U.N.O. We are essentially a peace-loving nation. It is our tradition: it is an inheritance which the Father of the Nation has left to us and let us be true to that. We have been adhering to it so far.

But the world has changed very quickly and humanity is on the edge of a precipice. Consistently with our policy we advocated that a democratic form of government should be established in Korea. We therefore sent our representative to sit on the Korean Commission. But unfortunately another power did not yield. Nevertheless the Commission went on addressing itself to the establishment of a democratic form of Government in South Korea. Soon after China claimed membership of the United Nations. We recognised China ourselves and pressed its claim before the United Nations but unfortunately it was not accepted. One power did not accept a democratic form of Government for the whole of Korea and it was left to another power not to accept or recognise China as one of the members of the Security Council through the United Nations Organisation.

Then the Korean war came. Even there we wanted to avoid aggression by one country on another. Therefore we supported the U.N. resolution. We were even prepared to send such kind of assistance to the U.N. armed forces

as was within our reach or possible for us. Later on we advised the U.N. armed forces not to cross the 38th Parallel but they did not do so. Now the U.N. troops are encircled there. China has got into a fear complex and therefore they have appeared on the scene with five or six hundred thousand men. The U.N. forces had therefore to retreat.

Now is the time for our intervention. We cannot allow this to go on. Whereas Russia and China have large numbers of men whom they can put on the field the only other weapon that is being considered by U.S.A. is the use of atom bomb. Once it is used destruction on a large scale is certain. Are we to be looking on? Now is the time when all our energies and the energies of the peace-loving nations of the world should be harnessed to cry halt and see that war does not progress and take a global turn. The atom bomb must be eschewed at any cost. We ought not to leave it as a legacy to the future generations. Let not the future historian say that we have taken a dark path.

12 Noon

Therefore the immediate objective of all the nations in the U.N.O. must be to see that there is a cease-fire in Korea. Immediately the North Koreans ought not to cross the 38th Parallel, nor should a single battalion of the United Nations remain to the north of the 38th Parallel. China must be recognised and taken into the United Nations. Then the question of Formosa might be decided at leisure. These are the immediate steps to be taken to avert a global war.

But I am not satisfied with this. In the long run for the purpose of peace and the establishment of permanent security in the world other steps have to be taken.

During the last war Fascism was the one enemy of democracy and both Communist Russia and democratic England and the U.S.A. fought shoulder to shoulder as brothers in arms. Unfortunately after the war instead of settling down to peace, each nation began to suspect the other. Today it is not the cry for living space which is likely to be the cause of war but fear complex which is gripping all the important powers of the world. Capitalist democracy is accusing Communism of an imperialistic outlook and an expansionist policy. The Communists on the other hand say that imperialism persists in the democracies and capitalism is likely to

engulf the world. Each is afraid of the other. This kind of fear should go. The world is large enough to accommodate both the ideologies and both experiments can go on side by side, both living at peace with one another. Therefore I suggest that this kind of fear complex must be removed and this suspicion of each other must go. Each ought to be asked to eschew the atom bomb as a weapon for ever. Then there should be a kind of disarmament. Every country which belongs to the U.N.O. must be asked to disarm itself and keep only such forces as may be necessary for the maintenance of peace and order within its own territory, that is sufficient for police purposes.

As we have found the last war did not put an end to the prospect of another war. From the beginning of humanity no war has put an end to war completely. Other means have to be devised and I consider that the only means of doing so is the strengthening of the United Nations ultimately with a view to the establishment of a world order and a world federal government. That can be the only ideal and unless one such government is established there will not be peace nor security in the world. Before such an event I would suggest that the several blocs that have come into being should be dissolved and the sooner it is done, the better. I would appeal in this direction to the United Nations. U.S.A. is a member of the United Nations. Who is to break the vicious circle is not easy to say.

Germany was defeated and an iron curtain was thrown round Eastern Germany. America and England say that they have demobilised their forces there and are accusing Russia of still keeping its forces intact. On one side China and Russia together have enormous military forces which they can use at a moment's notice. The others have got their strength in arms and ammunition and each is trying to measure its strength against the other. We should exert some influence in the U.N.O. and advise the various contending parties to drop their arms and settle down. When they were afraid of Russia, America and some other nations joined in an Atlantic Pact. Likewise, as soon as some Powers joined in an Atlantic Pact, Russia entered into a military alliance with China. One act leads to the other. China herself is afraid that there might be encirclement by America by having Korea, Japan and Formosa in the North, and by embroiling in Indo-China. Russia on the other hand is terribly afraid the other way. America also is equally afraid. It is the fear

that is persisting. I do not believe that either the one or the other is anxious to take more territory directly. The expansionist policy is all a myth.

Sir, if for any reason we are not able to persuade these countries, our course is clear. We shall not embroil ourselves in any war. We shall not join either the one side or the other. We shall still persist in bringing pressure upon them by persuasion and otherwise.

So far as our defences are concerned, we ought not to bite but we at least must hiss sometimes. If we do not hiss even, we will be trodden. Sir, it appeared a saint advised a snake not to bite. It went on not biting and children threw stones at it and ultimately it was about to cost its very life. The serpent then went to the saint and asked, "What shall I do? It is costing me my life." The saint advised that it should at least hiss. The serpent was never advised not to hiss, but only not to bite. We found that with all our interest in China, with our recommendation that she ought to be taken into the U.N.O., China has marched on Tibet. Tibet is one of the most peace-loving countries in the world. Both by tradition and religion, Tibetans never waged war. In the European Continent they can have Switzerland. Can we not have a similar Switzerland in the form of Tibet to our North? What is this 'liberation'? As our Prime Minister rightly pointed out, there is no question of liberation. It is all a myth, it is a hoax. China ought not to have marched on Tibet. Sir, as against the 450 millions of Chinese, if we with our 350 millions had armed ourselves and were ready for an offensive if necessary, China would not have ventured on Tibet. So far as our defences are concerned, we are not making all the efforts necessary. Possibly it has become impossible for us, or else the will is wanting. I am not prepared to say whether it is the one or the other. In a world where there is a race for armaments going on and there is an itching for fight everywhere, we, though do not enter the fight, should at least be on our guard. I should say that more than raising our armaments, we should if possible, unless all the people come into the U.N.O., enter into pacts of non-aggression with our neighbouring countries. I am glad to say that our Prime Minister tried in this direction. He tried to enter into a non-aggression pact with Pakistan and wanted a no-war declaration, but unfortunately it has been turned down. With respect to the other countries round about us, our immediate neighbours, we must enter into non-aggression pacts with

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

them. That is another precaution of safety. That is the way we ought to proceed. We shall be friends with all and enemies of none. That shall be the relentless policy that we should pursue.

Pandit Kunzru (Uttar Pradesh): We are discussing the international situation under the shadow of events that might soon lead to a crisis. The news that has been published in this morning's papers, about the assurance given by the leader of the Chinese delegation to U.N.O. to Mr. B. N. Rau that China had no intention of proceeding beyond the 38th Parallel, may seem to have eased the tension but until the proposal is placed before the United Nations in a concrete form and we know whether there are any conditions attached to it we cannot feel certain that the crisis that threatens to overtake us has been relieved. India, Sir, advised, in view of the difficulty of the situation, that the U.N. forces should not cross the 38th Parallel, but that the Powers concerned should enter into negotiations in order to see how the situation might be dealt with without giving rise to the fear of a world war. This was not, in my opinion, a policy of appeasement. It was a policy that took account of the concrete circumstances of the situation, of the hard facts that had to be faced. I do not say that the United Nations Organisation was wrong, was morally wrong, in trying to punish the North Korean aggressor, but it is not enough for us to know what is morally right or morally wrong; we have also to see whether what we consider right can be given effect to without endangering the very cause whose victory we have at heart. It was hardly possible that the countries that had prevented the union of North and South Korea would tamely look on while North Korea was being annihilated by the U.N. forces. The optimism that prevailed on this subject has proved to be short-lived and we are faced with a situation the end of which no one can see. If China today wishes to proceed beyond the 38th Parallel, then for the present there is no force that can check her advance. Indeed, the situation is so grave as to threaten the whole of what is known as the Far East.

Sir, the Prime Minister very rightly remarked yesterday that in a grave and changing situation like that with which we are faced now, it is not possible to put forward any suggestion that can bring about an understanding between the Powers that are in conflict with one another. But we can at any rate lay down the general

principles that should be followed even in a crisis, and perhaps in a crisis more than when times are normal. The Prime Minister yesterday laid stress on the necessity of utmost efforts being made to maintain world peace. Now, how are these efforts to be made? When can they have the best chance of success? The only way at present in which we can make an effort for the maintenance of world peace with the maximum support of other nations is that we should make the United Nations stronger than it is at present. I think events that have been happening for some time past have made it clear that we should do whatever we can to strengthen the United Nations Organisation. India is undoubtedly loyal at heart to this Organisation, but the decisions that it has come to, do not always seem to me to have been consistent with this object.

I shall give only one illustration to show how India has failed, in certain cases, to lend that support to the United Nations Organisation which it should have given. Sometime ago, a plan known as the 'Acheson Plan' was considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Plan contained four proposals, the most important of which were two. The first item related to the reference of a measure to the General Assembly when a deadlock had arisen in the Security Council. Now, it was evident that owing to the situation that the Security Council has been faced with during the last year or so, an effort was being made to devise some way of getting over what seemed to the supporters of the Acheson Plan as the technicalities of the United Nations Charter. India agreed to this suggestion. India agreed that situations might arise in which it might not be possible to give effect to the strict letter of the Charter, but at the same time, she refused to accept the proposal that every nation should keep a unit or units within its armed forces ready to help the United Nations in an emergency. Now, Sir, there are two things that I should like to refer to in this connection. One is that it was made clear that no nation would be under an obligation to supply the United Nations with troops without the sanction of its legislature. Every nation was asked to accept this proposal, subject to its constitutional processes. Had India agreed to this proposal, it would not have lost the power to decide, when asked to place its troops at the disposal of the United Nations, to do so. Again, the proposal that was made was in consonance with the spirit of article 43 of the United Na-

visions Charter. I do not therefore understand, Sir, why India refused to accept this proposal. India felt that such a proposal would create an undesirable psychological atmosphere. Now, this argument places the United Nations in a very difficult position. In normal times, such a proposal is not likely to be made, and if made, would be rejected by others on the ground that it showed unnecessary want of confidence in the sincerity and sense of responsibility of the Member-Nations of the United Nations. When it is made in a time of emergency, it is said that it might lead to a scare—to a panic—and thus precipitate a conflict on world scale. When, Sir, is any proposal that is not in conflict with article 43 of the United Nations Charter going to be given effect to? That article says:

“All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance and facilities including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.”

When India joined the United Nations, she obviously accepted this obligation. It is therefore, as I have already said, hard for me to understand why, after having agreed that when the Security Council was unable because of obstructive tactics pursued by parties to pursue a matter the matter might go to the United Nations, India refused to accept the other proposal.

I shall now refer to another matter which I think also deserves attention as a matter of general principle in view of our desire to maintain world peace. That part of the world in which we can make ourselves most effective is eastern Asia. Recent developments and geographical considerations show that in the course of a few years vast changes may take place that are not in consonance with our national interests and I believe not in consonance with the interest of the democratic countries and the United Nations. We, should, therefore, think whether we can take any special steps, apart from counselling the nations to follow the path of peace, to strengthen the hands of the democratic countries in dealing with a difficult situation, should it arise. Now all the countries in East Asia are in the same boat, but the countries that are more significant in this connection are India, Japan and Indonesia. They may be able imme-

diately by concerted action to stave off conflicts in the East. But I think that this is a question that should be taken account of by the directors of our foreign policy. We should strive to work together with these nations, not with any aggressive intentions, but in order to maintain the stability and give the democratic countries a fair chance of maintaining their internal and external security.

Sir, I should like, before I sit down to say a word about the changes that have taken place in Northern Asia. Central Asia was still lately only a name to us. But it has become a reality, and in some measure, a painful reality to us. China which claims to have interest in North Korea denied that India had any interest in Tibet and even accused India of listening to the counsels of those who were hostile to her. We need not be perturbed, Sir, by this accusation, but the conduct of China in regard to Tibet can hardly be regarded as friendly to India. Indeed, it is a warning to us and we should take steps immediately to strengthen our own position so that we may support all those whose security depends on us. The situation, Sir, may not immediately be dangerous, but we cannot wait to take such steps as may be necessary to safeguard our own interests and those of our neighbours till we are overtaken by a crisis. I shall not go into the details of this matter, but we have to be ready to support Bhutan, Sikkim, Nepal and Ladakh.

Now the Prime Minister in a somewhat aggressive reply to a question that I put to him the other day in this House said that the Government of India had decided that the Indian army should be reduced. He said the intention of Government was to have a mobile army which though smaller would be more effective than the present larger army. Sir, this raises many questions that I cannot go into for want of time. Mobility is not easy to secure at the present time, but apart from this, since the Prime Minister spoke of matters that lie within military sphere, I should like to ask him whether the military authorities are in agreement with the Government on this question. Had the Prime Minister said that economic considerations drove the Government to take this step, we should all have had to agree that the best word on this question should lie with the civil authorities. But since he referred to military considerations, I think we are justified in asking whether Government have in this matter taken the military authorities along with them. Sir, this is a matter of grave importance. Our army is not large, even though the

[Pandit Kunzru]

expenditure on it may be heavy in relation to our resources. It is a matter, therefore, of anxiety to all those who think about our defence problems that Government should at this stage have come to a conclusion that our army should be substantially reduced.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Sir, I shall say no more on this question, but if you will permit me, I shall finish by saying that the present situation requires that we should be in friendly relations with the countries that are on our western flank. These countries are Pakistan and Afghanistan. Happily, our relations with Afghanistan are excellent. For the first time during the last hundred years and more, we have a friendly Afghanistan to deal with. The prestige of the Government of India stands high there, and there is a general desire there to cultivate closer relations with India. Sir, it is clear to all those who look at the map of Asia that the territories lying between Iraq and the Bay of Bengal form a strategic whole. It is, therefore, desirable, indeed necessary, that we should take advantage of our present position to enter into closer relations with Afghanistan, for that is in the interest of our security.

The Prime Minister spoke yesterday about Afghanistan. No one can unfortunately add a word to what he said. But there is no doubt that an understanding between Pakistan and India and Pakistan and Afghanistan is as necessary at the present time as the development of cordial relations between India and Afghanistan. Perhaps, even now it is in our power to help in bringing about a better understanding between Pakistan and Afghanistan and I am sure that the Prime Minister who desires no strife in any part of the world and who, if I may say so, has followed a policy of great wisdom in relation to Pakistan, though it has wrongly been called a policy of appeasement sometimes, will lose no opportunity of helping in the removal of the friction that exists, in the interests not merely of these two countries, but also of India and the rest of the world.

Shri P. Y. Deshpande (Madhya Pradesh): As I listened yesterday to the speech of the Prime Minister, I must confess I felt cold—colder than the Delhi climate in the early morning. I felt cold because I missed in that speech, although the world situation was very very grave, any call to action. Why is it that the leader of the Indian Revolution who could some

years ago give a militant call for action when the situation was very very grave, has failed to give a call of action when the world situation is more grave than any situation that we have ever faced? When I begin to think as to why is it that in the face of such a developing crisis which will engulf the whole world today the Prime Minister feels rather indecisive, when I begin to think as to why is it that he is indecisive, I am compelled to analyse his policy which is based on certain assumptions, and these appear to me to be fundamentally wrong.

