

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

Members during the various Sessions shown against each:—

(1) Consolidated Statement Fifth Session, 1953 of the House of the People.

[See Appendix VI, annexure No. 44]

(2) Supplementary Statement No. IV Fourth Session, 1953 of the House of the People.

[See Appendix VI, annexure No. 45]

(3) Supplementary Statement No. IX Third Session, 1953 of the House of the People.

[See Appendix VI, annexure No. 46]

(4) Supplementary Statement No. X Second Session, 1952 of the House of the People.

[See Appendix VI, annexure No. 47]

(5) Supplementary Statement No. X. First Session, 1952 of the House of the People.

[See Appendix VI, annexure No. 48]

(6) Consolidated Statement (Suggestions) Fourth Session, 1953 of the House of the People.

[See Appendix VI, annexure No. 49]

MEMORANDUM AND ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION OF HINDUSTAN STEEL LIMITED, ETC.

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers:—

- (i) Memorandum and Articles of Association of Hindustan Steel Limited. [Placed in Library See No. S—226/53.]
- (ii) The Technical Consultants Agreement concluded between the Government of India and the German Combine. [Placed in Library. See No. S—227/53.]
- (iii) The Promoters Agreement signed at Bonn as supplemented by Exchange of Letters on the 21st December, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S—228/53.]

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Concl'd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved

by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 23rd December, 1953, namely:—

“That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration.”

Shri Syed Ahmed (Hoshangabad): Sir, I beg to withdraw my amendment.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, some amendments were withdrawn yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I shall make a note of them when I put them to the House.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to withdraw my amendment, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: When I put them to vote. I shall take them then instead of taking them now.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur Distt.): On a point of order, Sir, it is not with a view to placing any obstruction in the way of proceeding with the Motion that I rise now, but I have got a little misunderstanding regarding the procedure of this House. My point is whether a motion which has been brought forward in this House in a session which has been prorogued, can be...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is talking with reference to some other motion. We are at present concerned with the motion relating to the discussion on foreign affairs.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: I am sorry.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna) rose—

Mr. Speaker: Some hon. Members saw me before I came to the Chamber with a request that they may be given permission to speak. I did not promise any one anything; I have said that they may take their chance. But, I thought that the discussion was open. I have now before me, the relevant part of yesterday's proceedings. This is what happened. The

Chairman called upon Shri V. G. Deshpande and the hon. Member said: "चैयरमें महोदय". Then some hon. Members said that it was half past six. The Chairman said that the House may sit till seven o'clock and that he would be guided by the sense of the House. Then, several hon. Members said, no, no, we shall adjourn. Then, this is what the Chairman said:

"If the House is not anxious, I am prepared to adjourn it. But, it will be taken that the discussion on the motion is finished and I will call upon the hon. the Prime Minister to reply tomorrow."

Shri V. G. Deshpande said, "I was called."

Then, the Chairman said:

"The House does not want to hear the hon. Member. The House now stands adjourned till half past one tomorrow."

I really do not know what the wish of the House was: whether it did not want to hear Shri Deshpande or wanted to hear the Prime Minister alone.

Some Hon. Members: Discussion closed.

Mr. Speaker: Discussion was closed.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I was on my legs, Sir.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central): Wherever the name Deshpande occurs, the initials also may be indicated, Sir, and I shall be obliged.

Mr. Speaker: Shri V. G. Deshpande. I am not calling upon him. I wanted to know the desire of the House whether they wish that the discussion should be continued.

Some Hon. Members: No, No.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Chairman distinctly stated that it will be taken that the discussion on the Motion is finished

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I am putting this question to the House particularly because there is a lot of business today. I want to know, if at all the House is anxious to proceed with the discussion, what time could be allotted. Of course, the Prime Minister's reply will be there. If the House by its voting for adjournment has decided, on interpretation as to what the House meant by adjournment, that the discussion should be closed....

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: of course, I am bound by the decision of the House.

Some Hon. Members: It was closed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I make a submission, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the Chairman.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: While I was in the Chair, I thought that the House wanted to proceed with the discussion till seven. Therefore I wanted to know the mind of the House. Many hon. Members said that they wanted to adjourn: not that they did not want to hear Shri V. G. Deshpande, but they wanted the proceedings to close as they had to attend some other function. Therefore, the House adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: The interpretation to my mind, then, is that they wanted to proceed with the discussion for half an hour and not more.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I will call upon the hon. Prime Minister to reply at 2.15.

Some Hon. Members: No, no. Just now.

Mr. Speaker: Shri V. G. Deshpande.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I just draw your attention to one fact, Sir, that Shri V. G. Deshpande's amendment is completely out of order and highly improper? I should like to bring this to your notice. I am not coming in the way of his speaking. But, his amendment is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: He is not talking with reference to his amendment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I only wished to draw your attention to that, Sir. Mr. Deputy-Speaker looked into it and said that it was out of order in his opinion. Whether he passed any formal order or not, I do not know. As Shri V. G. Deshpande is going to speak now, I thought I could bring this matter to your notice.

Mr. Speaker: When he speaks, he is not necessarily speaking on the amendment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not coming in the way of his speaking.

مولانا مسعودی (جموں و کشمیر):
جو بانہج سستہ دیہیں پاندے نے
امہلت مہنت میں تجویز کی ہیں
ظاہر ہے کہ وہ ان کی تائید میں تقریر
کریں گے - اس لئے اگر جناب اس
امہلت مہنت کو آؤت آف آرڈر قرار دیئے
والے ہیں تو اس پر اپنا رولنگ
دیدیں - تاکہ فہر مناسب تقریر نہ
ہونے پائے -

[Maulana Masuodi (Jammu and Kashmir): Evidently Mr. Deshpande will be making a speech in support of what he has stated in the amendment. Hence, if you are going to hold this amendment as out of order you may as well give your ruling to that effect, so that an improper speech might be avoided.]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is mixing up speech with amendment. The amendment may be entirely out of order. But, yet, the hon. Member if he is called upon, is entitled to speak on the motion as it is. His amendment may not be admissible. Yet, he may advance any arguments if he likes. That is a different position altogether.

In view of the pressure of time, I think at the most three hon. Members can be accommodated, I will give them

a chance. Each speaker will have ten minutes and no more. Now, Shri V. G. Deshpande.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Mr. Speaker, I am not an admirer of our Prime Minister's foreign policy. But, in his yesterday's speech, which was in other ways a dark cloud, I did see a silver lining. The silver lining was that our Prime Minister said that in the changed context, the agreements and negotiations with Pakistan also would change. I hope that this announcement of the Prime Minister will be followed by suitable action. And I have to make certain suggestions with regard to that.

