

problems of the people. They do not know anything. They are as ignorant as the Ministers themselves, who are tackling the Manipur problem. The problems of the local people can be tackled by the local people alone. If you trust them you will beget trust. You must also reciprocate when they are behaving in such a democratic and constitutional way.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I have, a couple of hours ago, sent an amendment which has not, perhaps, reached you. But, there is an amendment in the name of Shri R. N. S. Deo which I support and which, I believe, is taken as moved. It is amendment No. 145 which is for the insertion of a new clause, clause 24(A). It reads:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provision, if any State is dissatisfied with the recommendations of the Zonal Council in regard to border disputes or linguistic minorities, and represents to the Government of India for the appointment of a Boundary Commission or for arbitration, the Government of India shall appoint a Boundary Commission or Tribunal consisting of Judges of the Supreme Court or High Courts for investigating into and adjudicating upon such representation, and the Government of India shall take necessary steps to implement the award of such Commission or Tribunal as the case may be."

It is unfortunate that, no matter how much we have pleaded, Orissa's case has been absolutely neglected and brushed aside by the Government. I do not know why even the Home Minister does not care to reply to our query. When we come to the last stage of this Bill, there is this provision for zonal councils. I do not believe that these zonal councils will be of any use.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue the next day if he does not believe in that. We will now take up non-official business.

## COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

### FIFTY SEVENTH REPORT

Shri Atkar (North Setara): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 1st August 1956."

Sir, this is a simple and non-controversial Report in connection with the allotment of time for the resolutions put down for this day. For the resolution on the representation of African and Asian Nations in U.N.O. in proportion to their population two hours have been allotted out of which only two minutes have been taken. The remaining one hour and 58 minutes have to go on that resolution. The other three resolutions have been allotted 2 hours and 15 minutes each. Sir, I suggest that this Report be accepted by this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 1st August, 1956."

The motion was adopted.

## RESOLUTION RE REPRESENTATION OF AFRICAN AND ASIAN NATIONS IN U.N.O.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume discussion on the following Resolution moved by Shri Brajeshwar Prasad on the 20th July, 1956:

"This House recommends to the Government of India to press for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations so that African and Asian nations may

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

be represented in the U.N.O. in proportion to their population and that all the representatives and delegates in the U.N.O. and its subsidiary bodies be elected on the basis of adult franchise."

Out of two hours allotted for the discussion on this resolution, 1 hour and 58 minutes are left for its discussion today.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya East): I have made two suggestions in the resolution. The first suggestion is that Asia and Africa should be represented in the United Nations Organisation and its subsidiary bodies in proportion to their numerical strength. The second suggestion is.....

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): Sir, the hon. Member may be requested to speak a little more louder.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sure he will warm up just now.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The second suggestion is that all the representatives and delegates in the United Nations Organisation and its subsidiary bodies should be elected directly by the people on the basis of adult franchise and not nominated by the respective governments. These two suggestions are really one; the first is implied in the second.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): What is the first one?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The first is that Asia and Africa should be represented in the United Nations Organisation and its subsidiary bodies in proportion to their population. This suggestion is implied in the second. For, the basis of representation in democracy is that equal numbers of people elect equal number of representatives. There is no reason why weightage should be given to the 'white races'. There is neither democracy nor morality in the argument that the rich few should govern the many. The 'white races'

are afraid of us. Their fear is without any foundation in reality. But our fear is justified, for we have been exploited for centuries. In a federal form of Government the majority does not exploit the minority. In the Swiss Federation, three major races live: the Italians, the Germans and the French. But there is no domination. There no group dominates the other. The United States of America is a world in miniature. All the races live there. But there is no domination of any group over the other.

Once the United Nations Organisation becomes an organisation of representatives elected by the people, sovereignty will have to be divided between the United Nations Organisation on the one hand, and the Nation States on the other. This means the establishment of a Federal Government on democratic basis.

Sir, why do I stand for a World Government? It is because I stand for peace. I have got no racial prejudices. I do not wish to exploit or dominate over the 'white races'. Recently, Sir, there was a statement by the Prime Minister. The statement was that one world is the only alternative to the hydrogen bomb.

3-35 P.M.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I heartily concur with this statement of the Prime Minister. The meaning of this statement is that Nation States have become obsolete; they are the root cause of war.

The people of the world must understand the forces driving them towards the coming holocaust. It has nothing whatever to do with capitalism or communism, with individualism or collectivism. It is the inevitable result of conflict between the non-integrated sovereignties in contact. We could put a Communist in the White House or establish the purest Jeffersonian democracy in Russia. The result would be the same. Unless an overall world organisation is established in time,

by persuasion and consent, no diplomatic magic will prevent the explosion.

Friction, conflicts and wars between people are caused not by their national, racial, religious, social and cultural differences, but by the single fact that these differences are galvanised in separate sovereignties, which have no way to settle the conflicts resulting from their differences except through violent clashes.

Conflicts created by these very same differences within the human race can be solved without violent clashes and wars whenever and wherever sovereignty resides not in but above the conflicting units.

The meaning of the statement of the Prime Minister is that the World State and not disarmament is the alternative to the hydrogen bomb. Nation States will disarm only if the United Nations Organisation is made the sole custodian of all defence forces. But, if the United Nations Organisation is not vested with these powers, no disarmament is possible. For, a military solution cannot be imposed upon a political problem. Problems of the world are entirely of a political character. A political problem is amenable only to a political solution and a military problem is amenable only to a military solution. You cannot have a political solution for a military problem and you cannot have a military solution for a political problem.

The meaning of the Prime Minister's statement is that the condition precedent to the acceptance of Panch Shila or any code of international ethics is the establishment of a World State. No climate of peace can be generated on the basis of the status quo. The situation cannot be frozen. The age of power politics has come to an end. The alternative to power politics or the system of balance of power is either chaos or the establishment of a World State.

The meaning of the Prime Minister's statement is that World State is possible here and now and not in some distant future. For, that is the meaning of the word 'alternative' when he says: "the only alternative".

The danger of nuclear war is not a distant one. World State, which is the only alternative to the hydrogen bomb, cannot be a distant goal if the danger of nuclear war is looming large on the horizon.

Sir, let me further interpret the Prime Minister's statement. The meaning of the Prime Minister's statement is that the establishment of the World State is the only alternative left open to us. There is no *via media*. The choice is between life and death. There is no golden mean.

The meaning of the Prime Minister's statement is that the creation of a third bloc of neutralist nations will not serve the cause of peace. For, peace can be attained only by a World State and by no other mechanism or stratagem. The creation of a third bloc will be a retrograde step in history. The task of statesmanship is to unify the two blocs into one and not to further subdivide the world. Before the outbreak of the second World War there were a large number of independent States. The Second World War unified the world into two blocs! The good that has been achieved by the last world war should not be frittered away at the altar of nationalism. The creation of a third bloc will neither facilitate the cause of world peace nor the ideal of a World State.

There is another interpretation of the statement of the Prime Minister. The meaning of the Prime Minister's statement is that mere fear of nuclear warfare will not preserve world peace for long. History is always in motion. It cannot be made to stand still. War has always been an instrument of change. If this avenue is closed, some mechanism will have to be devised for the purpose of facilitating changes in human society. If all avenues are closed,

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

human society will be shattered to pieces. Pent up energy must have an outlet. If peaceful channels are not carved out, violence is inevitable. The boiling tea pot will burst if there is no outlet for the steam to escape. The only mechanism for peaceful changes in human society is the world State.

What will happen if the charter is not revised? The Prime Minister says that this is the only alternative, namely, one world. Some thought creeps into my mind. I see some alternatives which I would give expression to without fear. If the charter is not revised, there will be war, either hyperbolic or limited, fought with either nuclear or conventional weapons. If no such war breaks out, Russia will establish her hegemony over the old world. If this is also not possible, there will be a political settlement between America and Russia. Africa, the Middle-East and South-East Asia will be divided into two spheres of influence. The status quo will be maintained in Europe only; Africa and the Middle East will go to Russia; and the whole of South-East Asia will pass into American sphere of influence. The refusal of America to support the western powers of Europe over the nationalisation of the Suez Canal is a gesture of friendship to Russia. Russia will tacitly support America in South-East Asia.

If none of these alternatives materialises, then there is another alternative. The last alternative is the establishment of a federal union between India, China and Russia. If these three countries come together, the demand for the revision of the charter of the United Nations Organisation will become irresistible. If this union is established, there will be no war, either hyperbolic or limited, fought with either nuclear or conventional weapons. If this union is established, Russia will not be able to establish her hegemony over the entire old world. If this union is established, there will

never be a political settlement between America and Russia. Only a political settlement on the basis of a world State is desirable for the black and coloured races of Asia and Africa.

There are two ways of establishing a world State. A world government can be established either in one long jump or step by step. If the charter is revised, the world State will be established in one long jump. But if it is not revised, a federal union between India, China and Russia will lead to the establishment of a world State step by step.

