

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Dated: 29.11.2014

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

1519

1520

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 11th June, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past
Eight of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M.

STATE ARMED POLICE FORCES
(EXTENSION OF LAWS) BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the extension of disciplinary laws in force in any State relating to the armed police force of that State to members of the said force when serving outside that State.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to Provide for the extension of disciplinary laws in force in any State relating to the armed police force of that State to members of the said force when serving outside that State".

The motion was adopted.

Dr. Katju: I introduce the Bill.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS
FOR GRANTS—contd.

DEMAND NO. 11—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to discuss the cut motions on Demand No. 11. The discussion was proceeding yesterday and today, I believe, the discussion is coming to an end at 10-15. At 11 there is going to be a voting. Before that, the Minister has

63 PSD

to reply. I made it specifically clear yesterday that 11 was the point inclusive of the time to be granted to the Minister for reply.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Sir, may we have half an hour more to speak.....

Mr. Speaker: I asked him yesterday and he said he would require about 45 minutes. Therefore the discussion will go on up to 10-15 so that he will have the necessary time for giving reply. Hon. Members will agree that there is no use their making allegations, statements, requests and all that. They must get the explanation from Government and even at the cost of one or two speakers for that purpose, I am going to give him as much time as he wants. It is equally important, perhaps more important, that his point of view should be not only before this House but before the general public outside.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Sir, I would make a submission. The Minister may be given 45 minutes. But since most of the time was taken by the Congress Party yesterday, the three remaining speakers from.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I may inform the hon. Member that I am not only keeping a list of Members who have spoken but the total time taken. The total time for discussion yesterday was three hours and 39 minutes out of which the Opposition Member took one hour and 36 minutes.

An. Hon. Member: It comes to less than half.

Mr. Speaker: It comes to nearly half. Hon. Members will see that the time taken is about one hour and 36 minutes.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): No cut motions from the other side. Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will see that when a cut motion is tabled,

[Mr. Speaker]

as I said in the beginning, it is the property of the House and every Member is entitled to express his views. It is not as if the Opposition has the right to make their speeches and bring out points, allegations and criticisms and the other side, simply because it is in a majority, should sit silent. No. They are expected to be replied to and they must give an adequate reply. That is the whole point. Any time taken now is time lost for the discussion. So the best course is to understand that we divide the time in a rough and ready manner. Sometimes one party may have a few minutes more; sometimes the other party may have a few minutes more. It all depends upon the subject.

श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे : सभापति महोदय, कल से रक्षा विभाग के अर्थ संकल्प की मांगों पर जो चर्चा हुई उस चर्चा को सुनते समय मेरा पर्याप्त मनोरंजन हुआ। मैं न देखा कि जो अहिंसा के पुजारी थे, जो इसमें विश्वास रखते थे कि इस देश की रक्षा के लिये अहिंसा का प्रयोग किया जायगा वही अब कहते हैं :

“शस्त्रेण रक्षिते राष्ट्रे शास्त्र चिन्ता प्रवर्तते।”

दूसरी तरफ जो लोग रक्त क्रांति में विश्वास करते हैं वह शान्ति परिषद् बुलाने की मांग कर रहे थे और हाउस में इस देश की सेना कम करने की मांग कर रहे थे। मेरी समझ में यह सुरक्षा विभाग का जो अर्थ संकल्प है उस समय इन विचार धाराओं के बीच में जो संघर्ष हो रहा है उस पर वाद विवाद करने का समय नहीं है। सुरक्षा का अर्थ संकल्प जब हाउस में आया है और सरकार ने सुरक्षा का भार अपने ऊपर लिया है तब हम मानते हैं कि इस देश में सेना होनी चाहिये। और जब हम सेना का उपयोग जरूरी समझते हैं तो मेरा कहना यह है कि इस पर भी वाद विवाद करने की आवश्यकता है, ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। वाद

विवाद का प्रश्न केवल इतना ही है कि आज जो देश में कांग्रेस वालों के शासन के समय जो सेना है इस से काम चलने वाला है या नहीं है। सेना की हमें बहुत भारी आवश्यकता है। मेरा यह कहना है कि आज सेना का जो संगठन हो रहा है वह देश की परिस्थिति के अनुकूल हो रहा है या नहीं। हमारा यह अर्थ संकल्प कांग्रेस पार्टी की विदेश नीति से बंधा हुआ है। हमारी विदेश नीति विशेष प्रकार की होने के कारण हमारा सुरक्षा का अर्थ संकल्प भी इसी प्रकार है और मैं जानता हूँ कि इसके कारण आज देश की सुरक्षा भी खतरे में है।

जब इस देश में पाकिस्तान का निर्माण किया गया, जब उस का जन्म हुआ, तो इस बात का विल्कुल विचार नहीं किया गया कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच में कोई नैसर्गिक सीमा नहीं है और, जैसा नेताजी के लैफ्टिनेंट श्री जगन्नाथराव कृष्णराव भोंसले, ने बताया, इस देश की २१०० मील लम्बी सीमा है २५०० मील समुद्री सीमा है और पाकिस्तान और हमारे बीच में कोई नैसर्गिक अड़चन न होने के कारण, हमारे देश की रक्षा का प्रश्न बिकट है। फिर हमारी सरकार की विदेश नीति के कारण, जिसकी प्रशंसा करते कांग्रेस पार्टी कभी नहीं थकती, कम्युनिस्ट भय भी तिब्बत के पास आ कर हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा पर आ गया है। काश्मीर के बारे में मेरे एक मित्र ने कांग्रेस पार्टी की और यहां की नीति की बड़ी भारी तारीफ की। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि काश्मीर का खतरा आज भी क्रायम है। इस के लिये भी हमारी सरकार की विदेश विषयक नीति ही जिम्मेवार है। मुझे पता है कि इस देश में जब शान्ति समझौता हुआ,

सीज़फ़ायर (cease-fire) का ट्रुस (truce) हुआ, तो यहां के मिलिटरी आफ़िसर से किसी से नहीं पूछा गया और उन से पूछे बग़ैर दुनिया में अपनी शान्ति का जय जय कार कराने के लिये सीज़ फ़ायर किया गया और यह अग्नि हमारे देश में जलती रखी गयी, जिस के कारण आज भी हम को बड़ा पैसा खर्च करना पड़ता है।

जब मैं इस प्रश्न की तरफ़ देखता हूँ और यहां के भाषण सुनता हूँ, तो मुझे ऐसा भान होने लगता है कि मानों इस समय दुनिया में कोई बड़ा युद्ध होने वाला नहीं है, लेकिन ऐसा समझ कर इस देश की सुरक्षा की सिद्धता की जा रही है। लेकिन एक बात जरूर है कि काश्मीर के बारे में थोड़ा भय और आशंका शासक वर्ग के हृदय में होने के कारण वह फौज को जो कम करने जा रहे थे, उसको उन्होंने और बढ़ाया है। लेकिन आप को किसी प्रथम श्रेणी की शक्ति के साथ युद्ध करना है, अमरीका या रूस के साथ युद्ध करना है, यह समझ कर इस देश में तैयारी नहीं हो रही है। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि आप को किसी देश के साथ लड़ाई हो और यह भी मैं मानने को तैयार हूँ कि सनीपवर्ती भविष्य में हमारी किसी बड़े देश के साथ लड़ाई नहीं होगी, लेकिन इस देश की सुरक्षा की सिद्धता आप को इसी आधार पर करनी पड़ेगी कि इस देश की लड़ाई किसी बड़ी भारी पावर के साथ रूस, इंग्लैंड अथवा अन्य किसी ऐसी ही शक्ति के साथ सनीपवर्ती भविष्य में लड़नी पड़ेगी और इसलिये इसी बुनियाद व आधार पर हमें इस देश का सैनिक संगठन सुदृढ़ व सबल बनाना चाहिये। लेकिन जब मैं इस डिफेंस बजट के आंकड़ों की तरफ़ देखता हूँ तो मुझे इस प्रकार की तैयारी के कोई चिह्न नहीं मिलते। और यह जो १९७

करोड़ का सुरक्षा का अर्थ संकल्प है, उस को मैं पर्याप्त नहीं समझता और मेरा तो उल्टा आक्षेप यह है कि इस देश में जिस प्रकार की सुरक्षा की तैयारी करना आवश्यक है, उस के लिये १९७ करोड़ का बजट काफी नहीं है। परन्तु मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि इस देश की आर्थिक अवस्था को देखते हुए इस से ज्यादा खर्चा आप नहीं कर सकते थे। और मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि आप अमरीका या दूसरे अन्य बड़े देशों के बराबर सुरक्षा पर खर्च नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन तो भी मैं अपना आक्षेप वापिस लेने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। यहां कहा गया कि यहाँ की फौज बड़ी भारी नहीं है, मैं इस को मानता हूँ, लेकिन जैसा कुछ मित्रों ने सुझाव दिया है कि यह सेना कम होनी चाहिये, मैं उस से सहमत नहीं। मेरा कहना है कि आज जो यह २२६ करोड़ का ग्रास ऐक्सपेंडिचर (Gross expenditure) है उस २२६ करोड़ में से मैं देखता हूँ कि केवल ७७ करोड़ खर्चा सिविल ऐन्ड मिलिटरी परसोनल (Civil and military personnel) पर खर्च किया जा रहा है। दूसरे हेड्स (heads) के अन्दर काफी एकॉन्सिमी और सेविंग (बचत) का गुंजायश है। यह जो इंग्लैंड से स्टोर परचेज (store purchase) के चार्ज (charges) पर करोड़ों खर्चा खर्च हो रहा है, उस में काफी कमी की जा सकती है। इस हाउस में सनागूह काफ़ी समय से जीप स्कैन्डल (Jeep scandals) तथा अन्य दूसरी कर्ज़ान (भ्रष्टाचार) और वेस्ट ऑफ़ पब्लिक मनी (waste of public money) की चर्चा चलती रही है कि किस प्रकार का कर्ज़ान और खर्चे का वेस्टेज इन में होता है। पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी (Public Accounts Committee) को रिपोर्ट भी आप देख लीजिये जो सालहा साल इसी

[श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे]

बात की शिकायत करती रही है और किस तरह से बजट एस्टीमेट्स (Budgeted Estimates) से ज्यादा खर्च बिना उस की पूर्व स्वीकृति के वहां पर होता रहा है, यह सब होने के पश्चात् भी हम देखते हैं कि उस दिशा में कोई सुधार दृष्टि-गोचर नहीं हो रहा है। एक मिलेटरी एक्सपर्ट (सेना सज्ज) ने मुझे बताया है कि इसी १९७ करोड़ के बजट में आज से दुगुनी फ़ौज हम भर्ती कर सकते हैं, और उस में काफ़ी एकोनामी हो सकती है।

जो गरीब देश है, उन को सोचना पड़ेगा कि जब दुनिया में रूस और अमरीका दो फ्रंट्स (मोर्चे) बनें हैं और दुनिया में बड़ी भारी लड़ाई होने वाली है, तो हमें भी अपना सैनिक संगठन किस प्रकार से करना आवश्यक है। यह ठीक है कि आप के पास उतना पैसा नहीं है, तो भी आप को अपने देश का सेना संगठन इस प्रकार से करना पड़ेगा कि उस में पैसा भी कम लगे और देश की सुरक्षा का भी समुचित प्रबन्ध हो। मैं आक्षेप करना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में कोई खास निश्चित योजना हमारे पास नहीं है। There is no planning regarding the defence of the country. मैं ने रिपोर्ट पढ़ी तो उसमें आर्म्ड फ़ोरसेज् के रिवारगनाइजेशन (Reorganisation of armed forces) के बारे में जिक्र है और उस में बड़ी तारीफ़ की गई है कि हम ने इस तरह सेना का पुनर्संगठन और रिवारगनाइजेशन किया : There is no reorganisation, but a complete dislocation and disorgan-

isation of the whole of the defence machinery. मेरी समझ में तो यह पुनर्संगठन नहीं बल्कि डिफ़ेन्स फ़ोरसेज् का रिवारगनाइजेशन, डिस्लोकेशन (विघटन) और असंगठन ही किया गया है। पहले कमान्डर इन चीफ़ (Commander-in-Chief) जल और नभ तीनों प्रकार की आर्मीज (सेना) का हेड (मुखिया) होता था और वहीं डिफ़ेन्स मिनिस्टर (रक्षा मंत्री) होता था, अब उन्होंने यह कर दिया है कि कमान्डर इन चीफ़ सिर्फ़ ग्राउन्ड आर्मी (भू-सेना) का हेड रहेगा, बाकी ऐयर और नेवी के अलग अलग हेड्स होंगे और इन तीनों में कोआर्डिनेशन (समन्वय) का भार सिविलियन डिफ़ेन्स मिनिस्टर के हाथ में दे दिया गया है। Without casting any aspersion on the ability or calibre of the Defence Minister, I want to say that the Defence Minister is not capable of reorganising and planning the defence of this country. मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक देश का कोई अनुभवी और सैन्य शास्त्र का ज्ञाता इस का संचालन नहीं करता तब तक इस देश का सैनिक संगठन अच्छी तरह से नहीं हो सकता है। मुझे शक है और मेरे हृदय में यह सन्देह है कि आप ने नेवी व ऐयर पर जो ब्रिटिश अफ़सर नियुक्त किये हुए हैं, वह एक हिन्दुस्तानी सेनापति के अन्तर्गत काम करने के लिये तैयार नहीं दिखाई पड़ते, और इसी कारण उन का विघटन कर दिया है और विघटन करने के पश्चात् यह कार्यभार सिविलियन डिफ़ेन्स मिनिस्टर के पास चला गया है। मैं पूछना

चाहता हूँ कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान में आपके पास सेना विशेषज्ञ नहीं हैं ? मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि सैनिक शास्त्र के एक्सपर्ट्स (विशेषज्ञों) की यहां कमी नहीं है और इसी हाउस में मेजर जनरल भौसले जैसे सेनातज्ञ मौजूद हैं, और उन की सेवाएँ आप इस कार्य के लिये ले सकते हैं। आप का जो जल, थल और नभ सेना का संगठन है, वह अच्छा और पर्याप्त नहीं है। एयरक्राफ्ट्स कैरियरस (aircrafts carriers) भी आप के पास नहीं हैं और उसके ना होने के कारण आप का सेना संगठन का काम अबूरा और अदर्या है। मैं यह मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि पुनः सेना के यह तीनों विंग्स एक कमान्ड और नेतृत्व के अन्दर आयेँ और उस हेतु इस हाउस आफ़ दी रोपुल और बाहर के लोगों का सहयोग हासिल किया जाय और एक डिफेन्स कौंसिल (Defence Council) का निर्माण किया जाय। इस के अलावा आप की मिलेटरी के अन्दर आज भी अनेक ब्रिटिश अफ़सर हैं। जब यहां यह पूछा गया कि उन की संख्या कितनी है और मैं ने जब यह प्रश्न किया कि यह ब्रिटिश सेना अफ़सर भारत और इंग्लैंड के बीच यदि विरोध उठ खड़ा होता है तो क्या करेंगे, तो मुझे इस का कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया और क्या आप देखते नहीं हैं कि काश्मीर के मामले में इंग्लैंड और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों देशों की नीति में विरोध है। क्या आप को भारत को पता नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान ने जब काश्मीर पर हमला करना चाहा तब वहां के इंगलिश कमान्डर इन चीफ़ ने पाकिस्तान की मदद करने से इंकार कर दिया। क्या हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में ऐसा ही प्रश्न उत्पन्न हो सकता है ? मेरा मत है कि आप सेना विशेषज्ञ यूनाइटेड किंगडम (United Kingdom) अमरीका व रूस से मत मंगाइये, क्योंकि यह आप के विरोध

में जा सकते हैं। क्या इन देशों के अलावा आप को और कहीं से मिलेटरी एक्सपर्ट्स प्राप्त नहीं हो सकते ? हमें इस काम के लिये इटली, जर्मनी और जापान से सेनातज्ञ प्राप्त हो सकते थे। वहां से मिलेटरी जीनियस (military genius) हमें मिल सकता था। मैं रूस, अमरीका और इंग्लैंड से एक्सपर्ट बुलाने के विरुद्ध हूँ। हम जर्मनी, जापान व इटली से इन को बुलायें। इस देश में सेना का जिस प्रकार से संगठन किया जा रहा है, उस के बारे में मैं दो ही शब्द कहना चाहूंगा। आप स्टैंडिंग आर्मी (standing army) थोड़ी रख सकते हैं, इस के अलावा आप देश के सब लोगों को मिलेटरी ट्रेनिंग दे सकते हैं और गुरिला स्कैवड्स (guerrilla squads) संगठित कर सकते हैं। और इ गुरिला स्कैवड्स के जरिये देश का अच्छी तरह से सैनिक संगठन हम कर सकते हैं। इस के अलावा आप जो माल इंग्लैंड आदि देशों से खरीदते हैं, उस के बारे में जो भ्रष्टाचार हुआ है और जो जीपस् स्कैन्डल हुआ, वह सब को पता है और यहां पर उस के बारे में अनेक बार चर्चा हुई है। मैं तो इस सिद्धान्त के ही विरुद्ध हूँ कि बाहर से युद्धसामग्री मंगाई जाये, और इंग्लैंड व अमरीका से तो लेने के लिये मैं बिल्कुल विरुद्ध हूँ। मैं सुरक्षा विभाग के मंत्री महोदय से एक सीधा प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बी.। को आजाद हुए पांच साल हो गये हैं और क्या कभी आप ने इस बारे में सोचा है कि अगर किसी प्रथम श्रेणी की शक्ति के साथ आप की लड़ाई होती है तो उस अवस्था में क्या इंग्लैंड व अमरीका आप को सहयोग और सक्रिय मदद देंगे ? आप को वह जीपस् (jeeps) व एरोप्लेनस देते नहीं, ऐसी अवस्था में आप कितने दिनों तक उस शक्ति के सामने लड़ाई में टिक