He has repeatedly explained his policy as a policy of non-alignment, as a policy that assumes that there are two blocs, that the world is split up into two blocs and that we must therefore take an independent line of action and judge every issue on its own merits. Yesterday Acharya Kripalani made the House laugh when he said that an ex-diplomat told the Prime Minister that there was only one bloc and no two blocs. I am afraid Acharya Kripalani has lately ceased to be an *acharya* and is fast developing into a politician. What does this non-alignment mean? It definitely assumes that there are two blocs in the world, according to the Prime Minister's assessment of the situation, and that there is nothing to choose between these two blocs, that they are equally bad, ethically and ideologically. I may be permitted to explain as to what we mean by a 'power bloc'. Unless we are clear about that expression we shall never be able to decide this issue at all. By a power bloc I mean a group of nations each one of which accepts a dictatorial central leadership of one nation. That group of nations can alone be called a power bloc. Look at the Soviet Bloc. Look at the way they have voted in the United Nations. You will find them uniformly voting with Russia and in no other manner. Look at the other nations in the United Nations. How have they voted? You will find that they have voted, just as the Prime Minister would like them, on each issue on its merits, independently of any influence of this nation or that nation.

That, Sir, leads to the inevitable conclusion that there is only one bloc and no other bloc. Other nations go the way they like in the United Nations. Therefore, unless we make our minds clear about this point, there cannot be an active foreign policy for India.

There was a time in India when there was infinite amount of sympathy

for Communism. If I am permitted to make a confession, I was one of them. For ten long years I worked with the Communists in India because they were fighting British imperialism as bravely as any Congressman could do.

An Hon. Member: Even in 1942?

Shri P. Y. Deshpande: And, Sir, that is the point. In 1942 they betrayed the Indian movement for freedom. They stabbed the Indian movement of liberation and aligned themselves with the British imperialists and Moscow. They sacrificed Indian independence for their ideological confabulations. I can tell you that after seeing this phenomenon of a number of Communists having been first attracted to the ideology of Communism all over the world and then as a result of the last war and as a result of the dictatorial functioning of the Communist Parties all over the world, I am getting wholly disillusioned about Communism. I have come to the conclusion that there is no greater menace to human liberty in the world than Communism of the Stalinist type. Unless this fact is realized by everybody, and more so by the Prime Minister, we cannot have a dynamic and active foreign policy.

The Prime Minister pleaded for peace. I am all for peace. Every one of us in India is for peace. That is the gospel that has been taught to us by Gandhiji. But Gandhiji's idea of peace was not an idea of sit-at-home. It was not a neutral idea. It was an idea that always gave a call for action, howsoever non-violent it may be. But in the face of the world situation why is it that we are not receiving any call for action in India from our Prime Minister? The reason is, he is in two minds. He feels that there is something wrong here and something wrong there too, and he cannot make up his mind yet. His, not being able to make up his mind, is, I suppose, the main reason why we are left cold and dry. I submit that there is only one hope of world peace and there is no other. Acharya Kripalani said that Gandhism has now got to be either re-fashioned or rejected. He said that our own State—although Gandhiji was the Father of our Nation—is based on violence and therefore there is no room for Gandhism in this nation now. I beg to disagree with him. Gandhiji's concept of non-violence was, according to me, a different one. Every State is based on violence to some extent. But Gandhiji never opposed State violence when it was used against thieves, robbers and murderers. Just as in the national field we need some kind of State violence to restrict the inhuman activities of thieves, robbers and murderers, similarly in the inter-

national field we need an authority which will restrain aggressive activities which are no better than thefts, robberies and murders. And I submit that such an authority can be only the United Nations authority and no other authority. We have pledged our support to the United Nations Organisation. As my hon. friend on my right just mentioned, we are under an obligation under Article 43 of the United Nations Charter to do our bit to maintain world peace by just making an appeal. We have got to forge sanctions for world peace, and the sanction that can be forged is the United Nations Charter and actions that can be taken under that Charter. We have pledged ourselves in that direction on every issue that came for action against an aggressor. Now, who broke the peace for the first time after the end of the last war? It is definitely aggression in Korea that has broken the peace for the first time. The world has known who are the aggressors and who want to be the aggressors and their philosophy also tells us that they have been nothing but aggressors all along the line. I ask the Prime Minister this question: Does he honestly feel that there can be any aggression from Britain and America on India at any time during his life-time or later? I am sure he will say, "No" to that. But will he be able to say with equal confidence that he has no fears of aggression from Russia and Communist China? I want, Sir, a categorical answer to that question. And so far as I am concerned, if there is fear for our independence, if there is fear from any side, it is the Red peril and the Communist peril and unless we gird up our loins to fight this menace of Communism, there can be no peace for us and no peace for the world. We have to make up our mind on that point once and for all. When I plead for arms up against the menace of Communism, I do not want the Prime Minister to align himself with this nation or that nation. All I would submit is, let us stand loyally by our Constitution; and let us equally loyally stand by the United Nations Organisation and no other organization, so that that organization may be a dynamic force in the world. Then the warmongers will know where they stand and if they do mischief they will be demolished in no time.

Shri Naziruddin Ahmed (West Bengal): Sir, the subject is of enormous importance and the little time available for me will compel me to condense much of what I have to say. Sir, we have to consider this war as a war of ideologies and not of blocs.

[Shri Naziruddin Ahmad]

It has been for some time the fashion to call the cold war as a war between two blocs, but as has been pointed out by Mr. Masani, there is really speaking only one bloc and that is the Soviet bloc. It is that Bloc that thinks, talks and acts together as a bloc while the rest do not think, talk and act as a Bloc. They differ as all independent persons would differ. The only point of agreement among them in the United Nations Organization is the ideal that they must settle their differences and their quarrels by debates and argument and by persuasion. If that is a characteristic which can make them a bloc, then only we may say that there is a fight between two blocs. The Anglo-American bloc is only a so-called bloc.

Sir, the Soviet Bloc really consists of the Soviet and the satellite countries, and China is part of the Soviet bloc and behaves as such. The entire business of initiating this war in Korea was palpably engineered by the Soviet bloc. This invasion by the North Koreans of South Korea and the Chinese intervention, imperceptibly at first but palpably now, is part of one scheme. Our policy in the international sphere, I must say with the deepest respect, is vague, unrealistic and sometimes vacillating. We try to support and please everyone and, as happens in such cases, we have failed to satisfy any one except perhaps ourselves.

An Hon. Member: Why should we satisfy anybody?

Shri Naziruddin Ahmad: We have the knack of alienating the sympathies of all. This is what we have achieved. It is not what we wish or what we think that matters in a dynamic world, but it is the real effect that our action produces that really matters. Our attitude to China is inexplicable. It is simply baffling. I say that our attitude to China is one of appeasement on the one hand and a mild, argumentative protest on the other. We have a soft corner for China. But how has China been behaving in this war? China has stealthily entered into this war. Their argument is that Chinese territory would be endangered if the United Nations army was allowed to proceed to the end of North Korea. The United Nations Organisation was eager and ready to offer proofs and guarantees to show that it has no such purpose. Anything that was needed to satisfy China as to the integrity of her territory or as to the safety of her country would have been readily given; it was for China

just to suggest the step and to agree to abide by the decision of the U.N.O. as to the integrity of her country and Chinese intervention would have been unnecessary. China somehow or other was seeking for an opportunity to intervene and why? It seems to me the reason is that China forms part of a bigger Soviet scheme, and that scheme is to engulf the whole of Asia and gradually the whole world under one Soviet domination.

Sir, we supported the intervention of the U.N.O. in the South Korean war. The U.N.O. decided that we must have a united Korea and we agreed to it. That involves this consequence that when the North Koreans receded beyond the 38th Parallel the United Nations Organisation would pursue them there to ensure the creation of a united Korea. That was the ideal to which we subscribed and at least to which we did not object when the United Nations Organisation forces crossed the 38th Parallel. The object was, according to the previous decision of the United Nations Organisation, to give them a united, contented and a democratic Korea. We again contended that China must be admitted into the United Nations Organisation. Our argument was—we rather hoped—that China was of a different political pattern than the Soviet, that China is not really as autocratic, as communistic as Russia is, but we have been sadly disappointed. The Chinese invasion of Tibet is clearly an imperialistic expansionist move. The pretence for the invasion of Tibet was that they must liberate Tibet. Liberate from whom? From no one that one can see. They wanted to have a military base in Tibet and much lies behind this invasion of Tibet. It means, if anything, at least, danger to our frontier.

We merely objected to the invasion. But, how did they respond? They said that we were the henchmen of the imperialists. This is not only unfair but we have been badly let down while we were supporting them in the U.N.O. What has been our reaction to this rebuff? We adhere to them all the more! We say that the Korean war cannot be solved except with the concurrence of China, and that China must be admitted into the United Nations Organisation. I submit that our reaction should have been to ask China to stop at once, to retire from this war, and to leave the field entirely to the United Nations on the one hand and North Korea on the other, so that the war might be localised. The Chinese entry in large numbers, in

millions, shows that China was getting ready for a long time. The Chinese policy is to involve the U.N.O. and the world into a serious entanglement. Therefore, my submission is that we must tell China, "You must withdraw; you must behave just like a democratic country; you must prove your good conduct before we can admit you into the U.N.O.; if you submit to these two conditions, retire from the war and show that you do not follow the Russian pattern but follow a democratic pattern, then and then only the question of your entry into the U.N.O. can come." I submit that these are hard realities; but there is a sad lack of appreciation of realities inside the House. There has been too much of talk in an idealistic fashion. I submit that in dangerous times like these, we must be hard realists and not idealists. As Lord Birkenhead once said, it is a good thing to be an idealist, but it is useful to be a realist. While the evil forces are gathering round us we should be stern realists and not so many philosophers. I submit that the entry of China into this war has been stage-managed. What has been the reaction of the independent countries in the U.N.O.? They say that the Chinese must withdraw from the war. But the Soviet representative M. Vyshinsky has opposed even the inclusion of the Chinese intervention in Korea in the agenda of the U.N.O.. He does not like this even to be discussed.

Now, Sir, our policy in regard to the invasion of Tibet has been dual. I do not know how to express my own feeling. Tibet has been invaded; we have been endangered. Calcutta is within 300 miles of the Tibetan frontier. This uncertain boundary line between Tibet and India will be another excuse for intervention. Our dual policy has not satisfied any one. In fact the Western Powers and others are already thinking of forgetting us. Mr. Churchill who is a great realist, who would have supported any action in Asia on behalf of the U.N.O., seems to be getting tired. He says that the U.N.O. should not be much entangled in Korea and that they should attend more to Western Europe than to Asia. I submit that if this happens, if Korea is left by the U.N.O., then the entire Asiatic bloc, I mean the democratic countries will be in considerable danger. Will any one like them to go away from this entanglement? I for one would not. I should therefore think that we should support the U.N.O. in every possible way and that is the effect of the amendment which I have moved.

The last Subject I should refer to is about our own intervention in

Nepal. Nepal is an independent country. No doubt, Nepal's administration is no doubt archaic, obsolete and unacceptable to us. But, should we interfere and poke our nose much into their private affairs? The result would be, as has been suggested by one of the speakers, that Nepal might be induced or rather forced into the arms of Sovietised China, and that would be a great danger to us. We should therefore at once recognise the present administration in Nepal, and try our best by suggestions to democratise the country. But, we should not in any case interfere. The result would be, that there would be reaction and China and the Soviet bloc would be glad to take advantage of it. The times are not propitious.

With these words, I submit that our foreign policy should be carried on in a vigorous realistic manner and not in a manner suitable for peace times. These are hard times and we must act as realists.

The House then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker: Before we resume the discussion. I have to say that a large number of Members are eager to speak. It is not possible to meet the wishes of all, unless the time limit is drastically curtailed.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: (Bihar): Make it one minute.

Mr. Speaker: I have always expressed myself against that kind of curtailment, because it means practically nothing. However, I think I shall have to rest satisfied with ten minutes time limit now. I do not know how many further Members will be accommodated by this arrangement, but...

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Orissa): There are other Members also whose names are not in the list there.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going by the list given to me. I am noticing those who are anxious to catch my eye and I am noting down their names also and then I try to adjust the priority, as I think proper.

Shri Mirza (Hyderabad): The time is not sufficient.

Mr. Speaker: Then, a large number of Members will not be able to speak, and I entirely agree to the latter alternative of having fewer but fuller

[Mr. Speaker]

speeches. But there is no help. Mr. Sahaya.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Bihar): Having heard a good number of speeches on this subject, I feel that before I proceed to discuss the subject, I should pay a tribute to the calm and dispassionate manner in which the Minister of Foreign Affairs presented the case of the present troubles in the international field. In a situation like this a little excitement, and even irritation was only human. But I am glad to say that on an occasion which really demands very calm and serene consideration, the Minister of Foreign Affairs has been able to maintain this calmness in a remarkable degree. In fact, Sir, when he finished his speech I asked myself the question whether he had really narrated the events as they had happened, up-to-date or whether he has given any indication of our foreign policy in his speech. I must admit that I found in his speech more a narration of the events than any distinct indication of the foreign policy to be followed by this country. Sir, I say this in no spirit of criticism or disappointment. In fact, I feel that this should be so. In the given situation, it will be exceedingly difficult for any Minister of Foreign Affairs of any great power to state categorically what he or his country is going to do tomorrow. In fact, I was surprised at some Members of this House suggesting that the Government of India should have helped the uprising in Nepal. Sir, Nepal is a country with whom we have social and cultural relations, whose sovereignty we recognise and with whom we had recently entered into a friendly alliance and above all peace and security in that country is exceedingly necessary, particularly at the present time in the interest of peace and security of this country itself. In fact, Sir, while the Prime Minister was speaking about Nepal, I felt that he could as well have avoided the few very definite statements that he made with regard to the King and other incidents while the emissaries of that Government were still in consultation with the Government of India to settle the affairs there.

The Prime Minister, Sir, has been able to allow two days for this discussion, and although as I have said, he himself has not given any definite indication of the foreign policy of this country, but having allowed this time, I feel that the purpose behind it was to enable him to know the views of

the representatives in this House, more than to give a statement of his own views. In this view of the matter, I feel I must make a few submissions for the consideration of the House and for his consideration also.

In international affairs, and particularly in the situation with which the world is faced at present, the consideration of three things is essential. Firstly there is internal defence, secondly, attempts at peace if possible, and thirdly, to choose friends and allies with whom one could associate in case of the peace mission failing, and in case ultimately of the outbreak of a global war. Therefore, let us first take into consideration the defence position of this country. In fact, the right course in the present conditions is not to discuss the defence question at all. But knowing as we do the conditions in this country, there is one thing which should be emphasised. The very first requirement at present in order to deal with the international situation effectively, either for peace or in the event of a war, is to strengthen our defence and our military position. In the matter of the Navy and Air Force, I think we have got to make a great leeway. Of course, I am not forgetting at all the economic position that faces the country. And I am not also ignorant of the fact that strengthening the military defences means a great strain on the economy of the country concerned. But is there a way out at present? I see none. After all if we consider the position of China, we will find that they have great man power. So have we with perhaps a little better military tradition. If we look at their armament factories I do not think they are in any way better than ours. And then again, they have been through a terrible civil war and prior to that civil war, they had been fighting with Japan for a very long time. Conditions of inflation and food scarcity in China were as bad, if not worse than what we have in our own country. But even with all that, they have been able to so husband their resources and improve their military power that they are in a position not only to face, but to face bravely the mighty power of the United States of America. What will happen to-morrow, no one can say. But today they have certainly been able to give a setback to the marching armies of the United Nations. I, therefore, submit that the very first requirement is that we must strengthen our military position. This will need a great sacrifice on the part of the people of this country. But even rich and powerful countries cannot strengthen their military prowess

without entailing great hardship on the people and the people willingly and pleasingly agreeing to do it. It is time that the country is taken into confidence. It may be argued that it creates a lot of difficulty. My own opinion is that if we try to avoid difficulty at this time we may have to face a much more difficult situation in the future. Therefore my first submission is that our military strength should be increased and the country made more strong. How this can be done I suppose is not within the scope of the present debate nor have I the time to deal with it.