But, before coming to that subject, I may make it very plain that I do not share the view of my friends like my very hon. friend Kumari Annie Mascarene that all over the world India is being admired for her foreign policy and particularly for her great Prime Minister. I do not know how much they admire us, but I know that the whole world is against us in foreign affairs and we have become the object of ridicule.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him proceed.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: This House is not the judge. I know that this House and people in India are never tired of congratulating ourselves on our wonderful foreign policy, but I can point out the one test case of South Korea and North Korea where our Armies have marched for a triumph which can be compared to the triumphs of the times of Asoka, whose inheritors we are. We thought that Shanti Nagar was being established and India would establish a moral code which would be imitated by all other countries in the world. But my own feeling is that India should not have interested herself in all these things, South Korean and North Korean problems, recognition of China, and for all this unwanted interference by India, simply for the sake of some Members in the international sphere

calling our Prime Minister a great diplomat and one of the greatest men in the world, India has paid a very high price. That is my opinion.

So far as Korea is concerned, we had been warning the Prime Minister that he should not interest himself in foreign affairs, he should not go out of his way to please or displease other countries so that China may be recognised, and we have seen the result. When we see the results of our Korean policy that at the end of 90 days we have not progressed much farther, I am reminded of a story in the Pancha Tantra where some monkeys went to a place where the construction of a building was going on. A wood was being cut. Half the wood was cut and a peg was placed in between. The monkeys went there, and they said: "God has entrusted us with the work of taking out the peg." Wise men told the monkeys that it was not their business, that they should not interfere with other's business, but the monkey said: "I will not listen. It is my moral duty". And while taking out the peg, we saw the result that its tail was cut off. And therefore, the author of the Pancha Tantra says that the monkey was trying to take away a thing which was not a concern of his. I feel that India's position so far as Korea is concerned is just like the monkey in the Pancha Tantra.

My feeling is that our foreign policy, the so-called foreign policy of dynamic neutrality, has proved a failure. We tried to please America, we tried to please Russia. We believe that foreign policy consists in sermonising and delivering lectures, and ultimately we saw that when our papers and our Members in Parliament were thinking that ours was a wonderful foreign policy, America, to whom we had gone with begging bowls for getting aids for different projects, that very America went and joined Pakistan, and then our Prime Minister is perturbed.

I want to ask why is our Prime Minister perturbed because America is giving aid to Pakistan? He is a

great international politician, and yesterday he said that when anybody takes military aid that means that they accept the inevitability of war. I do not think he is perturbed on account of that. China took the aid of Russia. Korea took the aid of Russia and our Prime Minister and Indian politicians were never perturbed on account of this theory that because military aid is given, that means the inevitability of war; because America has got arms, because England is increasing her defence preparations, that also proves that there is inevitability of war. Poor Pakistan taking small aid from America is not required to prove that there is no inevitability of war. That inevitability was there. I am a believer in calling a spade a spade, and I think that our Prime Minister is perturbed because we know that Pakistan's interests and India's interests are not identical. We are afraid on account of Kashmir that there is likely to be a conflict between India and Pakistan, and we are afraid that the Kashmir issue may be precipitated in a violent manner with the aid of America. That is the real reason why we are perturbed, and my feeling is that we have to face facts as they are. So far as America's aid to Pakistan is concerned, whatever way our Prime Minister may have with the friendly neighbourly State of Pakistan, my feeling is that Pakistan has no good intentions. But I agree with the Prime Minister that Pakistan will not be a gainer on account of this military aid. Nor do I feel that America has done an act of statesmanship by giving aid to Pakistan. I know that by giving aid to Pakistan, America has strengthened the forces which it wanted to counteract and change in Asia. America is a new, modern nation which does not know much of diplomacy. England knows it better, and therefore England knows that whatever our Prime Minister may say, our Prime Minister is really in the Commonwealth. In a similar manner America should have known that in spite of all talks of being neutral and other things, we are beggars, but ultimately on account of not only the

[Shri V. G. Deshpande]

Prime Minister— India is an ancient country with a very ancient civilisation—India was the only country which, on account of her strategic position, on account of her size and on account of her culture, would have fought Communism. The fact America has forgotten. While taking Pakistan on its side to fight against Communism, they have lost the only brain which could have helped them.

✓ So far as Pakistan is concerned, I think that alliance is an alliance between a giant and a dwarf, and Pakistan is not likely to gain. My own feeling is that Pakistan would have got Kashmir on account of our Prime Minister and on account of his policy of deciding the fate of Kashmir by a plebiscite. This taking American aid is going to turn against them like a bommerang. Yesterday we have seen what I regard as a silver lining in the cloud, and I appeal to the Prime Minister that now the realities are there. I do understand and I do accept that we need not be perturbed because there is an alliance. We have to face the reality that is there. There is no use saying that nothing is going to happen and the moral course is the greatest course in the world. I do not know what spirits are going to help us unless they be the spirits of wine and liquor, unless they are alcoholic spirits, because my feeling is that in international affairs it is not the spirit which helps us, but it is armaments, and our preparation for defence which helps us. We have to see who will be our friend. I do not want to dilate on this point very much. I have faith in a certain kind of morality. I believe that cowardice is not a morality and sermonising is also not a morality, but in the international world we have to see that neither neutrality, nor Communism, nor American democracy are the principles, but enlightened self-interest should be the guiding principle of our foreign policy. And I feel that when America is not there, if necessity arises, we should not be afraid of taking aid from whatever

sources it comes, but the aid from other sources would not be the chief weapon with which we are going to fight.

The last six years we have lost. We have not made any preparations for defence. There was a Five Year Plan involving expenditure of over Rs. 2,000 Crores, but not a gun was to be manufactured under that Five Year Plan, and even now we are seeing that no preparation is being made. In Goa and Pondicherry France and Portugal may help America, and even now Portugal has got thrice the troops which India has got. American machinery is already working in India. Under such circumstances, I would appeal to the Prime Minister that we have to make a comprehensive programme for the defence of this country. That is the first thing. While thinking of all these things, war has not come. I wish that it may not come ever, but we have to prepare ourselves with the supposition that war may come even tomorrow, within a year or two years, and therefore we have to make a plan for the defence of the country. For this purpose, I would demand that compulsory military education may be given to all young men in the country so that in times of emergency it may be possible to enforce conscription in this country. You have also to start war industries in this country, with a view to making the country self-sufficient in war efforts, and my own feeling is that in addition to this, we have also to take certain other precautions.