[श्री बी० जी० देशपांडे]

सकेंगे ? दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी आजादी को प्राप्त हुए पांच वर्ष व्यतीत हो चुके हैं, लेकिन अभी तक कोई सैनिक सुरक्षा की योजना हमारे देश में नहीं बन पायी है। कल लड़ाई होती है, और यदि इंग्लैंड आप के विरुद्ध है तो आप को माल देने को इन्कार भी कर सकता है। आप की खबर भी उन को मिल सकती है। आप को इस अवस्था में जानबूझ कर खराब डिफेक्टिव (defective) माल आप को सैबोटैज (sabotage) न करने के लिये दे सकता है। इस के लिये मैं मांग करता हूँ कि पांच साल की या कोई मुनासिब समय की योजना बना कर उस को सब के ऊपर प्रायोरिटी (priority) दे कर आप काम कीजिये, जिस में युद्ध सामग्री के मामले में हमारा देश स्वयंपूर्ण हो जाय।

इस देश की सेना की यहां बहुत स्तुति की गई है, इस प्रशंसा में मैं भी सम्मिलित हूँ लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो यहां की सेना बड़ी अच्छी है, बड़ी बहादुर है उस का कारण आज की सत्तारूढ़ पार्टी नहीं है। वह इतनी अच्छी है तो इस पार्टी के बावजूद भी है। यह हम ने काश्मीर और बाक्री जगहों में देखा है। लेकिन जैसी इस देश की विदेश नीति चल रही है उस के कारण फ्रॉज के बहादुरी के साथ लड़ने पर भी हम उस का पूरा फायदा नहीं उठा सकते। काश्मीर में हमारी फ्रॉज बहादुरी के साथ लड़ी लेकिन सीज फायर (cease-fire) के कारण आधा काश्मीर पाकिस्तान के पास चला गया। आज हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद हुए पांच साल हुए, आप ने इस बीच में क्या किया। आप ने आधा काश्मीर खो दिया है और डिफेन्स डिपार्टमेंट हमें आ कर बता रहा है कि आप की फ्रतेह हो रही है। दुनिया में ऐसी डिफेन्स और फारेन पालिसी

(foreign policy) कहीं देखी नहीं गई।

आगे चल कर मैं एक बड़े नाजुक और बड़े खतरनाक विषय पर बोलने वाला हूँ। यह धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य में मैं बोल रहा हूँ इसलिये शायद विधान से सम्बन्धित लोगों को यह अच्छा नहीं मालूम होगा, किन्तु डिफेन्स या सुरक्षा विभाग कोई कल्पना का विभाग नहीं है, कोई आदर्श का विभाग नहीं है, स्वप्न का विभाग नहीं है। सत्यदृष्टि का विभाग होने के कारण मुझे यह कठोर सत्य कहना पड़ता है कि भारत की सीमा पाकिस्तान से लगी हुई है। आज हम चाहें या न चाहें, यह भूलने के लिये हम कितना ही प्रयत्न करें, लेकिन भूलना असम्भव है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच संघर्ष जरूर होने वाला है। इस देश की सुरक्षा की तैयारी करते वक्त हम देखते हैं कि आधा काश्मीर आज भी पाकिस्तान के हाथ में है। पाकिस्तान ने आक्रमण कर के हमारे मुल्क को अपनी तरफ खींच लिया है। यह बात हम भूलने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, और यहां के सुरक्षा विभाग को इस के बारे में मैं एक इशारा देना चाहता हूँ। इस देश के रहनेवाले किसी भी सम्प्रदाय विशेष पर या उस सम्प्रदाय के सम्मान्य अपवादों पर किसी भी प्रकार का ऐस्पर्सन (aspersion) नहीं डालना चाहता हूँ और जो हमारा विधान है उस के भी विरुद्ध कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। परन्तु सुरक्षा का विचार करते वक्त मैं सेना विभाग को एक ही इशारा देना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के साथ जब लड़ाई हो तो आप को इस बात को देखना पड़ेगा कि पिछले सन् १९४५ के निर्वाचन में इस देश के किस किस सम्प्रदाय ने किस किस प्रकार का मत दिया था। किन लोगों ने ९० फीसदी या इस से भी

ज्यादा परिमाण में पाकिस्तान बनने के लिये अपना मतदान किया था, यह सोच कर आप को मिलिटरी पर्सनल ठीक करना पड़ेगा कि इस मिलिटरी में किस सम्प्रदाय के लोगों को किस परिमाण में लेना चाहिये। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे संविधान में धर्म या जाति के अनुरूप किसी में भेद करने की इच्छा नहीं है, परन्तु जिस प्रकार हम देश की सुरक्षा के लिये नागरिक स्वानन्त्र्य का संकोच करते हैं, उसी प्रकार से किसी सम्प्रदाय के प्रति कोई दुर्भावना न रखते हुए देश की सुरक्षा के विचार से हमें यह भेद करना पड़ेगा। यह सूचना मैं देना चाहता हूँ। काश्मीर की लड़ाई में मुझे पता है कि महाराज हरी सिंह की एक पूरी रेजिमेन्ट पाकिस्तान के साथ मिल गई थी।

इस के पश्चात् देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में मैं अपनी आंखों से देखी हुई चीज सभा के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। जब पाकिस्तान में हिन्दुओं पर अत्याचार हो रहे थे सन् १९५० में, तो मैं पूर्वी बंगाल की सीमा पर गया था। उस सीमा पर कुछ विशेष सम्प्रदाय के देहात थे। वहाँ मैं ने देखा कि पाकिस्तान की फौजें इधर के देहातों में आती थीं, और लोगों पर छिप कर हमले करती थीं, तथा फिर पाकिस्तान की सीमा में वापस चली जाती थीं। इस के लिये मैं ने सूचना भी दी थी कि जब ऐसे संकट काल का अवसर आया है तब सीमा पर के एक विशेष सम्प्रदाय के लोगों को सीमा से निकाल लेना चाहिये, लेकिन यह बात वहाँ नहीं मानी गई।

मैं अपना भाषण एक ही बात कह कर समाप्त करने वाला हूँ। इस देश की सुरक्षा किसी दल विशेष का प्रश्न नहीं है, यह एक प्रथक प्रश्न है। जिस प्रकार सत्तारूढ़

दल के लोग अपना आत्म बलिदान करने के लिये तैयार हैं उसी प्रकार देश की सुरक्षा के लिये इस देश के सब लोग, और उन में विरोधी दल के लोग भी शामिल हैं, आत्म बलिदान करने के लिये तैयार हैं।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): The Debate on the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of Defence which began yesterday has given me a good deal of amusement. It amused me to note that those who were protagonists of non-violence and believed till only the other day that the defence of the country will be possible through non-violent means, have now been compelled to say:

"Shastrena rakshite rashtre shastra chinta pravartate"

(Only in a country well protected by arms can there be any talk of pursuit of knowledge and science.)

On the other side, I found those who believed in bloody revolutions, voicing a demand to convene a Peace Conference and pressing for a reduction in the armed forces of this country. I think the discussion of the Demands in respect of the Defence expenditure is no occasion for raising a Debate on the controversial aspects of various ideologies. Once these demands have been brought before the House and the Government of the country have accepted the responsibility for the country's defence, the principle of maintaining an army towards that end has been recognised. Nor I think there is any need to discuss whether or not the use of armed forces is necessary. The only point at issue is whether the strength of the armed forces during the Congress administration of this country is adequate or not. The need for an army is imperative. What I want you to consider is whether the present organisation of our defence forces conforms to the conditions obtaining in the country or not. The defence expenditure of this country is firmly tied to the foreign policy of the Congress party. That foreign policy being as it is, has its vital bearing on the defence expenditure. I know that for this reason the peace of our country is also in a critical state.

At the time Pakistan was created, no attention was paid to the fact that there were no natural frontiers between the two countries. As Netaji's

[Shri V. G. Deshpande]

trusted lieutenant Shri Jagannath Rao Krishna Rao Bhonsle, has just stated there are 2,100 miles of land frontiers and 2,500 miles of sea-frontiers separating India from Pakistan. The issue of our country's defence has taken a more serious turn in the absence of any natural frontiers. Again, because of the foreign policy pursued by the present Government, of which Congress Party is never tired of praising, the Communist threat has overrun Tibet and is now close to our frontiers. One hon. friend has been luxuriant in his praise for the policy of the Congress Party and this Government vis-a-vis Kashmir. I, however, know the Kashmir danger looming as large as ever before. This too is attributed to the foreign policy pursued by our Government. I know that without a single military officer being consulted, the truce regarding the cease-fire was agreed upon. It was done to win applause of the world. Thus the fire was kept burning in this country and even now we have to incur heavy expenditure on that account.

As I look at this Budget and listen to the speech delivered here, I feel as if no big war is going to break out in near future. Even considering it to be so, the defence of the country is not being made secure. It has, however, one result. The ruling party has some fears and misgivings with regard to Kashmir which have impeded them to revise their earlier decision to effect a reduction in Army—and instead they have now increased it. They are, however, organising it on a basis that does not take into account the possibility of any war with any first-rate power—say Russia or America. I do not want you to go to war with any country nor do I believe that there is any possibility of any war in the near future. You will, however, have to make the defence of the country secure on a basis which takes into account the possibility of war in the near future with any of the big powers of the world—be it Russia, England or any other country. That and that should be the only basis for strengthening the armed forces of this country. The defence Budget figures, however, do not disclose any indication of the Government's willingness to adopt that basis. I do not regard this 197 crore rupee expenditure as adequate. I hold a view on the contrary that a sum of Rs. 197 crores is hardly adequate for the defence of a country so vast as India. Yet I concede that taking into con-

sideration the general economic conditions through which this country is passing, you could not earmark more money for expenditure on the defence. Still I am not prepared to withdraw my objection. It has been stated that our Army is not so large as it should have been. I agree it is so. But I cannot subscribe to the view that there should be a reduction in it. My plea is that a sum of 77 crores of rupees only is being spent on the civil and military personnel out of a gross expenditure of 226 crores. There is enough scope for economy and saving under other heads. A good deal of saving—say to the tune of several crores of rupees—can be effected in the expenditure incurred in regard to purchasing charges for goods purchased from England. The Jeep Scandal and many other instances of corruption and waste of public money have been the subject of discussion in the House for fairly long time. It indicates the manner in which public money is wasted in these branches. A perusal of the Report of Public Accounts Committee tells the same story. For years together it has been the complaint that the expenditure has exceeded the budgeted estimates without their prior sanction. Even then we do not find any signs of improvement. A Military expert has told me that we can mobilize an army of double the present strength within these very estimates of 197 crores of rupees and effect even further economy in that. Even countries with moderate financial resources will have to consider as to how best mobilize their military defences in view of a possible breaking out of terrific hostilities between America and Russia. True that we have limited financial resources. Still we will have to so organise our military as to entail less expenditure without undermining the country's defence. My objection is that we have no considered plan for our defence before us. There is no planning regarding the defence of the country. I found in the Report that a reference has been made to the re-organisation of the armed forces. The efforts in this respect have been much commended. There has been no re-organisation, but a complete dislocation and disorganisation of the defence machinery. To my mind, it is not re-organisation, but a complete dislocation and dis-organisation of our armed forces. Previously the Commander-in-Chief used to be the head of all the three wings of Services—namely, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. In addition he held the portfolio of the Defence Minister. As things stand at present, he is the head of the ground forces only. The Navy

and the Air Force are under the control of separate persons. The co-ordination of the three wings has been entrusted to a Civilian Defence Minister. Without casting any aspersion on the ability or calibre of the Defence Minister, I want to say that the Defence Minister is not capable of reorganising and planning the defence of this country. I assert that till an experienced soldier, who is well versed in the knowledge of all military weapons, conducts our military affairs, the defence organisation of this country cannot proceed on sound lines. I have my misgivings that the British officers in-charge of our Navy and Air Force are not willing to serve under the overall command of an Indian and that is perhaps why three wings have been split up and as a result the work of co-ordination has gone over to the Civilian Defence Minister. I want to know whether we have no military expert in this country. I do not think so. I believe we have no dearth of such experts in the country. In this very House we have in Major General Bhonsle a military expert of that calibre whose services you can acquire. The organisation of Navy, Army and the Air Forces is not efficient and adequate. You possess no aircraft carriers without which the defence organisation will ever remain incomplete. I demand that the three wings of services should be brought again under the command and leadership of one officer. Towards that end co-operation within this House and outside should be enlisted and a Defence Council be set up. Again even now the number of British officers serving in the military is quite considerable. I have not been given any reply to one of my questions as to what shall be the attitude of these British officers in the event hostilities breaking out between England and India. Is it not evident that the policy of the two countries is at conflict on the Kashmir issue. You Sir, are aware that the English Commander-in-Chief refused to help Pakistan at the time that country had planned to invade Kashmir. Is it not possible that a similar situation may arise with respect to India also? I maintain that we should not import our military experts from the United Kingdom, America or Russia, because there is a possibility of their turning against us at any time. Another question is whether or not we are able to get our military experts from countries other than these. We could get them from Italy, Germany or Japan where there is sufficient military talent. I am opposed to having such expert personnel from Russia, America or England. We should meet our requirements in this respect from Germany, Japan and Italy. I want to

say only a few words on the way the organisation of Armed Forces of this country is proceeding. We may cut down the strength of our standing Army, but we can supplement it by imparting training to the members of the public and also by organising guerrilla squads. In this way we can organise our defence on a very sound basis. Further, the corruption in the purchase of goods from England and the Jeep Deal is now common knowledge. The issues have been discussed in the House several times. Speaking for myself, I am opposed to the very principle of meeting our needs in regard to arms and ammunition from abroad. In particular, I am opposed to their supply from England or America. I have one simple question to put to the hon. Minister of Defence. It is whether during the five years of our freedom, has he ever visualized a possibility of our going to war with any first-rate power, and if so, whether he is confident to get active help from England or America in that event? Supposing they refuse supplies of jeeps or aeroplanes, how long will we be able to continue resistance? It is a matter of regret that five years of freedom have been allowed to pass without drawing up any plan for military defences of the country. Suppose there is a war tomorrow. There may be a possibility of England refusing to give war supplies. Another is that that country may have intelligence about our defences and may decide to supply us defective war materials deliberately in order to sabotage our defence. I, therefore, demand that a five year Defence plan or a plan spread over some other suitable period be drawn up which should be given priority over all other activities of the Government.

I endorse the compliments paid here to our Army. I may, however, state that the credit for the efficiency and valour of the Army cannot go to the party in power just now. The efficiency and valour of our Army is in spite of the present regime. It has been evident in Kashmir and elsewhere. What matters is that because of the foreign policy of this country we are unable to reap a fuller advantage of our Army's value in an encounter. They had put up a brave fight in Kashmir, but due to cease fire half the territory of that State is now gone over to Pakistan. Now let us examine what we have achieved in the five year's time of our independence. We have lost almost half of Kashmir, yet the Defence Ministry wants us to believe that we are winning. Nowhere in the world is such

[Shri V. G. Deshpande]

a policy with respect to defence and foreign affairs known to have been followed.

Now I am going to touch upon a very delicate and dangerous issue. I am speaking in a State which is secular in character. The constitutionalists may, therefore, perhaps resent it. The defence or security of a country, however, is not something imaginary. It is not a department wherein any ideals have to be pursued. Dreams have no place in it. It is a department where approach to all problems is essentially to be based on realism. I am constrained to voice this reality that India's frontiers are quite adjacent to those of Pakistan. We may like or dislike to mention it, but it is difficult to bypass the basic fact despite our attempt to do so. We will have to remember that conflict between India and Pakistan is unavoidable. While making any security preparations for this country, we find that half of Kashmir is still in Pakistan's occupation. Pakistan has usurped our territory through invasion. We can never be oblivious of this fact and thereby I want to give our Defence Ministry a hint in the matter. I have no intention to cast aspersions on any community or its professions. Nor do I want to say things in repudiation of the Constitution. But I may hint the Defence Ministry that in case there is war between India and Pakistan, they will have to analyse the 1945 election results so as to see which of the communities had voted whom. All attempts at the re-organisation of military personnel must necessarily be based upon the fact as to which communities had mustered more than 90 per cent. of their votes for the formation of Pakistan. The representation of various communities must be fixed on that basis alone. I am aware that in the secular set up of our country, any discrimination on grounds of religion or caste is not desirable. But just as we restrict civil liberties of individuals, on security considerations, we will have to discriminate against a particular community without entertaining any ill feelings towards it. I want to warn you Sir, on this account and saying that I am not forgetting that one full regiment of Maharaj Hari Singh had gone over to Pakistan.

Next I want to place before the House certain facts regarding our defence to which I have been an eyewitness. In 1950, when all sorts of atrocities were being perpetrated on

the Hindus in Pakistan. I had the occasion to visit the East Bengal frontiers. There I found that persons of a particular community populated the frontier villages predominantly. The Pakistani troops used to visit such villages on this side of the border and organise secret attacks on the Indian citizens and then return to their own territory. I had warned the authorities to evacuate these persons from the frontier regions in a time of emergency like that. That warning, however, went unheeded.