As regards our peace efforts I have no doubt that the work of a peace-maker is the service of God. Twice blessed are such peace-makers who succeed in their attempts but even those who fail are blessed enough. Our peace proposals and the difficult times in which they are made have, as far as we know, come to us from time immemorial. Even Lord Krishna attempted once but did not succeed. We may therefore pin too great a hope on our peace proposals. I do not mean to say that anything should be left undone to bring about peace but I submit equally strongly that nothing should be left undone to meet the situation in case the peace proposals do not succeed. Therefore it is necessary for every country to choose its friends and its allies. If the peace proposal succeeds so much the better but under conditions as they are today every big country is feeling that unless they have a war now it may be a more bitter war a few years later. With our best efforts we may be able to ward off war only for a time as did Chamberlain when he returned from Munich but whether we shall be able to do it long enough I do not know. As I said before, in a situation like the present a policy of neutrality, which means isolationism, will not do. We have to choose our allies. It is not a question of joining one power bloc or the other. It is a question where our interest lies and with whom we can pull together. In this connection I shall say no more than bring to the notice of the House what Lenin said at one time which many of us might have heard previously. He said that the road from Moscow to Paris lay through Peking, Shanghai and Calcutta.

Prof. S. L. Saksena (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I thank you very much for the opportunity you have given me to participate in this debate. I have read very carefully through the speech of the hon. Prime Minister but I have been surprised at the trend of the speeches which have

followed him. It seems from the speeches that the House does not approve of his policy and feels that he has committed a blunder in following an independent policy and that he should have become tied to the chariot wheels of the Anglo-American bloc.

I have been a critic of the Prime Minister in the past. I felt that his foreign policy was tied to the Anglo-American bloc but I am very happy to be able to say that that feeling has been dispelled. With so small a military force at our disposal he has succeeded in making India respected out of all proportion to our military strength and today the world recognises that we are really independent and that we follow an independent foreign policy. We do not care who will become angry with us, who will frown at us or who will swear at us. We do what we think is correct and what we think is in the best interests of our declared ideals.

Yesterday Acharya Kripalani criticised the Prime Minister by saying that we judged every issue on its individual merits and that there was no ideal which we wanted to serve. I think he forgot one important thing. The Prime Minister has said from the very beginning that our one aim is world peace and that is the one aim to which all his actions seem to have been directed. He has never cared for the frowns of the mighty; he has never even cared for some of us who have criticised him for ignoring our own interests. But he has always kept before him that noble ideal of world peace, at the altar of which he had been criticised sometimes from the point of view of our own national interests. He has been called an appeaser and what not but I am happy today that he has stood firm like a rock against the whole world and said what he felt to be right. If his warning that the 38th Parallel should not be crossed had been heeded probably today we would not have been in the brink of war. He was at that time jeered at when we refused to join the Korean Commission. Still he stuck to his opinion. Today the Prime Minister could have turned the laugh on his critics but he has been doing his level best to resolve the situation. He has been trying his best to persuade China not to cross the 38th Parallel. I think the House fully approves his policy. The prophecy which the Prime Minister made is today appreciated by the whole world and the entire world looks to him for saving world peace. I therefore on behalf of this House congratulate him. The House and the country should recognise this with gratitude to him 7 2/

[Prof. S. L. Saksena]

I also want to congratulate Mr. B. N. Rao who has so ably been discharging his duties and supplementing the work of our Prime Minister. I hope the House will send its appreciation of his services and the manner in which he has been trying to maintain world peace.

It seems some of us are afraid of the very name of Communism or of Communist countries. I think that should not be so. After all we are not a capitalist country, although we believe in the democratic way of life. We are also not a totalitarian country. But our ideals are also the ideals of Communism. Our ideals agree with those of Communism though in methods we differ. Our democracies have not been true to the ideal which Gandhiji placed before us and in that respect we have a unique message which is neither that of capitalism nor that of Communism. It is the ideal of Communism through the methods taught to us by the Father of the Nation and by the Seers of our country. I think by following that method, by living up to that ideology, we can take our country forward in the comity of nations. We cannot have a big, mighty army, but we have got something else—ideals—to place before the world which would make the world respect us. Sir, our Prime Minister has been trying to follow those ideals, and on this occasion I want to congratulate him on the lead he has given us and for the manner in which he has handled our foreign affairs.

I want to say something about Nepal. Nepal is on our border. Five hundred miles of its territory borders U.P., Bihar and West Bengal. My own district of Gorakhpur, which I represent in Parliament and of whose District Congress Committee I am the President, has got about forty miles of border with Nepal. Now, a strip of about thirty miles of lower Nepal is inhabited by Terai people who are common with the people of Gorakhpur District. These people have been usually coming to our meetings even before, Long before the struggle began. Today, Sir, I want to give facts from first-hand knowledge. It is the impression today that the revolt in Nepal has been suppressed. But I wish to tell you that that is far from the truth. The people of Nepal have risen in revolt against the Rana regime. They are with one voice behind their King whom our Prime Minister said yesterday we still recognise and shall recognise. That, Sir, is a great help to the democratic

forces who are trying to overthrow the autocratic regime. I do not see how we could do otherwise. A King cannot be dethroned—he can either abdicate or die. Merely because he has come to a friendly country, it does not mean that he ceases to have the right to the throne. I, therefore, welcome the statement that we recognise the King. That is a simple fact which would give assistance to the forces of democracy there.

Sir, I want to tell this House another thing. There are rumours of reforms. I want to tell the House that there can be no *via media* between democracy and autocracy. When the King himself wants progress and democracy, I do not think we should in any way try to give something which is an admixture of democracy and autocracy. We have experience of such a thing and we know it never succeeds. Therefore, I urge upon the Prime Minister to establish a Government in Nepal with the King at the head and with Ministers who are responsible to the people, who are of the people, Ministers who can convert Nepal into an independent, progressive, democratic country of which we may be proud and which will be friendly to us. I do not want that simple technical objections that we have entertained in the past, regarding its independence and things like that, should stand in our way. The autocracy of one single man, the Rana, and the bestial behaviour they have shown towards the rebels who had taken power in Birganj, should show us that if autocracy remains longer, that country will surely give way to communism. I wish that democracy, democracy in accordance with our ideals, should prevail there. It is only possible if we ourselves uphold those people who are now struggling for that cause. I can only say that if that is done, Nepal shall become a country of which we can be proud. Just as we helped Indonesia and we are proud of helping her to democracy and independence, so shall we be proud of having helped our border country of Nepal towards independence, democracy and progress.

Sir, with these words, I wish to conclude. I thank the Prime Minister again for the manner in which he has guided our foreign policy, and I hope the House at this momentous juncture will give its support to him. The majority of the speakers so far have done so and if everybody is allowed to speak I am sure they will all support the Prime Minister's policy than the policy of those who want us to be tagged on to the chariot wheel of the Anglo-American bloc.

Shri Frank Anthony (Madhya Pradesh): I beg to move:

That in the motion, after the word "thereto" insert the following:

"which is definite in its intention to resist any form of communist aggression against the country".

I have given notice of this amendment to the motion moved by the hon. Leader of the House not in any spirit of criticism but merely to focus attention on and to underline what I feel is the paramount need of our foreign policy, and that is, to make it known that India intends very definitely to resist communist aggression, whether overt or even covert, wherever that aggression may threaten our security or our frontiers.

Sir, I join with the previous speaker in paying a tribute to the Prime Minister. At one time, and until quite recently, I confess that I was rather exercised about our foreign policy. I felt—and I now realise that that feeling was wrong—that our foreign policy was in danger of becoming passively neutral, and in becoming passively neutral it was endangering our security and our frontiers. But I believe the Prime Minister can apply this unction to his soul—and it is something which does not fall to the privilege of many people today—that is, that he has been wise before the event. It is easy and usual for small people to be wise after the event, but I think that it can be justifiably claimed on behalf of India's foreign policy today that world events have justified our foreign policy, and I think in that respect it would not be out of place to pay some tribute to India's representative in Peking. In the beginning there was a tendency to criticise, to inveigh against our representative for having allegedly misled our Foreign Affairs Department. As it has happened, he has served the country well. He has served the Foreign Affairs Department well. As it has happened, international events have shown that our representative's information was more accurate than the information of the American military intelligence.

After having said that, Sir, I wish to emphasise this one point of difference between India's foreign policy and what I feel should be her foreign policy today. Last year when I spoke on foreign affairs, I drew attention to what I regarded as India's frontiers: Tibet on the one side and Indo-China on the other. One of those frontiers, Sir, has disappeared today; the other is in the process of rapid dissolution. Last year I felt that I should not speak strongly on this particular subject, that

the international position was fluid and critical. But I feel that international conditions have changed radically and that is why a precise and a definite reorientation of our foreign policy is called for today. Last year, I feel, the Prime Minister in formulating our foreign policy was bound to take notice of national sentiment as it prevailed then, national sentiment which was naturally pro-Asian, national sentiment which was naturally and understandably anti-colonialism, national sentiment which still is suspect of anything that the European democracies may do. But, as I have said, I feel that today the conditions have changed radically and it is my own feeling—and I cannot resist that impression—that our approach today to Asian Communism continues unjustifiably to tend to be imprecise, to be indefinite, because we are unable to separate the attraction of ideology from the grim reality of our survival as a democracy.

3 P.M.

We Indians are idealists, and even those of us who are convinced democrats are not prepared to condemn and repudiate in an unqualified way Communist ideology. Sometimes, when I myself am in a theorising mood, I wonder, when I look around and see the abject poverty in this country, when I see mass illiteracy, when I see our disease-ridden country, whether Communism would not be preferable to democracy for India. Nobody would ever accuse me of being a Communist. But when I look around and I see lack of cohesion, indiscipline and a certain amount of thriftlessness, and even when I remember what we are told of the objective manifestations of Communism; namely, ruthless regimentation, militarisation of labour, even then, as I say, when I am in a theorising mood, I wonder whether Communism would not be a better thing for India than democracy. Sometimes, in this same rather theoretical and analytical mood, I wonder whether democracy is suited to the genius of the Indian people, and sometimes I wonder whether this kind of thinking has not, in some way, affected our approach to foreign affairs. If we are not convinced in our own minds as to the relative advantages for India of democracy on the one hand and Communism on the other, then I can understand our approach to Asian Communism being imprecise and indefinite as it continues to be today. But, Sir, when I am in a realistic mood, I feel, that at this stage our line of action or perhaps our line of inaction should be definite with regard to Asian Communism. It is endangering our security and our frontiers. We are a demo-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

cracy. At least we purport to be a democracy. And when we purport to be a democracy, we cannot subscribe to the principles and the way of life of other democracies and by the same token subscribe to what Communism implies and means. And yet I ask myself today, "Has our policy assumed that definiteness which is necessary to guarantee the survival of Indian democracy?" As I have said, I have, by and large, felt that our foreign policy is correct. I agree that India's attitude towards the People's Government of China was a correct attitude. I endorse the fact that India rightly recognised that Government. Internationally, relations have to be determined not only by *de jure* but *de facto* considerations, and no one can deny the fact that the People's Government of the Chinese Republic was the *de facto* ruler of China, and the contention of the Prime Minister is right that India's recognition of the People's Government did not imply our appreciation or acceptance of the ideologies which motivated that Government. I am even prepared to endorse wholeheartedly India's cautious policy with regard to Korea. The problem there was not as simple as some of our friends in this House have sought to make it out to be. It was a complex problem. As a well-known commentator has remarked, the Russians sought to establish a Communist State in North Korea; instead they spooned a leftist Police State. The Americans sought to establish a democratic State in South Korea; instead they succeeded in spooning a rightist Police State. And for these reasons, the moral issues in Korea were not clear, and I can quite understand the Prime Minister having certain moral misgivings and I am inclined to agree with him in withholding India's complete material assistance in this matter, because it could be felt that if we gave complete military assistance we might not be able to give it with a completely clear conscience or completely clean hands. But after that, what position do we arrive at?

I feel that we have given every conceivable hostage to the good faith, the honesty and decency of Asian communism. India has espoused China's cause. She even violently supported her admission into the U.N.O. In fact, she did it so violently as to antagonise some of her friends in the democratic countries. We wanted to believe that Chinese Communism would evolve according to the genius of China, and that it would not dance to the tune of the Kremlin. I say, let us not even consider Chinese intervention in Korea

today. I am quite prepared to accept this proposition, that the Chinese Government has and had the right to be genuinely exercised about its Manchurian borders and about the security of its power installations. Let us not even consider its action in Korea. But what excuse—unless it be an utterly unworthy and dishonest excuse—can anyone assign for the cynical, unprovoked attack on Tibet? India has assumed the treaty obligations and rights which existed between Britain on the one side and Tibet on the other. According to these treaty obligations while there was some recognition of Chinese suzerainty there was definitely this condition, that India recognised the complete autonomy of Tibet. I do not think this point has been brought sufficiently to the notice of the Chinese Government. We have not told them sufficiently that this cynical and unprovoked attack on Tibet has outraged the conscience of every self-respecting Indian. I do not think that this point has been sufficiently emphasised.

Today, India cannot have the slightest doubt as to the character and motives of Communism. India's integrity, her high sense of moral conduct, etc.—what have these evoked in return? People have said that India has been rebuffed. I go further and say that all Indians and India's high sense of moral conduct have evoked certainly not repudiation but the perfect contempt which a bandit shows for the persuasion of a law-abiding citizen. I have always said this, and I maintain it today, that Communism works to a consistent and unchanging pattern. The first part of the pattern is a process of infiltration and subversion. The second part is that when Communism considers the time to be ripe, it goes over to the side of brutal and open assault. I say this without qualification, that in spite of all the ideology that we may indulge in, in spite of all the wishful thinking that we may indulge in, in the eyes of Communism, whether of the Chinese or the Russian variety, India will be right at the top of the list of victims, and I do not think that this point has been borne in sufficiently on the minds of our people. We still think of Tibet as something remote, as something which does not impinge immediately on India's security. Sir, I have discussed this matter with people who have been to Tibet recently and they have told me something which I do not think the average Indian realises, and that is that for the most part Tibet constitutes a vast natural airfield, and hostile planes operating from Tibet would only

have to cover a distance of 300 miles in order to bomb and destroy Delhi.

An Hon. Member: We are not afraid of it.