I have never believed in alignments. I have been suggesting this course since the last ten years on the floor of this House. I have been misunderstood. My real aim was to facilitate the achievement of the goal of a world State. A federal union between India, China and Russia will lead to the political integration of Asia in one long jump. But if either Russia or China refuse to federate, Asia will be integrated step by step. India must explore the possibilities of a federal union with the countries of South-East Asia, the Middle-East Asia and Africa.

The Government of Syria had instituted a Cabinet sub-committee to explore the possibilities of a federal union between Syria and Egypt. I have read proposals that have been published in the papers. Those proposals confirm the belief that we too can explore the possibilities of a federal union between India and any other country of South-East Asia or the Middle East, if China and Russia refuse to federate. A political vacuum of unfathomable depths has engulfed the entire globe. The advent of the nuclear age is responsible for this catastrophe. This vacuum can be filled only by the establishment of a world State. No State is a viable unit now,—neither America, nor Russia nor China nor India.

I have said that Asia and Africa should be represented in the United

Nations Organisation in proportion to their population. Let me quote some figures and facts. Asia and Africa are now under-represented in the United Nations Organisation. The total population of the new world is 35 crores 40 lakhs. It has 22 representatives in the United Nations Organisation. If 35 crores and 40 lakhs or 354 million people can have 22 representatives in the U.N.O., Asia should have 85 representatives and not 20 as it has today. Europe should have 36 representatives and not 27 as it has today. Africa should have 13 representatives and not 5 as it has today. Australasia may have one representative and not two as it has today.

Let us see what is the total population of Europe. The total population of Europe is 57 crores, 62 lakhs and 24 thousands. If 57 crores, 62 lakhs and 24 thousands can have 27 representatives in the U.N.O., Asia should have 64 representatives; Africa should have 10 representatives; North America should have 11 representatives and not 12 as it has today, South America should have six representatives and not ten as it has today. Australasia should have no representative and not two as it has today.

The total population of the world is 2,580 million. There are 76 countries represented in the U.N.O. So, for every 3 crore, 32 lakhs and 63 thousand and 158 people,—that is, 3,32,63,158 people,—there is one representative in the U.N.O. On this basis, Asia should have 41 representatives in the U.N.O.; Europe should have 17; Africa should have 7; North America should have 7; South America should have 3 and Australasia should have one.

Mr. Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House recommends to the Government of India to press for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations so that African and Asian nations may be represented in the U.N.O. in proportion to their population and that all

the representatives and delegates in the U.N.O. and its subsidiary bodies be elected on the basis of adult franchise."

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga Central): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament be constituted to scrutinise the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations regarding representation of different units constituting the U.N.O. and to recommend such measures as may be necessary to make U.N.O. a really democratic organisation fully representative of all the units constituting it."

Shri M. S. Guruswamy (Mysore): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House urges upon the Government of India to make efforts for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations so as to provide, among other things, for the prohibition of the manufacture and experiment of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the setting up of an international police force, the abolition of the veto power of the Big Five, the elimination of all colonialism in the world and election of popular representatives of peoples to the U.N. General Assembly."

Shri D. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House recommends to the Government of India to appoint a Committee consisting of officials and non-officials to study the working of the United Nations and suggest ways and means for making the U.N. General Assembly and its allied bodies truly representative of the nations of the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

world in accordance with their population and prestige."

Mr. Speaker: These three amendments are also now before the House. Shri Kasliwal will now speak.

The total time allotted is 2 hours; hon. Members will have 10 to 15 minutes each.

Shri Kasliwal (Kota-Jhalawar): I will try my best to finish within 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: No question of trying one's best; the limit should not exceed 15 minutes.

Shri Kasliwal: I consider that the resolution which has been proposed by my friend, Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, is very unrealistic and impractical..

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The Prime Minister is also unrealistic and impractical then.

Shri Kasliwal: And not conducive to healthy international atmosphere. I would also submit that under the present circumstances, the resolution is very much ill-advised and misconceived for the simple reason that he has not taken into consideration the provisions of the U.N. Charter.

I think my friend, Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, was not fair to himself when he said that the resolution had two parts: representation of African and Asian nations in the U.N. in proportion to population and election of delegates in the U.N. on adult franchise. There is another factor—a very important one—namely, the question of the revision of the U.N. Charter. The whole speech of the hon. Member was more or less confined to the ushering in and the establishment of a World State; and, he quoted our Prime Minister in support of it. I do not know from where he got it; but, I am not contesting him on that score for the present. I am contesting him on the plea which he has made that a World State can be ushered in by a revision of the U.N. Charter. If Mr. Brajeshwar Prasad had read the

entire history of the creation of the United Nations, he would have come to the conclusion that a World State cannot be established by a revision of the Charter. In support of what I am saying, I will quote what Mr. Harold Macmillan, leader of the U.K. delegation of the U.N. to the tenth anniversary celebrations of the U.N. at San Francisco said:

"The statesmen at San Francisco ten years ago saw that it would be unrealistic to try to fashion the United Nations as a kind of world government. The world was not ready for that. Nor could it be a sort of projection of the grand alliance of war. They saw clearly that if a world government was not to be set up, the United Nations would have to rely on persuasion, discussion and conciliation in order to settle disputes. For no sovereign state can be compelled by force."

How can you revise the Charter? That is another question which now arises. This question was very much in the air last year. At the San Francisco conference, many speakers from various nations gave their opinion about this. Mr. Krishna Menon, who represented India said on the question of the revision of the U.N. Charter, like this. "The crux of the matter was stated by Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon on behalf of the Government of India:

"If the Charter has to be revised, it will require agreement; and if there was agreement, there would be no need for revision."

Mr. Harold Macmillan said that U.N. was a very feeble body and there was no necessity for revising the Charter. He said:

"During these ten years, the United Nations had adapted itself with remarkable flexibility to the changing conditions of the world."

The same view was expressed by the Soviet and its satellites, as they are called. Mr. Molotov said:

"The U.S.S.R. believed there were no grounds for Charter revision. The Charter meets in full the tasks of strengthening universal peace and developing international co-operation in political, economic and other spheres. Revision of the Charter with a view to changing its fundamental provisions, far from promoting confidence among states, would in fact, impede attainment of this aim."

I am afraid this is exactly what Mr. Brajeshwar Prasad proposes to do, namely, destroying the confidence of nations by proposing a resolution of this nature. Mr. Skrzyszewski was also against the revision of the Charter and said:

"During the last ten years, we have witnessed frequent attempts to change our Organisation into an instrument of enforcing decisions contrary to the Charter."

The majority of the nations, except certain nations from Latin America, were of the view that there was no necessity for a revision of the Charter.

The question of the revision of the Charter came up at the last session of the General Assembly also. Under article 109, if there is to be a revision of the Charter, then there will be a general conference. According to that, an agenda was drawn up for calling a general conference for Charter revision. A committee has been appointed and I am told that this committee will now meet and report at the twelfth session of the General Assembly as to whether there has to be a revision or not. So far as the views of the Government of India are concerned, they are very well known. I had put a short notice question last year and the Prime Minister was pleased to say that there was no question at the present moment for a

revision of the Charter. On the question of the abolition of the veto, when my hon. friend, Mr. Gurupada-swamy, put a supplementary question, the Prime Minister said that the abolition of the veto would not be considered now. These are the views of various nations regarding the revision of the Charter, but all the same, my friend seems to be thinking that by a revision of the Charter, a World State can come into being. This cannot happen. As I have already submitted, the Charter was never intended for the purpose of bringing into existence a World State. If my friend had brought in a resolution directly saying that the Government of India should take steps for the establishment of a World State or a World State or a World Government...

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: By war!

Shri Kasiwal: I would have thought that there was some sense in it. But, a resolution which says that a World State should come into existence through a revision of the Charter is completely misconceived.

I will speak on one more point and that is with regard to representation of African and Asian nations in the U.N. in proportion to their population. If African and Asian nations are to be represented in the U.N. according to their population, why should not all the nations be represented like that? This kind of resolution is not going to create any confidence in the various nations which are today looking to India for guidance and to give them a lead as to how best peaceful conditions may be made to prevail in the countries and so on. When a resolution of this kind is brought forward, I respectfully submit that instead of helping the establishment of a World State, it will be a setback. I am afraid my hon. friend Mr. Brajeshwar Prasad has not read the provisions of the U.N. Charter. If he has read the provisions of the U.N. Charter, especially articles 3 and 4, he would never have made a suggestion that Asian and African nations

[Shri Kasiwal]

should be represented in the United Nations according to the population. Articles 3 and 4 clearly say....

4 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore he wants revision.

Shri Kasiwal: I have already replied to him. So far as the question of revision is concerned, if he has read articles 3 and 4, he would have come to the conclusion that it is impossible to do that because it is the States which are the members of the United Nations. Only the States are represented there and not the population.