With one more observation I will conclude my speech. The defence of this country is not the sole concern of any one single party. It is besides the point. Those on the Opposition benches in this House and the people outside, who do not subscribe to the views and ideals of the party in power, do not lag behind them in any way in their zest to sacrifice their all in the cause of the defence of their common motherland.

Sardar Majithia (Tarn Taran): To begin with I would like to endorse every word which my friend Major-General Bhonsle of I.N.A. said about the Army. We on this side of the House are proud of each and every man serving in the defence forces, not only officers but right from the soldiers upto top men. They are doing a jolly good work.

I would like to particularly mention the Air Force because I feel that enough attention is not being paid to that service which has done so much work in such a short time since it has been started. We know that it was due to the Air Force that Kashmir was saved. I do not want to belittle the role played by the Army but it was the Air Force and the other civilian transport planes which came to the help and took our Army to that vital spot in Kashmir which ultimately helped us in keeping it with us. Apart from this if we go back, we can again find the same thing which has been brought out in the Burma campaign of this last war. It was the Air Force which came to the help by dropping supplies, by dropping men and not only that, but maintaining them when they were hundreds of miles deep in the enemy country. Now we have got an Air Force in which the emphasis at the moment is on fighter squadrons. I would suggest that this Force is very very unbalanced not in itself only but

in relation to the other service, that is, the Army as well. It is unbalanced in itself because we have in this service, as I have already pointed out, fighter squadrons and I think one or two transport squadrons. What we require is a service which should help us in time of need—not that we are thinking of aggression, but we should be effectively able to deal with any attack on our country from outside. And the first thing that appears to me is this. Any attack which possibly may come has to be met from the land. The first thing that you find in such a case is that you have Air Force bombers coming across to bombard your vital spots, and they come in to help in softening up your defence points. The only effective means of checking these are your fighter squadrons. I have a very high opinion of the personnel serving today in our fighter squadrons, but I would suggest that the aircrafts which are being flown are not fully capable of dealing with the situation as it might arise if a first-rate Power comes across. We should not just sit back and say that we have jets but we should go a step further and see that we have jets of the latest type and not those that are practically going out of use even in the R.A.F.

The second point which I have already mentioned is in regard to the Army. We have got a very large Army and in order to feed them in case they are deep in enemy territory—as sometimes they find themselves to be—we do want to have a larger number of transport squadrons which should be effectively able to cope with the huge task of supplying the Army and also taking them across.

Much has been said about the socio-economic use of the Army from the Opposition side. I do not know what they mean. If we check up we will find our Army played a very effective role during the evacuation of that last tragic happening after partition of our country. They also are used, when the civil authorities cannot cope with the situation, in bringing law and order under control. Apart from this there is another aspect which probably escapes the Members over here, particularly those on the opposite side. The soldier, I know, considers himself to be the first servant of the country to which he belongs and every Indian, I am proud to say, in our Defence Services considers himself as such. He goes a step

further in his role and even when he is on the retired list he still contributes something towards the economy of our country. To give you instances I have not much time, but I would just mention, how our old soldiers after retirement brought the land in Lyalpur, in Sheikhpura, in Sargodha, in Montgomery under cultivation and produced wonderful crops, crops better than in other parts. I am quite sure that with the Bhakra Dam developing those soldiers will again go to work and develop the lands which now are barren again into those rich fields which produced bumper crops and which are now in Pakistan. That also is social service.

But the fear that I have got is that if we lay too much emphasis on this aspect we will be neglecting a most essential part and that is the training of our personnel. The fighting units of today are not the fighting units which they were about twenty years back or possibly thirty years back. At that time all that you needed was a soldier who should be able to drill himself properly, carry a rifle and fire. Now the services are highly specialised. You just take the case of a pilot in the Air Force. He has not only to know how to fly, he has not only to know how to command his men, but he has to know each and every part of his machine—not only of the aircraft but the wireless in it, the guns in it, how they fire, what can be the defects and how they can be removed. Well, all this takes time and requires constant practice and constant study to keep them in top form. The same is the case with our tanks in the Army. Tanks do not consist merely of the persons sitting in them and driving them. A tank is a very complicated machinery; it has got so many moving parts and unless a person knows how each part works he cannot be as efficient in the fighting services as we want him to be. We want our services to be at the top in efficiency as has been brought out on both sides of the House. But this is a thing which we are directly doing which hampers their efficiency, namely diverting them into other work which hampers their training. I would therefore suggest that we should lay our emphasis more on the training and efficiency aspect of it than on the other work which has been mentioned. But it has been amply brought out that whenever the need arose, as has happened in Rayalaseema, our soldiers have come to the help of the civilians, and I would congratulate the Defence Minister for taking that bold step and

[Sardar Majithia]

also the Commander-in-Chief of the Army for laying it down that the Army has to play its full role even at the expense of the equipment which they might find difficult to replace.

I would just like to mention one thing and that is that we can save quite a lot of our money by standardising the equipment. As an instance, I would say that I would like to have co-ordination of civilian and defence equipment. To give you just one case I would mention the communication systems. You have got your wireless systems over which you transmit your communications. If the Defence Services, that is the Army and the Air Force and the Navy and also the Home Department, that is the Police, can co-operate and standardise their systems I am quite sure that it will not only work out cheaper but help the industry in that field which needs help so badly. I was thinking of India becoming a central point for manufacture of these things and not only being able to supply internal requirements but supply other countries in the East which should find these products cheaper and quicker to replace than those from England or America. About pay and allowances, people have said quite a lot. It has been said that they are very high. If you want the proper type of men to lead our soldiers, you must pay them at least what they would be able to get outside in civilian jobs. Our soldiers are taking a lot of risk. They have to face bullets, and if we pay them exactly the same as what we pay to those people who are sitting at their desks in their snug offices, then I am afraid we would not be able to attract the right type of men to lead our soldiers.

With these few words, I would again congratulate the Minister of Defence for bringing this Budget, which I entirely support.

Shri Nambiar: We have been discussing this Budget and various points of view have been given expression to from both sides. I would like to suggest that the point of view, the approach, should be that there must be a contented Army; there must be an independent Army; there must be a strong and contented rear. Unless these three things are satisfied, there is no justification for us to say that our Army can defend our country whenever the occasion arises. Of course, we on this side do not oppose or belittle the necessity of a strong

national defence force. We want a strong national defence force, but it must be strong in its true sense. It should not be strong only in imagination, as the one which we are having today is. Let us approach this matter realistically and see whether a self-contented, strong Army exists today.

First I take up the other ranks, whose condition today is bad. The ordinary soldier starts on a pay of Rs. 22-8-0. Every five years, he gets an increase of Rs. 2-8-0 and ultimately he stops at Rs. 30. He does not get a chance even to keep his family with him. Quarters are not provided. Today, you are giving only 14 per cent. of the soldiers a chance to bring their families and that too, to live in tents by rotation every six months, whereas the position with regard to officers is entirely different. I have no quarrel with what you do for the officers. The officers must also be looked after, but why should there be so much gap between the officers and other ranks? If this sort of thing happens, and if the officers behave in the old, bureaucratic way, I fear there cannot be any good relations between the officers and the other ranks, and unless there are good relations between both, how can you expect such a big Army as ours to carry on the duties assigned to it? I can quote some examples. Is it not a fact, I ask the hon. Minister of Defence, that more and more suicides are taking place among the ranks—suicides because of the ill-treatment meted out to them? We sitting here and talking so much about defence do not take care of the situation, and unless we do take care, we will not have a good Army to defend our country when the need arises.

Let me clearly say that we are not here for retrenchment in the lower ranks. These Army personnel, these soldiers, who are there today must continue but their time should not be wasted for unnecessary purposes. They must be used for national reconstruction purposes, so that the money spent on them may be returned to the nation in the form of reconstruction activities, without which the Army cannot be supported by the people. If the money that we spend on the Army, on the technical equipment, and on the top-heavy administration,—if that can be canalised into nation-building activities without retrenchment of the staff, then the Army will be a magnificent, strong

Army with the help and support of the people behind it. That is the spirit, we say, in which the money must be utilised for a better purpose and not that there should be blind retrenchment in the Army and hundreds and thousands of men should go back to the field. We are not for retrenching the personnel, but we say: stop this wastage in the Department. I ask you: can any hon. Member here honestly say, keeping his hand on his chest, that there is no wastage in the Army today? I challenge you on that point. Crores of rupees are being expended on contracts and so much money is wasted.

10 A.M.

Treatment meted out to the ratings in the Navy is far from satisfactory. I had occasion to visit one of the tents where these ratings and soldiers live. I visited it not as a Member of Parliament but as a friend of a soldier. I can say boldly that these tents where the soldiers are stationed look like cattle sheds. They are so bad. The soldiers are treated like cattle. Please excuse me for saying that, but that is the situation. I do not say that because I want to cast any aspersions on the Minister of Defence or the Ministry of Defence or the Government of India but because that is the reality. Let us face facts. I say that there must be a thorough overhaul of this situation.

No doubt the officers must be treated well, but that does not mean that their pay must be Rs. 3,000 and 4,000. I can say that today there are Indian officers, patriotic enough, who are willing to serve the nation at a much smaller pay. They are not considering their pay as the criterion; they are motivated by patriotism. Can you rouse their patriotism?—that is the question. If you cannot rouse their patriotism, whatever amount you pay to them will be of no use. Give them that sense of patriotism. Give them that sense of national feeling. You bring King's Commissioned Officers, who sit tight over the head of the Indian officers, and when the Indian officers pass certain technical tests they are not promoted as they ought to be. Why have you abolished this tests system? Our officers are not given promotion in the normal course. You have installed King's Commissioned Officers over the heads of smaller Indian officers and therefore there is a feeling of discontent amongst the Indian officers. There is the feeling amongst the Indian soldiers. There is the feeling in the Navy and the Air Force also.

I shall quote one concrete case. There was one Mr. Achar who shot himself dead on the 15th March, 1951 in Tambaram in Madras. Why did he commit suicide? And then, there was a Corporal by name Mr. Irani. He agitated for a better mess. This also was in Madras. He has been court-martialled for the fact that he complained that the potato given to him was useless. This is all the charge, and that case is going on. I can bring before the hon. Minister hundreds of such cases, and I am going to bring them before him. I am going to take special care about this, but what I say now is this, that there must be a right approach. The hon. Minister and the entire Cabinet should look into this. The defence of the nation is important. We the Communists do not say that our national security should be violated. We shall be the last persons to say that. If we are not strong in our defence, we know the result. We should build a strong bulwark against any aggressor and in the present situation, we know who is the likely aggressor. Anybody can understand that.

Then is it not a fact that 44 Vampires of the United Kingdom were allowed to pass through India between January, 1951 and April, 1952 simply because the United Kingdom wanted to quell the uprisings in Malaya? Did not our Air Force support them, give them fuel and everything? I can show you an order which I have here by the Commanders of the Indian Air Force and Navy asking that facilities be given to these 44 Vampires. I am prepared to produce the thing before you. I can challenge you on that. Is it out of a sense of neutrality that we are doing this, allowing the U.K. Air Force to go to Malaya through our country for putting down the Malayan peoples' cause? Are we here to support the U.K.? Is this our policy of neutrality? We have English officers here, not as Advisers, but as Commanders in certain wings of the Army and rightly did one hon. Member ask this morning, "If there is a war between the U.K. and India, where will these British officers be?" I say, they will stab you in the back. They will murder you. That is what they will do.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa (Kolar): Suppressing there is a war between Russia and India?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him have his say.

Shri Nambiar: That being the case, why should there be an Adviser Corps or an Officer Corps composed of the Britishers? I ask you why? Because

[Shri Nambiar]

you want to support the suppression and the oppression of the Malayan people—yes—therefore you want English officers here. You say you are neutral and at the same time you support the U.K. and American methods. You are dependent on America for your stores. Hon. Members were saying yesterday that we have a 2,500 mile border.....

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection to his advancing those arguments. I only want to remind the hon. Member that he has just three minutes left at his disposal and if he has any other points he may develop those points as otherwise he will have no time.

Shri Nambiar: Hon. Members were saying that we have a 2,500 mile border and also a vast sea coast which must be defended. We cannot produce one single aeroplane in this country and we say we must defend our country against all odds! You cannot produce one single aeroplane. You have to depend on America and U.K. You say "Ours is a neutral policy, we have nothing to do with this bloc or that bloc". But your Army is still dependent on one bloc. Whom are you going to fool, I ask? What is the use of your saying this? Our countrymen are not fools. They see what is what. Therefore I say that you must change your attitude, change it in such a way that the entire Defence machinery and the entire Defence system is reorganized. Soldiers must be given the chance to develop and feel that it is their duty to defend the country. For, it is the soldier who has got the final word; it is the soldier who has to go to the front and die; the officers will be behind, I know. Therefore, unless you imbue the soldier with that spirit and patriotism, there is no use talking of all these things.

We must have an independent Navy and Air Force. We must have a strong Army. And the Army must have its roots in the people. If you do not have the Army with its roots in the people, there is no use because the people are not called upon to defend the country, the people have no interest in the defence and feel it is only a sort of military personnel who are asked to defend. No country in these days can withstand any onslaught unless the entire nation rises. Therefore we say that this national reconstruction is a part of defence. Some hon. Members on the Congress Benches were saying "We cannot understand the socio-economic construction put by

the Opposition". They cannot understand because their mind is such that they can only think in terms of the stereotyped, old, rotten methods. You are an appreciator of China. In China I saw with my own naked eye—and I think my esteemed sister Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit will also vouch for this in due course—that the Chinese Army goes to the field, works along with the peasants, goes to the factory and produces whatever is required by the Army. I saw these with my own eyes, and I can say that the Chinese Army will defend itself against any onslaught because it is having its roots in the people. I therefore suggest that the whole matter must be approached in that spirit. The spirit is that the Army must be contented, and at the same time it must serve the people, so that the people may stand as a strong rear behind it. It should cut itself completely out of any American or English influence so that we might have our own neutral policy.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): It was a German General, Clausewitz, who said that war is the continuation of politics by violent means. It is in this light that I would try to analyse a few aspects of our present debate. I have heard very attentively the speeches made from the Communist Benches, and specially one speech made yesterday by the hon. lady Communist Member of the House. I have compared her speech and found that it was word for word—I would say the general line—from an article written by one Lemin in the month of February. It has 13,500 words. It is here in my hand, and here is the speech of the hon. lady. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I think we are here to hear each other with patience. It is no use the hon. Member making allegations that another hon. Member read something word by word. That is not a proper way of doing it. Anybody is entitled to adopt the arguments of any other person. Such a dig as that, again, rouses passions and the issue before the House is entirely clouded. The hon. Member will take care to see that he does not make any personal allegations of that type.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Sir, may I make a submission? I challenge him to put the papers before the House and I would ask that these papers be placed before a Parliamentary Commission of all parties to go into the matter so that we may know the truth.

Mr. Speaker: It is no use getting into a heat and wasting breath over that kind of thing. Parliament's main business is not to appoint Commissions to find out which Member is right and which Member is wrong. It has to deliberate very seriously on the problems before it, ignoring all passions or parties and personalities. (*Interruption*).

An Hon. Member: We challenge...

Mr. Speaker: They can do it outside, elsewhere. Let there be no further argument.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: A very vital point was discussed, and it was our Defence policy. It was said that there are British officers who predominate here, and many other serious allegations were made to the effect that our Defence policy is a part of the Anglo-American imperialist policy.

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

It is in this connection that I have to say something. It is not the voice of the party sitting before us but the voice of somebody on the other side of the Hill. And in that sense I would just like to take away the House for a minute in imagination, to that hall where I myself have been a cadet for two years, and where we learnt the technique of how to criticize others. And the technique is, if we are going to do a thing ourselves we will put it on, the others are going to do it. That is the way. That is the Communist way. It has been taught, and systematically taught in the schools there. I would refer to those Army Schools where many Indians were being taught. I have also been there as a cadet, and it was taught how we should come back to India, weaken our defences, how we should criticize our Government. And what are those criticisms? There is sense in them, which is very deep, and which has a very deep meaning. Anybody who has been a soldier knows that a mock fire is necessary in one sector to attract the attention of people so that you may penetrate the defences in the other sector. On the one side they attract the attention of the public by saying "Your Government is following the policy of the Anglo-American bloc" and on the other side, silently, they are trying to penetrate our defence system in order to ruin it. In whose interests? In the interests of somebody on the other side of the fence. They have been trained for that. It was a couple of years ago, in 1950, in the last week of July and the first week of August, that many Indians assembled in Berlin, and it was decid-

ed there—there was a talk that a Third World War was going to flare up in the near future, and in that talk they promised there—that the interests of the Communist Fatherland will be the first and the interests of India will come next. (*Interruption*).

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam South): I challenge that statement. It is a wild allegation. He must substantiate it.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: It was in that meeting.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. That is the opinion of the hon. Member. (*Interruptions*). Hon. Members cannot go on interrupting like this. (*Interruptions*). Many hon. Members have made statements on this side of the House. Order please.

Shri B. C. Das rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member cannot go on like this interrupting even when the Chair is speaking. Many hon. Members have made statements here. That is the experience of the other hon. Member. Let us conduct the proceedings with decorum here. When the hon. Members get a chance, they can reply. They cannot cry like this. Order, order. The hon. Member will go on.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: It was in that Party in 1950 on the 5th of August at 11-30 in the night that the Indians agreed that the first loyalty of Communists is to the Communist Fatherland and its Army. The resolution reads thus:

"That the members of the Communist Party must convince the general public that in case of a general war the duty of the people is to help the Communist Army in establishing peace."