2 P.M.

The hon Prime Minister may not want me to speak on my amendment, but I feel that my amendment is quite in order. I would not dilate much on this point, but I would only say that I feel I have made a proposal which is quite sound, viz. that our Constitution may be amended. I have made some suggestions in this behalf,—and I think this House has a right to

make a suggestion that the Constitution may be amended—which should be considered. If that is done, we shall be in a position to make whatever preparations we are required to make for the defence of this country, so that India can brave the danger, if at all it comes as a united body, and for this purpose, we have to take all possible precautions in order to ensure the security of India.

✓**Dr. Lanka Sundaram** (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Speaker Sir, this is the fifth of a series of debates on foreign affairs, including the one special debate on Kashmir, which this hon. House had since its inception last year. As I sat through the debate yesterday, the feeling grew upon me minute by minute that the earlier debates which were remarkable for acrimonious controversy, conflict of ideals and ideas, and so on and so forth, was no longer there, and that the sector of disagreement between the policy of the Government on the one side and that of the other political parties on the other, is being reduced day by day. In fact, I was gratified to note that not a single speaker from this side of the House had raised anything substantial by way of disagreement with the enunciation of principles of foreign policy as laid down by and executed under the direction of the Prime Minister.

This debate started yesterday under very ominous circumstances. Yesterday was the dead line on the explanations process in Korea. The future of our *jawans* is very much involved in it. I was unhappy to hear one remark that fell from one of my hon. friends on this side of the House yesterday, expressing criticism of the manner in which General Thimmayya is conducting himself there: I strongly deprecate it. Our *jawans* have covered themselves with glory, and our anxiety today should be to see that they come back to this country with flying colours. Politics apart, it is a keen, delicate and dangerous military situation in Korea.

Two days ago, i.e. one day before this debate began, there was an an-

nouncement in the daily papers that an appropriation of Rs. 13 lakhs and odd has been made towards the establishment of a special military police, to cover our frontiers of the Himalayan region. Two or three days ago, our Ambassador has gone back from this country to Peking to open negotiations with China, with reference to the problems involved in Tibet, since the changeover took place. The result was that I felt a sense of urgency, apart from dangerous implications of the projected Pakistan—U.S.A. pact, that we are being enveloped all round by a sort of pincer movement of the world powers, involving the territorial security of this country, as far as our land frontiers are concerned. This is the feeling which grew upon me, as I sat through the debate yesterday, I would like, within the very short time at my disposal, to seek the permission of the House to direct its attention to the problems of the Himalayan region, in relation to our national security and foreign policy.

Before I come to that point, I would beg of the Prime Minister to take immediate and urgent steps to prevent foreign propaganda, from whatever bloc it may be, from continuing in this country. Today I had the privilege of getting *gratis* a copy of the 'American Reporter', printed and published in Delhi, and here is a map of a tell-tale character—printed in this same town under the auspices of the United States Information Service—which shows Kashmir as belonging to Pakistan. I am not searching for red herrings, Mr. Speaker, but the other day, when a very great dignitary of the U.S.A. came out here, the Prime Minister feted him, and the whole country was nice to him. I am referring to Mr. Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. And what did he do, after enjoying our hospitality? He wrote in his book: 'Politically Ladakh is part of Pakistan'. Today, the Ambassador of a great country has been touring this country and telling our people in the village also that his country will carry on its policies, despite the protests of India to the contrary. The

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

same thing is happening as regards certain countries of the world belonging to the other power bloc. Having listened with the greatest respect to the Prime Minister, as to the political, security and military implications of the projected Pakistan—U.S.A. pact, I would like the House to remember that a similar movement is going on now with reference to the other bloc.

Here I have drawn up two maps of our northern frontiers, with the assistance of competent people who know the area, or who have been touring these areas. On these northern frontiers, we have the Zozila Pass, the Niti Pass, the Mana Pass, the Rudok Pass, the Gartok Pass, the Tradum Pass, the Nathula Pass, the Yatung Pass, and it goes on like this,—I have got the list with me here—and I am giving this information with a sense of responsibility. Sixty thousand to one hundred thousand of Chinese troops are now poised across our Himalayan border. When I had the occasion to put a question to the Prime Minister the other day in another place as to what we were doing to defend our Passes, the answer was given that they are being defended by the frontier guards. That is why I made a reference to the appropriation of Rs. 13,14,000 by the Uttar Pradesh Government, to bring about a constabulary to look after these Passes. May I ask the Prime Minister: Is this attempt to defend our territorial security sufficient to meet the demands made now? The time has come when not only the Indo-Pakistan borders both in the east and west, but also vast Himalayan range, 2,000 miles in length, from the Hunza and Gilgit areas in the north west, to the Daffas and Abors tribal areas in the east, must be properly secured. Here there are a number of territories, some sovereign, some protectorates, and some parts of Indian territory. There is Nepal also, in whose affairs, we cannot interfere. But certainly, we have got a sense of urgent responsibility, as far as Bhutan and Sikkim are concerned. This is not the place for me to express my sorrow at the

fact that we have not consistently intervened in the case of Tibet. When Tibet was invaded in 1950, our protest and *demarche* went out on the 26th of October 1950, and we could not do anything further, even though, as I have said earlier, there was a vast concentration of troops on the other side. I am not speaking with any sense of phobia towards America, and my hon. friends in this House know well that I am not a pink, or even a red for that matter. But I say that the country's security must come first. I feel that this debate would have done its duty by the country, if the attention of this country is focussed upon the imperative necessity for the strengthening of our borders—I mean our land borders, from Kashmir on the one side, to Burma, Tibet and China on the other.

I have before me a small document presented to the Constituent Assembly of India. I am now going to the North East Frontier, and I am quoting from that Memorandum of the Government. In the 'Note on the Tribal Areas of the North-Eastern Frontier', it says:

"The Memorandum from the External Affairs Department mentions that by an oversight no notification was issued for the Northern boundary of Assam, and the Naga Hills. Tribal Area is the only statutory tribal area of Assam. It also mentions that the Indo-Burma boundary of the Tirap Frontier Tract has yet to be decided and that it is proposed to define this so that the Naga tribes are all included on the Indian side."

I shall give one more small quotation, which is very important to my point today. The Note continues;

"Meanwhile, Chinese cartographers, ignoring the tripartite convention"—the MacMahon Line convention of 1914—"which, as stated above, they declined to ratify, showed as included in their territories the whole of these tribal areas down to and even including

parts of the administered portions of Assam. In the result, Tibetan influence persisted in the border areas, which even now are not free from the inroads of Tibetan tax-collectors..... The strategic importance of these frontier areas from the point of view of security is obvious. The areas constitute a buffer between the Assam valley and the actual frontier of foreign powers."