Shri Frank Anthony: You may not be afraid of it, but I want to know how you intend to resist it. I am not actuated by any fear complex. I just want to prevent friends like my hon. friend who just gratuitously interposed from indulging in dangerous wishful thinking. I say that the paramount objective of any foreign policy must be to secure our frontiers and to secure our way of life. Is sitting on the fence good enough? Or may not we be in danger by sitting on the fence so long that the iron may enter our soul? Sir, I am not, for one moment, suggesting or advocating a policy of bellicosity. I join issue with Acharya Kripalani when he espoused a policy of complete and absolute neutrality. But I was wondering what he meant. I conjured up before myself a picture of a kind of a genderless, corpselike policy of neutrality, and that is the kind of thinking that my friend over there is perpetrating, namely, that we can draw or misdraw an analogy—a false analogy—from small countries like Switzerland, that we can, if we choose to, adopt a policy, as I say of inarticulate neutrality that we will guarantee our own neutrality. I am absolutely convinced that nothing is farther from the truth. This is a fallacious and pernicious analogy. India is a vast country, it is too big a country, it is too strategic a country to do anything but to excite the greed and the inquisitiveness of the aggressor and the expansionist. And, today, Sir, who in this House will deny that the mantle of imperialism, the mantle of territorial expansion, the mantle of ruthless colonialism has been assumed completely by Communism. No one but a power-blind visionary or doctrinist can deny that. When I say that, I do not agree with Dr. Mookerjee. He suggested that we should go about in the role of a mad dog—that we should bite Tibet or Nepal on the one hand and that we should bite Pakistan on the other, and if necessary we should bite Communist China. That at least was the impression he left in my mind. But my thesis is this. I am in complete agreement with the Prime Minister's policy that we should insist, that we should continue to insist, that we reserve to ourselves complete independence of judgment, and on assessing on its merits every vital problem in the international field.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Member has already exceeded fifteen

minutes; the new-time-limit is ten minutes.

Shri Frank Anthony: I will finish in two minutes.

May I say, Sir, that I feel and feel strongly that the only way in which we can secure respect for our way of life is for our frontiers to be strong and as has been pointed out by several speakers, strength today is commensurate with our armed strength. And I want to end with this note. I say this, certainly let us make it known to all our neighbours, to communist China that we want to be friendly with everyone, that we are not concerned with ideologies which motivate their Governments or their peoples. But we also insist on respect for our own frontiers and our way of life. What we want is this—more specific collaboration in building up our defences with the only people who can help to build our defences, those democracies with industrial potential. I agree that we have no industrial potential, but I strongly disagree with Acharya Kripalani when he said that we have no military potential. We have the finest human material in the world and we can only strengthen it by collaboration with the democracies.

That does not mean that I am asking you, that I am asking the Prime Minister to become a camp-follower of the democracies—not at all. I do not believe they will ask him to do it either. But we would get their collaboration in building up our armed forces to a much greater degree than we are getting it today if they are convinced that we are not prepared to accept aggression in any form against our frontiers when it emanates from Communist sources.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That in the motion after the word "thereto" insert the following:

"which is definite in its intention to resist any form of communist aggression against the country".

Prof. S. N. Mishra (Bihar): At the very outset, I would like to disabuse the minds of people of any wrong impression that may have been created by the speeches made last evening and also by some of the speeches this afternoon. I think, Sir, what the hon. Member Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena has said this afternoon is to a great extent the sentiment of the majority of this House. And, I suppose it was only an accident that your eyes have been descending heretofore mostly upon those who in some measure, had been feeling that they were taking

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

part in some sort of an anti Communist Conference.

Sir, I am not one of those who are afraid of Communism, totalitarianism, or any other 'ism' of this or that type. I am one of those who feel that the policy our Prime Minister has been pursuing is the only correct policy that could be pursued under the present circumstances. Sir, I say this with a certain amount of confidence and certitude that that is the opinion of the majority of this House and also of the people whose sentiments and urges we are expected to represent here.

Sir, having said that, I shall come to the gravity of the international situation to which our Prime Minister has been repeatedly drawing our attention. Our sixth sense tells us that it is only five minutes to 12 in the international sphere and nothing else can save the world from a catastrophe on the edge of which it is so perilously poised today, unless all the great powers of the world listen to the counsels and advice of our Prime Minister, who even at the risk of being misunderstood has been repeatedly offering them. That is the only way out of this extremely dangerous situation. And as for the great country, America and her people, for whom I have great respect and admiration, I would like to remind them of what Abraham Lincoln said at one time: "The remedies of the quiet past are no longer a solution for the stormy present." They have to be re-examined and refashioned according to the spirit of the times. I am one of those who feel that we have to work in closest co-operation with America for as Harold Laski once said, it is upon the industrial potential of America and how they are going to use it that most of the fate of humanity depends.

I would also like to take this opportunity to contradict another impression that has been gaining ground. There seems to be a section of people in this country who want us to take part in a sort of cold war of denunciations, mutual recriminations and mud slinging. What I want to tell them, Sir, is this. It can help some people, it can even help a class or a section of people. But it is not going to help the country as a whole to speak against a country, or against a particular group of countries. This is not a policy which any nation can be advised to follow. Sir, it is only by streamlining our nation for all eventualities and possibilities to come that we can hold our banner aloft. It is not by indulging in recriminations against this group or that group that we are going to make a headway.

Sir, I would now proceed to some of the arguments that have been made by some of the hon. friends here. Notable among them is the hon. Member Mr. Masani who of late has developed a flair for propounding a theory—and he has been doing it in every college society, in every townhall and in every market-square. That is his pet theory of one bloc. I do not understand how even an hon. Member of Mr. Masani's intellectual stature could gloss over facts so patent and clear. All that seems to be only for the convenience of his theory, I would say, Sir, with all respect to him. Otherwise, how can he gloss over the fact that there are nations held together in military pacts and political alliances—Atlantic Pact, the Western Union defence force and all the rest. What do they indicate, if they do not indicate a sort of military alliance or a bloc? What do the twenty-two countries of Latin America mostly going *en bloc* on a side and voting together indicate? Sir, I think that these are facts which should have weighed with the hon. Member Mr. Masani when he thinks that it is a great idea that he has propounded before the world, or at least before our country.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

He has also taken pains to point out some of the fallacies in the basic assumptions of our foreign policy. It is strange that at a time when even scoffers and doubting Thomases are coming round to our point of view and learning rapidly in schools of adversity that what our Prime Minister has been saying is proving true with correct mathematical exactitude, hon. Member Mr. Masani should get confused and misguide people in the way he has been doing. That is a rather strong word, but I cannot help using it. But when the hon. Member speaks he is perfectly understandable. When he speaks you can be very well sure that he speaks economics pure and simple and does not speak foreign policy. There is always a kitchen smell in all the fragrance of his arguments. And the smell is one of an aristocratic kitchen. My hon. friend is an erstwhile Socialist—and probably he still claims that he is a Socialist. May be, he is a Socialist of an extraordinary make. Therefore I find it difficult to catch the significance and import of what he has been saying. But this much tribute I may pay him. I have been observing from the last session that he has a remarkable power of marshalling facts in favour of a particular group or a particular bloc, and he will, therefore, have more encomiums and approbation from them than probably from the hon. Members of this House.

Sir, I have found it suggested that expansionist or aggressive Communism, now poses a great strategic menace on our northern border. I do not think that the advance of Communist forces in Tibet should have been magnified to the extent it has been. Our Prime Minister—as a matter of fact, all the spokesmen of our foreign policy—never denied that China had the suzerainty over Tibet. Having conceded the basic thing, which you legally had to, what is this unnecessary alarm? This is simply creating a sort of fear complex as my hon. friend sitting behind me told hon. Member, Mr. Frank Anthony while he was speaking: When we accept the suzerainty of China over Tibet, it was rather strange and I thought somewhat unnecessary that even the little hue and cry should have been raised over the movement of the Chinese forces into a certain part of Tibet. It seems to me there was absolutely nothing shady or subterranean about it. I want to put a question to the hon. the Prime Minister whether it is a fact that our Ambassador in Peking was informed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China on the 31st of August that they were going to take action in Sikiang which is the outer part of Tibet. That report has not been contradicted so far. It is almost accepted that that part of Tibet is an integral part of China. It is only the internal part of Tibet which has been considered to be autonomous. I think this point should have been clarified in the statement of the Prime Minister.

Again, there is another theory of the Pacific Pact or some sort of a Regional Pact. What is this Pact based on? It is based on certain quixotic fears about Communists aggression. These persons who raise unnecessary alarms do not understand that Communism is never an import but it is an eruption from the contradictions in one's own society. It is never totally imported from any other country. And I want to ask what is this Pacific or Regional Pact to consist of? Shall it consist of Chiang Kai Shek in Formosa, Syngman Ree in Korea, Pibul Songram in Siam, and Bao Dai in Indo-China? What is exactly the picture that my hon. friend Mr. Masani has in his mind about this Pacific Pact or a Regional Pact? Frankly speaking, I cannot understand. Probably he will clarify this point still further in some of the meetings that he will take pleasure to address sometime afterwards for the edification of his countrymen. As for the infiltration of ideas I want to make it clear that this possibility can never be completely ruled out. This possibility is always there. But the infiltration of ideas cannot be

checked by having some sentries and military guards over our frontiers. It can only be checked by economic betterment of our people. And if we want our people to be economically better off, we should not speak in the same breath about going on war with this country or that country. We will have to be at peace with our great neighbour China if we want that we should achieve some economic betterment for our people. As for China you can rest assured that she has so many worries over her own head that she will be well advised to cool her breath over her own porridge instead of cooling it elsewhere. That is the position in which China finds herself today.

Sir, with your indulgence I shall say something about Nepal. I was surprised that about Nepal also some contradictory opinions have been voiced by hon. Members here. But the firmness with which the Prime Minister made his statement on that matter gives us ground for optimism. Any indecision and wavering in regard to Nepal is certainly harmful for India and I want to make it clear that Nepal and India, from larger considerations of defence and strategy, must always be considered as one unit. This is the paramount consideration which should always weigh with India. I would like hon. Members to ponder over the situation that has arisen in Nepal. Nepal is now a seething cauldron of discontent. Why has this situation arisen? Do the powers that be in Nepal care to ponder over the situation in all its implications? They will be well advised to consider what our Prime Minister has always been emphasizing, namely, that the democratisation of Nepal is an urgent necessity. That is what must be done here and now by a swift stroke of statesmanship.

Before I submit my final word which will take about a couple of minutes, I would like to refer to what hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani said last evening. He was suggesting in a way that if you say that you are going to judge every issue on its merit, then probably it indicates that you have no philosophy, no perspective. I would very respectfully submit to the hon. Member, Acharya that the perspective is always there. The perspective or philosophy is of peace. And in that view of the matter he will not find that, although we have been judging every issue on its merit, we have been doing things in a rather haphazard and in a sort of unsystematic or unscientific manner. Like the broken fragments of a mirror they do not disagree, but they rather fit in the framework of the great perspective of peace.

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

Therefore the issue is not a question of judging in that way. He also said that we should observe silence in international diplomacy and not take too much part in talking in the international forum. Sir, here I am reminded of a story and I shall resume my seat after telling it. A quarrel was going on between a Sikh and a Jat about the nature of a big shining disk in the firmament—whether it was the sun or the moon was the point of dispute. Another man who passed by was asked to give his opinion. Clever as he was he smelt danger in expressing an honest opinion, and said:

“भई, मैं तो परदेसी हूँ, मैं क्या जानूँ कि यह सूरज है या चाँद है।”

(“Brother, I am a foreigner, what do I know whether it is the sun or the moon!”) Probably the great Acharya finds it wiser to express a point of view in the same way. That is a very realistic attitude, but I do not think in the context of events India finds herself today, it is possible for her to do so. Sir, I am very thankful to you.

Shri Joachim Alva (Bombay): One of our great philosophers said that God created man, half-baked him and found a Negro; under-baked him and found him a European and baked him well and found him an Indian. These are very flattering words which may give satisfaction to our souls but today we have seen the world gripped in horror, man pitted against man and today we are called upon to solve big problems in a spirit of humanity essentially and thereafter as peace-makers or war mongers.

The Prime Minister yesterday made a great speech. Perhaps it was one of the best speeches of his career for the simple reason that he condemned no nation, he condemned no people; he followed the golden principles of peace and delivered us an address which was the authentic voice of our Master! You may recall what Mahatma Gandhi said during the time of the last war when bombs fell on London, when war was nearer at hand and we did not know what to do. Our freedom was in danger and there was every fear of the enemy invading us and at that time Mahatma Gandhi said: “When bombs fall over London, my heart sobs. But if the Japanese conquer our land, we shall fight unto the last ounce of our blood”. This is the spirit to which you and I can cling.

The Prime Minister recalls a letter which he had received from a Korean lady. She says, “My country is sick

and dying of cold, disease and starvation.” We offer our sincerest sympathies and condolences whether they are Americans, Koreans or Chinese.

If it comes to a question of aggression, the Prime Minister has repeated a great historic phrase. The Himalayas are our borders; that phrase is as true as the Monroe doctrine or the Truman doctrine. He said boldly that we shall see that the Himalayas shall not be crossed by any foreign power, Eastern or Western and no Western power shall be allowed to have the Himalayas as a base for aggression against any other foreign power. These are great words and today when we are asked to decide between peace and war, there are friends who ridicule our foreign policy. I would put them in three categories: revolutionary, ex-revolutionary and pseudo-revolutionary.

I will start with Mr. Deshpande. I shall take his own words. He said that he was an ex-communist. We are afraid of all ex-people, ex-viceeroys and ex-everybody. At one time they become congressmen; at another time Socialist and then Communist! We have no clothes to change; our clothes are old and golden and we shall stick to one coat and not change, or propound policies which are not true and lasting.

Acharya Kripalani was once a great revolutionary—in fact; some foreigners compared him to Danton or Robespierre. But he has now lost the fire of revolution and today he gives us another kind of force.

The Prime Minister's address yesterday was magnificent. The Prime Minister built up 7 bridges. He touched upon Pakistan, Goa, South Africa, Korea, China, Formosa, the atom bomb, Tibet and Nepal. I shall take up Pakistan first. May I urge upon my hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee that Pakistan is not our enemy today. It may have been before April 1950 but today bigger issues are at stake, greater calamities have happened nearer and if Pakistan aims to hit at the heart of India, that same bow will be aimed at Pakistan. Today our dangers are nearer home. If any foreign power either tries to invade Pakistan or India, it is the concern of both the countries and both the countries would be affected. The Iron Curtain between Pakistan and India was smashed by the All India Newspapers Editors Conference and an amount of goodwill flowed between the countries and only yesterday we heard that Pakistan was so sorry that we the Editors did not go over there

for they had prepared a special train and they had arranged numerous receptions. In view of the changed atmosphere, let us not fight about Pakistan. Let us talk of other dangerous problems.

You have got the Radio Goa which has been inflicting incalculable harm. At one time it may prove to be a dangerous instrument in the hands of foreigners when perhaps the internal security of our country would be imperilled or invaded by a foreign power. Why I emphasize this danger, it is because Radio Goa in the hands of a foreign power can strike terror here. I think the Prime Minister could not have said anything better than this, that ultimately all these foreign possessions in India shall have to come into our own hands.

About China, Sir, I want to say this much. There has been a warning of history. China and Japan were the greatest friends in history. One of the cardinal aims of the great Sun Yat Sen was that China and Japan shall not fight and that they should live in peace forever. But due to the intervention and manipulation of foreign powers both the countries were in a deadly combat for nearly half a century so much so that today they hate each other. That historic lesson China and India shall never forget. India will have to be patient and if ever strife enters our soil, it shall be the end of all the power and greatness of Asia. These powers have to live as neighbours in love and friendship and if that love is torn to bits, we shall be engaged in a deadly combat more deadly than has been experienced for over forty years between China and Japan. Today let us not fight; let us have patience. Nepolean once described China as a sleeping Giant. Whilst the Giant was asleep, his ears were bitten by some flies. When he was awake, he just drove them away. That is the lesson of Tibet.