This is the origin of the Communist movement of peace, and I must revert once more to Clausewitz, the great German General, who said: "A conqueror is always a lover of peace." I would add only one sentence: "that the Communists who want to be conquerors of tomorrow are pretending today to be the best lovers of peace."

This brings us to the political demagogue, and when I speak of politics, I speak in terms of the Army, and as I told the House before, war means a continuation of politics by violent means and nothing else. So during this period which we call the peace time, any country which has quite an efficient general staff considers what it is going to do in case of an emergency. A general staff on the other side of the fence has tried to study our defences, has succeeded in sending

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

people into our defences to get information of day to day events, including information about our armaments. For what purpose? It is for an emergency, that a time may come when they are going to liberate India.....

An Hon. Member: Who?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: This Communist International, Cominform. Their General headquarters think that a time will come when they will liberate India from the hands of the Anglo-American Imperialists. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: This liberation is a very serious thing. Accordingly they have prepared a plan in which they have put also Kashmir as British. Here I have the copy of a map which says that Kashmir is British and the map is published in 1950. I wish to give you a warning....

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Is the hon. Member entitled to repeat his practice of referring to certain documents of a mysterious character which he has not the gunption to lay on the Table of the House and to subject it to an examination by an impartial Commission to be appointed by Parliament or by any other quasi-judicial body?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have understood the point of order. If any hon. Member refers to any document or reads extracts from it on the floor of the House, he must place it on the Table of the House. It is open to him not to refer to any or say in his own words.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I will just conclude. In short, I say that the House should not be carried away by the Communist manoeuvres of deceit. We must face realities, and the realities are that, if the condition is dangerous, and if this 'politics' is taking us towards a war, then we must be prepared for it, and we must prepare our defences accordingly.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopaldaswami): I have listened to this debate which has extended over five hours with great interest. I have no reason to feel disappointed at all. Though there were one or two voices which sounded a somewhat discordant note, I think, almost the entire House including even the Members of the Communist Group in this House is now convinced that the provision that we have made in the Budget for defence is in no sense of the word extravagant

in the circumstances of the present day. I was rather interested to get the view of my hon. friend, Mr. Nambiar, who spoke last from the Communist benches. He stated it as his conviction that the Army has got to be strong, and by that I suppose he implied that it is not too strong now and it must be made stronger than it is. If it is to be made stronger, *prima facie* the implication is that probably the provision that has to be made for expenditure on the Armed Forces has got to be stepped up in order to make it strong, according to the standard of Mr. Nambiar. He also stated it as his conviction that a strong Army should be based upon a strong people. I entirely agree with him. The point is not whether we are spending more than we should, but whether we are spending it in the right way and whether there is scope for improvement in the manner of our spending which would conduce to make our defence arrangements even more efficient than they are. In the course of this debate it was interesting to note that no less than four ex-officers of the armed forces have participated. Two of them belong to the Indian National Army which had for its object the liberation of this country. The third, I was very pleased to find is the scion of a ruling family in this country, who has come here as an 'independent', who served, I believe, as a pilot flying officer in the second world war. The fourth is a seasoned ex-member of the Armed Forces—he was I believe, in the Air Force—and he had many constructive suggestions to make as regards how we should improve the efficiency of our Armed Forces. All of these deserve to be congratulated. The first three of them made their maiden speeches. The last—I believe, that was not his maiden speech—has spoken more than once already and I should like to convey my own congratulations to them for the constructive suggestions that they have made. As the time at my disposal is short, I do not propose to deal with every one of the suggestions that they have made. But, I can assure every one of them that all that they have said will be given the best possible consideration, and if it is possible for me to modify the existing policy or practices in order to bring about greater efficiency, it will be my earnest endeavour to do so.

I should like to refer first to the very interesting point that was raised by my hon. friend from Orissa, Mr. Patnaik. He has, I know, been a very close student of Armed Forces in

every country, their organisation, their functions and so forth. He has produced literature which shows the amount of study that he has devoted to this subject. Anything that has come from him has always been received by me with more than ordinary interest. In the present case, he put forward one or two main propositions. He first said that we should have as our twin objectives in the organisation of Armed Forces two main things. One was national security and the other was economic stability. He went on further to develop this idea of economic stability to make out a case for what he considered the socio-economic role which the Armed Forces should play in overall national development.

Now, let me take these two points. There can be no two opinions as to the Armed Forces being primarily intended for ensuring national security. We have to have an efficient defence against external attack. But, national security means not merely protection from external attack, but also means the bringing into existence and the maintaining of conditions in the country which also make for peace and security. From this stand-point, it becomes difficult for me to distinguish between national security and economic stability. Economic stability has necessarily to be founded upon both external and internal security. Without that security economic development will be greatly prejudiced and we cannot develop to the extent that we might if we had that security both from outside and inside. Therefore, I was rather intrigued to listen to his emphasis on national security and economic stability. But, he went further, as I said, and tried to make out that economic stability also connoted overall national development in the economic sphere. He went on to argue that the Armed Forces must take a very active hand in the actual realisation of the overall economic development. He therefore suggested that the Armed Forces should take an active part in productive activities. In other words, his twin objective for the Armed Forces was both protective and productive. It is only with regard to the latter that I have a few things to say, which might not exactly tally with what he has tried to emphasise.

The Armed Forces have got a role to play. What their part in war should be, everybody knows. What their part in peace should be is a thing about which there might be justifiable difference of opinion. So

far as the part which the Armed Forces play in peace, the general doctrine that is accepted by all those who have devoted thought to the organisation of Armed Forces is this that the Army, during peace, is in training for war. The Army, as someone. Members did emphasise in the course of the debate is not there simply sitting idle during peace. It is in a continuous active process of training. If you interrupt that training, materially, I mean, and put them on to tasks which will not conduce to that training, it means you take away so much from the efficiency of the Army or Armed Forces which they should maintain all through their career in the interests of conserving national security. That is why people like me have felt some hesitation in trying to convert the Armed Forces during peace time into an Army of men whose business it is to produce goods of various descriptions, whether it is in the sphere of cultivating agricultural land or participating in industries, either large-scale or small-scale, so on and so forth. That the Armed Forces should be ready and willing to be called upon to do work of that description during emergencies, during times when it is necessary, in the interests of the nation, to step up production for a temporary period, nobody will question. The Armed Forces have given proof of that already. But, the broad proposition which my hon. friend Mr. Patnaik has put forward was something more than this. As I said the other day, it is an attractive idea. But, we cannot straightaway accept it for immediate implementation. We shall have to investigate all aspects of it and see to what extent the Armed Forces can be used for purposes of this nature. I for one would not limit the intervention of the Armed Forces only to occasions of emergency. There are occasions even when there is no emergency and there are tasks upon which the Armed Forces could be engaged for the purpose of helping increased production in the country. There are public utility activities in which the help of the Armed Forces might be of great value. I would only state this as a tentative conclusion of mine, namely, that you can find blocks of productive work for temporary periods for which the men in the Armed Forces could be drawn upon for purposes of execution; things, for instance, like the restoration of dismantled railway lines here and there or the digging of canals or the planting of a certain area in the Rajasthan desert for the purpose of afforestation, things like that which

[Shri Gopaldaswami]

are blocks of work on which the Armed Forces could be engaged for specific periods after which they will get back to their operational headquarters.

Those are matters which could be considered, which could be examined for the purpose of seeing whether the Armed Forces could be so used in the tasks of production. Beyond that, if you want to go further, we shall have almost to revolutionise our ideas as regards the way in which we recruit our Armed Forces, the numbers we recruit, the amount of training we give and the periods for which we keep them in the colours. Those will raise large problems, and we shall have to examine them more carefully than we have yet been able to do before. We can say "yes" to ideas or suggestions of that nature.

I think I would not deal with the other smaller points which my Hon. friend Mr. Patnaik raised in the course of his speech. I would refer now to the points, some of the points, which my hon. friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty raised in the course of her speech. She it was that, I think, sounded the discordant note as regards the Defence Budget. She certainly is not satisfied with what provision has been made in the Budget. She considers it extravagant and she thinks that even this extravagant amount is spent in ways which cannot merit her approval. I quite understand her attitude in regard to this matter. But she put forth arguments in support of her position which I find it somewhat difficult to follow. She, first of all, tried to controvert the position both myself and the Finance Minister took the other day, viz., that if you compare the provision made for defence expenditure with the total Budget of the country, not merely of the Federal Centre, you would probably find that it does not exceed about 25 per cent. according to my hon. colleague's figure. The arithmetic that was given to me brought it to about 20 per cent. Whatever it is, it certainly is not anything like 50 per cent. which is the percentage you have to arrive at if you take the Federal Centre's Budget alone into consideration. She said if you added the expenditure on Police to the expenditure on the Defence Services, the percentage would be much greater. Well, Police expenditure is always treated as part of the civil expenditure of any State.

Secondly, there is nothing like this percentage going up enormously if you

add it with Police expenditure. The real matter for comparison was that we were spending on the Armed Forces of the country something which was an extravagant percentage of the total revenues of the country. We did not try to pit the expenditure on the Defence Services against the expenditure on all other services. We took the total revenues of the country and we also took the total expenditure of the country, and tried to show that if you took those things into account, defence expenditure was nothing extravagant. Hon. Members on this side have given figures which show that even in a country like the United States of America, the expenditure on defence is as much, if not more, than what we incur here today even in regard to the Federal Centre.

Now, the other great point which Shrimati Renu Chakravartty tried to make was that we were so dependent upon foreign sources for our equipment for the Armed Forces, we were so dependent upon them for other things connected with the Armed Forces, that we were completely, or very nearly completely, under their domination and we were making ourselves a party to some fell design on their part, the ultimate objective of which is an attack on Soviet Russia and China. Well, I have been connected with this Government for some time now. I am not aware of any concealed intentions on our part to participate in any attack on any country, not even Soviet Russia. And it is a thing which amazed me when she developed this proposition. I suppose she was merely bent upon saying that we were not independent in any sense, we were tied to the apron strings of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, that we were maintaining Armed Forces of this magnitude merely because we wanted to be of help to these countries and not to ourselves, and so on. A more grotesque description of our policy few can imagine. We are independent, we are sovereign. Our Armed Forces are our own. Nobody has got the slightest voice in the administration of the Armed Forces by the Government of India. It is the Government of India that lays down the policy. It is the Government of India that determines what equipment they should have consistent with the condition of our finances, and wherefrom we should obtain it and so on. It is true that a good part of what we require by way of equipment has to be

obtained from the United Kingdom. Past history has something to do with it. But if the suggestion is that we continue to be a part of what hon. Members on the other side are accustomed to call a colonial system, if it is their suggestion, if it is their view that we take orders from the other members of a colonial empire, that we order our own policy accordingly, that is, I would say at once, a false description of our policy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, is the expression "false" parliamentary?

Shri Gopaldaswami: I contend, Sir, it is parliamentary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member does not say any particular person is a liar.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: He refers to declarations made on the floor of this House as false declarations. I am not speaking on behalf of any particular individual, but on behalf of the House. I would ask you to consider that point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing wrong in that. "False", "Incorrect"—these are very parliamentary terms.

Shri Gopaldaswami: The hon. the lady Member also made references to the employment of British officers in our Armed Forces. The suggestion was that these officers were dominating the whole show, and were dictating the policy and were seeing to the implementation of the policies of which they had approved. This, again, I think, is a very incorrect description of their position in the Armed Forces.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Not false position?

Shri Gopaldaswami: I am trying to make some concessions to the sentiment of hon. Members on the opposite side.

These officers are employed here not because they want to dominate over us, but because we think that their services are useful in the running of the three different services. They occupy certain positions. Excepting for an adviser in the Army, practically everybody else holds a position in the Army, a position which, but for him, would be occupied by an Indian officer. He occupies that position on the same terms and is under the same discipline as any Indian officer would be. I know hon. Members opposite would ask me at once, "Why then do

you not employ Indian officers?" The answer is simple. The answer is that there is no Indian officer who can be considered not to have the latent capacity for occupying even the highest position in our Armed Forces. That is perfectly clear and is illustrated by the existence of officers in such capacities even today. But we want our Armed Forces to be efficient, we want our Armed Forces to be manned at the top by people who not only have the capacity to become first rate officers, but who have had the training and the experience which are necessary for putting them in those places. If an emergency arose, and we had to choose between them and officers from outside, there is no denying the fact that we would choose an Indian officer and put him in charge, even if he had not had the previous training, but in times of peace it is only wisdom, it is only our own interest which dictates to us, the wisdom of seeing that these people get the training and the experience necessary for occupying those positions.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Does General Cariappa need an adviser?

Shri Gopaldaswami: General Cariappa has an adviser today, but then that adviser, is entirely.....

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: But my question was whether General Cariappa needs an adviser at all.

Shri Gopaldaswami: My hon. friends on the other side, if they were in General Cariappa's place, would want not only one adviser, but a host of them. There is nothing which detracts from the position of a General in the Army, if he has to consult a person or two and get advice before he takes action. He is not bound to take that advice, he can reject it, he can act on his own. But it is only good for the service as a whole that he should get that advice, so long as it is considered to be absolutely necessary by the Government.

There were some other things said about pay scales and so on, about the sky-rocketing differences between the pay of the lowest man and the pay of the highest man. That is a very large question. It will take me a long time if I have to traverse all the arguments that can be said for and against it. The reply has been given in regard to these points by people who have served in the Army or the Armed Forces. I should leave it there for the present. There was something

[Shri Gopaldaswami]

said about the low pay of the other ranks. It is true, I believe, the initial pay is somewhere about Rs. 22, but people often forget that in addition to the Rs. 22, he gets his food, clothing, lodging, and other amenities. While I am not here to defend the actual figure, I would only say that the man in the Army is economically not worse off than the best paid worker, corresponding worker outside the Army. There was another point referred to by Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, and that was that India made a supply of certain arms, ammunition, and wireless appliances to Tibet some two years ago. I do not know what the point was that she was driving at. I can only say that for many years, India has supplied arms to Tibet. It was in pursuance of that practice that some arms, ammunition, wireless apparatus and so on, were supplied to Tibet. The value of the supplies is nothing very much to be spoken of, there is nothing in it, which indicates that we did it carelessly or without due regard to the political relations that subsist between Tibet and India, or anything of that kind. I really do not know what she was trying to make against Government, by referring to that particular matter.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: But, should we continue still the policy followed by the Britishers, of supplying arms, ammunitions etc. to Tibet?

Shri Gopaldaswami: That is a matter which no doubt, we will consider in a very independent way and come to a very independent decision.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Is the American code being used in the Navy?

An Hon. Member: Is it a question hour, Sir?

Shri Gopaldaswami: I am afraid I must decline to discuss codes in this House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: But do you deny the using of a code which other foreigners know?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not in the public interest to disclose it.

Shri N. S. Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): We have the Hindu Code, here, Sir.

Shri Gopaldaswami: Then there was something said about top heaviness in our Armed Forces administration. I do not know what is meant by top-

heaviness in administration; if it refers to the number of highly paid officers employed at headquarters, either in the Defence Ministry or in the Armed Forces headquarters, I should say at once that our set-up here compares very favourably with any corresponding set-up in any other country.

It is possible that for the moment the expenditure on some of these officers is heavier than it would be when we settle down permanently under the new scales of pay and so on. Officers at headquarters have necessarily to be senior officers and their rates of pay, as for instance of K.C.I.O's. in the Army, are, as hon. Members are aware, somewhat higher than the rates which corresponding officers draw and will continue to draw. For the moment it may be somewhat higher than it might otherwise be, but neither in numbers nor even in the total expenditure can it be maintained that there is anything like top-heaviness.

Then there was something said about the procedure followed as regards dismissals, discharges and so on. I should like to state to the House the correct position in regard to this matter. No officer or soldier can be dismissed or discharged without a proper inquiry. He can either be dismissed or discharged administratively or dismissed as a result of a court martial. In all cases he is given ample opportunity to defend himself and to lead any evidence that he may have in his favour. In the case of an officer, he can only be dismissed by the Government but in his case too an appeal lies against that order. When the case comes to the Government, it is scrutinised very thoroughly and every attempt is made to see that no injustice or unfair treatment is meted out to him. As you know, people are never satisfied with the final orders that are passed by the highest appellate authority under the rules. They go on plying the Minister with further representations and perhaps things are raised in other ways. So far as I am concerned, I never refuse to look into a case if *prima facie* there is any ground for reconsidering anything that is said in a representation merely because some order had been passed finally by some previous appellate authority. Even if it is a case where the Minister himself has passed orders, any further representation bringing to light new facts and so on is usually examined with all the care

that is devoted to the first examination of the man's case and suitable orders passed. I do not think that the Armed Forces personnel have anything to complain of either as regards the procedure or as regards the manner in which that procedure is worked.

11 A.M.

There was one point raised by my hon. friend from Neilore, Mr. Ramachandra Reddi. He was a little perturbed over the fact that the Armed Forces were now under three Service Headquarters—one for the Army, the second for the Navy and a third for the Air Force. He seemed to recommend that all these three Services should be brought under the over-all supervision of a common Commander-in-Chief of all the Armed Forces. Thereby only did he expect sufficient co-ordination in regard to both organisation and discipline as well as for operational purposes. Now, I believe another hon. Member from the Communist Benches said that this trifurcation of the Headquarters was due to the fact that the British Chiefs of the Navy and the Air Force would otherwise refuse to work under the Chief of the Army. I do not know if those British Chiefs have any grouses or dissatisfaction of this sort or have expressed them at any time. I can only say that sufficient co-ordinating machinery is today in existence, even if you take merely the Service part of it into consideration. At present all important questions relating to the three Services come before a Committee of the Chiefs of Staff first. They discuss the matters and come to decisions. Then there is the Minister's

Committee, and on the top there is the Defence Committee of the Cabinet. These two latter co-ordinating bits of machinery are those which lay down policy at the highest possible level. Any co-ordination that is required amongst the three Services is brought about in these three ways and I do not think the present system suffers from any lack of co-ordination either as among the Armed Forces Chiefs themselves or as between them and the Minister and the Cabinet.