Regarding the point that representatives and delegates should be elected on the basis of adult franchise, I think he had the same thing in mind, viz., the establishment of a world government and world state. And I think it is an extraordinary statement that he made when he said that there is no morality and democracy there as smaller nations govern bigger nations or something of that kind. I submit that I do not know from where he got the idea that the United Nations is an organisation which is the governing organisation. The United Nations does not govern anybody. The United Nations has nothing to do with such a thing as an administrative body. He seems to think that the United Nations is something which has got certain fundamental governmental organs. He seems to think that the United Nations has got a police force and army and things of that sort and, therefore, the United Nations can govern. I submit that it is not so. If his resolution were to the effect that there should be a world state, a world government, directly recruited from the opinion, from the voice of the people as a whole, I do submit, there would have been some sense in the resolution. But the resolution he has framed and the extraordinary speech he has made in support of the resolution does not carry us anywhere.

Dr. Sarosh Chandra (Aurangabad): I rise to oppose the Resolution moved

by my hon. friend Mr. Brajeshwar Prasad, whom I cannot blame for not having read the United Nations Charter, as my predecessor has stated.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: It is still alive.

Dr. Sarosh Chandra: However, I do not understand fully the purpose of moving the Resolution; nor could I understand by the speech which he has made here what he wanted to do. He did say that he wanted to establish world government. I feel that if he wants to establish world government he will find that a large number of people, and also the representatives of the Government and the Government themselves, would also agree with him on this point. But by passing this Resolution, he has not been able to convince us, in what manner the world government will be established. Therefore, I fail to understand the purpose in moving this Resolution.

Now, regarding the question of the revision of the Charter, I find that my friend Mr. Kasiwal has very properly replied to my friend that this question has been discussed in the United Nations. We have also been enlightened by our Prime Minister on this issue on several occasions whenever any questions were put to him and it is very clear that there is no need for the revision of the Charter at this moment because if we want to revise the Charter, if there is any need for revision of the Charter, that is for bringing the different nations together. If there is agreement between different nations, there is absolutely no necessity for revision and if there is no agreement then again this purpose will not be served. Therefore, this question of the revision of the Charter of the United Nations at this moment does not arise and will not serve any purpose.

There is another point which is also mentioned here and I feel that there is great force in that; it is about the representation of the Asian people in

the United Nations and the United Nations Secretariat. I think this question has been raised by the leaders of our delegations very powerfully several times in the United Nations and this complaint, our grievance, has also been admitted by the United Nations. The United Nations have admitted that the Asian representation is not in proportion to their population and in proportion to the status which the Asian countries enjoy and I, therefore, strongly feel that the delegates who represent India in the United Nations should continue to urge the stronger representation for India and other Asian countries in the United Nations Secretariat. I know that recently some better representation has been secured for India. But I feel it is not enough when compared to the representation which the United States, France and other European countries have got. Therefore, that is a very important point for which we must fight in the United Nations.

There is another point and that is this. I feel there is very little interest and knowledge about the working of the United Nations in this country and also in Parliament. I had the privilege of attending the Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Vienna and there also this question was raised. It was suggested there—and a resolution was also passed—that larger representation should be given to Members of Parliament and not officers of the Government alone should be represented at the United Nations. That resolution, I think, was passed and also ratified by all countries. Therefore, I feel it is very important that the representatives of the people, that is, the Members of Parliament, should be given more representation at the United Nations. I would also suggest, as has also been suggested by an amendment, that a committee should be appointed. But I do not agree with the amendment that "officials and non-officials" should be associated with that committee. I would suggest that a parliamentary committee should be appointed which should go into the details of the

working of the United Nations and its other agencies.

I have nothing more to say. Again I oppose this Resolution in the form in which it has been presented. But I thank him for moving this Resolution in order that we may be able to discuss and also know something more about the working of the United Nations from our distinguished leader of the delegation, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. Therefore, I again urge that our representation at the United Nations should be further strengthened and we should also form ourselves into some kind of Committee so that we can study this question in detail.

Shri Mathew (Kottayam): The desire that all the free nations of the world who conform to the fundamental principles of the United Nations should be brought into that organisation is a reasonable one and I think there would be unanimity on that point. So much, I feel, is all that I have in common with the mover of the Resolution. I shall not go into the general question whether a revision of the Charter is necessary. It may be that in some respects it may be necessary. But that is a question into which we need not go now, for the mover has referred to only two directions in which he feels that the revision is necessary and with regard to both those points, I am not at all in a position to agree with him, even as the two speakers who succeeded him were unable to agree with him. With regard to the way in which a sovereign country decides to choose its representatives at the U.N., it must certainly be left to that country. As an Indian citizen of course I believe in adult franchise for elections to the Legislature. I am proud of that element in our national Constitution, but that is something upon which we cannot insist in the case of all other countries. There is no adult franchise in so many countries and we cannot insist with regard to those countries when it comes to a question of choosing their representatives at the U.N.

(Shri Mathew)

that it must be done on the basis of adult franchise, even if it were desirable. That seems to be altogether out of the question. It may be a devout ideal which may be worked and prayed for, that the system of adult franchise should be brought into effect in all the countries in the world as far as their legislatures are concerned. That is a very different matter. These Legislatures of States have no analogy with the U.N.

Again, with regard to the other contention that the nations of Asia and Africa should be represented on the U.N. in proportion to their population, as has been pointed out, if at all it is to be considered, it cannot be confined to the nations of Asia and Africa. It has to be extended further. That however is a point which I do not want to stress much because it seems to me that it is not only not practicable but is something which cannot be seriously entertained in the case of any nation. The nations or States are the members of the U.N. and certainly they would come together in such a world organisation only on the present understanding and rule, that whether it be a big nation or a small nation it would be on a footing of equality with the rest, that each will have one vote. That is a very clear thing. If anybody says that this principle ought to be revised, I do not know what to say. It is something to which the smaller nations would not and cannot agree. For example, we have 360 millions of people in India and Britain's population, I suppose, is 50 million. To say that we should have seven votes and Britain should have only one vote is something to mention which would be enough to rule it out. I repeat therefore, the nations of the world will come together on a footing of equality, that each will have one vote. If all the free nations of Asia and Africa, as of all other parts of the world, who conform to the fundamental principles are brought in, then it does not matter that each one has only one vote, for

Asia and Africa will make its weight felt so that, with regard to this very general desire of my hon. friend who has moved the resolution, I say there is an agreement in spirit on the remote or ultimate goal.

With regard to the two definite suggestions that he has made however, it seems to me, if I may put it that way he must have misunderstood or misread the whole situation or character of the U.N. I need not quote any authorities, as my friend Shri Kallival did. We can rely on our own reading of the situation, on our own good sense and understanding to convince ourselves that on both these points the contention of the hon. Mover of the resolution is something which cannot be seriously looked at.

Shri M. S. Garagadswamy: Bernard Shaw in one of his books has said: "The practical men know where they are but not always whither they are going, whereas the thinkers know whither they are going but do not always know where they are." I do not know to which category my hon. friend Shri Brajeshwar Prasad who has moved the resolution belongs?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: We sail in the same boat.

Shri M. S. Garagadswamy: Though I do not approve of the resolution as it is, still I must thank him for his endeavour to focus the attention of the House on this important question of the U.N. Charter. At no time did we discuss this Charter, at no time had we any debate on the various clauses of the Charter. From that point of view I appreciate his move and congratulate him on his worthy attempt.

I have moved an amendment which specifically brings forward various issues on which revision is required. First of all, I may point out that the authors of the San Francisco Charter met in April 1945 when the war was still going on. The circumstances that prevailed at that time were entirely different. They were

immediately concerned with the problem of winning the war and also with the question of somehow or other getting an international organization soon after the war. In the noise and rumblings of warfare it was hardly possible for them to deliberate calmly and coolly on the various problems confronting the world and the implications of those problems.

The Charter was drafted during the pre-atomic age. When it was drafted no nation had announced the invention of the atomic or the hydrogen bomb, and so it was not possible for the authors of the Charter to make a provision to deal with this specific problem, though there are various general provisions dealing with disarmament. The question of the atomic and hydrogen bombs which has now introduced a new explosive danger in our international relations was not even contemplated, and so the discussion that took place at San Francisco in 1945 was rather unrealistic and from this point of view I must say the Charter has become a little out-moded. There is no provision in the Charter which specifically says that hydrogen and atomic bombs should be prohibited or experiments in them should be dispensed with. This has been left to the goodwill of governments. This has to be brought about by negotiation and by agreement. We have so far failed there.

Secondly, the most important aspect of the U.N. Charter is the provision relating to the veto system. That is the heart of the Charter; and that is its greatest weakness. When the big Powers met at San Francisco they thought the Covenant of the League of Nations was unrealistic because the responsibility for maintaining peace was not left to the Big powers. So, now they thought that the primary responsibility for safeguarding peace should be left to the Big Five only. And when their responsibility is greater, they felt, they

should enjoy more power to discharge that responsibility. On the basis of this logic, the right of veto was given to the Big Five. Now, what is this right of veto? According to what Louis Fischer, this power of veto creates a sort of peculiar UNO arithmetic that one is bigger than ten. One Power can veto the entire decision of ten members in the Security Council.