I quite see that the situation involving the Dafas and so on is really explosive, and I have no desire to complicate our country's security by making undue references to details and documents involving vital security information. But the point to which I am inviting the hon. the Leader of the House's attention is this. I understand today the Chinese troops have percolated in this area. I understand that China is claiming suzerainty over certain areas belonging to the North East Frontier Agency, and I want steps to be taken to see that the 'MacMahon line' is properly defined and our territorial security is ensured. I beg of the House to remember that I have not made references to all these problems with a view to complicating our long standing friendly relations with China. My country's security is first, Mr. Speaker. That should be our motto, and I am sure that this brief intervention on my behalf will induce the Government of India to take speedy steps. I daresay negotiations are already started in Peking on these and other issues, e.g. issues like our access to Mount Kailas and Manasarovar not only in the religious and emotional sense, but also problems of treaty rights, and our trade position with Tibet. One by one our Consulates are closing from Sinkiang right down to Gartok and others. These are the matters which are involved, and I draw the attention of the House to these points in order to show that we are caught up in a vast pincer movement of the world powers who, from the point of view of global strategy, are taking up positions right across our frontier. One is the Pakistani menace in that

sense involving the U.S.A's military pact. In all certainty, Mr. Speaker, the Chinese troop movements might be intended to take stock of the position, or take control of the position, which has arisen in Tibet two years ago. In all certainty, there is no unfriendliness on their part, but I am trying to show what the resultant position is: that we have got to be on our guard. I hope, Sir, that this debate will serve the purpose of focussing the attention of the country on strengthening our defences on the land frontiers.

Sir, I have got my amendment No. 1, the substantive portion of which runs as follows:

"strengthening our national defences, and in particular by taking urgent steps to build up our defence industries; and

"undertaking measures to secure national unity".

Sir. I would like to be brief on these two small points. If only the debate on the armaments industries had come up day before yesterday as was originally intended—and I know it is coming on this evening—this House would have known that today we are not only curtailing production in our Ordnance factories but also retrenching wholesale; all over the country, whether it is in the Khamaria factory or the Ambarnath factory, there is trouble. I want the Prime Minister, as the Defence Minister of this country, to ensure that there will not be any slackening of these defence industries, so that production will be built up. Actually, Sir, what is our striking potential? What is our industrial potential? Take Shipbuilding. Day by day it is going down—I am in a particularly special position to say what I am saying. Where is our automobile industry? Two out of five units for which licences were granted are likely to close down permanently. One has already shut down for a number of reasons. Then, there is hardly any aviation industry. We must not depend upon foreign powers, whatever the bloc, for our defence equipment, in order that our foreign policy

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

is carried out properly. With the result that we must make these here itself, and we must ensure that our defence and our foreign policy are not imperilled through lack of action on our part.

Finally, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the entire tenor of the 20 odd amendments given notice of hinges upon one point, namely, national consolidation and strengthening of defence. There is a very beautiful expression in French which when translated into English reads: "A Government of national concentration". I am making an appeal to the Prime Minister I am quoting his own words in his speeches at Dehra Dun and at Calcutta. The whole country is in favour of national unity. I beg of him to implement that policy. The country is behind him personally. It is likely that the country is not behind the Government in the larger, wider sense, in certain respects. But it devolves upon him to carry out, the policy into effect, the call he has made at Dehra Dun and Calcutta and also yesterday in this House. I have listened to the speech of my hon. friend, Mr. Mukerjee, and others yesterday and even today, to the speech of Mr. Deshpande. They are all ready to rally round the cause of our security. Our very existence is being imperilled. I am not a scare-monger, Mr. Speaker. But if the call which the Prime Minister has issued is put into effect, I am sure there will be a magnificent response from every man, woman and child in support of his policy, to declare to the world that the country is one and that it cannot be divided when the question of her survival and existence is involved.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House was good enough to show me so much indulgence yesterday by the patience with which it listened to my long address and subsequently. But I feel I will not be justified in taking much more of its time. This is the last day of the session and much work has to be done. Nevertheless, I should like

to say a few words, more particularly with reference to what has been said by hon. Members.

Most Members in so far as foreign policy is concerned, or the present developments in this policy are concerned, have not really, in effect, challenged me. They may have emphasised some aspect of it or the other. That is a matter for gratification to me. I must confess, however, that when Mr. V. G. Deshpande said that he saw a silver lining in my policy, I began to feel some doubt as to whether I was quite right, because, normally speaking, we are far apart, and what he considers right, I consider wrong and *vice-versa*. However, there has been undoubtedly a very great deal of agreement on the broad lines of policy, and in fact, many of the criticisms that have been made have been made outside the matters that we were really discussing yesterday. Perhaps some hon. Members felt their style cramped because I had requested them to confine themselves to the two or three subjects which I had mentioned. Normally, sometimes when these debates take place, speeches roam over a wide field; they cover the entire world. And so, because we were supposed to confine ourselves more or less to particular matters, here was this slightly baffling and cramping effect.

My hon. friend opposite, Acharya Kripalani, whose words are always listened to with respect by all of us, had not caught up to the fact that we were discussing foreign affairs. He started discussing the Preventive Detention Act and all that. Now that is my difficulty, that in this changing dynamic world hon. Members opposite do not catch up to events. They still live in a past age, a good age—a very good age, but not of today—without attempting to face the different problems of today. The language, the arguments and the slogans and the reasoning of yesterday do not apply today. It is obvious. It is a patent thing. Yet the same old things are

said, the same old arguments are trotted out, whether they have any reference to the discussion or not. Normally speaking, one very favourite argument, when these debates take place, for hon. Members opposite, is the Commonwealth—the Commonwealth connection. Altogether they cannot get rid of them.

If instead of referring to it so much, they spend a little time in understanding what it is, perhaps our paths would be easier and their paths too. But, everything that is ill is traced to the Commonwealth connection. The Commonwealth connection may be good or bad. I think it is extraordinarily good; I stand by it. I still stand by it without agreeing in the slightest with the policy of any country in the Commonwealth or disagreeing with it. It is not that, but, when I am told, 'Oh, this has happened and that has happened because of the Commonwealth connection', it has no connection, no relevance because the thing might have happened without the Commonwealth connection or with it. You can discuss that matter independently whether it is good or bad, but don't say that a certain condition is caused by this.

However, I was very glad to find the hon. Member opposite, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee studying the Gita. And, I hope he will continue those studies and reach that part of it in which a question is put by Arjuna and Krishna answers it in noble language—that famous part:

स्थितप्रज्ञस्य कं भाषा समाधिस्थस्य केशव ।
स्थितधीः किं प्रभाषेत किमासीत् ब्रजेत किम ॥

I hope, all of us in debate or in the rest of our lives will remember these noble words and try to live up, to the best of our ability, to that ideal.

I do not propose to say much about the major subjects that we discussed yesterday; I have said enough. But, some points that were mentioned, not

really relating to those subjects, I shall refer to.