May I refer to one point which was mentioned—I would not say made, by my hon. friend, Mr. Jaipal Singh? He seemed to think that the bogey of martial and non-martial races still existed and should be obliterated. I think Government have already issued orders that this distinction should disappear. In one or two cases it does exist not as a distinction between martial and non-martial races but for purely administrative reasons. But the policy of the Government is to do away with this distinction and even where through the indirect channel of administrative reasons it tries to raise its head, their policy is to do away with it in the quickest possible time.

I think I have finished my time. Though I have many more things to refer to, I would close at this point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put Shri T. K. Chaudhuri's cut motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The House divided: Ayes, 65; Noes, 303.

AYES

Division No. 3]

Achalu, Shri
Ajit Singh, Shri
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.
Buchhikotlah, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
Chatopadhyaya, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri T. K.
Chowdary, Shri C. B.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
Damodaran, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarvagadhar
Deo, Shri R. N.

Deshpande, Shri V. G.
Gam Mallindora, Shri
Girdhari Bhol, Shri
Gurupadaswamy, Shri
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
Mangalagiri, Shri
Mascarene, Kumari Annie
Menon, Shri Damodara
Mishra, Pandit S. C.
Missir, Shri V.
Mookerjee, Dr. S. P.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
More, Shri S. S.
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Mushar, Shri
Naidu, Shri N. B.

Nair, Shri N. S.
Nambiar, Shri
Narasimham, Shri S. V. L.
Nayar, Shri V. P.
Patnaik, Shri U. C.
Punnose, Shri
Raghabachari, Shri
Raghavaiah, Shri
Rajabhoj, Shri
Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
Randaman Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri Gopala
Rao, Shri K. S.
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Rao, Shri Vittal
Reddi, Shri Madhao
Reddy, Shri Eswara

[11-5 A.M.]

Rishang Keishing, Shri
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Shah, Shrimati Kamlendu Mati
Shastri, Shri B. D.
Singh, Shri R. N.

Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Vallatharas, Shri

Veeraswami, Shri
Velayudhan, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achint, Ram Lala
Achuthan, Shri
Agam Desji, Shri
Agarwal, Prof.
Agarwal, Shri H. L.
Agrawal, Shri M. L.
Ajit Singhji; General
Akarpuri, Sardar
Alageesan, Shri
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
Asthana, Shri
Badan Singh, Ch.
Balkrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri
Basappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. B.
Bhakta Darshan, Shri
Bhandari, Shri
Bhartiya, Shri S. R.
Bhargava, Pandit M. B.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C. S.
Bhawani Singh, Shri
Bhawanji, Shri
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Borooah, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brobmo-Choudhury, Shri
Burgobain, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandak, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Charak, Shri
Chatterjee, Dr. Susitranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri G. L.
Chavda, Shri
Chettiar, Shri T.S.A.
Chinnaria, Shri
Dabbi, Shri
Damodaran, Shri G. R.
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Bell Ram.
Das, Shri K. K.

Das, Shri Ram Dhani
Das, Shri Ramananda
Das, Shri S. N.
Das, Shri N. T.
Deb, Shri S. C.
Desai, Shri K. N.
Deshmukh, Shri C. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Deshpande, Shri G. H.
Dholakia, Shri
Dhulekar, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Digambar Singh, Shri
Doraswamy, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulehand
Dube, Shri U. S.
Dutta, Shri S. K.
Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Ebanazer, Dr.
Elayaperumal, Shri
Fotedar, Pandit
Gadgil, Shri
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ganpati Ram, Shri
Garg, Shri R. P.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Ghulam Qadar, Shri
Giri, Shri V. V.
Gohain, Shri
Gouder, Shri K. S.
Govind Das, Seth
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Badahah
Hari Mohan, Dr.
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hembrom, Shri
Ibrahim, Shri
Islamuddin, Shri M.
Iyyani, Shri E.
Iyyanna, Shri C. R.
Jagivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jain, Shri N. S.
Jalpa Singh, Shri
Jajwara, Shri
Jangde, Shri
Jassani, Shri
Jayashri, Shrimati
Jena, Shri K. C.

Jena, Shri Niranjan
Jha, Shri Bhagwat
Jhunjunwala, Shri
Joshi, Shri Jethalal
Joshi, Shri M. D.
Joshi, Shri N. L.
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jwala Prasad, Shri
Kakkan, Shri
Kale, Shrimati A.
Kamble, Shri
Kandasamy, Shri
Kanungo, Shri
Karnmarkar, Shri
Kasliwal, Shri
Katham, Shri
Kajju, Dr.
Kazmi, Shri
Keahvalengar, Shri
Keekar, Dr.
Khardekar, Shri
Khedkar, Shri G. B.
Khuda Baksh, Shri M.
Krollikar, Shri
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Kureel, Shri P. L.
Lallanji, Shri
Laskar, Prof.
Lotan Ram, Shri
Madiah Gowda, Shri
Mahtab, Shri.
Maltra, Pandit L. K.
Majhi, Shri B. C.
Majithia, Sardar
Malviya, Shri K. D.
Malliah, Shri U. S.
Malvia, Shri B. N.
Malviya, Pandit C. N.
Malviya, Shri Motilal
Mandal, Dr. P.
Masuriya Din, Shri
Mathew, Prof.
Matthen, Shri
Maydeo, Shrimati
Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
Mehta, Shri B. G.
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mishra, Shri Lokenath
Mishra, Shri M. P.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Mishra, Pandit Lingaraj
Mishra, Shri B. N.

Misra, Shri E. D.
 Misra, Shri S. P.
 Mohd. Akbar, Bof
 Mohiuddin, Shri
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 Muchaki Kosa, Shri
 Mudaliar, Shri C. B.
 Muniswamy, Shri
 Musafir, Ghani G. S.
 Muthukrishnan, Shri
 Nair, Shri C. K.
 Namdhari, Shri
 Nanda, Shri
 Narasimhan, Shri C. R.
 Natarawakar, Shri
 Nathwani, Shri N. P.
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Nesamony, Shri
 Pannalal, Shri
 Pant Shri D. D.
 Paragi Lal, Ch.
 Parikh, Shri S. G.
 Parmar, Shri E. B.
 Patel, Shri B. K.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Pawar, Shri V. P.
 Pillai, Shri Thanu
 Pocker Sahab, Shri
 Prabhakar, Shri N.
 Prasad, Shri H. S.
 Raclilah, Shri N.
 Radha Raman, Shri
 Raghuraj Sahal, Shri
 Raghuraj Singh, Ch.
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramiah, Shri
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Ram Das, Shri
 Ram Saran, Prof.
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramanand Shastri, Swami
 Ramasethiah, Shri
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.

Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Ranbir Singh, Ch.
 Rao, Diwan Raghavendra
 Rao, Shri B. Shiva
 Rao, Shri Seehagiri
 Rauf, Shri Bhole
 Razmi, Shri S. K.
 Reddy, Shri H. S.
 Reddy, Shri Viswanath
 Richardson, Bishop
 Roy, Shri B. N.
 Roy Narain, Shri
 Sardar A. S.
 Sakona, Shri Mohanla
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sankanna, Shri
 Sankarapandian, Shri
 Sarma, Shri
 Satish Chandra, Shri
 Satyawadi, Dr.
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Sewal, Shri A. E.
 Shah, Shri E. B.
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Prof. D. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. R.
 Sharma, Shri E. C.
 Shobha Ram, Shri
 Shukla, Pandit B.
 Siddanajappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri Babunath
 Singh, Shri G. S.
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri L. J.
 Singh, Shri M. N.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Dr. S.
 Sinha, Shri A. P.
 Sinha, Shri Anrudha
 Sinha, Shri B. P.
 Sinha, Shri C. N. P.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha, Shri N. P.

Sinha, Shri S.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarakeswari
 Sivasana Singh, Shri
 Siva, Dr. Gangadhar
 Smetak, Shri
 Sothia, Shri K. C.
 Soman, Shri N.
 Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Suresh Chandra, Dr.
 Suriya Prasad, Shri
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Amma
 Syed Ahmed, Shri
 Syed Mahmud, Dr.
 Tandon, Shri
 Tek Chand, Shri
 Telikar, Shri
 Tewari, Sardar E. B. S.
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Tiwari, Shri V. N.
 Tiwari, Pandit B. L.
 Tiwari, Shri R.S.
 Tiwari, Pandit D. N.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Tripathi, Shri V. D.
 Tudu, Shri B. L.
 Tyagi, Shri
 Ukey, Shri
 Upadhyay, Shri M. D.
 Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Dayal
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Vaishnav, Shri H. G.
 Vaishya, Shri M. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Vartak, Shri
 Venkataraman, Shri
 Vidyalkar, Shri
 Vijaya Lakshmi, Shrimati
 Vishwanath Prasad, Shri
 Wilson, Shri J. N.
 Wodeyar, Shri
 Zaidi, Col.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I shall put the remaining six cut motions. The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I shall put all the Demands relating to Defence together to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 108 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was **adopted**.

[As directed by Mr. Deputy-Speaker the Motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND NO. 11—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,23,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 12—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—ARMY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,13,30,43,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Army'."

DEMAND NO. 13—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—NAVY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,50,86,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Navy'."

DEMAND NO. 14—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,48,07,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force'."

DEMAND NO. 15—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE CHARGES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,65,51,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Non-Effective Charges'."

DEMAND NO. 16—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,33,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 108—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,33,34,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay'."

DEMAND NO. 22—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,96,95,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to consolidate the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,55,94,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 24—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,35,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

Activities of Diplomats and Diplomatic Establishments abroad

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakha-patnam): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure of Govt. to pursue a real Peace policy

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(i) *Foreign Policy and the relationship with the Anglo-American powers.*

(ii) *Withdrawal of India from the Commonwealth.*

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Sir, I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(ii) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Foreign Possessions in India

Shri K. Subrahmanyam (Vizianagaram): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Foreign Policy

Shri R. N. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The cut motions are now before the House for discussion.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I confess to a sense of trepidation to initiate the debate on the foreign policy of our country, for the reason that I readily agree that the foreign policy of any country is a territory which has got to be trodden rather carefully. Looking through the Demands for Grants I personally do not consider the expenditure of under Rs. four crores in terms of the total Budget as anything very excessive towards the maintenance of the instruments through which our foreign policy is executed. But before I take up my own cut motion for detailed examination, I may be permitted to make a few general observations on the scope and structure of our foreign policy.

I have been rather steeped in Nehruyana to such an extent that I readily concede that there is nothing exceptional in the enunciation of the principles which are supposed to guide our nation's foreign policy. In fact, I am here to freely acknowledge that the enunciations made by our Prime Minister, who is also our Foreign Minister, during the past few years constitute the chirpings of the immortal soul of the human being, and I also recognise that the Prime Minister, who is also the Foreign Minister, has devoted considerable time and enthusiasm to pursue the quest of the ascent of man. But I am also here to say without any fear of contradiction that the foreign policy of a country

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

cannot be limited to generalisation, that the foreign policy of a country must be conditioned, as it is remorselessly conditioned, by the blunt realities of a world at war, with the result that even on this very solemn occasion when, as I said earlier, I feel rather hesitant to speak on foreign affairs, I must say a few things with a sense of responsibility. They might hurt some people, but I give you my personal assurance that I have not come here in search of a romp of scandals.

Before I do so, I would like to draw the attention of this House to three or four major points of our foreign policy with which I am in complete agreement. Indeed my heart was gladdened when I saw that our Government was unable and unwilling, and said so and remained so, to sign the San Francisco version of the Japanese Peace Treaty, and eventually signed their own with Japan. I am also here freely to acknowledge the marvellous intervention sought to be made, though it turned out to be a case of "Ives labour lost", when the Prime Minister intervened on Korea in his telegrams to Stalin and Acheson. I am also here to pay a tribute to the initiative displayed by the Prime Minister in regard to the convocation of the Asian Relations Conference, though I am sorry to say that the follow-up was not as brilliant or as consistent as could have been in other circumstances.

To my mind the foreign policy of this country can be summed up in two words which the hon. Prime Minister, who is also the Foreign Minister, has made famous during the past few years 'dynamic neutrality'. I have listed down some of his very favourite expressions, the Prime Minister's favourite expressions, like, "No gang-ing up with world Powers", 'Dynamic neutrality', "Resistance to aggression", "Where peace is in peril we would not sit quiet". These expressions are in full consonance with our Indian heritage: "*Yada yada dharmasya glanirbhavati Bharatah . . .*" I have no quarrel with that. But it occurs to me, and I must say without fear of contradiction, that the so-called policy of dynamic neutrality which we have been pursuing during the last few years is neither dynamic nor neutral. I think I should say without any qualms of conscience that it is a very far cry from the statement made by the Prime Minister in 1931 that "the corpse of Bhagat Singh shall stand between us and England" to the hoisting of the British flag on this Parliament House we saw done only a few days ago. I am treading on dangerous

ground, but I am going to say here without any hesitation that the presence of Rs. 800 crores of British investment in our midst, with the presence of a similar amount of sterling balances in London, with the Imperial preference always there as a cardinal point of our economic and fiscal policy, with the interlocking of our Defence Services, with the Commander-in-Chief taking part in the discussions of the Imperial General Staff—it is clearly shown that we are not neutral but that we belong to a bloc, a bloc of Powers. Secondly,—I am afraid to say this but I say it with a sense of responsibility, and I am a keen student of economics and financial affairs—the way in which day by day our country's economy is being percolated by American dollar diplomacy makes me feel sad. When this \$1,000 million loan which has been mooted these days comes to be paid out to India, I think the circle will become complete. I am here freely to say this and I say that without any reservations, that I am not smitten with any phobia towards any country. My country, India, first and last, right or wrong. I am here to voice my feelings about maintaining not only the territorial integrity of this country but also the prestige of this country abroad.

Let me briefly go through the balance-sheet of our foreign policy during the past five years. We are supporting our neighbour Governments in Burma and Nepal, one with a loan and the other with material and equipment. But in the case of Malaya, Indo-China and Ceylon we have scuttled our ships. See the contrast, Sir, see the contrast. I can go on building up indices like this as regards the lack of a sense of hard reality in regard to several countries in the world. Take two examples. In the case of Egypt we are unable to send our Ambassador there because we are unable to make up our mind regarding the recognition of the King of Egypt as the King of Sudan also. In the case of Palestine, from the lofty heights reached by Ambassador Asaf Ali at the special Palestine session in March, 1947, when he demanded the presence of the Jew before the bar of the U. N. O., it is one sad story of decline. Even today we do not recognise Israel.

Since I do not have the time to go into the foreign policy of this country in respect of every one of our neighbours, near and distant, I would leave it there and pass on to an examination of the implications of the cut motion standing in my name. I respectfully submit to this House and particularly

to the Prime Minister, who is also the Foreign Minister, the proposition that we are not properly screening, selecting, training and controlling our diplomats who are sent out abroad. We have sent out a ventriloquist in one of the delegations. We know that a dispute over a nursemaid had smashed up our embassy in Argentina. I am not here to rake up old scandals. I only want to know whether we are benefiting from our past experience as a result of lack of proper control over our diplomats abroad. These are small things but I shall now pass on to two sets of major propositions which I beg the Leader of the House to remember in connection with the formulation of his foreign policy.

There is no recorded instance in world history where the diplomats of a country arrogated to themselves the functions of policy-making and policy-execution. I have recorded down here the statement which one of our Ambassadors made. It was a policy pronouncement which had not been authorised by the Government of India. I do not like to mention names. I can mention them, but I believe in dignity and decorum, and because I am anxious to see that the foreign policy of my country is properly executed I shall merely refer to broad instances. I know of two recorded instances where our Ambassadors to Washington and Moscow publicly condemned the internal and domestic policies of the countries to which the person had been accredited. I know the instance of another Ambassador who arrogated to himself the right to give his personal opinion on a question of the highest importance bearing on world peace. I know of three of our diplomats viz. in Brussels, Cairo and Teheran, who a few years ago publicly endorsed the police action in Hyderabad. Have you any other instance in world history of this kind? I beg the Leader of the House to remember that there is a tremendous necessity to have some kind of control and check over Indian diplomats abroad, who are merely the instruments for the execution of the foreign policy which this House may lay down in consultation with the directions of the Leader of the House.

I want to refer to another aspect of the question in regard to our embassies abroad. I have listed down here certain facts. Our Washington embassy had six tenants in five years. One of our diplomats has been pushed around different countries of the globe five times within less than five years. I know of a very important embassy in this city where from the Ambassador

down to the doormat all have stayed ever since they came here. To know a country would take a number of years. I do not know why this kind of constant shifting is taking place in almost every one of our diplomatic establishments, barring perhaps London and one or two other instances where the incumbents were more permanent. I am making a very serious and a very sincere suggestion to the Foreign Minister to ensure that when people are selected and sent abroad they are continued in their tenancy for a reasonable period of time, so that they can understand the countries to which they are accredited and they can send to us information which is of vital importance in the formulation of our own national foreign policy.