We have seen by experience how this power of veto has been exercised by the Big Powers. This power has been used indiscriminately by the Great Ones quite a number of times. Secondly, you will see also that the Big Powers who participated in the San Francisco Conference are not the same Big Powers today. Only four of them are there in the present Security Council and the fifth Power, namely China, has been replaced by Formosa. By no stretch of imagination, Formosa can represent the Chinese mainland. I feel therefore that the character and composition of the Big Power group itself has changed. Still, the UNO Charter does not recognize it. No attempt has been made by any government to make it more realistic. Even if it is agreed that the power of veto should exist, still I would argue on the same basis, and say that China should have been a permanent member of the Security Council. But that has not been made possible.

Anyway, I am opposed to the power of veto, because it makes five Powers in the world super-sovereign States and we have clothed them with tremendous amount of power to rule the entire world, according to their whims and fancies. I think it is precisely because of this power of veto that we have not been able to establish peace in the world, for, the Great Powers have never been united after the San Francisco Conference.

I have followed the debates of the San Francisco Conference, and I know what a great battle was waged on this issue of veto. In fact, the counter-force

[Shri M. S. Gurugadaswamy]

itself was about to break down on this issue. But afterwards, many small Powers grudgingly agreed to the veto power, because otherwise, they thought that the conference would collapse. A representative of Canada who participated in that conference, Mr. L. B. Pearson, said 'You can make us take it, but you cannot make us like it'. So, you can understand that this veto formula was not accepted democratically by all the nations, but only grudgingly.

Now the situation has changed. The responsibility thrown on the Big Powers has not been properly discharged. Therefore I think we should make an attempt now to scrap the so-called principle of unanimity.

My next point is in regard to colonialism. Even here, the Charter has become outmoded. The Charter does not approve colonialism, but indirectly it has blessed the colonial system, by having a provision for the creation of a Trusteeship Council. According to the provisions of the Charter, the Trusteeship Council should look after the territories of the vanquished on the basis of trusteeship. That is just an enlargement or protection of the mandate system of the League of Nations. We have had a bad experience of the mandate system, and we know how the mandatory Powers misused their responsibility. Even now, I do not see any hope of the liberation of these territories which are under the system of trusteeship. So, in a way, the UNO Charter has blessed colonialism, and it is promoting colonialism, and moreover is not taking any action against the recalcitrant mandatory Powers, such as the Union of South Africa.

Apart from this, I may say that the debate in the UN General Assembly has become very unreal. The assembly has become just a debating society. The League of Nations was also just a debating society, and it was condemned precisely on this score, because it did not solve any issues. May be, in the economic field or the social field, the Economic and Social Council and other humanitarian orga-

nisations attached to the UNO may be doing something just like their counterparts in the League of Nations. But that is not relevant here, because we are dealing here with the political aspects of the UNO Charter.

I feel that politically, the UNO has failed to establish peace and safeguard the security of the world. It has not been able to bring round the recalcitrant Powers. It has not been able to control the aggressive States which are waging wars or creating tensions in the world.

Now, what are the issues so far settled by the UNO? Maybe, one or two have been settled, but they are very minor issues. The major issues have not been settled, because the UNO Charter itself does not allow quick settlement of disputes. For instance, the Charter has given some diplomatic and economic powers to the UNO. The UNO can decide upon diplomatic and economic sanctions, when a Power becomes recalcitrant and aggressive. But there is no provision regarding military sanctions in specific terms; though there is some little reference to it, yet there is no machinery to apply the military sanctions against the aggressive Powers.

For instance, there is no international police force. It may be very difficult to create such a police force. It may look impractical also to demand the creation of an international army for the purpose of maintaining and protecting the peace of the world. But still, without an international police force, it is not possible to check the aggressive tendencies of the different States, and it is still less possible to create a psychology or temper of peace in the world.

The Military Staff Committee that has been contemplated in the charter is just an appendage of the Big Five. In that committee, only the Chiefs of Staff of the Big Five meet and discuss matters; and when they themselves are divided, what is the course of action they can adopt? They are unable to decide anything, and they merely postpone everything. Further,

they do not believe in each other, and the whole relationship is surcharged with mutual hatred and suspicion. In a situation such as this, the Military Staff Committee does not serve any useful purpose.

So, I say that many of the provisions of the UNO Charter have become outdated. Shri V. K. Krishna Menon might say that the Indian delegation has always played a very valuable role. May be, in the existing circumstances, being an able man, he might have played a very valuable role. But he would have played a still greater role, if the UNO had been a better instrument of peace. Today, the most tragic thing is that the UNO has not been a great and powerful instrument of peace. If you scan the various provisions of the UNO Charter, you will find that war has not been outlawed at all. I think there was a provision to this effect in the League of Nations Charter. But in this charter, I find that war has not been outlawed at all.

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: To which provision of the Charter is the hon. Member referring?

Mr. Speaker: He says that there is no provision to that effect in the UNO Charter.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I was saying that there is no specific provision in the UNO Charter, which prohibits war as such. It was done so in the covenant of the League of Nations. Shri Krishna Menon may say 'Oh, what could we do in the existing circumstances? We are helpless. We are only a nation. There are so many other nations—60 of them. They should also move in the matter'. I only say that we could take steps to propagate our views for the drastic revision of the UN Charter.

Unfortunately, the other day the Prime Minister answering my supplementary question said that the question of the revision of the Charter would not arise because it was not necessary. This is very unfortunate. Why do the Government of India think that the Charter is perfect?

if they think it is not perfect, then why should they not take steps in the direction of revision? The time has certainly come for a revision. So why not take some steps in this direction?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I speak on this subject with a great deal of difference because of the presence of one of the most leading exponents of the principles of the United Nations in our midst today. All the same, I would say that I do not agree with Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy that the UNO has failed. It has done some very commendable things. It has stayed the hands of aggressors in several countries. Its allied agencies have done something to promote economic well being of nations. To say that it has failed is not just, though I, like every one else, would better. That it should have done much better. But whatever it has done, given the circumstances, given the limitations, given the tensions in the world, given the temper in the world, it has given a good account of itself.

The most extraordinary arguments against revision of the Charter came from an hon. Member on the floor of the House. He was quoting the ghostly voice of the chancelleries of this world, those persons who had practically no influence in the shaping and making of the foreign policies of their nations. Foreign policy changes from time to time. It is a dynamic thing. To quote some person, who is not a Foreign Minister today, to quote somebody who had made a statement two or three years ago, is not to make out a case against revision of the Charter. I speak with due respect about these persons because I am very humble and small man myself, but I think that the views of somebody who is not the Minister now or of somebody whose views do not prevail in the foreign office of USSR now or the views of somebody in Poland, where, I think, the whole set-up has been changed, quoted against revision of the Charter cannot represent a fair picture of the situation.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

I believe that the Charter does need revision, though not in the way in which my learned and idealistic friend, Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, wants it. You cannot hold elections for the UN all over the world on the adult franchise principle. On this suggestion, my imagination staggers. Of course, he must have a more virile imagination than I have. But certainly I feel a strange kind of paralysing effect when I am told that all over the world—and some countries are undeveloped—the election should take place on the principle of adult franchise. For what purpose? For electing representatives to the UNO. This is not done, this cannot be done and this shall not be done.

Again, to say that the only criterion for election of these representatives should be population is not applying a fair yardstick. Of course, population is a big factor. It has, no doubt, to be taken into account, but there are certain imponderable factors of the situation and those imponderable factors of the situation have also to be taken into account in order to judge the fitness or eligibility of a country or nation for membership of the U.N.

Therefore, while I say that there is need for revision of the U.N. Charter, I say that the matters to which Shri Brajeshwar Prasad referred to do not appeal to me. At the same time, I would say that this is a thing which is not to be done on an *ad hoc* basis. It has to be done in a very deliberate manner and, therefore, I suggest that a representative Committee should be formed, so that they could discuss the matter, and come to a conclusion as to how the Charter should be revised.

I think as long as there is room for regional pacts in the U.N. Charter, it does need revision. What do the exponents of the U.N.O. say? All these regional pacts—SEATO, NATO, Baghdad Pact and so on—are there because they are not tabooed by the U.N. Charter. Now, what do you think of a Charter which, while

working for universal peace, while working for the welfare of mankind, is dividing the world on a military basis? Of course, I know that these pacts have also an economic side to them. I know that in the recent meeting of the Baghdad pact countries, it was emphasised that the economic programme would be pursued with a great deal of vigour. All the same, the military aspect of these pacts is much more vital than the economic aspect. So long as this kind of thing can be permitted within the framework of the U.N. Charter, I would very humbly submit that the Charter does need revision.

At the same time, I would like to know what the U.N.O. has been doing for the under-developed countries. Sometime ago, it was said that they were going to have a special fund called SUNFED—Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development of under-developed countries. While on the one hand, the U.N.O. is a body which makes for peace, it is also a body which makes for the economic well-being of under-developed countries. Now, this is not done as a matter of course. This is done only as a gesture of goodwill towards the undeveloped and underdeveloped countries. What I would like to say is that the U.N.O. through its special allied agencies, should make a provision for bringing about a better economic well-being and by having such funds as the SUNFED.