China took over Tibet only after the 38th Parallel was crossed and Pandit Nehru's warning in regard to the 38th Parallel has been proved true. That if they crossed the 38th Parallel it would bring untold hardship to everybody. That warning has become the warning of history. This warning will be remembered very long after you and I perhaps leave these benches. On account of the American crossing that Parallel came untold dangers; if the Parallel had not been crossed you might not have witnessed the spectacle of China being obsessed with fear and hence Tibet was invaded. China might not have been in a jittery state and the people in Tibet would not have asked for help.

Then I come to Nepal. The rulers of Nepal and the people of Nepal must know that the Government of India are their best friends. Let them not be afraid and let them not give any bases to any powers of the West or the East. Nepal being our neighbour, we shall treat them as true brothers.

On the point of Egypt, Sir, the Prime Minister must have overlooked it. In regard to Egypt we have certain definite notions. Egypt has suffered on account of India; Egypt has a dispute with Britain. Though Britain and India are Members of the Commonwealth, we shall give every moral sympathy to Egypt in her struggle over her rights for complete possession over Suez. You know that the Middle East has been the hunting ground of all the powers of the West as it contains the rich booty of oil and today Egypt demands that she should have the theoretical right of Sovereignty over the Suez and naturally we offer Egypt our complete sympathy.

In regard to the atom bomb, as I said, God created man not to destroy him, not to pulverize him, not to completely destroy life, progeny and even vegetation all over as it was done in Hiroshima. Our hearts go to those old victims of the atom bomb. The Prime Minister said rightly that the atom bomb shall not be used in any shape or in any form, in any place. If, in disregard of all values, any of the powers of the West use the atom bomb, they shall have outraged our moral conscience and be out of the just moral code.

My hon. friend Mr. Masani referred to one point yesterday and that was about Czechoslovakia. He said that there was a telephone call from Russia in Paris when Czechoslovakia was deciding between America and Russia. I would like to correct him. When I was in Prague I have heard their Foreign Office people say that when Czechoslovakia was seriously considering the question of getting aid from America and America hesitated, deciding upon the terms of assistance. Just when America wanted to dictate terms of assistance, Russia came and offered them assistance. I think it was entirely wrong to say that just a telephone call could have changed the minds of the Czech people, especially when the people were situated on the other side of the border with Russia so near them.

These are the points that I wanted to touch on. You have seen, Sir, that the first World War was caused by powerful German cartels. The Second World War was caused by the same cartels operating in unison with British

[Shri Joachim Alva]

and American capitalists. The Third may be caused by the super-cartel of about 500 billion dollars on one side and other people on the other side. As I said in my speech on the Korean debate, we are today torn between two ideologies, one ideology for the dethronement of moral values and the other ideology for the enthronement of material values. We have made our decision. We shall not join one side or the other. We shall remain firm and that policy alone shall help us, and that policy alone shall be valued, after all the wars and conflicts are over in this world.

श्री गौतम : सदर साहब, जो फ़ारैन पालिसी (foreign policy) इस वक्त इस मुल्क ने अपनाई है उस के सिवा कोई दूसरी फ़ारैन पालिसी हो सकती है. यह कम से कम मैं नहीं मानता। आप उस को सिद्धान्तवाद के तौर पर लें तब भी यह जरूरी है कि हम दुनिया को यह बतायें कि हम लड़ाई नहीं चाहते, कोई भी लड़ाई हो हम उस में हिस्सा लेना नहीं चाहते, और हम दुनिया से लड़ाई को रोकना चाहते हैं। इस के अलावा आप प्रैक्टिकल प्वाइंट आफ व्यू (practical point of view) से भी देखें तो जैसी इस वक्त हमारी हालत है उस को देखते हुए मैं नहीं समझता कि जो लोग इस वक्त किसी तरह की लड़ाई में हिस्सा लेने की बात कहते हैं वह उस के अच्छी तरह से मानी समझते हैं और जो मुसीबतें और जो तबाही इस मुल्क के किसी लड़ाई में हिस्सा लेने पर आवेंगी उस को अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं। वह बिल्कुल आसानी से बग़ैर उस की गहराई को सोचे हुए यह बात कहते हैं। अगर आप उन मुल्कों का नक़शा देखें जो कि पिछली लड़ाई में तबाह हुए थे तो आप को यह भालूम हो जायेगा कि अगर किसी मुल्क के रहनुमा अपने मुल्क को किसी लड़ाई में डाल कर ऐसी तबाही लाने वाले हैं तो वह उस मुल्क के नेता होने लायक

नहीं हैं। फिर जो तबाही पहले हुई है उससे कहीं ज्यादा तबाही अब होगी क्योंकि अब हमारे हथियार बहुत ज्यादा तबाह-कुन हो गये हैं। एटम बम (Atom Bomb) की तबाही यूरोप ने नहीं देखी, यूरोप में जो तबाही हुई है वह वग़ैर एटम बम के हुई है और उस को भी देख कर लोगों के रोगटें खड़े हो जाते हैं। लेकिन एटम बम की तबाही हम देखें और फिर हम आसानी से लाइट हार्टेडली (light-heartedly) यह कहें कि हम किसी लड़ाई में हिस्सा लेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम को सोचना चाहिये कि क्या हम अपने मुल्क की रहनुमाई करने के लायक हैं या नहीं। मेरा यह ख्याल है कि हमेशा यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये और इस मुल्क को भी यह कोशिश करते रहना चाहिये कि दुनिया में लड़ाई न आवे और अगर लड़ाई आवे तो कम से कम जितना हमारा वश चले हम इस मुल्क को लड़ाई से अलग रखें। अगर हम ने यह किया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम सही रास्ते पर अपने मुल्क को ले जायेंगे और दुनिया को भी हम सही रास्ते पर ले जाने की कोशिश कर सकेंगे।

जहां तक लड़ाई को दूर रखने का इस वक्त ज़रिया है उस में यों कहिये कि यू० एन० ओ० (U.N.O.) ही एक, अकेली चीज़ है जो लड़ाई को दूर करने की तरफ, इस दुनिया की एक कोशिश है। लेकिन यू० एन० ओ० को यह ताकत और आसानी से हासिल हो सकती है और प्रयास ताकत हासिल हो सकती है अगर यू० एन० ओ० के जो भी मुल्क वहां मैम्बरान हैं वह खुद पहले जो बेइन्साफ़ी और अन्याय दूसरे मुल्कों के साथ करते हैं उस को दूर करव। जो मुल्क वहां पर बैठे हैं वह खुद उर दूसरे मुल्कों के

साथ अन्याय करते हैं, दूसरे मुल्कों को गुलाम बनाये हुए हैं, तो वहां बैठ कर यह कहें कि हम दुनिया में न्याय चाहते हैं, हम दुनिया में शान्ति चाहते हैं, तो यह बात उनके मुँह में ज़ेबा नहीं देती, उन के मुँह में यह बात नहीं फबती। इसलिये जितने भी यू० एन० ओ० के मेम्बर हैं उन को और दूसरे मुल्कों को यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि सब मुल्क आज़ाद हों, गुलामी सब मुल्कों से दूर हो और कोई भी मुल्क किसी दूसरे मुल्क को गुलाम न रखे। जब यू० एन० ओ० के मेम्बरों की यह हालत होगी तभी उन के मुँह से यह आवाज़ सही निकलेगी कि वह न्याय चाहते हैं और दुनिया में शान्ति चाहते हैं।

हम आज देखते हैं कि जो फ़ैसले यू० एन० ओ० में होते हैं उन में से कुछ तो बहुत माकूल हो जाते हैं, और कुछ में उन की इतनी खुदगर्ज़ी भर जाती है कि वह हम को सही नहीं दिखाई देते। मिसाल के तौर पर आप कोरिया को लीजिये। कोरिया में हमला हुआ, यू० एन० ओ० ने ब्रद घंटों के अन्दर यह फ़ैसला कर दिया कि कौन एग्ग्रेसर (aggressor) है और उस के खिलाफ हथियार भी उठा लिये। अपने आप को खतरे में डाल कर और दुनिया में एक नई लड़ाई होने का खतरा भी मोल ले कर वह वहां चले गये। दूसरी तरफ़ हम ने काश्मीर के मामले को यू० एन० ओ० में पेश किया, कई साल से हम ने दरह्वास्त दे रखी है कि आप काश्मीर के मामले में कम से कम एग्ग्रेसर कौन है इसका तो फ़ैसला कर दीजिये, लेकिन यू० एन० ओ० का फ़ैसला नहीं हुआ है। इस तरह जब हम यू० एन० ओ० की तरफ़दारी देखते हैं तो उस का जो मारल स्टेचर (moral stature) है वह कम हो जाता है और उस के

फ़ैसले उतनी अहमियत नहीं रखते और उनमें उतनी मारल बैकिंग (moral backing) नहीं होती जितनी होनी चाहिये जिस से कि दुनिया में शान्ति स्थापित हो सके और लड़ाई दूर रखी जा सके। इसलिये यू० एन० ओ० के मेम्बरान को अपना रंग बदलना पड़ेगा, जो उन का कैरेक्टर है वह बदलना पड़ेगा। और जब तक वह इस को नहीं बदलते तब तक उन में वह ताकत नहीं आयेगी जो इस दुनिया में शान्ति स्थापित करने के लिये आना ज़रूरी है।

जहां तक हमारी गोवर्नमेंट की कोशिश का सवाल है अगर मैं उस को सही समझता हूं तो यह हो रही है कि चीन और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों मिल कर दुनिया में लड़ाई को रोकने की कोशिश करें। अगर यह कोशिश है तो मैं इसको बहुत मुनासिब समझता हूं। अगर चीन और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों यह एटीट्यूड (attitude) ले लें कि हम दुनिया में लड़ाई नहीं होने देंगे जो मेरा यह ख्याल है कि वह बहुत हद तक इस में कामयाब हो सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि हमारा यह एटीट्यूड कि हम दोनों गृहों में से किसी में नहीं होंगे और लड़ाई आयेगी तो हम उस में शरीक नहीं होंगे, इस में प्रौर कामनवैलथ (Commonwealth) के एसोसियेशन (association) में दोनों में कुछ इस्तिलाफ़ है। यह दोनों एक दूसरे के खिलाफ़ जाते हैं। जब तक हम कामनवैलथ में हैं तब तक दुनिया के जो दूसरे मुल्क हैं वह हमको अंग्रेज़ का एक हिस्सा समझते हैं, अंग्रेज़ी कामनवैलथ का एक हिस्सा समझते हैं, चाहे यह ग़लत हो या सही। और इस से बहुत सी चीज़ें ऐसी हैं जिन में हम उन के साथ बंधे रहते हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं कहता हूं कि कामनवैलथ के मेम्बर की इस्तिफ़ाद से

[श्री गौतम]

जहाँ तक हमारे डिफेंस (defence) का मामला है हमारे लिये यह मुश्किल है कि जब तक हम यह वादा न करें कि जब भी अंग्रेज पर कोई मुसीबत आयेगी तो हम उस की मदद करेंगे तब तक अंग्रेज हमारे डिफेंस के मामले में मदद नहीं कर सकता और हमारी ताकत नहीं बढ़ सकती।

लेकिन दूसरी तरफ यह भी है कि जब तक हम कामनवेल्थ में हैं, तब तक कोई दूसरा मुल्क भी हम को मदद नहीं दे सकता। और जो साइंटिफिक रिसर्च (scientific researches) होती हैं, उन का फायदा न अंग्रेज से होता है न दूसरे मुल्कों से हो सकता है और जब हम यह कहते हैं कि जब ये दोनों ब्लाक आपस में लड़ेंगे, तो हमारी कोशिश होगी कि हम लड़ाई को बंद करें तो हम को इन दोनों ब्लाकों से और ज्यादा अलग होना पड़ेगा। इसलिये जब तक हम कामनवेल्थ में हैं, हमारे लिये ऐसा ऐटीट्यूड लेने में दिक्कत है। लेकिन अगर हम कामनवेल्थ से अलग हो जायें और चीन से कोशिश करें कि वह भी रूसी अक्षर से अलग हो जाये, तभी यह ऐटीट्यूड हमारा सही हो सकता है। गुप्त इस में शक है। लेकिन फिर भी अगर यह कोशिश की जाये, तो मुझे यह गलत नहीं मालूम होती।

जहाँ तक चीन का ताल्लुक है, कोरिया के मामले में मुझे कोई ज्यादा कहना नहीं है। जो चीन का ऐटीट्यूड है, उस में मैं चीन को गलत नहीं पाता। तिब्बत के मामले में मैं समझता हूँ कि चीन की यह ध्यावती है कि तिब्बत पर उस ने हमला किया। मैं उन ट्रीटीज (treaties) को जो उस वक्त किमी जमाने में हुई थीं जिस समय तिब्बत के ऊपर चीन का अधिकार माना गया था सही नहीं

मानता। मैं उस से अपने आप को पाबन्द नहीं मानता। मैं मानता हूँ कि तिब्बत एक आजाद और अलग मुल्क है और चीन का वह हिस्सा नहीं है। इम्पीरियलिस्ट चीन (Imperialist China) का भले ही वह हिस्सा हो सकता है, लेकिन चीन का वह हिस्सा नहीं है। और इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि तिब्बत को एक अलग और आजाद मुल्क की तरह रहने का पूरा पूरा हक है और रहना चाहिये। जो पहले की ट्रीटीज का वास्ता देकर, चीन उस पर अपना कब्जा करना चाहता है, मैं अपने आप को उस से पाबन्द नहीं मानता। मैं समझता हूँ कि तिब्बत को एक आजाद मुल्क के तौर पर ही रहना चाहिये और चीन का अधिकार उस पर नहीं होना चाहिये। यह चीज इसलिये भी जरूरी है कि हमारे और चीन के बीच में एक बफर स्टेट (Buffer State) भी होनी चाहिये और जब तक वह बफर स्टेट रहेगी, दुनिया के लिये शान्ति स्थापित करने में आप को और दूसरे मुल्कों को भी आसानी होगी। इसलिये मैं यह दरखास्त करता हूँ कि इस बात पर गौर किया जाये कि चीन का अधिकार तिब्बत पर न माना जाये और उससे यह कहा जाये कि आप तिब्बत से अलग रहिये और उस पर आप कब्जा करने की कोशिश न कीजिये।

नेपाल के बारे में तो जो और सब दोस्तों ने कहा है, मैं भी उस से सहमत हूँ।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri Gautam (Uttar Pradesh): I, for one, am not prepared to concede that our country could have any foreign policy other than the one it has already adopted. Even if you were to consider the question from the doctrinaire point of view it is necessary

that we declare to the world that we do not want a war, that whatever war there be we do not want to take part in it and that we want to prevent the world from going to war. Besides, even if you were to look at the matter from the practical point of view I fail to understand, in view of our present plight, if those who, at this juncture, talk of participation in any kind of war, fully conceive the implications of that talk and properly realize the sufferings and the destruction that would befall this country in case of its getting embroiled in any kind of war. If they were to have a look at the maps of the countries that suffered devastation during the last war they would realize that if the leaders of any country are inclined to thrust their country into any war and thereby invite destruction of that kind they do not deserve to be leaders. Besides, this time the destruction is going to be on a much larger scale than before because the weapons we possess now are much more destructive. Europe has not yet seen the havoc caused by the atom bomb. Whatever destruction has been caused there was caused by weapons other than the atom bomb and yet the sight of it makes one shudder with horror. If, however, we were to consider the destruction caused by the atom bomb and still say lightly that we should participate in any war I feel we should reflect whether, after all, we are fit to be the leaders of our country. I am of the view that we in this country should for ever be trying that the world be saved from a war and that if ever it comes we should as far as possible keep this country aloof from it. If we act that way we should be leading our country on the right path and should also be in a position to endeavour to take the world on to the right path.