Acharya Kripalani complained that we do not consult other parties in regard to foreign affairs; and he said that in other countries foreign affairs is a national policy in which, to a large extent, all parties agree. Now, I am not personally aware of these other countries where in foreign affairs all parties agree, except in certain countries where other parties are not allowed to exist. But, normally speaking, there is a great difference. It is all right in the old days when foreign affairs was looked upon, if I may say so, from a narrower angle, but nowadays, when foreign affairs is entangled with economic affairs and other matters, that is the very subject on which parties disagree; whether it is any country in Europe, or even in England,—a country which shows a great measure of discipline in such matters,—there is a great deal of difference in outlook—not in everything of course—and indeed policies change when Governments change, and even, to some extent, when foreign Ministers change. Perhaps, the hon. Member had in mind, what is often called in the United States of America, the "bi-partisan policy" of the United States. I am not competent to say what that "bi-partisan policy" is. I find it difficult sometimes to understand that. But, however, that may be, even in that bi-partisan policy, there are considerable differences as between one Government and the other. I only point out that it is not quite correct to say or to think that a nation, and the various groups and parties in the nation must necessarily have one policy. I should like to have it, not that I am opposed to it, but I ask hon. Members opposite whether all of them agree to any single policy. Leave out us, I put it to them. There are leaders of parties opposite and several parties; do they agree to any single policy in regard to foreign affairs? I would submit, they do not. In some matters they may agree, in others, they do not. In some matters they may agree, in others, they will disagree, but, by and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

large, they have no single policy. I want to consult, undoubtedly, and one should consult, and in times of crisis or difficulty or when grave issues are being considered, it is right that the nation should hold together and that there should be the greatest consultations possible. I agree entirely; but, to say that in developing a foreign policy, one must take always into consideration a large number of heterogeneous ideas and proceed on the basis of consulting numerous groups with different viewpoints, would be to make foreign policy a question of debate between differing groups. As a matter of fact, that type of debate, while it may not yield results in times of crisis it is still more likely to create difficulty. If war is considered a time of crisis, it was said by Macaulay that while wars have sometimes been won by bad generals, it is not known in history that a debating society ever won a battle.

Now, it is suggested that we should reduce the conduct of these high affairs relating to foreign policy to frequent consultation and debate—not debate in this House I mean—I am all in favour of consultation as far as possible, but somebody must shoulder the responsibility for that policy; otherwise, we will find that nobody is responsible and the outcome will be a bit of this and a bit of that, without any coherence, without any logic and trying to satisfy all parties. It is better to have a slightly different policy, a coherent policy and not a policy without any coherence.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Sir, I am very sorry. I withdraw my suggestion. Let the foreign policy be one man's policy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Acharya Kripalani said that he is all in favour of the policy of non-alignment, but that we, who proclaimed it forgot it and do not practise it. I do not know what he had in mind. It is perfectly true that we happen to live in this work-a-day world and have to co-operate with our neighbours, our

neighbour in the street, our neighbour in the town and our neighbour internationally. We have not, as a nation, or as a Government, taken to *sanyasa* yet. We have to co-operate with the world; we have to give and take. We have to accept many things that we do not like just as others have to accept from us much they do not like. So that, to say that we must consider ourselves as irreproachable, as blameless, and guiltless and must not touch anybody who does not come up to the particular ideal of ours, whether right or wrong, is a different matter, and is not a realistic approach to anything. We go to the United Nations; all kinds of countries are represented there, and, in our heart of hearts, we like some of them more than others. We meet some parties, we go there, we confer and when we confer in the United Nations or anywhere else in any Committee, there are compromises. We do not say, 'You must take my word, yes, or no, or I go out'. Countries do not behave like that; even individuals, normally do not. So that, often enough, in these matters, whether in the United Nations or elsewhere, we have to compromise about many matters which come up. It may be true that when we support, the process of compromise, there is some danger, that we do not compromise too much; we do not go the slippery path; it may be so. But, there is no help for that; you have to face that and guard against that. You cannot say, 'I would not talk to anybody who does not take my word completely; or I go out'. Let me put it in a rather crude form. I say, I will only talk to people who talk my language, say Hindi. Of course, for a time, for a moment it may have a good effect. But, I may be cut off from the rest of the world, the entire world. Of course, my saying that is severe; but it comes to the same thing in regard to ideas. Suppose, I say I would not talk to anybody who does not hold my ideas, who does not accept my ideas. Again, I cut myself off, because there has to be communion of ideas, there has to be give

and take about it, there has to be an understanding in this dynamic, ever-changing world of today. Leave out the world; take your own country. The public of this country,—whether you take them in the North-East of India or right down in Cape Comorin, all kinds of conditions there are,—they are essentially identical, essentially the same. There is a very strong identity, uniformity in the whole of the country, but yet there is a variety, a richness of variety, which is a great thing. We welcome that richness of variety; we cannot drive anybody and everybody with a single stick, with a single idea. We have to adopt ourselves and we have to give them freedom to do things as they do. Therefore, in international affairs, we cannot take up this attitude, 'Oh, you must agree with me, or I would have nothing to do with you'. The result may be that you can sit in your isolated conditions separately and have nothing to do with others. That is not possible. Even if we wanted it, that is not a possibility. Today, we live in a world—whether you like it or not—we live in the beginning of the atomic age, of the jet planes, and all those kinds of things that rush us past at several miles a minute, and therefore, when we talk about agreeing to something, which may not be quite upto our way of thinking or something that we dislike, it may be—that often happens—that others agree to many things that we do but which they do not like. That is the only way to do things. The point is whether we agree to something basically wrong. Whether that upsets the basic policy that we pursue or other things which are of secondary importance in life. In foreign affairs, especially, what counts is what you place first. Priorities count, and it counts a great deal whether you give a certain thing the first place, or the second place or the third place. If you are always thinking in terms of something in the third order of priority, your first and second go overboard. Therefore, in order to take the first thing, which is most important, you have things to put away the

second and the third, in spite of the pain that it may cause you.