At the same time, can anybody tell me—I speak subject to correction—that the U.N.O. is really representative in its character? I am not talking about the percentage of population. Leaving alone that factor for the time being, has it a representative character? I think our delegates and our Prime Minister have been saying all these years that China should be represented on the U.N.O. Now, China is represented by Formosa. Formosa is a country. I do not want to say anything about that country. It has its own good points or bad points. But, I think, if the

U.N. Charter permits China to be represented by Formosa in the Councils of the United Nations, it is something fundamentally wrong with that Charter and I would say that this Charter should be revised, if for no other reason, at least for this reason.

I have been reading—I have not read as much as some of my other friends have read—about the U.N. and its organisations; and I would like to read more and get more knowledge. But, what is said about the U.N. is this: that it can make recommendations but it cannot enforce its decisions. I borrowed a book from a friend of mine and I found this there. I put it to you: Do you not desire to revise the Charter so that U.N. is in a position to make its decisions acceptable? I am not talking about International Police or Military; I am not talking in terms of all that. Do you not want to make the U.N. an instrument which can not only recommend but which can also make its decisions acceptable?

On account of all these things, I would say that the Charter needs revision. But, we have to go into this question very thoroughly and for that we should appoint a Committee of this House and that Committee should be assisted by officials—why I mention officials is because some of our officials are also there in the U.N. Secretariat and they should discuss this problem and come to certain conclusions. All the same, I think there is need for the revision of the U.N. Charter.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House should be thankful to the hon. Member, Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, for his tabling this Resolution through which this House has got an opportunity to discuss certain matters with regard to U.N. It is a fact that when this U.N. was conceived, it was conceived as a living organism, and it was thought that, with the changing

times and with the changing situations, this Organisation will grow and certain revisions will be made in course of time with the agreement of the sovereign Nations that participate in this great Organisation. Therefore, to argue at this time that there is no necessity for review or revision of the Charter of the U.N. with regard to the representation of the different nations, is without any foundation. I very much disagree with my hon. friend who has quoted so many great persons to show that this Charter does not require any review or revision. The very circumstances in which this Organisation was established and the fact that only 5 or 6 Member States, who were members of the Allied Nations participating in the second World War, were there at that time, only denote that it is always opportune to discuss the achievements, the failures, the potentialities and the future of this Organisation, and I think the House should be grateful to our hon. friend.

This Resolution, as I have understood it, gives an indication—it may not be perfect in its wording—but it gives an indication of two points. One is that there should be a change in the representation of countries which fall in the region of Asia and Africa because they have been so far neglected and these two regions consist of very big populations and, therefore, their representation should be increased.

The second point which he has urged is the method of representation of the several States that are participants in this great Organisation.

I very much support the idea of giving representation to Asia and Africa in the U.N. But, I would suggest that this is not sufficient. The whole question of representation should be considered and, I think, it is going to be considered. It may not be possible. But, as far as I am able to know, the members of the U.N. have voted that there should be called a Conference of all the Member States to consider this question

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

of revising the Charter. It may or may not be possible.

In the present Charter, there are provisions for amendments. One is with regard to the different Articles, some change here and there. That can be done if two-thirds of the Member Nations support a Resolution for some amendment and if the amendment is passed and ratified by all the participating Nations, then it is accepted as mandatory. If any of the Member Nations does not ratify that amendment and if the permanent Members of this Organisation and of the Security Council do not require any change, one of them only can prevent any amendment. Therefore, the scope of the amendment is very much limited, though there is no restriction that there should be no amendment.

But, with regard to the revision of the Charter, a specific provision is made that within 10 years, by a simple majority of votes, the Member Nations can decide that it should be reviewed and then it can be reviewed, by calling a Conference of the Member-Nations and deciding the issue. Therefore, the main point which I would like to suggest is this. I agree that there is great necessity and this question should be studied by our Members. We want that the U.N. should function and function efficiently. We want that this Organisation should be as universal as possible and the functioning of this Organisation should be on the basis of equality, which equality is lacking. There are provisions in the present Charter which say that, just as every man is equal before law, every sovereign State is equal in matters of voting and other things. But, in practice, what do we see? We see that the representation of the different Nations is not on an equal footing even though it has been said that the maximum number of representatives of each sovereign State will be only 5. Even a small nation can send 5 representatives. The big nations, however big they may be in

economic resources, in population, in contributing to the funds of the United Nations Organisation, no matter, every sovereign nation is entitled to send only 5 representatives.

I would, therefore, suggest that a Committee should be appointed, consisting of the Members of this House, which can go into the provisions of the Charter and review the work of the great Organisation during the last 10 or 11 years and examine witnesses on different points—mainly our representatives who are there working on our behalf—and after taking into consideration all these factors, we, on our behalf, should suggest to the United Nations through our representatives that we want a revision. As some hon. Member has said, our Prime Minister has already indicated his view. If the participating nations come to the conclusion that there is occasion for revision there should be revision. Therefore, a Committee of the House should consider this question and, after considering the evidence of our representatives and reviewing the work of the Organisation, we should make our suggestions in this respect.

With regard to the second point, that is, representation of the Member Nations on the basis of adult franchise, certain suggestions have been made from time to time. One suggestion has been made that the representatives of sovereign States should be chosen on the basis of adult franchise. For the reform of the United Nations Organisation, there is a great necessity to discuss, consider and examine the work and review the working and then take evidence from all our representatives and others that have participated in that great organisation. After hearing all these things, the Members of this House should express their opinion on the reform of the United Nations Organisation and also examine whether any changes or amendments should be made in the working of the Organisation. With these remarks I support my amendment and I hope the hon. Member,

who has moved this Resolution, will accept it and that Government also will consider it.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): Before I come to the Resolution and Shri Gurupadaswamy's amendment, I would dispose of the two amendments moved regarding the constitution of a committee to enquire and recommend on revision of the U.N. Charter.

Assuming that the Charter of the United Nations needed revision, I do not think that a committee of this House or any other committee constituted in this country would be of very much use, because in order to determine the necessity of the revision of the Charter and in what way the Charter should be revised, the committee would have to examine not only our representatives in the United Nations but we have to ascertain the views and bear the suggestions of all other representatives from the different countries in the United Nations. The reason is that a revision of the Charter must be affected in accordance with the consensus of the opinion of all governments all over the world. Therefore, a committee set up in this country would be in a singular difficulty and would not be able to make much of a contribution.

I, however, do not subscribe to the view that the Charter of the United Nations needs any revision. Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, who has moved the Resolution, has asked for revision on two grounds: firstly, that the Asian and African population must be represented in accordance with their proportion, and secondly, that there should be election of delegates and other representatives on the basis of adult franchise.

We on this side of the House are very ardent enthusiasts of adult franchise in many instances, for example, not only in parliamentary or assembly elections but also in municipal elections—my State of Bengal, for instance, does not possess adult fran-

chise for municipal elections and we are pressing for it. But to ask for adult franchise in an international context to elect representatives on an international body would seem to be extraordinary for this reason. Here is a body on which the government of the country must be represented. This body would formulate decisions. Our delegate must vote one way and the decision would have to be carried out by the government. If there is a conflict between the government and the delegate on the United Nations, it would be an impossible affair. Suppose, in the United States, a communist happens to get elected as a delegate, it would be an impossible situation, the government pulling one way and the delegate pulling another way, when the government is supposed to be represented there. Therefore, as things stand at present and the United Nations is not being a world government or world parliament, an aspect to which I shall presently come, the question of adult franchise, I think, is an unpractical question in this matter, and the delegates must be chosen as representatives of the government. I can agree to Parliament choosing the delegates because we having a parliamentary democracy with a responsible government, the parliament is likely to reflect the views of the government. Therefore, that may be the most democratic way of choosing the representatives.

I now come to the main question at issue about the necessity of making revisions in the Charter, either to get a proportional representation on a population basis as suggested by Shri Brajeshwar Prasad or to prohibit atomic weapons or abolish the veto or secure independence for the colonies or settle other major issues through an international police force, as suggested by Shri Gurupadaswamy, or even to outlaw war. Regarding Shri Brajeshwar Prasad's stand, I think it is based on idealism which verges on utopianism. The

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

difficulty is that what we are dealing with is an international body where nations as such are represented, the United Nations—let us not forget it—and not the united world. It is not the parliament of man in a federation of the world. Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, of course, would have it that way. He would revise the Charter in order to turn the United Nations into a world government. However much we may sympathise with this point of view from an idealistic standpoint, it is impossible, and I should say, it is very injurious, if not mischievous, to try to establish a world government through the agency of the United Nations.