As a machinery for the avoidance of war, at the present moment, U.N.O. happens to be only concrete effort made by this world. But the potency of the U.N.O. in that respect could greatly increase if its member nations could in the first instance undo the injustice and repair the wrongs they are doing to other countries. When the countries represented there are themselves unfair in their treatment of other countries, when they are themselves keeping other countries in their thralldom, it hardly behoves them to sit there and declare that they want that justice should rule the world and peace should prevail. It hardly befits them. Hence all the member nations of the U.N.O. and all other countries should make an endeavour that all the countries should become free, that none of them should remain in bondage and that no country should keep any other country in subjection. Only when members of the U.N.O. attain that

position will they be in a position to declare in earnest that they want peace and justice to prevail in the world.

We find today that whereas some of the decisions of the U.N.O. are fairly sound others are so palpably actuated by selfish motives that they do not seem to be fair. Take Korea for instance. There was an attack on Korea. Within a few hours the U.N.O. decided who was the aggressor and they also took up arms against him. At a risk to themselves and at the risk of a second world war they proceeded thither. On the other hand, we took the Kashmir issue to the U.N.O. and it was some years ago that we made an application asking them at least to make a declaration as to who was the aggressor in Kashmir. But the U.N.O. has not yet given its decision. Thus, when we observe this partial behaviour of the U.N.O. its moral stature is reduced and its decisions cease to have the importance and the moral backing which should belong to them and which might serve to bring peace to the world and ward off war. Hence the members of the U.N.O. would have to change their attitude and their character. Until they do so they are not going to acquire that strength which is essential for the establishment of peace in the world.

So far as our own Government's efforts are concerned, if I understand them aright, they are directed on the lines that China and India should in collaboration make an effort to prevent the break-out of a world war. If any such effort is being made I regard it as extremely laudable. If China and India were to take up the attitude that they are not going to let the world drift on to another war I am of the view that they could succeed in that objective to a very great extent. But I feel that our attitude that we will not live up with either of the two blocs but would hold aloof in case a war breaks out is not quite in conformity with our association with the Commonwealth. The two attitudes are antagonistic to each other. So long as we are in the Commonwealth other countries of the world, rightly or wrongly, look upon us as an ally of the British and a part and parcel of the British Commonwealth. As a result of this association we are tied down with them in several respects. For example, in the matter of defence, the present position is such that unless, as a member of the Commonwealth, we give them an undertaking that we would go to their help whenever they are in trouble they are not expected to help us in the matter of our defence, with the result that our strength cannot grow. On the other hand no other country can extend us any help so long as we are in the Commonwealth.

[Shri Gautam]

In the matter of scientific research we cannot derive any benefit either from the English or from the other countries. Moreover, when we declare that whenever these two blocs go to war with each other it would be our endeavour to stop them from fighting we should, in that case, have to keep still more aloof from either of these two blocs. So long as we are in the Commonwealth it is difficult for us to take up that attitude. We can, however, take up that attitude, justifiably only if we break away from the Commonwealth and try to persuade China also, similarly, to cut away from Russian influence. I have of course my doubts on that score. All the same I do not think it would be wrong for us to bend our steps in that direction.

Speaking about China I have not much to say in regard to her part in Korea. I do not find China in the wrong in the matter of her attitude in that behalf. In the matter of Tibet, however, I am of the view that China's attack on Tibet was an act of high-handedness. I do not admit the validity of treaties made in remote times under which China's suzerainty over Tibet was recognised. I do not feel bound to recognise them. On the other hand, I hold that Tibet is a free country with a separate entity of its own and that it does not form a part of China. It could have formed a part of imperialist China but not of the present Chinese Republic. Hence, I think that Tibet has and should continue to have the free right to retain her entity as a free and independent country. I do not feel myself bound to recognise China's claim to extend its dominion over that country by invoking old treaties. I maintain that Tibet must remain an independent country and must not come under the domination of China. This is all the more essential for the reason that there ought to be buffer state between our country and China for the existence of that buffer state would help us and other countries in the maintenance of peace in the world. Hence, I would submit that this question should be considered and China's claim on Tibet should not be conceded. China should be told to keep its hands off Tibet and not to try to extend its dominion over Tibet.

In the matter of Nepal I am inclined to agree with whatever observations have been made by my other friends.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have fixed a time-limit and the hon. Member has already exceeded this time-limit.

Shri Raj Bahadur (Rajasthan): The Prime Minister yesterday very correctly summarised the whole situation when he said that it is faced with the issue of "peace or war". Sir, it is faced with this question and the fate of the entire humanity depends upon the answer to this question. The answer to that question has to come from four nations, the principal participants in world politics today. On the one hand we have the U.S.A. and the U.K. and on the other Russia and China. And for us who belong to the other nations and countries of the world, the issue that we have to face is "whom to choose from these two". A foreigner who might have listened to the speeches that were made yesterday, would have gone with the impression that our Prime Minister is not backed by the country in his foreign policy. He has been accused of not following a realistic policy. Some Members have gone to the length of saying that we must choose our allies, and one hon. Member actually said that we must not keep on sitting on the fence. But, Sir, the question whom to choose and whom not to choose is a very difficult one. On the one hand we have seen that whenever it comes to a question relating to the interests of our country, whether it is question relating to Kashmir or one dealing with our compatriots in South Africa, or in dealing with the racial question, all the western powers who have aligned themselves under the so-called Anglo-American bloc have never shown any regard for our legitimate interests. So far as the Kashmir issue is concerned, in spite of knowing all the facts of the case, Anglo-American bloc has not uttered a word of sympathy, so much so that even after the hon. Mr. Justice Dixon gave his verdict that Pakistan was the aggressor, they have not been doing anything in this matter. We have not found their policies proceeding in the right direction. We did not have any support from any of the powers that align themselves with the Anglo-American side. All that they want from us in the guise of their friendship is our man-power. They also want military bases in our country which they may get if we go with them. They have been resenting our policy of neutrality so far as the Korean war is concerned. They want that we should give them armed help which only means that we should provide them with cannon fodder. If we on the other hand even look at the other bloc the case is no less disappointing in so far as from heresy to high treason is the price for their friendship. This side has always discarded our hand of friendship. Apart

from that they have not spared us even. We are familiar with their tactics of infiltration and creating chaos inside other countries. Which side to go to, which side to choose is the question.

So far as the other aspects of the Russian policy towards us are concerned, it is well known that on account of the enslavement and exploitation of our country by the Britishers for about two centuries, our bias could have been clearly in their favour as a matter of natural reaction. But in spite of our perfectly neutral attitude and perfectly independent policy, the position is that even on this particular question of Tibet which was so vital for us and which so vitally affects our cultural and commercial interests, the Sino-Russian bloc has without caring for us, without even consulting us, come out right with a sort of aggression against our aforesaid vital interests.

Therefore, we are on the tenter-hooks of a dilemma and so it is difficult to be dogmatic about the wisdom or success of any one particular line of foreign policy. We have seen that during the last two or three months, and even as late as just a fortnight ago there was a volume of opposition in our country against the foreign policy pursued by the Government. But events of the last fortnight have silenced that opposition. The world has realised and is realising that the policy that was pursued by us is the only policy that can go to solve the world's troubles.

In relation to the Korean affair I may say that the genesis of the whole trouble is quite clear. When dealing with Korea, we have got to realize that the intervention of the Chinese Armies in the Korean war is not an isolated incident or factor. If we examine the question closely we can see that this has resulted from the policy of keeping the conclusion of the peace treaty with Japan so long in the cold storage. We can easily see how the military help given to Bao Dai in Indo-china by the U.S.A., the stationing of the 7th Fleet near about Formosa, the perpetuation of the colonial rule in Malaya, are all parts of the policy of these western powers which is responsible for maintaining foreign possession over isolated pockets in India. There is no reason why any foreign power should keep places like Goa and Pondicherry in India under their domination. It is the same spirit of colonialism, the same spirit of Imperialism that seeks to keep a string of military strongholds round the Asian continent in order to perpetuate their commercial exploitation and to protect their trade interests that they have been enjoying for centuries. On account of this scare or threat, to her

security, China wanted to take steps to see that the western powers do not get possession of Korea. This is the genesis of this trouble that has brought the world to the brink of a crisis. And it is obvious that unless the causes of this sickness or disease from which humanity is suffering are remedied, there can be no peace in the world. The Disease from which the world is suffering has grown chronic and if the patient is not taken care of he is bound to meet his end. Chronic maladies require drastic remedies. It is obvious that if we want peace in the world, the peace treaty with Japan should be concluded without any more delay. It is obvious too that all the various causes which create lack of trust and confidence between powers and nations must be removed. It is the racial and colonial policies that are responsible for the estrangement and hostility between nations and countries. These should be given up for good. It is impossible to secure world harmony and human brotherhood so long as there is racialism or colonialism such as we see in the policy of Apartheid in South Africa or the white Australia policy. There is no earthly reason why a country as large in area as the U.S.A. should be inhabited by a population which is equal to that of New York only or equal to that of only two cities like Bombay and Calcutta. In fact that is the entire population of Australia. If the Western powers are really sincere and honest about their professions of peace and humanity these big powers must realise that feelings of fellowship never flow unilaterally. They can be developed and promoted when love and friendship flow from and on both sides.

4 P.M.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Bihar): It is for the second time or third that I am speaking in this House on foreign affairs. In November-December 1947 I spoke on the foreign policy of the Government of India. It was then that I suggested that American troops must withdraw from Japan.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Hear, hear.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: At that time I had also suggested the method of compelling America to withdraw her troops from Japan. I had suggested that India and China must come together. I had suggested that we should walk out from the United Nations Organisation. (Hear, hear.) All those suggestions have been incorporated in the four amendments that I have tabled today. I am not making any new suggestion to this House.

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

I have come to the conclusion that in the interests of the country it is necessary that we must join hands with China and Russia. I advocate the establishment of a Delhi-Peking-Moscow Axis. The policy which our Prime Minister is pursuing is one which only a philosopher King can pursue. He knows what to do, when to do and how to do. If I had been assured—if any such assurance in the nature of things can be given to anybody—that he would continue to be at the helm of affairs for a period of another ten years I would whole-heartedly support the policy which he is pursuing today.

An Hon. Member: Where is the doubt about it?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Yes, there is a doubt and that is why I am referring to it. The doubt is that even philosopher kings in all forms of government are victims of natural and political calamities. I do not like to elucidate this point further. I hope hon. Members of this House fully understand the implication of my statement. It is with a view to warding off these dangers that I have suggested the establishment of a Delhi-Peking-Moscow Axis.

An Hon. Member: How can there be an axis with three points?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am definitely of opinion that today we can if we like put the wheels of our State on the right track, so that it may become impossible for the future Government of India to jeopardise the vital interests of the nation either due to lack of understanding or at the behest of a small group of exploiters and profiteers.

Sir, I start with the assumption that America wants war now. For if any breathing time is given to Russia she would become invincible. The reason why America is not starting a war now is that she has got no allies.

Several Hon. Members: Oh!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I would elucidate this point. Europe is sick of war. It is not going to join any war today, either for the sake of Korea, or for the preservation of any American interests in South East Asia. America stands all alone in the field of international politics today. The only hope is India. They are depending upon India. I apprehend an economic offensive in India by the Americans. I hope the lure of dollars, and the promise of help without any guarantee would not entrap us. All kinds of temptations

would be dangled before us. I hope that we would not fall into this trap. If we do so, it would act like the Pandora's box. I am definitely of opinion that there would be no war if India, China and Russia came together for no power can fight the combined forces of India, China and Russia, the greatest combination of powers known to history. It would not be possible either for America single-handedly or in alliance or for any combination of Anglo-European powers to meet India, China and Russia in war.

Sir, I am not afraid of Communism. Let me ask a straight question to this House. Will the people of this country oppose if Communism comes to this land?

An Hon. Member: No.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Who will stand to suffer if Communism comes to this country? A small group of profit-seekers and exploiters! Is it in their interest that we are sitting here? I am not afraid of Communism. I do not say that the Government of India should accept Communism. But we are not afraid of Communism. Why this bogey then?

I have been listening since yesterday to the speeches of hon. Members condemning Russian expansionism and the threat of Russian domination. Sir, I hold the opinion that the centre of political gravity has shifted from Moscow and Washington to Delhi and Peking. If this Axis is formed the dominant partners would be India and China and not Russia. There is no danger of domination.

I hold the opinion that there will be no war if we ally ourselves with China and Russia. There will be peace and stability in South East Asia. From the point of view of both military strategy and Geo-Politics it will be physically impossible for any alien power to land troops in South East Asia. If we want peace, we must join hands with Russia and China. I am quite sure that whatever hon. Members of this House may feel now events will justify the stand I have taken in this House today.

There is another reason why I want this Axis to be formed. I hold the opinion that India's material prosperity and our economic development is possible only within the ambit of this Axis. In pursuance of the laws of political gravitation all the countries of South East Asia including the Far East would, if we join hands with China and Russia begin to rotate round the

Delhi-Peking-Moscow Axis. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I must get some margin for this laughter.

The region is the granary of the world. It is a reservoir of vast agricultural, mineral and industrial wealth. We need not go in sack cloth and ashes before the American capitalists in order to borrow dollars or ask for technical help. If we come together we would not require any dollar from any outside power.

I am clear in my own mind that if these Axis powers come together there would not be any necessity for spending a large part of our budget on the army. There will be no need for maintaining three separate huge armies in Asia. What goes to the army today would be utilised tomorrow for nation-building purposes.

I have no time to elucidate the meaning of an Axis. I gather from the face of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee that the phrase three armies has probably created consternation. I hold the opinion that there is no danger in allying ourselves with China and Russia. manifold advantages will accrue to this country if this Axis is formed. If we join the Axis there would be no war and our economic prosperity will be assured. The Americans are not going to help us without extorting a guarantee that in the event of war we would support America. If we give any such guarantee the result would be not economic development but bombardment of our towns and villages by Russian and Chinese planes. It is only to the extent to which it would be consistent with the maintenance of American supremacy over the world that America would give help to us.

Sir, I want to take a few minutes more. I want to remind you that I have not taken any long time of the House during the last four years. I will not take more than five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give the hon. Member three minutes.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Many thanks, Sir. I will finish in three minutes.

If this axis is formed, it will not constitute any danger or any threat to our independence. No system of alliances can endanger the independence of a country. We are free to the extent we are strong. As long as we remain strong and powerful, we are free. No political constitution or international guarantees can safeguard our independence if decadence sets in and, we lose our inner vitality. We talk of Russian

expansionism. It is wrong to characterise only Russia as an expansionist Power. The malady lies not with the Russians. Expansionism is inherent in the institution of the nation-state. Was England an imperialist Power? Did England not develop an Indian Empire? Were the French expansionists? Each and every country of Europe had empires of their own. Given time and opportunity, every nation would develop an empire. If we want to do away with the menace of expansionism, we must demolish the institution of the nation-state. Russian expansionism is not a passing phase. It has become an instrument in the hands of history. It will lead to establishment of world hegemony under the leadership of the proposed Axis powers. Without the dynamism of Indo-Chinese expansionism, Russian expansionism would wilt and wither. If we want progress in Asia, we must become one political unit. I do not want three Governments in S. E. Asia consisting of India, China and Russia to continue for long. There must be one Government in the end.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, this two days' debate has ended in a somewhat unusual manner and for the moment such thoughts as I had collected in my head have been rather dispersed. I have listened with great attention to what hon. Members have said during these two days, and I am thankful to some of them who had words of commendation for me, and am still more thankful to those who had words of criticism for me for the policy we have pursued. The debate has ranged over many subjects and the expression of opinion has varied greatly. As the House will see there was at one end Mr. M. R. Masani, at the other end Mr. Brajeshwar Prasad and between those two extremes other hon. Members wander about.