I would like in brief to make a reference to some of the treaties of friendship which have been entered into by us during the course of the last few years. I am not saying what I am going to say in a mood of levity; I am saying it with a sense of responsibility. Our treaty of friendship with Afghanistan dated January 4, 1950, mentions in Article 2 "everlasting peace and friendship"; but Article 9, para. 2 stipulates that the treaty is only for five years, terminable at six months' notice. Our treaty with Iran dated March 15, 1950 mentions in Article 1 "perpetual peace and friendship"; and no notice of termination is provided for. Take our treaty with Nepal, dated July 31, 1950. Article 1 mentions "everlasting peace and friendship", but Article 10 stipulates one year's notice of termination. Our treaty with Indonesia dated March 3, 1951, mentions in Article 1—"perpetual peace and unalterable friendship"; and no notice. It occurs to me as a serious student of these documents that these expressions "perpetual peace", "everlasting peace"; "unalterable friendship" etc. and the provision of notice of termination, the non-provision of notice of termination—all these must be uniform and consistent in all treaties. I am making a humble suggestion on the floor of this House to the hon. the Leader of the House, who is also the Foreign Minister, that there must be some sort of basic, cardinal approach to all these treaties, because the foreign policy of a country is executed in terms of treaties which are registerable at the Secretariat of the United Nations.

I have a book here by Dr. Ganju described as being lately the Secretary for Information of the A.I.C.C., with a preface by my hon. friend

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

Dr. Keskar, who happened to be the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time when he wrote that preface a few months ago. I beg leave of the House to read two passages from it. On page 32, you have the following lines:

"It is felt, and not without justification, that our Foreign Ministry continues to be led by fads and not by facts, even though it has already cost us a great deal."

Another passage on pages 29-30 runs thus:

"Yet, the Government move on with their own policy, with their own interpretation of that policy, without anyone to question them, without any opposition from any quarter for there hardly exists any party strong enough to oppose the Government, even if they move slowly, suspiciously, secretly, or the wrong way. Not even the once mighty Congress dare oppose the Prime Minister . . . He can move any way he likes, and he is quite conscious of this . . ."

As I have said, I have the profoundest regard for the Prime Minister, who is the Foreign Minister, but I must say with all sense of responsibility that I possess that the whims and caprices of a single individual cannot constitute the policy of any nation. It must be formulated by a remorseless process of study, understanding, co-operative effort and the pooling of intelligence and experience. In order not to strike a discordant note or a pessimistic note, I shall leave this there, and shall only make two constructive suggestions for the consideration of the hon. the Prime Minister and the House.

I have heard it said that there is a move on the part of the Government to abolish the Standing Committee attached to the Ministry of External Affairs. I want an assurance from the hon. the Leader of the House that no such thing would be permitted to happen. If I am misinformed, I am prepared to withdraw what I have said. On the other hand, I am anxious to see that some institution like the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S.A. is brought into existence in this land, so that the Treasury Benches and the Opposition, both in this House and outside, can cooperate in terms of a bi-partisan foreign policy. I have

known the manner in which the present Administration in the U.S.A. has chosen people from the opposite camp to be their spokesmen abroad. A similar thing can happen in India and should happen in India. A similar thing has happened for years together in England. That is why I say, with the greatest personal regard for the Prime Minister, that the time has come when we should sit together as realists; the time has come when we should drop the pose of moralism, or even a romantic international approach, as I would like to call it. It is time we build up sanctions in this land. It is time we mobilise public opinion for our foreign policy, because as I said at the opening of my speech there is no one, even on this side of the House, who would like to imperil the security of this country, and I am sure that if a right approach is made by the Leader of the House there will be a tremendous response in this country towards the execution of the foreign policy based upon realism and the needs of this land.

Finally, I would like to end up with one single simple remark. It is this. For the Prime Minister there is a tremendous amount of goodwill in this land, and to my personal knowledge there is an equal amount of goodwill all over the world. Let him not squander it. I make an appeal. Let him take the people into his confidence. Let him take all sections in this House into his confidence, and let a policy be evolved and executed which will be in the best interests of this country.

सेठ गोविन्द बास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
मैं ने उन सब कटौतियों (cuts) को देखा जो कि यहाँ पर हमारे सामने आने वाली हैं और अभी मैं ने डाक्टर लंका मुन्दरम् जी के भाषण को भी बड़े ध्यान से सुना। उन के भाषण को सुन कर मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ कि जो हमारी वैदेशिक नीति है उस का वह यथार्थ में समर्थन करते हैं। उन्होंने जो बड़ी बड़ी बातें हमारी वैदेशिक नीति में हैं उन की चर्चा अपने भाषण के आरम्भ में ही की और उस चर्चा के बाद उन्होंने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को इस बात के लिये बधाई दी कि उन्होंने समय समय पर उन बड़ी बड़ी नीतियों का

अनुसरण किया। उस भाषण में छोटी छोटी बातें सुन कर और छोटी छोटी बातों में विरोध देख कर मुझे कुछ आश्चर्य हुआ। उन के भाषण में एक बात को सुन कर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति अमेरिकन डालर के अनुसार चलती है * * * * *

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : गलत क्या है ?

सेठ गोबिन्द बास : बिल्कुल गलत है। और क्यों गलत है इसके प्रमाण आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। क्या डाक्टर लंका सुन्दरम् उस समय को भूल गये कि जिस समय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा था कि ३८वें अंश का उल्लंघन करना सारे संसार के लिये बुरी बात होगी ? क्या वह उस अवसर को भी भूल गये कि जब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा था कि चीन को यू० एन० ओ० (U.N.O.) में लेने की नितांत आवश्यकता है। जिस जापानी संधि की उन्होंने चर्चा की उस जापानी संधि के सम्बन्ध में भी वह इस बात को भूल गये कि उस समय अमेरिका की हमारे प्रति क्या भावनायें थी। चीन में उस जापानी संधि पर हमारे हस्ताक्षर न करने के कारण हमारे लिये जो भावनायें हैं उन्हें मेरी बहन श्री विजयलक्ष्मी जी यहां बतलायेंगी। आज हमारे दाहिनी ओर बैठने वाले और उपाध्यक्षजी, आप के बाईं ओर बैठने वाले जो यह बड़े बड़े चीन और रूस के समर्थक हैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन को स्वयं, चीन और रूस की क्या स्थिति है और आज चीन और रूस हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का कितना समर्थन कर रहे हैं, यह बात नहीं मालूम। तो डाक्टर लंका सुन्दरम् का यह कहना कि अमेरिकन डालर के अनुसार हमारी वैदेशिक नीति चलती है इससे क्यादा गलत बात और दूसरी कोई नहीं हो सकती।

फिर जरा हम देखें कि आज हमें स्वतन्त्र हुए बहुत समय नहीं हुआ है। हम कोई बहुत शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र भी नहीं हैं। हमारे पास बहुत धन भी नहीं है इतने पर भी यदि आज हमारा इतना सम्मान सारे संसार में हो गया है तो इसका क्या कारण है। हमें इस पर विचार करना है। और गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करना है मेरी दृष्टि से इस के तीन प्रधान कारण हैं। पहला कारण है हमारे देश की महानता और उस का इतना पुराना इतिहास और इतनी पुरानी संस्कृति। दूसरा कारण है हमारे इस युग में महात्मा गांधी के सद्दृश्य महापुरुष का अवतार लेना और हमें सत्य और अहिंसा के मार्ग से स्वराज्य दिलाना। और तीसरा कारण है हमारी वैदेशिक नीति, जिस का सारा श्रेय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को है। तो हम इन सब बातों की ओर आंख मूंद लें और आंख मूंद कर हम केवल छोटी छोटी बातों को देखा करें, यह बड़ी हास्यास्पद बात है।

मैंने अभी आप से निवेदन किया कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का सारा श्रेय हमारे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को है परन्तु उसी के साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति हमारे देश की प्राचीन परम्परा के अनुसार भी है। हम ने कभी भी अपने इतिहास में दूसरे देशों को दबोचने या अपने राज्य को बढ़ाने का विचार नहीं किया है। हमारे देश का विदेशों के साथ सब से अधिक सम्बन्ध सम्राट अशोक के समय में रहा और यदि अशोक काल का इतिहास आप देखें तो पायेंगे कि उस समय जो हमारा सम्बन्ध दूसरे देशों से था वह मैत्री का सम्बन्ध था, प्रेम का सम्बन्ध था। फिर अपनी वैदेशिक नीति में हम ने सदा इस बात का प्रयत्न किया और प्रत्येक युग में इस बात का

[संठ गोविन्द दास]

प्रयत्न करते रहे कि जो दबे हुए हैं उन को उभारना है, उन को ऊंचा उठाना है। आधुनिक काल में भी यदि आप दृष्टि डालेंगे तो हमारी जो बंदेशिक नीति है वह इन्हीं बातों के अनुसार मिलेगी। जिस समय हम स्वतंत्र नहीं हुये थे लेकिन महात्मा गांधी के कारण हमारी आबाज की कुछ कीमत दुनिया में हो गई थी उस समय के इतिहास को भी अगर आप देखें तो हम ने सदा यही प्रयत्न किया था। सन् १९२१ में महात्मा गांधी के हाथ में हमारे देश की बागडोर आई। इसी साल मुस्तफ़ा कमाल पाशा को हम ने बर्खास्त दी। सन् १९२७ में हम ने चीन को बर्खास्त दी, मिथ, सीरिया, बेल्लेस्टाइन और ईराक के साथ हम ने अपनी सहानुभूति प्रदर्शित की, फ्रांसिजम और नात्सीइजम का विरोध किया, स्पेन के प्रजातांत्रिक दल से हम ने सहानुभूति प्रकट की, चीन पर जापान के आक्रमण का हम ने विरोध किया, इंडोनीशिया और इंडोचाइना के जितने स्वातंत्र्य के आंदोलन हुए उन सब का हम ने समर्थन किया। यह सब हम ने उस समय किया जिस समय कि हम स्वतंत्र नहीं हुए थे, और स्वतंत्रता के पश्चात् भी यदि आप देखेंगे तो आप को मालूम होगा कि हम ने इसी नीति का अनुसरण किया है।

अभी डा० लंका सुन्दरम् ने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के स्टालिन और एचीसन को लिखे गये पत्रों का जिक्र किया। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन पत्रों में जो कुछ कहा गया था उस का चाहे कोई प्रत्यक्ष नतीजा न निकला हो लेकिन वह पत्र जो सन् १९५० में लिखे गये थे उन का एक ऐतिहासिक महत्व है और संसार के इतिहास में उन पत्रों का महत्व

रहने वाला है। यहां पर जो एशियन कांफ़ेस हुई जिस में कितने ही देशों के लोग आये उसका भी साथ श्रेय, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को है और वह एशियन कांफ़ेस भी एक ऐतिहासिक वस्तु थी, इस से हम आंख नहीं मींच सकते। उस के बाद भी, जैसा मैंने जिक्र किया, कोरिया के सम्बन्ध में, चीन को यू० एन० ओ० में लेने के सम्बन्ध में, जापान से सुलह के सम्बन्ध में हुई इन सब बातों में हम ने अपनी प्राचीन परम्परा का, अपनी प्राचीन बंदेशिक नीति का ही अनुसरण किया है। हम देखते हैं कि हमारी इस नीति के कारण कभी अमेरिका नाराज हो जाता है और कभी रूस और चीन नाराज हो जाते हैं और हमारे दाहिनी ओर बैठे हुए लोग तो सदा ही नाराज रहते हैं। क्या करें हम विवाद है, कोई उपाय नहीं। यदि कोई यह बीड़ा उठा कर यहां आया हो और बैठा हो कि चाहे अच्छी बातें हों या बुरी बातें हों, कोई भी बातें हों, हमें तो उन का विरोध ही करना है तो ऐसे लोगों के सम्बन्ध में कोई दबा, कोई इलाज नहीं है। लेकिन हमें अपनी बंदेशिक नीति पर विश्वास है और जब तक इस देश की जनता हमारे ऊपर विश्वास प्रकट कर के यहां बिठाती है तब तक, हम उसी नीति का अनुसरण करने वाले हैं। इस प्रकार हम देखते हैं कि संसार के नैतिक क्षेत्र में हम ने इस नीति को खरी नीति सिद्ध कर दिया है। अब पश्चिम क्षेत्र में भी हमें सफलता प्राप्त करनी है। इस दृष्टि से हमें कुछ विचार करना है। एशिया के देशों की सारी समस्याएँ एक सी हैं। सब देशों में शरीबी है और उस शरीबी का कारण मुख्यतः उत्पादन की कमी और जनबल तथा प्राकृतिक साधनों का उपयोग न होना है। इस का कारण यह है कि एशिया के सभी देश अशिक्षित हैं, उन के पास बिक्षेपन्न नहीं

है और उन के पास धन नहीं है। यदि आप विचार करेंगे तो आप को मालूम होगा कि एशिया के देशों में सर्वत्र यही बातें हैं जब उपाय इस का क्या है। इस का उपाय यह है कि एक दूसरे को समझ कर सहानुभूति के साथ एक दूसरे की समस्याओं पर विचार करें। मैं एक दृष्टांत आप को दूंगा। कुछ देशों में बहुत अधिक आबादी है और कुछ देशों में आबादी की बहुत कमी है। भारत में एक वर्ग मील के पीछे और पाकिस्तान में भी एक वर्ग मील के पीछे ३४१ आदमी निवास करते हैं, जापान में ४०८, चीन में भी करीब करीब इतने ही। मैं अभी आस्ट्रेलिया और न्यूजीलैंड गया था, आस्ट्रेलिया में एक वर्ग मील के पीछे केवल चार आदमी रहते हैं, न्यूजीलैंड में आठ और मैं ने सुना है कि कनाडा में भी करीब चार आदमी निवास करते हैं। आस्ट्रेलिया और न्यूजीलैंड वाले समझते हैं कि आबादी का प्रश्न उन देशों से सम्बन्ध रखता है जिन देशों में अधिक आबादी है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यथार्थ बात ऐसी नहीं है। यह प्रश्न सारे देशों से सम्बन्ध रखता है और सारे देशों की वैदेशिक नीति से सम्बन्ध रखता है। यह एक बड़ा मसला है। इन देशों में आबादी बहुत कम है उन्हें अधिक आबादी की आवश्यकता है। कॅनेडा के सेनेटर रूबक ने लिखा है :

“History has shown that if you neglect to use the territory which is yours to cultivate and to occupy and in consequence you are unable to defend the territory which has been assigned to you in due season some one else will use it and occupy it.”

हमारे बंगाल के जो पुराने गवर्नर मि० कॅसी ये उन्होंने भी लिखा है :

“If we fail to populate Australia quickly enough, we run the risk of losing our country.”

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी बतला दूँ कि रे मीडेट टूमैन ने इस बात को स्वीकार करते हुए लिखा है “We can develop the world to meet the pressure of populations in countries like China and India and Central Europe. It can be done. It is not impossible.” आप सोचें और जिस समय वैदेशिक नीति पर विचार करें उस समय इस सम्बन्ध में आप अवश्य ध्यान दें। इस सम्बन्ध में भारत में अमेरिका के राजदूत मि० चैस्टर बाउल्स ने एक बड़ा सा लेख लिखा है। इस लेख के अन्तिम अंश को पढ़ कर मैं आप लोगों के सामने सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने लिखा है : “Let us hope that the present Congress will accept the challenge of our foolishly restrictive and discriminatory immigration laws. The time for honest, principled, democratic action is long over due.”