The question of a world government is a big question, and if you were to ask for my opinion about it, I think the present time is not opportune for a world government. For a world government we have to have certain things. Before a world government can come into being, we have to be sure that all groups in every part of the world, all nations in every part of the world, are on a footing of equality, that there are no disparities in resources as between the different nations—in resources military, in resources economic and all kinds of resources which give power to a nation. If there are disparities in resources, one group will easily dominate the other groups as happens in today's world. Why do we find that a nation like the United States controls so many nations? It has its resources, military resources and economic resources and although many of these nations are independent, yet they cannot get out of the meshes of the United States. That is the position of the world now. Under these circumstances, if we bring a world government into being, it will be a government by the more powerful groups in the world and the small nations will go under.

5 P.M.

If I had time, I will try to give my views as to how and when a World Government can come into being.

But, what I want to say is that a World Government is a utopian dream now; it cannot come into being now. We have, therefore, to think in terms of an international body which will secure the interests of peace. In what way can it secure the interests of peace? By gradually bringing the nations represented therein to a consciousness that certain things will have to be done if peace has to be preserved. All kinds of sanctions may be there but the most powerful sanction would be the sanction of public opinion, both inside each nation and outside. It is true, for instance as Shri Gurupadaswamy says, that war has not been outlawed. Because it is no use laying down a pious wish. No nation would accept that. That is the difficulty. Perhaps only those nations would accept the outlawing of war, who have not the power to make war. Otherwise, those who have the power to make war and those who count will not accept that. Therefore, it is no use to have this pious wish.

He has complained that the atomic weapons have not been prohibited in the Charter. There is ample scope within the U.N.O. to prohibit atomic weapons but the Charter is not the place for it. It can provide means for prohibiting but the prohibition of atomic weapons will have to be done with the consent of the nations concerned. If you and I vote that America or Soviet Union should not manufacture atomic weapons, they are not bound to listen. We have no power to compel them. So, it must be done with the consent of the nations and chiefly with the consent of the nations concerned with the manufacture and testing of such weapons. That consent has to be induced by the pressure of public opinion, world public opinion as well as internal public opinion by the creation of the consciousness and the propagation of the consciousness of the dangers which atomic weapons will bring to themselves, how the manufacture of atomic weapons will be a serious impediment to the increasing of the standard of

living of the nations which manufacture these weapons, and so on. These are the ways of prohibiting atomic weapons—not the revision of the Charter.

Something has been said about veto. It is precisely the measure to preserve peace in the world. It is no good saying that one nation can veto the will of ten. There is nothing wrong in it. What is veto? It is not a positive thing; it is a negative thing. By a veto, a nation cannot say that this will be done; it can say that this will not be done. If, today, nine or ten members of the Security Council decide that an army will march on to the Soviet Union, can you say that this view should be allowed to prevail? Or, take a more plausible case. If they decide that in support of Pakistan, an army should be marched into Kashmir, can we agree? This will at once bring in war and if the person, who does not accept it, has power enough, he will challenge it. Under those circumstances, the whole edifice of peace in the world will be in danger. Therefore, it has been very wisely provided that when there is a conflict between the Great Powers, the conflict must be resolved on the basis of unanimity, because, when there is conflict between the Great Powers, if there is no unanimity, one great power is sure to go to the length of challenging the position of the U.N.O. We know that if any great power thinks of challenging the position of the U.N.O., then no amount of unity among other powers is going to prevail on that power. For instance, the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., by themselves, can stand up against most powers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. We have two hours for this Resolution and he has taken fifteen minutes.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I will just now finish, Sir. Shri Gurupadaswamy talked of an international police force in this context. What would happen,

if, without veto, we had an international police force? Any member or members combining to make a majority in the Security Council—six of the members—could utilize this international police force for their own devious purposes. Already we have seen what has happened in Korea. That would happen in other parts of the world.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Where is the necessity for the U.N.O.?

Shri Sadhan Gupta: That is the point. The necessity of the U.N.O. is there. It is only to preserve peace within the limitations which the world is subject to, today. Sovereign nations are there and they must continue to be there unless humanity has developed to a sufficient extent, to such an extent that we can shed our sovereignty and come together in a common group or even in a common Government. That is how the U.N.O. should develop. We cannot force the pace now. The pace will have to be forced as the consciousness is developed.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Gorakhpur Dist.-North) rose—

Mr. Speaker: Only two hours have been allotted for this Resolution. Unless the House is willing to sit till 7 P.M. I am afraid I cannot accommodate him. Is the House willing to sit till 7 P.M.?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I will give him five minutes. I will ring the bell exactly after five minutes.

Shri S. L. Saksena: I thank Shri Brajeshwar Prasad for having given us an opportunity to air our views on this important subject. I do agree that the Resolution has come probably before its time. It thinks of a Parliament of Man, not even a World Government. I think it is our ideal. I remember our Prime Minister having once said that every nation should limit its sovereignty and work towards World Government. But, I

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

think it has yet to come and we cannot force the nations to form a Parliament of Man. But, still the Resolution has focussed attention on two important aspects—one is that the importance of African and Asian nations is not reflected in U.N.O. The most important body is the Security Council which was formed ten years ago. The Great Powers are there. France is there; Formosa is there as it is supposed to be a Great Power. Britain is also there. The other nations have grown up in stature India is itself treated as one of the world powers although it has not got a place on it. A revision of the Charter is due and there must be due recognition of the importance of the nations as they are today. I think France does not deserve to be there. Germany is rising and if it becomes peaceful and united, I see no reason why it should not get a place. Ten years are a long time. Especially during the last ten years there have been many changes. Many countries have become free. India, Burma, Pakistan and many other countries have become free. China itself has become a new China. Formerly it was Chiang Kai-shek's China. Now it is different. Therefore, a revision of the Charter is overdue. It should take place and one of the important changes should be in the composition of the Security Council. It should be according to the present stature of the different nations and I think that India should get one of the five permanent places.

There is also reference to representation in the U.N. Our hon. Minister Shri Krishna Menon raised this question there. I do not think it has been given due consideration. I think it should be considered properly and more people from Asia and Africa should be included in it. I do not think it will be proper to have representation based on population, but the Parliament may be asked to choose delegates.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: But, how many?

Shri S. L. Saksena: There are nations who feel one nation. There is no question of so many delegates from each nation. You cannot allow India to 400 members and Britain only 5 to 15 members. That will not do.

Therefore, I think that there should be a revision and it should give due importance to all nations in the Security Council. All important nations should get their due representation.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of veto. I agree with my friend who spoke last that at this stage the taking away of veto will create chaos. I think that it should remain.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I never said that the veto power should be deleted.

Shri S. L. Saksena: I only say that your dream cannot materialise today; it will come true probably after a long number of years. We all wish it to come.

The Minister Without Portfolio (Shri Krishna Menon): Mr. Speaker, Sir, whatever the views Members of the House, either by groups or individually, may take about the contents of the resolution and amendments, I am sure we will all feel that we have had an occasion, on account of this resolution being put down, to debate the United Nations. I would like to express my appreciation of the fact of the interest taken in this question, but I am afraid there the approbation must cease. The Government does not agree either with the form of the resolution or its contents, or the arguments advanced in favour of it or any of the amendments. It is, however, necessary, Sir, to say that large number of statements that have been made, if I may say so with all respect, wandered away from the main purpose of the resolution, from a World Government to relations between China, India and between somebody else, representations of one people by one weight and of another people by another weight and so on. I think it

would be useful for the House to sit back and look at the United Nations as it is, what its Constitution is, how it came into being and whether all these arguments are applicable without dissolving the organisation.

I do not know how far the House wants me to go. But if you just take the world of the modern age, that is the last 200 years, it is only in the last 200 years, that we have moved to an international conception. Before that we were in the days of empire. For the first time in modern history with the Peace of Westphalia begins the conception of nations gathering together in their conflicts and the Treaty of Osnabruck first laid down that the electors, meaning Governors, and the nations shall be represented by one vote for each State.

We have today no world legislature, no world Government, no world executive, no world administration. From that time onwards various attempts have been made by independent sovereign nations and I am sure the House will agree with me when I say that all nations are very proud and are very jealous of their sovereignty; none would surrender it; least of all we.

There is no one in this House who would be prepared to surrender the sovereignty; of this Parliament except by its own consent.

So the progress went on in that way till we came to the 19th Century. We first have the concept of Europe, which is again another attempt to bring together a family of nations in a World Government. It is not an attempt for a monolithic unity, it is merely a gathering, the concept of nations. From there we have the last experiment of the League of Nations, and I shall refer to it in a moment because one of my friends has put in an amendment regarding its purpose.

Then we have the United Nations. Now, the United Nations has its origin in the United Nations Declaration on the 1st January, 1942, based upon the terms of the Atlantic Charter

and all those who signed the United Nations Declaration in 1942, the 26 countries including India, they are the original members of the United Nations. In October, 1943, by the Moscow Declaration, the position of the United Nations was set out. The Moscow Conference on the 19th of October, 1943 declared:

"The necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organisation, based on the principle"... this is the most important part of it—

"...of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This is the key to the whole of this problem; that is, the United Nations is based upon the sovereign equality of nations and that equality cannot be upset, cannot be vitiated in any form either by the economic, political or moral power or by the weight of population. It is one-nation one-vote, open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

This was then confirmed in the Conference at Tehran, 1st December 1943, where it was declared:

"Co-operation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery oppression and intolerance".