Acharya Kripalani said that we should not have gone to Korea and we should not have referred the Kashmir matter to the United Nations. I find that the policies of many of my hon. friends opposite are normally a policy of negation—"what we must not do". Now, am I to argue in the year 1953 what we should have done or not done in the year 1947? Can we ever come to the present in our talks for the understanding of these problems. I can argue that point—what was done in 1947? After all, we are considering the situation today and that is, if I may say so, my difficulty, that hon. Members opposite cannot come to the present. They are so wrapped up in the past events. Let us assume for a moment that we committed not one but a hundred mistakes, 2, 5, or 7 years ago. What about it? We have to face the situation today, or else we shall never come to the present.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Rectify the mistakes, that is all.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, hon. Members opposite asked about Korea. Why did we go to Korea? Was it to gain honour, glory and prestige that we went to Korea? We went to Korea because, if we did not go to Korea, the first thing was that there would have been no truce, no cease fire in Korea, the war would have gone on with all the dangers of that war expanding. Regarding our going or not going, I cannot speak, of course, with the prophet's certainty, but as we saw the problem then—and subsequent events have justified it—the only way at that time to get that Resolution through in the United Nations first, and subsequently between the two Commands, was for India to fill a gap, which no other country could fill. I am not talking in terms of any virtue of India but it is a factual statement that no other country was agreeable to fill that particular gap. If that gap was not filled, then the agreement did not come off. If that agreement did not come off, then the cease fire did not

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

take place and that terrible war went on. I am not going into the merits of the war—that presents a different story. Therefore we had to face the problem with the utmost reluctance. We accepted the job and I would accept it not once, but a hundred times again, because I owe a duty not only to my country but to others, and I was amazed to see, not only in this House, but for the last one month or two people say or write in the newspapers, "Call back immediately your troops from Korea". It surprises me that when they say these things, they do not consider the question with the least degree of responsibility. We are not a great military nation, nor a rich nation, but we have certain standards by which we act as a people, I hope as a nation. Because somebody says something, because President Rhee says something that we do not like, can we call back our troops and upset the whole apple cart, war or no war, massacre or no massacre? That is the height of irresponsibility. We are not going to do that so far as we are in charge of the affairs. We are going to discharge the work to the best of our ability. Our ability may be limited, but in so far as we can do it, we shall do it and we shall discharge it with fairness and impartiality.

Mr. Mookerjee thinks that most of the evils flow from our connection with the Commonwealth. Monazite being sent out of our country must have something to do with the Commonwealth! Foreign experts come here and Gurkhas are given *Khukris*. Let us examine these great charges.

"Monazite goes out and comes back in the shape of bombs." I have respect for Mr. Mukerjee, but very often his facts go wrong. We have plenty of monazite and we put a ban on its export, but we do sell it or exchange it for something that we badly require and we take something that we have not got,—something, let us say, even in connection with atomic energy. No country can make progress in this way. If we shut up our shop and do not supply anything that we have, lest

it might be used by somebody else, we don't get what we want. Therefore, that is where judgment comes in as to what we should give, to whom we should give, at what price and in what quantities. That is a matter of judgment. You have to consider the problem at every stage. We have given monazite to others and we have given to half a dozen countries very little quantities, sometimes in exchange for something which we badly needed for the very purpose of developing monazite. But merely to think that we are doing so under the pressure of somebody or just to make money out of it is completely untrue. As a matter of fact, if I may say so, hon. friends here from the Travancore-Cochin State will remember that we have had an argument with the Travancore-Cochin Government because we wanted to take over—and we have taken over—under the Central Government, in association with the Travancore-Cochin Government, some of these factories there of this type and the Travancore-Cochin Government has not been, to begin with, very forthcoming in this matter because certain private interests were involved. We did not want private interests to take charge of them and so we took them over in consultation with and in co-operation with the Travancore-Cochin Government. Therefore, sending of monazite has nothing to do with the subject under discussion. Monazite does go and we want it to go for a particular purpose and we think it is an advantage that it should go in exchange for something that we badly need.

We are not interested in, nor have we the capacity for making atomic bombs or using them. The question does not arise, but we are interested in the development of atomic energy for civil use and it is quite possible that in 10 or 15 years time, atomic energy might be used for civil purposes—as a tremendous source of power, easy source of power. When that comes in, it will upset entirely—not immediately but in the course of

time—the whole question of power supply.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Can't we police exactly whether it is going for civil use or for bombs?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. I am not saying that. I am interested in atomic energy. Our developments are, if I may say so, in the initial stages. It is for the great nations to answer the question which the hon. Member put. She asked: "Are you policing it?" But I am saying that this atomic energy is a tremendous source of power and it is quite certain that it could be used for civil purposes. Though it is not an economical proposition today, yet, in the next ten or fifteen years, relatively in the near future, it can be used. Now, imagine what a tremendous difference it will make to our country? In a country like the United States of America it is not much needed for civilian use, because there are tremendous supplies of power there. They do not want much more. But in countries where power supplies are not so abundant, as in India and other under-developed countries, it will make a great difference. If we concentrate this power, we can carry it in a suit-case to the deserts of Rajasthan and convert Rajasthan into a fertile land; so that it does make a tremendous difference to under-developed countries. It is a new source of power. Just 150 years ago, the Industrial Revolution came and saved the world out of drudgery. We are on the eve of another greater revolution which will change the world, provided the word survives and provided wars did not destroy it, but it is a different matter. I am not particular about atomic power as such—our country is not interested—but I am interested in the science of it, because, when the time comes, I would be in a position to use atomic energy, and produce it. We do not want to compete—we cannot compete—with the great nations who desire it, but as a matter of fact, we are known to be among the select few nations where

good scientific work in the preliminary stages is done on atomic energy. We are the only country in Asia, at the present moment, which has gone ahead a little—there are some countries in Europe and, of course, in America. So, in doing this work, we use monazite, we preserve it and we give it to some persons who give us the know how to work it. We put up factories; they take the monazite and process and give it to us; the next stage is, we process it ourselves. So, it is not a question of giving something under pressure or to please somebody else.

Then, Mr. Mukerjee referred to foreign experts. Naturally, I cannot discuss the question of any individual expert, good or bad. But I do not understand this business, he objects not to foreign experts but to a particular nationality of a foreign expert. Obviously he does not object to foreign experts as such. Now it is quite clear that we want to develop our industries, our technique, our sciences. We want to develop them. Obviously, in developing them we want expert guidance. We may conceivably develop without expert guidance too; but only you will take ten times as much time; instead of two years, we would take 15 or 20 years for the same. It is obvious that every country has done it too. We want the best technical advice possible. Let there be no mistake about it. It is not patriotism or nationalism that counts in this matter. If we want a technical expert man from abroad, we ought to get him from abroad—it does not matter whether your man is thrown out of his job or not. We cannot get a second-rate man for doing a first-rate job. Technically considered, you may have, although it is not good, a second-rate administrator, but you just cannot do it if you want a second-rate technical man to do a first-rate technical job. It would not be done, simply. Therefore, we must have the very best men,—we may make a mistake in choosing the man. But the sooner we get high-class technical experts, the sooner we can ask them to start the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

plants. It is part of their business to train our people, and it is not a question of 'lecture' training, but training by experience in doing big jobs. We have undertaken in this country some of the biggest jobs that are being done in the world. There are the river valley projects. Some hon. Members have seen them, and often they have criticised them. That criticism may be right or wrong in a particular matter, but the fact of the matter is that they are magnificent jobs magnificently done, taken as a whole. Anybody who sees them realises it. It is not a question of argument. Anybody who sees them, whether he comes from any part of India, or from Russia or China, realizes that it is a magnificent job magnificently done, in spite of all the mistakes that have been committed.