आज दुनिया की हालत क्या है, आज दुनिया की हालत यह है कि इस दुनिया के आधे निवासी बड़े सुखी हैं और उन्हें किसी चीज की आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन आधे निवासी ऐसे हैं जिन के पास न भूमि है, जिन के पास न रहने को घर है, और न किसी प्रकार की जरूरी चीजें उन के पास हैं। दुनिया की यह हालत सदा नहीं रहेगी। आज जो सुखी हैं उन को सुखी नहीं रहने दिया जायेगा। यह बातें संघर्षों,

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

युद्धों, और विप्लवों की जड़ है। आबादी के विषय को भी उसी प्रकार आप को विचारना होगा जिस प्रकार दूसरे विषयों को विचारा जाता है और इस विषय में विशेषतः सहानुभूति के साथ विचार करना होगा। क्या हमारी सारी भूमि और सारे संसर्गिक साधनों का उपयोग हो चुका है। यदि आप कनाडा को देखें, आस्ट्रेलिया को देखें, अफ्रीका को देखें, ब्रिटिश गायना को देखें, ब्राजील को देखें, अरजेंटायना और न्यूजीलैंड को देखें, किसी भी देश को आप देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि यह बात सही नहीं है। अब जब कि दुनिया इतनी छोटी हो गई है तब कुछ देशों में जरूरत से ज्यादा आबादी हो जैसा हमारे ऐशियाई देशों में है, और कुछ में नहीं के बराबर। यह बात चल नहीं सकती।

12 Noon

में अन्य बातों के साथ साथ ४५५
प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वैदेशिक नीति पर विचार करते समय वह इस प्रहत्व के सवाल को न भूलें और इस आबादी के सवाल पर अवश्य विचार करें। जब हमारा कामनवैलथ (Commonwealth) से सम्बन्ध है तो कम से कम कामनवैलथ के इन देशों में जहाँ की आबादी बहुत कम है और जहाँ आबादी की नितान्त आवश्यकता है, वहाँ हमारी जन-संख्या घानी चाहिये। हम किसी के ऊपर जबरदस्ती कोई चीज नहीं लादना चाहते। जहाँ तक मूल निवासी लोग हैं हम उन के हितों के बीच में नहीं आना चाहते। उन को हम किसी प्रकार परेशानी में नहीं डालना चाहते। लेकिन यदि आप आस्ट्रेलिया को देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि आस्ट्रेलिया का क्षेत्रफल कितना है। वह हिन्दुस्तान से भी बड़ा

है। यदि आप कनाडा को देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि वहाँ पर मूल निवासी नहीं हैं। अफ्रीका में यह प्रश्न अवश्य उठता है मगर अफ्रीका में आज जिस प्रकार का आन्दोलन चल रहा है उस से आप को मालूम होगा कि अफ्रीका में भी भारतीय वहाँ के मूल निवासियों के विरुद्ध कोई काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। वह वहाँ के मूल निवासियों के साथ मिल कर आन्दोलन में भाग ले रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं आप से निवेदन करता हूँ कि जहाँ तक मूल निवासियों का ताल्लुक है हमारे भारतीय जहाँ कहीं भी है वह वहाँ के मूल निवासियों को किसी प्रकार का भी कष्ट देना नहीं चाहते हैं। मगर उन लोगों की आबादी इन देशों में बहुत ही कम है इसलिये मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारी जैसी परिस्थिति है और जैसी परिस्थिति ऐशियाई देशों की है, उस परिस्थिति में हम को भी इन देशों में स्थान मिलना चाहिये।

में अन्त में फिर अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी को उन की इस वैदेशिक नीति के लिये हृदय से बधाई देता हूँ। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस नीति का अनुसरण करते हुए और आज हमारे देश का संसार में जो स्थान है उस को देखते हुए और हमारा कामनवैलथ देशों के साथ जो सम्बन्ध है उसको मद्देनजर रखते हुए और इस आबादी के प्रश्न को और जो दूसरे प्रश्न हैं उन पर विचार करेंगे। और इन प्रश्नों को विचार करने में यह स्थल करेंगे कि दुनिया जो आज आधी सुखी है और आधी दुखी है, ऐसी परिस्थिति नहीं चल सकती।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अन्त में मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी को उन की वैदेशिक नीति पर फिर बधाई देता हूँ और उस का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

(English translation of the above speech)

Seth Govind Das (Mandla-Jabalpur South): Sir, I have seen through all those cut-motions which will come before the House, and also heard attentively what Dr. Lanka Sundaram said just a short while back. In the beginning of his speech he mentioned the major aspects of our foreign policy, and congratulated the Prime Minister upon the major policies adopted from time to time. This gave me an impression that he supported our foreign policy in the real sense of the term. I was slightly astonished at those minor things which he said in opposition to it. In particular, I was very much pained to hear him say that our foreign policy moved at the bidding of the American dollar.....

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-Bagh West): What is wrong in this statement?

Seth Govind Das: It is absolutely wrong. Why it is wrong, I would like to put before you the proof. Has Dr. Lanka Sundaram forgotten that occasion when our Prime Minister said that the crossing of the 38th Parallel may entangle the whole world in war? Has he forgotten that occasion as well when our Prime Minister said that China should very urgently be made a member of the U.N.O. He also forgot the attitude of America towards India on the occasion of the Japanese Treaty, which he referred to. What China thinks of India for her not having signed that Japanese Treaty, will be stated by my hon. sister Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi. Sir, I would like to confess to all these supporters of Russia and China who are sitting on my right hand and on your left hand side that they themselves do not know the conditions prevailing in China and Russia nor the support that the two countries are giving to our foreign policy. There cannot be a more wrong statement than the one made by Dr. Lanka Sundaram that our foreign policy was guided by the American dollar.

Also, we have not been independent for long, nor do we constitute a very powerful nation. We do not have much wealth either. What is then the reason for the respect that we command in the world? We have to think it out seriously. To me, there are three main reasons for it. The first one is the greatness of our country, its ancient history and the age-old culture. The second one is the incarnation of a great soul like Mahatma Gandhi, who won

63 P.S.D.

for us independence by Truth and non-violence. And the third reason is our foreign policy which is to be accredited solely to our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. How very ridiculous it is to ignore all these major things and look only to minor ones.

Just now I submitted that the entire credit for the soundness of our foreign policy goes to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But I would also like to say that our foreign policy works in accordance with the ancient tradition of our country. Never in the annals of our land, have we ever thought of crushing other countries or extending our territory. Of all the times, and mostly in the Ashokan age, we have had connections with other countries; and if you turn the pages of history, Sir, you will know that the ties have been of love and friendship. Throughout different times our foreign policy has shown a tendency for the uplift of the down-trodden. In present times as well you will find our foreign policy working on those very lines. Even before our independence when our voice carried some weight in the world because of the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, there was the same tendency. The Mahatma took up the leadership of our country in 1921. That very year we sent felicitations to Mustafa Kamal Pasha. In 1927 we felicitated China, expressed sympathy for Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Iraq, protested against Fascism and Nazism, sent our sympathies to the democratic party of Spain, protested against the Japanese aggression on China, and supported all the freedom movements of Indonesia and Indo-China. We did all this at a time when we were not independent. If you only look a little more deeply you will know that we have maintained this very policy even after independence.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram mentioned just now the letters written to Stalin and Acheson by our Prime Minister. Here I would like to make it clear that the contents of those letters which were written to them in 1950 were of historical importance, and will continue to be so in the history of world, no matter that they yielded no results. The credit for convening that historical Asian Conference in which many people from various countries participated also goes to our Prime Minister. We cannot close our eyes to it. Even after that, as I mentioned, our foreign policy as a whole continues to work according to our ancient traditions in so far as the question of Korea, the question of U.N.O. membership for China and signing of a peace treaty with Japan were concerned. We find

[Seth Govind Das]

that at times America is annoyed and at times Russia and China get angry with us for this policy of ours while the hon. Members on our right hand side are always annoyed with us. We feel helpless, there seems to be no way out. If a member is resolved to come here for opposition only regardless of the fact that his point of opposition is good or bad, nothing can deter him from doing so. All the same we have full confidence in our foreign policy, and so long as the masses of this country support us. I should like to be frank to say that we shall continue to follow that very policy. We have proved this policy to be sound in the moral sphere of this world; but we have to achieve success in the mundane sphere as well. That should be our approach. All the Asian countries are faced with problems of similar nature. Each country is confronted with poverty, the main reason for which is the shortage of production and the non-utilization of man-power and natural resources. It happens so because the majority in all the Asian countries are uneducated, and there is a dearth of specialists and monetary resources. If you just think over it you will see that these conditions prevail everywhere in Asian countries. What is the remedy now? Only that we should understand each other and consider the problems sympathetically. This I will illustrate. Some countries are densely populated while in others the population is quite sparse. The population per square mile in India and Pakistan is 341, in Japan it is 408, and in China it is about the same as in Japan. Recently I had been to Australia and New Zealand. In Australia population per square mile is only 4, and in New Zealand it is 8. I have also heard that the population per square mile in Canada is about 4. Australians and New Zealanders feel that the problem of population concerns the thickly populated countries only.

I want to say that in reality it is not so. This problem concerns all the countries and has much to do with their foreign policies. It is a big problem. These countries are sparsely populated and need inhabitants. The Canadian Senator Roubec writes: "History has shown that if you neglect to use the territory which is yours to cultivate and to occupy and in consequence you are unable to defend the territory which has been assigned to you, in due season, some one else will use it and occupy it."

Sometime Governor of Bengal, Mr. Cassey has also written: "If we fail to

populate Australia quickly enough, we run the risk of losing our country."

Alongside, I may tell you what President Truman writes in agreement with the above. "We can develop the undeveloped parts of the world to meet the pressure of populations in countries like China and India and Central Europe. It can be done. It is not impossible."

You think over it and do keep in mind that fact while thinking over the foreign policy. Mr. Charles Bowles, the American Ambassador in India, has written a lengthy article in connection with this problem. I want to read out the last portion of that article. He writes: "Let us hope that the present Congress will accept the challenge of our foolishly restrictive and discriminatory immigration laws. The time for honest, principled, democratic action is long over due."

What is the position of the world today? Half of its population is happily very comfortable, and practically needs nothing while the other half is without any lands or houses or other necessities of life. Such a state of affairs cannot continue for long.

Those who are comfortable to-day, will not for long be allowed that comfort. These things give rise to struggles, wars and revolutions. The question of population shall have to be considered by you in the same way as you have considered other questions; it needs, however, a sympathetic attention all the more. Have our lands and natural resources been utilized fully? If you look to any of the countries, such as Canada, Australia, Africa, British Guinea, Brazil, Argentine or New Zealand, you will find that we are backward in this respect. The world has become so small now. Such a state of affairs cannot continue that some countries like those in Asia be very densely populated while others may have scanty population.

Among other things, I would like to request the Prime Minister that he may bear in mind the importance of this population problem while considering the foreign policy. In view of our relations with the Commonwealth countries, our population should be allowed to move to those places in the Commonwealth where more and more population is needed. We do not want to force anything upon any country. We do not want to come in between the interests of the aboriginals, nor do we want to trouble them. Look to Australia. In area it is bigger than India. And if you look to Canada, you will find that there are no aboriginals.

Similar question arises in Africa, but from the present day movement there you will find that the Indian residents are not going against the aborigines of that place. Indians are participating with the aborigines in the movement. I, therefore, submit that our emigrants, wherever they have settled, do not want to trouble the aborigines in any way. But the population of the aborigines in those countries is very scanty; and thus keeping in view the pressure of population in Asian countries as also the present position, I would like to say that we should be given place to live in those scantily populated countries.

In the end, I once again thank the Prime Minister for his foreign policy. I hope while keeping in view our position in the international politics and the relation with the Commonwealth countries, he will consider the question of population and other such questions. I do hope he will feel that such a state of haves and have-nots in this world cannot continue for long.

Sir, once more I congratulate the Prime Minister for his foreign policy and support it heartily.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: The usual view hitherto in this House about the foreign policy pursued by the Congress Government under the leadership of Mr. Nehru has been one of general approval. I do not need to refer here to the enthusiastic panegyrics sung from the Congress benches in support of that policy. Even Members who have been critical of that policy, at least of certain aspects of that policy, have lent general support to it but it has never been considered in what complex of circumstances that policy was formulated. It is said to be a policy of neutrality. The architects of that policy have themselves been hard put to it all these years to explain or to define their policy properly. It has been said sometimes that it is a policy of neutralism and disentanglement with the rival power blocs that are competing for world supremacy today. It has been said sometimes that it is an independent foreign policy. It has been defined sometimes as a policy of dynamic neutralism. A very important point was ignored, that our foreign policy could never have been a policy of neutrality because from the very outset, we made certain very important commitments with one of the partners of the rival power blocs which compete for world supremacy today. I refer to our relationship with the Commonwealth, no longer defined as British. But, the fact remains that the most important constituent of that

Commonwealth of Nations is Great Britain till today, and the policy of that Commonwealth is none other than the policy of what is known as British Imperialism. Might be that we are having a new version of that imperialism today; but the fact remains that we are also a partner, a supporter of that policy, euphemistically termed the Commonwealth policy or the Commonwealth peace policy.

It has been claimed from the Congress Benches that the foreign policy pursued by the Congress Government for the last half decade has raised our status and prestige in the international comity of nations. But, look round, Sir! Where does our standing and prestige stand today? Look at South Africa; look nearer home at Ceylon; look at Malaya or Burma. We know where we stand today. We get slaps somewhere; we get kicks somewhere; we are crushed under the boots of Malanzism in South Africa. But, still it is claimed that our prestige stands very high. It is true that sometimes we indulge in displaying very high-sounding and lofty ideals as being the guiding principles of our foreign policy. We sometimes claim that we are playing a very great part as a factor in the world politics today. But, the way that we have built up our power potential belies that claim absolutely. Nobody cares for our words. If we appeal for peace, that appeal goes infructuous. We go with the beggar's bowl to America and to England for doles. Our plans of reconstruction which are meant to build up our power potential are supplementary to the plans that are formulated by the British Commonwealth of Nations under the leadership of Great Britain and nothing more than that. Our Defence forces are at the grip of the British General Staff. It is no use claiming that those officers have been lent to us by the British Government and that they are under our orders. They certainly are *de jure* under our orders. But, at the same time, may we ask why all these officers are invited from one power alone? If we need technical advice, if we need military advice, if we need Generals and Admirals to advise us as to how we should build up our navy, do we need to go to Britain alone?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): On a point of information. Sir, does my hon. friend want that even Russian Generals and Admirals should be consulted?

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: My friend perhaps does not know that I am not

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

a member of the Communist party. I do not ask our Government to invite Generals and Admirals from Russia alone. May I ask, Sir, was it not a fact that certain German Generals and German Admirals of high standing, who were against the Nazis, who were in exile in Switzerland, had offered their services to the Government of India and their services were refused?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): It is not a fact. I deny that. This is the first time that I have heard of it. I have not heard of it before.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: The hon. Prime Minister has said that it is not a fact. But, will the hon. Prime Minister please explain why we have to go to Britain alone for this expert advice? There are other powers; there are experienced Generals, experienced Admirals and experienced Air Commodores and Air Marshals belonging to other nations as well. So, let us not boast of our neutralism. We irrevocably committed ourselves long, long ago, five years ago, with entanglements with the so-called Commonwealth of Nations, no longer termed British. But, the fact remains that we are in the Commonwealth, our economy is integrated with the Commonwealth economy. It was said on the floor of this House that our plans of reconstruction which are intended to build up our power potential, our military potential and all that are, as a matter of fact, supplementary to the plan of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The facts are what they are. Let us not shut our eyes to these things. We know that at certain moments our Prime Minister addressed letters to international statesmen, to Stalin and to President Truman for bringing about peace, for peaceful negotiations and settlement of the question of Korea. Where does the Korean matter stand now? What effect has that appeal produced? The time has come when we have to judge the foreign policy that is being pursued by the results that we find it has produced today. The plain fact is that we have no standing in the world of today as a power. We are looked upon as satellites of a power which is rated as a third-rate world power, I mean, Great Britain, and the foreign policy, the so-called independent foreign policy which we champion is nothing but a make-believe foreign policy, a foreign policy of supine self-satisfaction, a foreign policy which is intended to make our people at least, if not outsiders, believe that we are doing very great things

when we are really doing nothing. We are regarded as no factor in world politics. That remains the sum total, the overall result of our foreign policy today.

Shri B. Shiva Rao (South Kanara-South): As I listened to the last speaker, my mind went back to the biography of Disraeli which I had read many years ago. Disraeli was not only Prime Minister of England, but in his own way, a literary figure. And many ambitious authors used to send copies of their works to Disraeli in the hope of getting a favourable review. One day, it is said, Disraeli got a book from a young lady who had written her first volume. He read it, and sent back a letter in his own hand, and the letter was somewhat on these lines: "Dear lady", he said, "I have read your book with much interest, and there is a good deal in it which is new and true. But the only criticism I have to offer is, what is new is not true, and what is true is not new." That, Sir, I think aptly and very appropriately sums up the speech to which we have just listened.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): You are a Disraeli?

Shri B. Shiva Rao: So far as this debate is concerned, it is a little difficult when six cut motions have been lumped together on behalf of three Opposition groups without any indication, except from the two speakers who have spoken this morning, as to the line of reasoning in support of their cut motions, to be very precise. As the House saw yesterday and also this morning in the debate on Defence estimates, they combined for purposes of a division. But their speeches revealed a good deal of divergence in points of view, and sometimes they were diametrically opposite.

Now in regard to the estimates which we are now discussing on External Affairs, let me deal in the main with the cut motion which stands in the name of the spokesman of the Communist party which charges Government with failure to pursue a real peace policy. Precisely what the Communist party has in mind in making such an accusation, we shall not know until Mr. Hiren Mukerjee makes his speech at a later stage in this debate. So far, judging from the speeches which have been made from the Communist party benches in the last few days, that accusation seems to rest mainly, if not exclusively, on the failure of the Prime Minister to

call a world peace conference. It is easy to make such a suggestion. I hesitate to quote any poetry with so much of poetic talent on the other side; but, Sir, I was reminded of a couplet which I had read also a long time ago—a couplet without rhyme, but with a good deal of reason in it.

Shri Velayudhan: Who is the author of that couplet?

Shri B. Shiva Rao: The couplet is this:

“You may summon spirits from
the vasty deep. But will they
come?”

Every Foreign Minister. I presume, including our Prime Minister, has to consider whether, in the event of his summoning an international conference, in the first place the atmosphere is favourable for such a conference; and secondly, whether there would be an adequate response to such an invitation. Recently the Foreign Minister of a neighbouring State decided to summon the leading spirits of the vasty deep of the Middle East to create a Muslim bloc; but, if I may quote the words of the poet, did they come? May I remind hon. Members who make such a suggestion that in this very building, in another part of this building, two or three years ago, the Prime Minister called an international conference to discuss the problem of Indonesia. And that conference, I say, led to very fruitful and significant results. I refer to it because there is another cut motion which stands in the name of the Communist Member, Mr. H. N. Mukerjee which he is not proposing to move in this debate. I think he has shown more prudence than valour in that decision. Because that cut motion refers to the failure of the Government of India to champion the cause of the dependent races in Africa and in Asia.