And, Mr. Speaker, you remember, that is translated during the war against Hitlerism, so that from the very beginning the organisation has been based, both historically going into the pre-United Nations days and also in the context of all the circumstances of the world and of the development of ideas at that time, on the

(Shri Krishna Menon)

basis that nations, large and small, have equality in this organisation.

Reference has been made to the League of Nations and I will refer to two aspects of it. In the League of Nations, this sovereign equality of nations, large and small, was even more perfectly put down, that is to say, both the Assembly and the Council of the League was pledged to have unanimity of vote on any decision, in theory anyway though in practice it did not work like that. What is more. In the League of Nations there was no difference, in theory, between the great powers and the small powers, and there is in the United Nations on the representation of permanent members, so that, if there is any difference between the two, according to the actual realistic context of the world, the United Nations constitution and its practice is an improvement. It is an improvement that has been brought about by experience.

Sir, perhaps, this is an appropriate occasion for me to say that in this resolution occurs the word "U.N.O.". Nothing turns upon it, but by the Administrative Regulation of 1947, this has been abandoned and it is now called the U.N.—the United Nations—and the organisation specialised agencies.

Now, the text on which we have to rely is the United Nations Charter. I now invite reference to this Charter. First of all, take the Preamble. The Preamble begins by saying:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war etc."

Then it goes on to say:

"Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

It further says:

"Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good

and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations...."

From the very beginning, while it is quite true its moral foundations are, and I hope will continue to be, in the public sentiments, their opinions and attachment to the world, it was so constituted that it was the Governments that were represented.

Before I refer to the specific provisions of the Charter, I want to connect it up with our own Constitution. Under article 51 of our Constitution, it is the States that are responsible for promotion of international peace and security. It is not Parliament, it is not the people, it is not the electorate. It is the State and the State is known to the world only by its Government. The Government represents the State and nobody else does. It is true that Government is controlled by Parliament; the Government is appointed by the President under our Constitution. But in a country where there is responsible Government and where the executive is removable, it is Government that represents the State and therefore, the United Nations today is a conference where Governments represent the States, and it is not possible to discuss the great issues of the world with each delegation being composed of elected representatives and each Government perhaps having different views and sometimes perhaps all these Governments having a view different from their own Parliaments, which would make a very good comic opera. So, it is entirely an impractical suggestion.

I want to refer to the three ideas that are contained in this resolution. First of all, the Government is asked to press for the revision of the charter of the United Nations. I will take that first. We voted on a resolution last time that it is not possible for us either to vote against it or to move another resolution, unless this resolution has been rescinded by the United Nations by two-thirds majority. But

that resolution was not for the revision of the Charter. Article 108 of the United Nations Charter says: that if there has been no revision of the charter, then the General Assembly ought to appoint a conference, not for revising the charter but for considering what should be done about it.

Our Government has been consistently opposed to the idea of wholesale revision of the charter. There are many reasons for it. We, with the parliamentary systems, are not accustomed to pull out our Constitution every ten years, and rewrite another one. We may amend our Constitutions, we may improve them as our conventions and practices change and have their impact on the various institutions and ideas, but we are not accustomed to this idea of taking up the revision of the Constitution once every ten years and ask our Constituent Assemblies to take it up and rewrite the Constitution. But apart from that, I think we believe that there are shortcomings in the United Nations but they are not due to the shortcomings of the charter. They are due to the shortcomings of Governments, nations, of people, of civilization. We do not change human nature by having a better charter. The difficulty is to get the nations to conform to the charter as at present.

Therefore, at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, the tenth Assembly, adopted a resolution. I will not read the whole of it, but this part, I should like to go into the record. It said:

"Believing that it is desirable to review the Charter in the...."

It is very different from what one expected here—

"...light of experience gained in its operation, Recognising that such a review should be conducted under auspicious international circumstances, that is to say, when the tensions of the world are not so bad as they were and they are—

"Decides that a General Conference review the Charter shall be held at an appropriate time:

Further decides to appoint a Committee consisting of all the Members of the United Nations to consider, in consultation with the Secretary-General, the question of fixing a time and place for the Conference, and its organisation and procedures;

Requests the Committee to report with its recommendations to the General Assembly at its twelfth session;"

We are committed to this in the United Nations. The ultimate shape of this resolution is largely the result of amendments brought in by the Indian delegation, so that we are committed in the United Nations and the whole committee of the whole membership of the United Nations—a committee of the House, so to say—is committed to consider the ways and means of establishing a conference, if it so thinks fit, for the purpose of reviewing the charter.

I have given the general reasons why we have not supported a revision of the charter. The next is, at a time when it is so difficult even to obtain some degree of working arrangement under the existing charter on account of tensions between nations, on account of difficult conditions in the world, on account of the bi-polarized state of existence, we do not think it is very wise to rock the boat at this time. We will do no service to international development, we will do no service to the furtherance of the cause of peace and co-operation by trying to amend—even to amend—the charter as it stands at present. The charter can be amended, by another article, in respect of such things as the enlargement of certain Organs on account of the efflux of new members, or perhaps be considered, but for other changes that we want to make in the charter, it is necessary to get

(Shri Krishna Menon)

the unanimity, in the Security Council, of the Great Powers. That is probably the reason why many Members have referred to the veto.

Now, I would like to say that the word veto does not appear anywhere in the charter.

An Hon. Member: Unanimity.

Shri Krishna Menon: The word 'veto' is a newspaper coinage. It simply means that there has to be Great Power unanimity and we should be the last people in the world to decide that this Great Power unanimity should disappear. It is the sheet-anchor of the stability of the United Nations at the present moment.

We can all recall the experience of the League of Nations when one by one, the nations left it. It has also to be remembered that there is not one of these Great Powers who will give up the veto. Mr. Cabot Lodge, the permanent representative of the United Nations States in the United Nations told me,—and he declared in public also,—that the United States will not give up the right of veto because the United States cannot, under the constitution, be ordered about to wage war against anybody regarding its own matters. It means in great questions concerning the security of the world, concerning the enforcement by the nations, there must be agreement. There is a difference between the United Nations and the League of Nations. The League of Nations covenant provided for no machinery for enforcement. The Security Council provided the machinery for enforcement. That machinery cannot be put into operation unless the Great powers of the world agreed, because they have the arms, they have the power and, what is more, if we make decisions in regard to enforcement leaving the powerful people out of it, then, it means that we have no agreement in the world and there is no outside force to enforce the decision.

Shri M. S. Garasudravamy: We do not agree as to what will happen.

Shri Krishna Menon: The idea of general opposition to the veto has arisen in countries which really have no responsibilities in this way and who get rather bothered by what may be perhaps called an abuse of veto. Any power can be abused, and there are some who argue that the capacity to organize votes or to appeal to one passion or another is also an abuse, so that the fact that the veto is abused by a Power is no argument against that power itself.

Now, I would like to deal with the other parts of this resolution. The resolution seeks not to improve the United Nations, not for establishing peace and security, and not for one world—these points were made in the speeches—but asks that "African and Asian nations may be represented in the UNO in proportion to their population"—that is one of the purposes—and "delegates in the UNO and its subsidiary bodies be elected on the basis of adult franchise". First of all any revision of the charter cannot apply only to one part of the world. It must apply to the entire world. I would like to ask the mover of the resolution, how he would manage to elect, even if it were permissible, the delegates and subsidiary organs of the United Nations by adult franchise. Only a certain number of them go into one of these organs every year. They are elected at the General Assembly. Only after the election at the General Assembly, you are there. Then you go back to your country and by the time the next election, the general election, comes, your term is over. It is an entirely impracticable suggestion and the objection to it is very much more. It is possible to have an elected body as a world Parliament only when there is a world law and a world State.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: This is exactly what I say.

Shri Krishna Menon: But it is yet to be. We are dealing with the world as it is.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: But I am dealing with the world as it will be.

Shri Krishna Menon: We get nearer to it somewhat, in our lives! The election, if it could take place in the way you suggest, would mean that there would be a people with a mandate from the electorate of the country, to conduct affairs of that country in the United Nations independent of the sovereign Parliament. That would be the position. That is to say, the delegation of India, going into the United Nations, elected by our constituencies on adult franchise would be operated by the mandate of the people as different from the mandate of this Parliament. That means the whole conception of sovereignty of the nation, apart from the rule of law inside the country, would disappear.

Ultimately, the question arises as to how the decisions of such a United Nations could be carried out. The decisions today are carried out by national Governments. Every Government has got a Parliament. The United Nations passes a resolution which is only by way of a recommendation. Every resolution has in its operative part the word, "recommends". I do not know to whom it recommends, but it says, "recommends". If any action has to be taken, it is laid down again in the charter by the phrase, "according to the constitutional procedure of each nation."