Then, to do big things, we have to look and consider them in a big way and remove all trivial failings. You remember the bigness of the job. Remember that it requires courage to take up that big job. You do not do a big job in a pettifogging way. So, we will not entrust them to any persons who are not absolutely top-ranking. In that particular respect, from the point of view of experience, I am sure even in the present generation our engineers are very good; they have been exceedingly good; they are improving, that is to say, they are getting experience of these big jobs and they can do the biggest job, I am quite sure, after a few years' time. But, for the present, it does help us to have good experts from abroad. From the point of view of finance, sometimes it does not matter what you pay him, because he saves you so much. So, the question of foreign experts must be viewed in that light.

Now, about the Gurkhas and the *khukris*. Well, the *khukris* are light, shining instruments. They are hardly instruments of warfare now, much less in this atomic and bombing age. It is true that we allowed the export of a number of *khukris* to Malaya for

the Gurkhas there, because they are more as a part of their ceremonial attire just as the Sikhs have their *kirpans*. It was a private transaction in which we did not want to come in the way.

Now, Dr. Lanka Sundaram gave some facts which rather surprised me. I do not know where his information comes from about the happenings on the Indo-Tibetan border. He said that 100,000—or, I forget 50,000—troops are concentrated there. I have a few sources of information too, but I have not got that information. I should be very happy if Dr. Lanka Sundaram will supply me with some information on that subject so that I can verify it. I am in intimate touch this way and that way on the border, on both sides, and those figures which he mentioned, so far as I am concerned, are completely wrong, and far out from truth. I would like to say further that in a way, in the way in which Dr. Lanka Sundaram put it, there seems to be some connection with our talks with China which are going to take place in the course of the next week in Peking—some connection between them and the recent developments in regard to the proposals for U.S. military aid to Pakistan.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It was not my intention.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It was not your intention, I know, but Members might have thought so. As a matter of fact, this question of our talks in Peking has been under correspondence for the last many, many months, and ultimately, I should think, about three months back, we suggested to the Chinese Government that we would like to have some talks with them and that we could have them either in Delhi or in Peking. Thereupon they agreed to Peking. We asked our Ambassador to come here. We have had talks with our Ambassador and now he has gone back: and one or two other officials of our Foreign Office are also going there. I think that before this year is out the talks will begin.

But they have no relation to any other problem, except these problems in regard to Tibetan trade, pilgrimage and such like problems.

Now, Dr. Lanka Sundaram also referred to some maps and Chinese claims to suzerainty, and the McMohan line and all that. I cannot speak for the Chinese Government, of course,—what they may have in their minds or not. But I know what has happened in the course of the last two or three years. Repeatedly we have discussed with them these problems, in regard to Tibet especially, because India has some special interests in Tibet, trade, pilgrimage, etc. At no time has any question been raised by them or by anybody about frontier problems. This House knows very well that I have declared here in answer to questions, in foreign affairs debates, repeatedly that so far as we are concerned, there is nothing to discuss about the frontier. The frontier is there: the MacMohan line is there. We have nothing to discuss with anybody, with the Chinese Government or any other Government about it. There it remains. The question does not arise. So our people have gone there not to discuss the frontier problem. It is not an issue at all to be discussed.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram also referred to some leaflet of the External Affairs Ministry in which something was said about an undefined border. Now I speak from memory: but, so far as I remember, that refers to the border with Burma. Especially in the Naga territory, there is an area which is not really defined and there have been vague talks with the Burmese Government. So far as the MacMohan line is concerned it was fixed long ago. It is true that having fixed it on the map, it is not fixed in the sense of putting down pillars and the like, there may occasionally be some doubt.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I interrupt the Prime Minister, Sir. The memorandum I quoted was from Mr. Ramadhyani and the comment was of our External Affairs Ministry to the memorandum. This was submitted to

the Constituent Assembly and dealt with the Tibet-Assam border and the Burma border.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot say anything about that, though it is possible.....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It is in the Library, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The gentleman is in the Library or the paper?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The paper.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be.

Well, since these days of the Constituent Assembly our Historical Division has given a great deal of thought to these matters and we know much more about it and this question has not troubled us at all. But as I said, there is a certain undefined area as between Burma and India and there were various proposals too for not merely defining it but also slight exchange of territory to adjust things. But they have remained where they were.

Several hon. Members have talked about our defence industries being speeded up. I shall be very happy to speed them up. In fact the progress we have made and we are making in regard to defence industries is very considerable. These big industries take some years, but it does not matter. Some are functioning, others are being built, others are, if I may say so, in the foundation-stone laying stage. I should like to go ahead faster. It is not merely—although that is an important consideration—a question of finance. It is a question of technical training. You cannot have these things for the asking. You have to grow into them to some extent. We grow faster than others, but we have still to grow. Ultimately it becomes a part of the industrial development of the country.

I entirely agree with hon. Members who say that we should not be dependent upon other countries. Of course, nobody can be utterly and absolutely, hundred per cent., independent. Some dependence for something

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

remains and should remain; there is no harm in it. But you must not be dependent to the extent of being enfeebled or unable to function properly because of that dependence. It takes time to build these things up, to build industry up. If you look to other countries, whatever they are, you will see that they took a mighty long time to reach the level they have done now. And I think that the progress we have made in this matter during the last five or six years is very far from negligible.

One thing I should like to say. Mr. Deshpande repeatedly referred to our going about with a begging bowl asking for aid of America or some other countries. Now, at no time has any of us ever gone with a begging bowl to any country—I want to make this perfectly clear—and at no time are we going to do it hereafter. We welcome aid on honourable terms, because it helps us to speed our process of change to industrialisation, whatever it is. But, normally speaking, aid has come to us: the initiative even has been on the other side. We have welcomed that; we have discussed it and we have agreed or disagreed, as the case may be, in regard to a particular matter. There is no question of “begging bowl attitude” which is bad for the giver and for the taker.

Also, I did not say that if Pakistan takes military aid that makes war inevitable. I made no such suggestion. What I said was that this kind of thing hampers peace. It comes in the way of peace; it is a factor against peace. It is not by itself so important as to bring war or peace, there are many factors which ultimately govern events.

I think, Sir, that I have dealt with most of the important points that were raised in this debate. I agree entirely with the hope expressed by many hon. Members about the unity of the country and the consolidation of the country. That is obvious. That is our purpose and that should be our effort.