I have already referred to the fact that India took a very leading part in hastening the independence of Indonesia. There is another country which owes its independence almost entirely to Indian initiative. I am referring to Libya. The independence of Libya was secured on the basis of certain resolutions put forward by India at the United Nations General Assembly Session in 1949. And I offer this fact to my hon. friends opposite without any comment the voting on that resolution for the independence of Libya which has now become an accomplished fact, the voting on that resolution was 48 in favour of that resolution and one against—and that was Ethiopia, because she had reasons of her own to oppose that resolution—and there

were out of those who attended that U.N. session, nine abstentions. There was no support forthcoming from those nine powers for the independence of Libya, and among those powers were France, New Zealand, Sweden and the entire Soviet bloc. India's part in the solution of the Libyan problem was described by the leader of the Libyan delegation who was also the President of the National Congress of Tripolitania—I am quoting his words—as having earned “the ever-lasting gratitude of the Libyan nation, and as having confirmed India's leadership in the struggle for the liberation of Africa and Asia”. That is a fitting answer to the charge so easily flung against the Prime Minister by hon. Members sitting opposite.

I have tried a little research on my own in the last day or two to see how far this accusation against the Prime Minister's foreign policy can be sustained from the records of the United Nations General Assembly. The hon. Member who initiated this debate has criticised his foreign policy as neither dynamic nor so neutral. I believe he was at one session of the General Assembly. I have been at four, and therefore, I may claim a little more knowledge of the working of that world organisation than the Member who initiated this debate. From time to time the Soviet Union initiates a debate on world peace. In that resolution are many parts, some passages condemning the preparations of war which are going on in other parts of the world, and other passages asking for power pacts in order to strengthen world peace. Now, what has been the attitude of India in regard to every one of these resolutions? India has consistently supported the positive parts of such resolutions, since they called upon all States to settle their disputes and differences by peaceful methods, and to refrain from resort to force or the threat of force. I will give the House an instance. In 1950 there was a resolution which urged united action for peace. India, acting on instructions from the External Affairs Ministry, took the stand that international peace and security depend not only on measures against aggression, but on the observance of the principles and the purposes of the United Nations; particularly on the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the maintenance of economic and social well-being in all countries. Every time that a debate has taken place in the U.N. Assembly on this general problem, India has urged the members of the United Nations to

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

stimulate universal respect for such rights. I think the leader of the Socialist Praja party who was a valued colleague of mine at the 1949 session, and who reflected very ably the views of the Government of India in that session, would join me in paying this tribute. India has always urged the members of the United Nations to stimulate respect for these rights and to intensify their efforts to achieve conditions of stability, and progress in under-developed areas. India has also laid stress on improving the machinery of the United Nations for the task of peace on every occasion. There was once a resolution also from the Soviet delegation, dealing with the threat of a new war, and the strengthening of peace and security amongst the nations. In the course of that debate the Indian delegation, again acting under the instructions of the External Affairs Ministry, submitted a resolution suggesting that economies which may be achieved by reducing armaments throughout the world should be utilised for the creation of a U.N. Peace Fund, for the development of under-developed areas.

I could go on multiplying instances, but as my time is short, I would point out to the House that on every occasion an attempt has been made in the direction of either universal disarmament or the establishment of international control over atomic energy, and its use for peaceful purposes. India has supported such moves without any reservations. My hon. friend Seth Govind Das has made a reference to certain concrete subjects in regard to which India has taken a very definite stand. So far as Korea is concerned, India has always asked for the creation of an independent and united Korea by means of free elections, and its economic rehabilitation. My hon. friend also referred to the fact that we did not sign the Japanese peace treaty at San Francisco. I believe it was only yesterday that the Indian Press carried the full text of the treaty we have just signed with Japan.

There is another point to which I would like to make a reference for the special benefit of the members of the Communist party. India has taken a very active interest in the liberation of South West Africa. In 1950 India took the initiative in formulating a resolution urging South Africa to respect the verdict of the International Court of Justice. And what was the voting on that occasion? 45 nations voted for the resolution. South Africa, of course, voted against it, but with

great regret and disappointment we noted that South Africa was not alone in that respect: the entire Soviet bloc and only the Soviet bloc voted with South Africa. These are matters which Members of the Opposition would do well to remember. So far as the liquidation of colonialism is concerned, there is literally no country in the world which has such a consistent and magnificent record as ourselves. I say this, because I have received letters from grateful people from all parts of the world; dependent races, wherever they may be, in Africa, in the Pacific, or in the Atlantic, have written in grateful appreciation of the efforts made by the Prime Minister and India in order to hasten their political emancipation. I say that this analysis, which must necessarily be brief, proves beyond challenge from the standpoint of every thinking and fair-minded person, that in our foreign policy, we have, throughout the years since we achieved independence, pursued a line designed to improve the prospects of world peace. In pursuing that line, whether in the United Nations or outside, sometimes we have found ourselves on the same side as the Western powers; sometimes we have found ourselves with the Soviet bloc; and sometimes we have dared to stand almost alone. If the prospects of world peace are somewhat bleak, as undoubtedly they are today, the responsibility lies elsewhere, and not on the shoulders of the Prime Minister.

There is one last observation which I would like to make, especially in view of some of the observations which were made by the last speaker. He could not understand "the enthusiastic panegyrics" which Members of the Congress party have showered on the Prime Minister for his foreign policy. I do not know for whom he speaks. Since statistics in respect of the General Elections have frequently been quoted on the floor of this House, may I also add my quota to it? The Communist party, in the elections to the House of the People, secured about 2.9 per cent. of the total votes, and yet they have the "courage" to challenge those who sit on this side of the House, in regard to the foreign policy of the Prime Minister. Some hon. Members are laughing at the observations I have just made, but in the hundreds of speeches which I made in my election campaign, I deliberately gave prominence to our foreign policy, but what did my friends of the Communist party do? After two weeks, they withdrew their candidate.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): We have defeated several Ministers also.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: On the basis of these incontrovertible figures, I say there is overwhelming support for the foreign policy of the Prime Minister, both in this House and outside.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): During the second world war, the famous political thinker of England, Mr. H. G. Wells described the foreign policy of Mr. Churchill as 'a pitiful jumble of incoherent nonsense'. I think the same may be said of our foreign policy also. I shall substantiate that statement towards the latter part of my speech. Now I shall confine myself to certain problems of international affairs.

Now we are witnessing a great and dismal drama, a world struggle, a perpetual cold war, a war of attrition that is going on between two ideologically muscle-bound giants. The whole world has been divided into two camps between America and Russia and each of them is trying to dominate the world. Each of them is trying to establish world hegemony. Once again the old game of power politics, secret diplomacy and spheres of influence have been revived. This has meant a race for arms and also meant countries lining up in rival blocs just to establish and maintain the balance of power in the world. If we look around the world today, we vividly see that the great nations, particularly the big powers, are increasingly in bondage to their Armies, Navies and Air Forces. This must naturally and inevitably lead to war with all its horrible and revolting consequences.

But, Sir, who is to avoid this calamity? Who is to avoid this spectre of chaos which is threatening to overwhelm and swallow up the world? Can Russia do it? No. Can America do it? No. Or can the U.N.O., that international organisation, do something in the matter? Definitely no. You must understand that America and Russia are equally responsible for these ugly and nefarious manifestations in international affairs. All their attempts to know, understand and appreciate each other have so far failed to yield any result. Nor can the U.N.O. which has become a victim of nefarious power politics restore peace and order among these rival States. Then I ask, who else can fulfil this job of peace making? I feel that India can and must take up this work of peace making. Today, unfortunately, India is sitting on a fence, playing the role of doubtful Hamlet, just witnessing the diplomatic dance

that is going on in the world without participating in it. I want that India should play the role of a peace-maker and if possible, invite all the statesmen of the world, particularly the statesmen of the two power blocs, to a conference in Delhi and make earnest efforts to bring about rapprochement between them. These two power blocs and statesmen may not agree and may refuse to agree with each other, but India should play the role of a peace-maker and should offer her good offices to these nations and bring about some sort of compromise on vital issues.

I know that the task of peace-making—and that too between America and Russia—is not an easy task. It is a great responsibility. It entails lot of patience, effort and devotion. Our Prime Minister may say that it is a gigantic task, a task which cannot be undertaken today because we are having so many numerous domestic problems of our own to which we have to pay our immediate attention. He may also feel that the two great Powers may not agree to our mediation effort. I know there are difficulties in the way. I know it is a stupendous responsibility. But the cause is great; so our efforts should be great. We must understand that only India with her great spiritual heritage of peace and goodwill is best fitted to play the part of a peace-maker. We may fail in our effort, but that need not upset us. Failure in peace-making is better than no peace-making at all.

I feel that our Prime Minister seems to be little bit modest, or shall I say, a little bit shy to take up this responsibility, or he may be suffering from fear complex. But I humbly appeal to him to get rid of this shackle of modesty, fear and shyness. If I have understood him correctly, the greater part of his life has been spent in pleading and writing for international peace and goodwill among nations, but unfortunately it has largely been theoretical and academic. It is not practical and constructive. There is no use, I must say, in making mere pious declarations and there is no use in praying for peace without organising the world for it. The Prime Minister should not do like the Christian theologian who prays for healing without going to the doctor.

I have taken much time over this issue because the problem of peace is all important. If we succeed in establishing peace, the whole world including India, will march on to millennium; if we do not succeed, the whole world including India will march on to oblivion.

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

As part of this peace offensive, I suggest that the Indian Government, particularly our Prime Minister who is also Foreign Minister, should take the initiative to bring about a revision and modernisation of the Charter of the U.N.O. The Charter of the U.N.O. has become an outmoded document; it has failed in its purpose, and particularly those sections of the Charter which deal with the veto system should be deleted. The veto system has been responsible for the insecurity of the world today. It has produced a peculiar U.N.O. arithmetic that one power is greater than ten. So this nefarious provision in the U.N. Charter should be deleted. At the same time, India should launch a world-wide movement for creating an international force under the auspices of the U.N.O. Further, the U.N.O. should be made more comprehensive to include all the nations of the world irrespective of smallness or bigness.

Now, I will deal with the question of the liquidation of colonialism. I will end within two minutes. I have got a memorandum by the *Bharat Yuvak Sangh*. There they have depicted very vividly that our policy towards foreign pockets in India has been a failure. The Government of India has not done anything so far to acquire these foreign pockets. It is nearly four years since we concluded an Indo-French agreement and no action has been taken yet to see that a referendum is held in these conclaves. Moreover, the French Government is taking advantage of this breathing time and it has begun to consolidate its hold on these foreign pockets. Now, I will read a paragraph wherein it has been stated that the Government's foreign policy is just helping the anti-Indian elements there. This is the paragraph:

"The French Government, taking advantage of the breathing time, began to consolidate its hold in India by various means. Mr. Baron, the then Governor of French India *** organised the French India Socialist Party, now under the leadership of Mr. Edward Goubert and set up against the National organisations. By looting and setting fire to the houses and shops of the nationalists and others who opposed the party sponsored by the Government, the people were kept terrorised and subdued. In spite of the attention of the India Government being drawn then and there no relief

was forthcoming in defence of their kith and kin. The attempt of the India Government in running to sweep Indonesia of foreign rule before having its own country cleaned and cleared of foreign domination seems paradoxical".

Again, the Memorandum goes on to say that Sri Aurobindo Ashram has become a centre of foreign influence....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want aspersions cast upon important institutions through reading some script or some text. It is not right to make references to institutions or individuals who are not here to defend themselves.

An Hon. Member: Individuals only.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Institutions also.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I submit that these individuals are responsible officers. They are men who are holding offices there. I am not attacking them as individuals, but as people who have been holding offices and who have been responsible for much havoc there.

Before I conclude, I would say one word about neutrality. We are not neutral today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: We are not neutral today. What we see is a travesty of neutrality and nothing else.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): I heard with close attention the speech of Dr. Lanka Sundaram who opened the debate on foreign affairs, and the first impression I had was that he wanted to imitate Shri Gopalan when he opened the debate on the President's Address. He dropped a similar bombshell when he said that the foreign policy of this country was based on the whims and fancies of an individual. Well, Sir, I take it as an insult to this country that any one should say that our foreign policy is based on the mere whim and fancy of an individual. I may say at the very outset that the foreign policy of this country, though it happens to emanate from a great individual, represents the aspirations of the entire country. I may add, and I shall presently show how, it is in fact a historic necessity. You will remember, Sir, how very many attempts were made before the last World War to establish peace in the world. There was first of all the attempt at disarmament. There was, then, the attempt at renunciation of

war as a national policy. There was the attempt to stabilise peace by local security pacts. We had also the League of Nations. You will remember how all of them have died a premature death. Attempts at disarmament commenced at Hague in 1899 were proceeded with at Washington in 1921; and they collapsed at the Geneva Conference in 1932. Renunciation of war as a national policy originated in the brain of Briand and ended with Kellogg. We all know how Kellogg finished it by hedging it with so many qualifications, as, for instance, the right of self-defence. I can imagine ghost of Hitler saying that it was self-defence that determined the foreign policy of Germany. We know how many alliances there have been. There was the Holy Alliance. There was the Triple Alliance. There were, later, a series of Locarno Pacts. And we have also seen the Axis Pact. None of them have been able to secure that stability and that peace which the world has been hankering after. As for the League of Nations, it failed every time there was aggression.

Now we have the United Nations. We all expected so much from it. But it has stood crippled from its very inception on account of the lack of co-ordination between the different units. We have also made an attempt to determine our disputes in an international court of justice. The International Court of Justice even today stands as a mere symbol of the human desire for the judicious settlement of disputes. It has yet to settle any major dispute. So that, when the Second World War ended, we entered an era when the human race was war-weary, and was looking forward for a new method of establishing peace. We needed new light, and we prayed for it. And there it came, for the second time, from Asia. And not only we in this House, but the whole country, are ever grateful for it. There is a certain principle behind it. There is a philosophy behind it. We have found it by experience that no nation, however eminent it may be, can be trusted to keep the banner of freedom or peace aloft. Germany produced a Hitler. Not only Germany, even France, the home of liberty, equality and fraternity, produced a Napoleon. England, too, the birth place of democracy, produced a Clive. Russia produced Stalin. Well, we cannot expect even America not to produce a great Yankee some time or other. So, we do not want to trust any nation. We do not want to bind ourselves to any nation. Nations must develop the attitude of deciding every question on a

moral basis. I am sure, and the House will agree with me, that if only we can inculcate in the minds of the various nations that they should not tie themselves to any particular policy, and that they should judge every issue on its own merits, then we would have established that era of peace which we are all yearning for so much.

An attack has been made on our association with the Commonwealth. But perhaps before I come to that, I may reply to some of the charges made by the Communist speakers in respect of our foreign policy in general. Dr. Lanka Sundaram himself made a very remarkable statement. He said that our policy is neither dynamic nor neutral. Well, Sir, if I may say so it is not only dynamic, but it has been a dynamite. It has been a dynamite in the sense that we have awakened the world from its lethargy, from its old-fashioned ideas. We have been very active. I would ask such of those members of the Communist party who criticise our foreign policy (it is no use talking) to come to brass tacks. Come to facts and figures. Take any particular issue. Is there a single issue in respect of which we have failed to keep up our ideal? I would like to pose some questions. I would like them to tell us, for instance, whether they would have liked us to advise the United Nations forces not to cross the 38th Parallel or not? I would ask them whether they would have liked us to champion the cause of Indonesia or not. I would ask, again, whether they would have liked us to fight for the recognition of China in the U.N.O. or not. I would ask whether they would have liked us to support the cause of liberty in South West Africa and Libya or not? I hope their spokesman would get up some time tomorrow and answer these specific questions and tell us in what respects we have failed. Our neutrality is not blind. We have been champions of liberty in Asia, in fact in the whole world.

In a sense, Sir, I would not be ashamed if our foreign policy is based on the whims and fancies of an individual. It would be just like saying that the kernel of Hinduism is based on the whims and fancies of Lord Krishna; that Muhammadanism is based on the whims and fancies of Muhammad; that Christianity is based on the whims and fancies of Christ. We are proud of the whims and fancies of Pandit Jawaharlal, on that sense.

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

About the Commonwealth of Nations, time and again the Communists refer to it with decision. It comes with ill grace from those benches. The very flag they fly is the flag of Russia, and I would like to ask them with what courage they are here in this country parading under that flag.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of information. What the hon. Member said is not correct. I need not describe the flag of the Soviet Union. But if the hon. Member refers to documents, he will find that the red flag, which is used all over the world, is the flag of the international working class movement. It is different from the official State flag of the Soviet Union.

Shri Raghuramaiah: What I am saying is that a foreign flag is used in this country as a party flag. You are trying to crush the aspirations and the greatness of this country under the weight of that flag. It is no use talking time and again against the great work we are doing. Tell me one instance where our membership of the Commonwealth of Nations has interfered with our freedom and independence in dealing with other nations? Has the Commonwealth of Nations ever interfered with our attitude to China, with our attitude to Indonesia, with our attitude to South Africa or

South West Africa? Has the Commonwealth ever stopped us from saying or doing what we want? The truth is you want to deprive us of even our notional friends so that we may be at the mercy of a certain power bloc about which you know you have been saying so much. (Interruption). Sir, I do not like to give way to childish interruptions. We cannot forget the fact that we have been associated with the British. How can we? And when that Commonwealth can be utilised by us as a basis for friendly co-operation, I do not see why we should not remain in it. We have fitted a Republic into the Commonwealth. It is the greatest achievement of this country. It is no more called the British Commonwealth. They call it the Commonwealth of Nations. I would only like to say one word more and that is that if there is one thing about which this country is proud, about which the whole world—taking a historical view—will look back upon as the greatest contribution of this country in the twentieth century, it is our foreign policy and I commend it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Thursday, the 12th June, 1952.