I do not quite know whether I should deal with the large number of points that have been raised. I think perhaps it will be better if I chose some of the most important of those points and dealt with them. We have been discussing matters of grave import and though one likes hilarity occasionally, sometimes it does not fit in with the subject. The subject for our discussion has been one of the highest importance and over this subject has hovered all this time tragedy and possibly catastrophe. As I sat listening to the speeches of hon. Members, various pictures floated before my mind; pictures of the Korean battle fields and armies marching to and fro and people dying; a picture of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

possibly some room in Washington where two statesmen, leaders of their nations, holding earnest converse together to find some way out of these present difficulties; and other pictures. Because, there is hardly a person concerned with the foreign affairs of a nation who is today not carrying a heavy burden, not trying to grope—I repeat the word—grobe, in the sense darkness surrounds us. Some hon. Members are full of light—they have no need to grope. They know exactly what should be done at any moment. I envy them for this feeling of brightness and lightness. Mr. M. R. Masani said in the course of his speech that it will be a great tragedy if Mr. Truman and Mr. Attlee decided to appease China. It is a pity Mr. Masani is not in the White House at Washington to advise them.

Many hon. Members have referred to our policy being unrealistic. The realism and the lack of realism have been referred to repeatedly, and there has been often mention of sitting on the fence, not knowing what one does or what one should do, of doubt and uncertainty and so on and so forth. It seemed to me that those people who pride themselves of being practical politicians normally know nothing about realism or about the state of affairs that they have to meet or the question they have to answer. It is an easy thing to say that this policy is not realistic. It is also easy to say that there is uncertainty, the policy is changed, etc. It is not for me, of course, to talk much on the policy of our Government with which I have been associated. That policy, inevitably, has to deal with world affairs and if any hon. Member thinks that the Government of India moulds world affairs, then he is very much mistaken. The Government of India's part in affecting world affairs is very, very little. Let us realise it. I do not say that we cannot affect them. I do not say that we have not affected them or influenced them to some extent. But, obviously, the measure that we affect them or influence them is a very little measure. Our policy is a very small part of various policies that mould world affairs. If the world goes wrong, then it may be, of course, that it is due to some error of ours, but surely it is the resultant of a large number of policies of various countries, and in particular of the great countries who, because of their power and influence, mould that policy much more than the smaller or the weaker countries. Some hon. Members seem to think that because various policies in the world have failed, our policy has been wrong. I have little to say to that, except that

I would beg of them to look through the history of the past five years, let us say, since the last world war ended, and see the record—sometimes of success, more often of failure—of the policies that have been pursued by various countries. We have had little to do with those policies. Sometimes, at the best we have expressed an opinion. Sometimes, we have, if you like, played a passive role. Sometimes, a small active role. Therefore, it is in this context that you have to judge a policy, a context in which we cannot do very much. Sometimes, a moment comes when even that small thing that we might do might make a great difference, and if we do not do it, we fail.

Now, I should like, before I deal with the wider questions, to deal with two or three specific matters that were raised. Many hon. Members referred to the question of defence. They were anxious that we should not weaken our defence. Indeed, they talked of re-armament, and increasing the strength of our Army, our Navy and our Air Force. They were afraid that we might weaken them. The hon. Pandit Kunzru referred to a question and an answer to that question which I had given. Well, of course, that question and answer—and specially the answer—necessarily had to be very brief. I could not deal with the subject in the course of a brief answer, when especially that question was a supplementary question, and I am afraid I could hardly deal with this big question of defence in the present debate. Nevertheless, I should like to say something about it, and the first thing is this, that no Government in this country can possibly think lightly over the question of defence or think of weakening it at any time. Every Government must give first priority to the defence of the country. That is so. Now, what is defence? Most people seem to imagine that defence consists merely in large numbers of people marching up and down with guns. It is true that defence consists of armed men and machines. It is also true that defence does not consist of them only but of many other things.

Defence consists—if you want the equation for defence—of the defence forces, of the industrial potential of a country, of the morale of a country and any number of other things, such as the economic position of the country etc. Now, you have to balance those things, and you have to balance them on the one side with the capacity of the country,—the resources of the country—and you cannot upset that equation very much. You cannot go

beyond the capacity, beyond the resources of a country in any programme that you may make, whatever the danger may be. There is one thing which can go up, and that is your morale, and that is your determination not to surrender, whatever the danger, whatever happens. If that is present, then nothing can conquer you. But if you rely too much—if I may use the word in a different sense—Mr. Masani referred to the Maginot line and talked of the Himalayas—but if you rely on the Maginot line, on men with guns and lose your moral fibre, then you are done for.

Therefore, when you talk of defence, remember your resources; remember your capacity; and remember that defence consists of the economic position of a country, of the industrial potential of a country plus the defence forces. You may, of course, change the equation here and there. You may apply some more here, and apply a little less there. That is always possible, but you have to work within those limitations. An army or any other defence force which cannot provide its own equipment, more or less, is not an independent army. It depends on others. There is no harm in its depending so, except when crisis comes when you cannot get those things.

In other words, the real development and strength of an army and a country lies in developing the industrial resources and the economy of the country, out of which armies and defence forces and everything come. Otherwise, it is just a superficial thing, which you may carry on by borrowing money or by any way you like for a little without any basic strength. In the modern context of the world, wars may go on and on and you cannot expect too much help in regard to equipment or anything else from outside, and unless you have that economic basis, you cannot go very far even in your defence apparatus. Therefore, we have to consider all the time how to balance these things. Therefore, at the present moment of financial stringency, we have more especially to consider whether it is worth while having ten thousand or twenty thousand odd men with guns or something much more efficient to help us in our defence.

These are the factors, but the fact that we should give the topmost priority to defence is obvious. Do you think that any Government dare take chances with that? But I would beg of such hon. Members as talk of defence so much and of peril to country to consider it in another context and that is this. If there is peril to this country, if there is danger to this

country and if there is urgency,—and there is urgency about our problems; there are many of our problems which are terribly urgent; take our food problem, that is terribly urgent—so if there is all that, how will you fight, I ask you, with the best army in the world if you cannot feed your army, if you cannot feed your people?

Again, defence becomes a food problem. It is not a question of guns. The first thing about defence is that people are fed. Hungry people do not fight. A hungry army cannot fight. Hungry people are bad economic material behind an army. Are you going to fight on the home front or on the external front? Therefore, food problem comes first of all, even when you think of defence. Therefore, the problem of industrial development and growth becomes equally important, so as to build up the resources whereby we can have defence. It is all tied up together. You cannot take one item singly and separately and say, 'Concentrate on defence'. Then, everything else goes. Defence also goes, because the foundation for defence goes.

Now, I have referred to food, and I have referred to other things. The food problem has been discussed often enough in this House and the sugar problem and the controls and so on and there has been a great deal of excitement when these subjects have been discussed. But the House will forgive me if I say that neither in this House nor in the country do I sense a feeling of utter urgency about these problems that ought to exist. We talk about controls, and if there is a little lack of sugar, there is shouting all over the country, because there is not enough sugar. And then you talk to me about defence. Well, a country which cannot put up with a few controls, a country which cannot do without a little sugar—how is that country going to face the enemy at a critical moment, I should like to know. Therefore, I beg this House and the country to remember that we do live in India in times of grave crisis and in times of grave crisis people have to give up everything that they hold dear—their families, their children and everything.

If you cannot give up your sugar, your wheat, your rice, for a while, then no number of soldiers will be able to protect you, the Himalayas will not protect you and nothing will protect you, because there is an inner strength which you lack. Of course, we have to keep an army—we have to keep the best army. It is no good keeping a second-rate army, it is no good keeping a weak army. Whatever we have must be first rate. We have to balance it with all these other factors, whether it is feeding the people, or keeping up the economic position of the country,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the industrial growth of the country and all that. We have to balance them and try to advance as rapidly as we can. That depends ultimately not on Government decrees. It may depend on government law to some extent. Ultimately these matters depend on how the public and the House look upon these questions, how much they support the various policies, whatever they may be.

Take our food policy. It is a war policy—if you like—forget peace. We have used the term 'war' in another context. But I say from the point of view of today's war situation in the world, food is the most urgent and important thing today in this country. Therefore, it becomes a part of our war policy. To do it, to save it, not to waste it, to grow it, to keep it, all these various steps we have to take in regard to it.

So, it is in this larger context that we have to see these problems. Obviously, in this country we have, somewhat grown shy or shall I say lax, in our thought and in our deed, during the last few years, having achieved independence. But I do not think we have lost that moral fibre that brought us independence. And do you think that if any danger or peril comes to this country, we are going to weaken or surrender or bend down before it? Has that been our habit during the past generation when we struggled for freedom? Even if we do not have a single gun, we will fight and fight to the death. We are not going to surrender to any enemy that comes, any aggressor that comes from the mountains, or the seas or from elsewhere.

Now, that is so. But I do not wish to indulge in tall talk, because all this kind of thing does become tall talk. And we have to be careful, we have to plan and think and we have to realise the difficulties of the situation. But the fact remains that we live in dangerous times and we have to think, therefore, in terms of those times and dangers that surround us and that surround the world. And listening to some of the speeches, I felt some of the hon. Members talked, what I consider, in a most unrealistic fashion. They went on talking about two blocs and one bloc—whether there are two blocs or whether there is only one bloc. Mr. Masani felt that there is only one bloc. Well, if there is only one bloc, the matter ends there; the question of our joining one or the other does not arise.

But, if I may respectfully remind the House, these questions and these arguments are completely out-of-date. They do not count today. The world

marches rapidly and changes, new situations come and we have to deal with each situation as it comes. And today if a person thinks in this manner, it merely means that he is yesterday's man, he is last year's person and that he is not keeping pace with the changing world and changing events.

Today we have to deal with questions as they arise from time to time, day to day, hour to hour and in foreign policy, especially, one has to decide every hour almost what one has to do. Here is a danger facing the world. Why did we have this debate in this House? Because new situations had arisen; new dangers threaten the world and we wanted the counsel of the House as to what we should do and we wanted to tell them what policy, generally speaking, we are pursuing. It does not help much if the kind of speeches delivered last session or last year are repeated when the situation is completely changed. It does not help at all. And my fear is that, somehow or other, we in this country do not keep pace with events. We read about them in the newspapers, but we have got into grooves of thought and we cannot get out of those grooves in this changing world. It is no good your telling me that you dislike this country or that country—that you dislike Russia or you dislike China, or that you dislike the United States of America or the United Kingdom. I do not mind your likes or dislikes. But I have to deal with a situation and the House has got to deal with a situation and facts are facts and do not disappear on account of your likes or dislikes.

Military changes have taken place in Korea. All kinds of things are happening—dangerous things. Do you think you are going to meet that situation by expressing your strong dislike of that change or something else? You will not. Suppose you were responsible there? What will you do—deliver a speech, telling them what you like and dislike, and which bloc you belong to? That will not help the situation in the slightest.

So it is in this spirit of realism that I want you to approach this question—what has got to be done today; what has got to be done tomorrow. It is in this spirit of realism, I am sure that President Truman and Mr. Attlee are meeting in Washington and conversing together, because they have to deal with a positive situation, they have to issue orders, they have to decide what to do and what not to do—not vague theoretical things and idealistic, or if you like, moral approaches to the problem.

I hope such connection as I have with the foreign policy of India is not immoral. Nevertheless, I want not moralism about this especially. There is far too much moralism and people think that because they use a few moral words or slogans they have discharged their duty. We should apply our good sense as much as possible. We should, of course, apply our idealism. What is idealism—may I ask? Is idealism something in the air with nothing to catch hold of? Idealism is the realism of tomorrow. It is the capacity to think in a slightly longer term—to think what is good for the day after tomorrow, or for the next year—and fashion yourself accordingly. The practical person, the realist, looks at the tip of his nose and does not see much further; the result is that he is all the time stumbling.

Now, I should like this House, or individual Members of this House, whenever they have some leisure at their disposal to think of the last five or six years of diplomatic history of this world—of what has been done, what has been achieved and what has not been achieved. It is an astonishing period of history, where there has been repeated failure, in spite of the best of intentions—not our failure, other peoples' failure. And the astonishing thing is that failure comes again and again and no lesson is learnt from that failure and the identical policy is pursued yet again. It is an extraordinary thing. I should have thought that the lesson of the two Great World Wars—the first World War and the second World War—was obvious enough to any man, to any person who would give thought to it. Nevertheless, it was not so obvious and more or less the same path is followed.

But leave the last two wars out. Take the last five years since the war ended. Again more or less the same thing is done. Now it may be that it is one particular country's fault, or group of nations' fault: it may be Russia's fault, it may be the Communist group of nations' fault. Admitted for a moment. What then? Suppose a group of nations is functioning in a way which is objectionable? How do we meet that—that is the problem which is before us. It is no good looking it in a way which defeats our own purpose.

People talk a great deal about Communism and as an hon. Member said, some Members thought that we were having a discussion about Communism, or that this House had suddenly become an Anti-Communist conference or congress. Well, it is an interesting subject and we can discuss it sometime or other either in this House or

outside. But it has not much bearing on the issue. And I say those persons here or elsewhere who think of world problems today as just revolving round the word Communism or Anti-Communism are going hopelessly astray and they will never reach any objective or any goal. And the difficulty is that much of the thinking—not here but elsewhere—is revolving round that word.

The House knows very well what the policy of the Government of India has been in regard to Communist activities in this country. It has not been a tender policy, and it is not going to be a tender policy. So it is not a question of holding any particular opinion about that policy. It is a question of looking at the world as it is, looking at great forces at work—mighty forces moving millions and millions of men—trying to understand them, trying as far as we can to divert them into right channels and to prevent them going into wrong directions. That is the problem. Do you mean to tell me that I should go and tell China—hon. Members seem to think that I should issue an ultimatum to China or I should warn them not to do this or that, or I should send a letter and tell them that it is foolish to have a doctrine of Communism. That may be my opinion or your opinion. Exactly how my functioning in that way is going to help anybody I do not see. Remember, the world has many countries, small and big. There are some countries which by virtue of many things are called Great Powers. They are great nations with great resources behind them and inevitably they play a great part in world history today.

There is the United States of America, a great power, a great democratic power. There is the United Kingdom. There is the U.S.S.R. All these, quite apart from their policies, are great powers influencing the world's history today. Now, take China. Can any one deny China at the present moment the right of a great power, from the point of view of strength and power, to mould events—not in the world, but her own—and shape her destiny or round about her? She is a great power, regardless of whether you like or dislike it. It is true that she is controlled today by Communists, as Russia is. It is an interesting question whether her shape or type of Communism may be the same or different, how she will develop, how closely they will be associated together.