Anyhow, apart from any crisis that might arise we have to do that. I do not want this House or the country to imagine on account of the various developments that have taken place, which should make us wary that something is happening which should create any kind of fright or panic. We have to be wary, we have to be vigilant and we have to be united and work together. And in working together, ultimately, it is not so much the number of armed soldiers that counts.

Some hon. Members have put forward amendment about compulsory military service. Now—if I may say so—if there was one special method which could be devised for the weakening of the country it would be compulsory military service. What does it mean—compulsory military service? I am not against it in theory or practice. But just look at it. If we divert all our energies to compulsory military service, it will have one good effect.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I said compulsory military training.

3 P.M.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It may have one good effect, that many of our people would benefit physically by it. But all the money spent upon it will have to be diverted from somewhere. Inevitably it will have to be diverted from various economic activities that we are trying to carry on. Ultimately the strength of the country will depend more upon our economic progress, plus other things of course. If economically we are weak, then a vast number of people walking about in step will do no good to the country.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Can you not link up the two?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not two but many things. That, the hon. Member will realise, is the object of a National Plan—linking up various things and giving priorities. The

whole object is linking up various things. The Plan may be deficient, that is a different matter. But that is the whole object of the Plan.

A nation's security depends on many factors. In the first place, defence forces. They are obvious of course. Secondly, industrial potential capacity of the country which keeps the defence forces going. Otherwise defence forces are useless. Thirdly, the economic capacity of the country. And, fourthly, the morale of the country. That is the equation for the defence of a country. And the last two or three are more important even than the first, although the first has to be there.

I am grateful to the House, Sir, for the indulgence with which it has received my motion.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर—
रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ): मैं एक सवाल
पूछना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी सवाल पूछने
का समय नहीं है आर्डर, आर्डर, नो सवाल।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह हमारे
ऊपर बहुत अन्याय हो रहा है।

Mr. Speaker: I am now proceeding to put the amendments and hon. Members, as I call their names, will please say whether they want their amendments to be put to the House or whether they want to withdraw them.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 1).

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): I press my amendment (No. 4), Sir.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 6).

Shri Syed Ahmed: Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 7).

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 9).

Shri N. Somana (Coorg): Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 11).

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I press my amendment (No. 12). May I speak, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Jethalal Joshi (Madhya Saurashtra): Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 13).

Mr. Speaker: Coming to Shri V. G. Deshpande's amendment (No. 14) I find that certain parts of it are clearly out of order. Clause (d) is out of order. Then sub-clause (ii) of clause (g) is out of order; also sub-clause (iv) of clause (g). So those portions will be deleted.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): I press my amendment (No. 15).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 16).

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Dist.—South): Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment (No. 17).

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I am pressing my amendment (No. 18).

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): I am pressing my amendment (No. 19).

Mr. Speaker: Coming to Shri U. C. Patnaik's amendment (No. 20) I am inclined to hold that the whole of it is out of order, for the simple reason that what he suggests is beyond the scope of the present motion.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Sir, before my amendment is ruled out of order may I make a submission about its admissibility?

Mr. Speaker: The matter is very clear to me. There is no use taking up time over it. I will now put the

[Mr. Speaker]

Opposition amendments first and then I will put the other amendments.

I will put the amendment of Mr. Rajabhoj. The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same this House is of opinion that the policy of dynamic neutrality is a failure and that active association with like minded allies is called for."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the amendment of Shri V. G. Deshpande—such part of it as survives, that is except the portions I have ruled out of order.

The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy of the so called Dynamic Neutrality so far pursued by the Government has proved a failure and suggests the following seven points programme for dealing with the situation created by the reported Pak-U.S. Pact:—

(a) in foreign affairs India should eschew her policy of neutrality and pursue a policy of getting aid from all available sources without committing the country to any ideology;

(b) diplomatic relations with Pakistan should be immediately severed;

(c) the Kashmir issue should be withdrawn from the U.N.O.

(d) ****

(e) the foreign pockets in India should be forthwith cleared even, if necessary, by resort to police operation;

(f) the work of reorganizing the defence of India should be immediately undertaken through compulsory

military training of young men and steps should be taken to start war industries with a view to making India self-sufficient in that respect and for this purpose our Five Year Plan may be suitably amended.

(g) fifth column activities in India should be suppressed with a firm hand and for this the following measures should be adopted:—

(i) all the foreign missionaries should be externed from India and their activities should be stopped;

(ii) ****

(iii) one hundred mile zones on the borders of Pakistan should be cleared of people who are likely to have leanings towards Pakistan; and

(iv) ****."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the amendment of Shri Sarangadhar Das. The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House regrets that the policy pursued by Government, while claiming to take peace to distant lands, has brought war nearer our own frontiers."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the amendment of Shri T. K. Chaudhuri.

The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the policy followed by the Government up till now has completely failed to subserve the national interests of India or to secure a genuine independence of

* Ruled out of order by the Speaker.

the country's foreign policy from entanglements with Anglo-American imperialist diplomacy in world affairs."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the amendment of Shri N. Sreekantan Nair. The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House feels that the wrong policies adopted in regard to Kashmir have led to the U.S.-Pak alliance which has embittered further the relations between India and Pakistan."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Members, Messrs. Lanka Sundaram, Ram Subhag Singh, Syed Ahmed, S. V. Ramaswamy, N. Somana, Jethalal Joshi and K. C. Sharma wish to have the leave of the House to withdraw their amendments.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The only amendment that now remains is that of Shri Raghuramaiah.

The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House approves of this policy."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the motion, as amended.

The question is:

"That the present International situation and the policy of Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration and having considered the same, this House approves of this policy."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION RE. ASSOCIATION OF MEMBERS FROM COUNCIL OF STATES WITH PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—*Concl'd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 12th May, 1953, namely:—

"That this House recommends to the Council of States that they do agree to nominate seven members from the Council to associate with the Public Accounts Committee of this House for the year 1953-54 and to communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by the Council."

This motion was under discussion.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I, with your permission, Sir, rise on a point of order? As the Order Paper shows, this is further consideration of the motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 12th May, 1953. I shall only invite your attention to Rule 238 of the Rules of Procedure and I need not say anything further. The rule says:—I shall read it with your permission—

"On the prorogation of a session, all pending notices other than notices of intention to move for leave to introduce a Bill, shall lapse and fresh notice must be given for the next session.

Provided that fresh notice shall be necessary of intention to move for leave to introduce any Bill in respect of which sanction or recommendation has been granted under the Constitution if the sanction or recommendation as the case may be has ceased to be operative."

I would also refer to the rule that when motions are to be moved, notices are to be given for them.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): May I say a word, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Not necessary.