These are interesting questions which you may go into. But the point at issue is this. Here is a great nation, China, which cannot be ignored, whatever resolution you may pass and whatever speeches you may deliver. Here

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Is this great nation, the United States of America. You cannot ignore that nation. By talking about American imperialism or American dollars people seem to imagine that because you have got a phrase or slogan, or because there is some aspect of the myriad shapes of American life which you do not like, therefore you should condemn the whole nation and say you should ignore it. So, we have to take facts as they are. The facts are that there are some great nations in this world with concentration of power in their hands, influencing many other nations. That being so, and it also being so that there is a conflict between these great nations, an ideological conflict as well as, if you like, a political conflict—although a great deal is said about ideology, I rather doubt if ideologies come much into the picture except as a weapon, except as something to use in the other fight; anyhow, these great countries, by a succession of events, have become opposed to each other, politically and otherwise—what are we to do about it? Either they have a war and try to suppress or defeat each other, or one group triumphs and the other is defeated. What else? Is there any other way?

The only other way presumably can be that first of all they avoid war; secondly, they develop in their own areas as they like, without any interference from the others, and they influence each other in a variety of ways. It is possible that that way the contradictions, etc., involved may gradually be solved, or they may not be ultimately solved. I am not a prophet, I do not know. But the way of war anyway is between them, and, because of the concentration of power in the hands of these great big nations and because that power is not so very unevenly matched, it means a very disastrous war. It means ultimately no victory—may be a military victory, but no real victory, that is, if by victory you mean the achievement of certain objectives.

If you talk of democracy, well, I doubt if after the terrible disaster of a world war democracy can survive; the democratic nations may win the war, mind you, I have little doubt about that,—but I doubt if after the disaster of a world war democracy can survive, because physical conditions may be different. I doubt even if relatively high standards of living can survive in the world, and many other things may happen. Anyhow, because of this, these great nations—all of them—wish to avoid war. I have no doubt about it. Can anyone say that America wants war here and today? Anything more

wrong I cannot imagine. It is absolutely, completely wrong. If America wants war, she can have it. Who can prevent it? But she does not. Obviously. She wants to avoid war because she feels the great dangers to the world and to everybody in a world war. So does England want to avoid war. But still forces are compelling them in a direction which may end in war. And the whole problem today is to how to prevent that. That is the problem for England, America and for us, and for other countries also, I hope.

So the talk at this moment of this group and that group and of our policy being one of sitting on the fence I do not understand. I say we have taken a more active part in the past two or three years in foreign policy than many other countries, barring the Big Powers. I do not understand this business, except that these people who talk like that know nothing about what they are talking of and do not study or read or understand what is happening around them. I have said repeatedly in this House that I just do not want to get entangled in foreign affairs; I have no desire; I have no ambition that way. My work in this country is big and difficult enough. Why should I get entangled? But how can I help it? I get entangled, our country gets entangled, for a variety of reasons. We cannot help it. Today, at this moment I say we are not shouting much I suppose some hon. Members think that taking part in foreign affairs means delivering impassioned orations condemning this or that. It is true that we have not taken part in foreign affairs that way, and we do not propose to take part in foreign affairs that way. We take part daily and hourly in decisions, in consultations giving in every day whether it is the United Nations, whether at Lake Success or the various capitals of the world and may I here say that we have been served very well by our representatives in the important capitals of the world. Because there is often some criticism about them and it is difficult for them to reply to that criticism and it is no easy for me to go out and talk about our Ambassadors. But I say clearly here and now that we have been served very well by our Ambassadors in the principal capitals of the world at Lake Success, in Washington, in London, in Peking and Moscow.

Today you might have read in the newspapers of a certain initiative by our representatives at Lake Success took in common with a large number of other Asian representatives to make a certain suggestion or proposal about asking the Chinese Government for a cease-fire and not to go beyond the

38th Parallel. You see how things have changed. We talked about the 38th Parallel in another connection some time ago. Now the roles for the moment are reversed and they may be reversed again in the future. It is not realism to talk as if nothing had happened. So our representative Shri B. N. Rau made this proposal and the representatives of almost every Asian country agreed with it and they put that forward. I do not know what the reaction of the Chinese Government will be but I welcome the initiative of our representatives and I am quite sure that every peace-loving individual, wherever he may be, will welcome it and I feel sure that the Governments of the U.S.A. and U.K. will welcome it.

This does not solve any problem; the problems are too big to be solved but when you are driving hard towards a catastrophe and disaster, every move gives you time to consider and negotiate and this is useful and valuable. Therefore this is a good move and I hope it will succeed and if it does succeed, it will bring a certain relief not only to the harassed people who are facing trouble but even to those people not less harassed who have to think about these matters at a distance. So, we are functioning all the time to the best of our ability.

What does it mean when people talk—I had not used the words, this bloc or that bloc in my address to this House yesterday, but these words have been bandied about since I spoke. I am not thinking in terms of blocs. It does not interest me very much. I am thinking in terms of what my policy is to be on a specific subject. Acharya Kripalani said: "What is this? You say you judge every policy on merits? Can any question be judged apart from 101 other questions?" Acharya Kripalani in an oratorical way put up a question and gave his own answer. Who judges questions cut off from other questions? May be, in an academic talk that may be done. No person dealing with realities can do so. In fact every question that comes before us has to be judged from a hundred different view-points, the effect of it, the consequences of it and so on and so forth. In every matter that comes up we are fully consulting people and countries with which we are friendly. I can only say that we are having friendly consultations with a large number of countries. We are continually consulting them. There is hardly a thing we do which we do not tell the countries with whom we are having friendly contacts; we talk with countries of the Commonwealth. Of course we are in close touch in regard to consultations etc. with the U.S.A., with other countries; we have been in close contact with the South

East countries, with Burma, Indonesia, etc. They are constantly telling us what they do. All this process goes on all the time and the result of that is we arrive at a certain decision which may fit in with what some countries think. If it does not wholly fit in, we always try to make it fit in. If our view-point is different, do you want me then to say that we should give up our view-point or the result that we have arrived at because somebody else thinks differently or some other nations think so? Presumably that. I do not understand all this long argument and people repeatedly saying that. I just would not do that. I am on my side and on nobody else's side. I am on my country's side and nobody else's side.

We have many friends and we collaborate and co-operate with them. But I am not prepared to surrender my judgment or my country's judgment or my country's position to any single country or group of countries. Then again some people say we are isolated. I do not know what isolation means. We are not isolated; we function with others.

I beg this House to consider Asia specially. Asia in a tremendous ferment of change. One does not know whether that change is good or bad. It may be bad but as I see the world, it is not a question of Asia only. I see many things taking place which I dislike intensely and for the moment, I am not talking of war and peace which are bad enough but rather about the whole temper of people, the whole tone of people of all that one holds precious in life which gradually seems to be fading out in whatever country you may go to. People have become more brutal in thought, speech and action and all the graciousness and gentleness of life goes away and all the other human values and standards weaken. Of course, plenty of them remain. I am not saying everything worthwhile has gone away completely, but I say this coarsening process is going on all over the world including our own country. I am sorry to say. We are being coarsened, vulgarized all over the world because of many reasons but chiefly because of the succession of wars and violence etc. Whatever else they may do, they coarsen and vulgarize and I am not quite sure whether if this process goes on and human values go on falling, whether for many sensitive persons life will offer very much of value at all. We talk of victory and defeat, war and peace. Surely we fight a war to gain some objectives and we want a victory for certain objectives and not merely to say that we have knocked down the other person. Now these very objectives for which human life and human society has stood all these years seem to be challenged. They are challenged sometimes by some theory

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

or ideology. They are challenged by authoritarianism which crushes the individual and they are challenged even in democratic societies not by democracy but by this growth of violence and in the mentality that is bred by war. So in this state of affairs are we to allow ourselves to be swept away and lose all our integrity of thought or action or should we hold fast to it and try to understand our friends, try to go with them and try to co-operate with them? Of course where we feel that there is a wrong course of action we part company. I do not see how any hon. Member can have any doubt when such a thing occurs. One has to follow the right course and follow it regardless of consequences. We talk of possible invasions of India or our frontiers being threatened or anything happening even far from India, which may be bad, which may be dangerous to the world. I hope we have still enough moral fibre and spirit left in us to face any danger not only on the borders of our country, but far away, if we think that that is a danger to the world.

5 P.M.

There are two or three other matters, if I may deal with them separately. One is in regard to Nepal. My attention has been drawn to the fact that perhaps I did an injustice in what I said about the State of Nepal. My description of the independence of Nepal, I am told, was perhaps not quite correct. I think it was perfectly correct, but I had been somewhat misunderstood. What I said yesterday was this, that the independence of a country is ultimately judged by the foreign relations of that country. A country can be completely independent as Nepal has been; but, if it has no foreign relations in the larger comity of nations, it does not count in the same way as an independent country. I pointed out that during the last hundred years or more, although Nepal was an independent country, it had no foreign relations except through the British in India. That was their only window to the outside world. That is true. It was only recently, in the last 20 or 30 years that I believe they had an Ambassador at the Court of St. James, and later in America. What I wish to make clear is that I was not hinting at the fact that the British Government in India prevented them from doing so, but rather that they themselves did not think it necessary or desirable or feasible to develop these international contacts. Much has been said about Nepal in the course of this debate. I do not wish to add anything to what I said yesterday. I think I have made our position clear enough. It is now, I

think, almost exactly a month since this new situation arose in Nepal and we have dealt with it, I think, I may well claim, with a very great deal of patience. We have been criticised by various people on various grounds because of that, on opposing grounds. Nevertheless, we do not propose to be rushed. What I said yesterday was clear enough indication not only of how our minds are working, but of the steps that we are taking, or rather the line that we are adopting in our talks, we propose to adhere to that line and as soon as the time comes when I have to make any precise formal announcement, I shall come to this House and make it.

About China, about Tibet more particularly, Prof. Ranga was somewhat displeased at my referring occasionally to the Chinese suzerainty over Tibet. Please note that I used the word suzerainty not sovereignty. There is a slight difference, not much. I was telling the House of a historical fact; I was not discussing the future. It is a historical fact and in the context of things it is perfectly true that we have admitted repeatedly this Chinese suzerainty over Tibet just as we have laid stress on Tibet's autonomy. But, apart from this historical or legal or constitutional argument, or even the argument that Mr. Gautam raised about Buffer States and the like, which, if I may say so is not much of an argument, ~~it may be his desire and my desire, but it is not an argument—the~~ real point to be laid is that it is not right for any country to talk about its sovereignty or suzerainty over any area outside its own immediate range. That is to say, if Tibet is different from China, it should ultimately be the wishes of the people of Tibet that should prevail and not any legal or constitutional arguments. That I think is a valid point. Whether the people of Tibet are strong enough to do that or not is another matter. Whether we are strong enough or any other country is strong enough to see that is done is another matter also. But, it is a right and proper thing to say, and I see no difficulty in saying it to the Chinese Government that whether you have suzerainty over Tibet or sovereignty over Tibet, surely, according to any principles, principles you proclaim and the principles I proclaim, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else.

Sir, I do not know how you are going to proceed about this Motion. There are a number of amendments. I cannot accept any amendment. I think Mr. Anthony's amendment was about our resisting communistic aggression. I do not just understand how that

amendment fits in. I am going to resist every type of aggression, communist or other whatever it may be. Why put it in?

There is one other matter, and I am sorry to take more of the time of the House. Pandit Kunzru criticised very much the attitude that we have taken up in the United Nations. That attitude has been governed by two factors. One is our judging the situation and deciding what would help at the time. The other was our feeling throughout that it is not much good passing resolutions which, generally speaking, are condemnatory and our associating ourselves in condemnation even though that condemnation might be justified, because that does not help. We wanted to find a way out. Our associating ourselves with that particular resolution meant that the possible capacity we have to help was greatly reduced. Just having condemned, we could not approach the other party, we could not deal with it, we could not understand the other party's viewpoint and place it before our other colleagues and friendly countries; and the result would be that such useful function or service that we perform, we could not perform. Apart from this, there was this general approach which we have had in this matter. Either you are aiming at conflict or at peace and settlement. If one is aiming at peace and settlement, one should adopt ways that lead to peace and not ways that lead to war. It may be that people do not want war; but it is a risky business going that way because it often leads to war. We have seen in this particular case that action has been taken which was thought would not lead to an extension of the fighting area, but which did lead to consequences which the people did not like or did not foresee. Therefore, in those resolutions we felt that we should not support them because that meant reducing the chances of a settlement of this question by peaceful methods.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like to know from hon. Members if any of them wish to press their amendments. I will read out their names, one after another. Shri Brajeshwar Prasad.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Sir, I beg for leave to withdraw all my amendments.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Prof. K. T. Shah?

Prof. K. T. Shah: I do not wish to press my amendment.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Syamnan-dan Sahaya?

Shri Syamnan-dan Sahaya: I am not pressing my amendment, Sir.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Naziruddin Ahmad?

Shri Naziruddin Ahmad: I want it to be put to the vote of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the Government of India should adopt fully the line of action followed by the U.N.O. in all respects in regard to the maintenance of peace in the world."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Frank Anthony?

Shri Frank Anthony: I beg for leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no Resolution to be put to the House. The Motion was for taking something into consideration and it has been taken into consideration.

Before I call upon the Minister of Finance to make his Statement, I have to read out a letter which was addressed to me by Shri Damodar Swaroop. It is as follows:

"Sir,

I was on my feet more than a dozen times both to-day and yesterday; but unfortunately was not given an opportunity to speak on the Foreign Policy Resolution for reasons not known to me.

I am, therefore, walking out of the House with mild feelings of protest.

Yours sincerely,

Damodar Swaroop Seth

7-12-50."

I am only exceedingly sorry that the hon. Member should have taken this step; I could not help it. Hon. Members have to stand from time to time

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

and a large amount of discretion has to be left to the Chair to regulate the debate to the greatest advantage of the House. If this step were to be taken, then the whole House would be empty. I hope the hon. Member will reconsider his decision and not act in such a way in future.

STATEMENT RE RELEASE OF
STERLING BALANCES.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): With your permission, Sir, I wish to make a brief Statement on the arrangement recently agreed with the Government of the United Kingdom for releases from our sterling balances.

The House is aware that the present Sterling Balances agreement entered into in July 1948 will terminate on the 30th June, 1951. As a result of my recent discussions with Mr. Gaitskell, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the United Kingdom Government, the two governments have now agreed on the broad outlines of a new agreement to be formally concluded in due course. The contemplated agreement will provide for a release up to £35 millions from our Sterling Balances in each of the six years beginning with the 1st July, 1951. Provision will be made for a measure of flexibility by stipulating that any part of the amount not drawn in a particular year will be carried forward and added to the releases for later periods. Further, the two governments will consult together if in any

year the Government of India find it necessary to exceed the release of £ 35 millions and to draw upon the releases for subsequent periods by more than £ 5 millions.

The latest balance in our Sterling Balance is £ 619 millions. Of this a certain amount will be utilised under the present agreement before the 30th June, 1951, to meet the probable deficit in our balances and payments over the next few months. A part of our Sterling Balance will have to be maintained over a long period as a currency and exchange reserve.

Having regard to all these considerations, the Government of India are of the view that the proposed scale of releases over a period of six years is in the best interests of the country.

Shri Hussain Imam (Bihar): Sir, would it be open to the House to discuss this agreement? Will some day be allotted for its discussion? It is a very important financial arrangement which the House would like to discuss.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On prior occasions such Agreements were discussed. What does the Leader of the House say?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): We shall consider the matter, Sir, whether it should be discussed in the House or not.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter to Eleven of the Clock on Friday the 8th December, 1950.