Therefore, the execution of this policy can only be carried out by Governments. The United Nations has no arms to execute the decisions and this places it in a difficult situation. The idea is whether in our time, with sovereign parliaments, a world organisation can be constituted by election of persons who have no relation to their own national governments and that is why we think it is

necessary to argue this point very closely.

It is also said, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations is not good enough, because it has not written the abolition of war into its Charter, while the League of Nations had done so and secondly, the United Nations has not done away with the hydrogen bomb. I want to say here and now that the sentiment with regard to the increased representation of Asian and African countries, the desirability of getting some agreement on the abolition of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction—these are all part of the Government's policy and we are continually doing everything we can. I will come in a moment to how it can be done. We are told that there is no provision in the U. N. Charter for the abolition of war. But, the Charter begins by saying—I am quoting from the Preamble:

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind...."

And, the first article says:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective and collective measures...." etc.

The fact that the Parliament or the United Nations or any other organisation has not been able to achieve its aims is not a cause for revising its aims; it is a cause for further efforts being done.

Reference was made to the League of Nations Covenant having some provision for the abolition of war. All that is said in the Preamble is this:

"The High Contracting Parties, In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war...."

We formed the United Nations to provide a machinery against aggression and for collective action. It is

[Shri Krishna Menon]

quite true it has not proved very successful, because the conditions of work become divided by the balance of power doctrine, the two armed camps and so on.

Mr. Speaker: Article 2(3) of the U. N. Charter says:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner...." etc.

Shri Krishna Menon: The only international resolution with regard to the outlawry of war is what is known as the Kellogg Pact. You would see right through that war today can be outlawed only by agreement; and, if we are realistic, only by agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. They have the arms and they have to agree to lay down the arms. If the whole world decides by vast majority and if they still do not agree, the danger of war will survive. But each year the United Nations dedicates itself to the problem of lowering tensions, of bringing arms down to lower levels and trying to seek agreement. It is not necessary to revise the Charter in order to take these steps. They are done by the resolutions of the United Nations, the object of the United Nations being to rid the world of war, to bring down the level of armaments and various other things. On each occasion, a policy resolution, based upon agreement or trying to make the Governments come to an agreement, is being passed for the last ten years. Sitting together, these Governments have been trying to find if a disarmament convention can be drawn up. Until now there has been no agreement; they come a little closer and then they go further away. But still, they continue their efforts.

It is not that the abolition of the hydrogen bomb was not known at the time the U. N. Charter was discussed at San Francisco; in fact, it was known. The fact that it is not written

in the Charter is not the reason why still we have the ~~existence~~ of the hydrogen bomb. It is because there is no agreement in the world; there is suspicion between nations; there are various controversies between different groups of nations and they are trying to evolve different methods of war.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that there should be greater parliamentary representation in the delegations from India to the United Nations. While I have no desire as such that we should lay down any rule with regard to this, I should like to point out that increasingly the delegations to the United Nations are composed of Members of Parliament. I have not got the figures before me, but speaking from memory, I can say that out of the 16 members who went as delegates, alternates and advisers last year, 7 were Members of Parliament. The year before, out of 15, 8 were Members of Parliament; I mean 8 were parliamentarians, including one person from the Delhi State Assembly. It is not possible in our parliamentary system to limit international representations to Members of Parliament. That is the difference between a Congressional Government where there is no executive responsible to the Parliament and a Government like ours where the Parliament is supreme. If the Parliament does not like the Government, it throws the Government out, at least theoretically. Therefore, the position is that the nomination of the delegates to the United Nations is really an accreditation of representatives to another unit. In fact, the Chairman of the delegation to the United Nations for the time being is the Ambassador to the United States. That is how he is accredited. Either way we look at it, we get into a situation where the Government does not conduct the national foreign policy but Parliament. Rightly or wrongly, we have adopted a system where the Government is responsible to the Parliament; Government gives an

account of its activities to the Parliament. As far as the idea of a parliamentary committee going into the revision of the Charter is concerned, of course, it can study any problems; but, so long as there is a parliamentary system like ours, the responsibility must rest with the Government.

References have been made to statements of the Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that the Prime Minister makes more than one statement and therefore, I do not know to what it refers. It is quite true that he has often referred that the world must move towards unity; but, he is not speaking about the reform of the United Nations Charter. He is speaking about an idea which has been evolved from small groups—even lesser than tribes—in days gone by; and now, nations meet and we are conferring and taking collective action by agreement without imposing our will upon anybody else. The time may come when all the people in this planet will be able to join a World Legislature, have a World Law and a World Government. That is possible, but that is not the basis on which the United Nations is founded. It is based on agreement between sovereign nations and, therefore, while a World Government is always ideal and something to be worked for, it cannot be obtained by an amendment of the Charter.

Various Members of the House have raised the question why we are not able to write into the Charter the abolition or the outlawry of the hydrogen bomb. If we cannot get a resolution passed, how can we get a Charter written?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: You have to work for it.

Shri Krishna Menon: It is just like saying to a man, "When you have no bread, why don't you have cakes?" So, it is entirely impractical.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: You must work for it.

Shri Krishna Menon: I am afraid the hon. Member does not read the newspapers. I think probably some more effort is required on the part of those of us sitting on these benches and the Ministries to circulate and publicize the work of the United Nations. It may be that the vigilance of Parliament is required. It may be that the publicity which the proceedings of the United Nations receive outside is not adequate. It was only a few weeks ago that the Government of India, the only Government outside the Disarmament Commission, represented its views to the Disarmament Commission. In the last two years we have carried the brunt of the fight for some beginning in the disarmament field. It is not always a popular business because while disarmament itself is outmoded and everybody wants peace, if you try to cut somebody's arms, he does not like it. If you say: stop the explosion, it hurts the people who are responsible for the explosion. It is not always an easy task to undertake. If the only object or purpose of the Resolution is to press Government towards further action, no urging is required. But the urging is quite in order. The more the Members of Parliament and the public opinion in any country is exercised about this matter, the better it is. Ever since we have taken an active part in this matter, since 1952, various attempts have been made by us through the existing machinery. We are not, as a country, part of the Disarmament Commission. It is composed of members of the Security Council plus Canada and we come in to it only by approaches in the way that we made this year or at talks in the Assembly and, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to feel that in any attempt we make we have the overwhelming and enthusiastic support of the House. But to say that because the hydrogen bomb is not mentioned in the Charter

[Shri Krishna Menon]  
it will create trouble would be fallacious.

With regard to the point in the Resolution that the representation in the United Nations to the Asian and African nations should be on the basis of population, as an Asian country it will be a very unwise thing for us to talk about it because there are many countries in Asia and Africa with a big population and we ourselves have a big population. So, if we try to use that, even though it is an impracticable proposition, for arguments sake, it would only have the effect of arousing the suspicion of the people in other countries. Incidentally it is worthwhile mentioning here that we use the exactly opposite argument inside the United Nations when it comes to paying contributions. We do not pay them on the basis of population. We pay them in some other way.

The idea of representing people in the United Nations on the basis of population has been canvassed a great deal and much has been written about it. Recently an erudite American has written a book on this subject which presents a perfect picture. But it was not helpful because it was not those who can contribute to them (the United Nations) on behalf of the Governments who can deliver the goods. That is the position.

Then there is the other point that representatives must be those who have popular backing or what is called adult franchise. There may be other countries—I cannot mention them; it would be improper—where there is no adult franchise. Apart from that, to make a proposal of that kind would be for us to take the position of prescribing to others what form of government they should have. After all, no one has said the last word on what is the best form of Government. It is for each country to decide what form of government it should have. If we were to bring in the United Nations a public controversy by saying that only people elected accord-

ing to adult franchise should be there, we would be trying to outlaw a lot of people who should be there. And that is the argument we have always used against the exclusion of the People's Government of China from the United Nations. It is not a question of the United Nations' willingness. It reflects the order of the day, the facts as they are, and therefore, they must be represented. So that no part of this resolution and none of the arguments that have been put forward can receive the support of Government. The hon. Member can well draw the satisfaction that he has afforded an opportunity to this House to discuss this matter and that he has brought it forward in as objective a fashion as he can. I hope he would find it possible, in his wisdom, to withdraw it. If, on the other hand, he does not withdraw, I can only say my powers of persuasion are very poor and we must appeal to the House to reject the resolution and all the amendments.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the hon. Member withdrawing?

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I want to give some reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes. That is why I called him.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareli Distt.—East):** He will reply and then he will withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** We have much exceeded the time of two hours. I would like to call the next resolution. Therefore, he will kindly finish in five minutes.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** How much time, Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** Five to seven minutes.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I have been dubbed as impractical, visionary and idealist. I do not know how far I am practical or impractical. That is for the House and for the country to judge, but I strongly protest that I should be called visionary

or idealist. How far this proposal for the establishment of a World State is practical, time alone will determine.

Mr. Speaker: Is it not part of the resolution?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: It is the resolution. What I maintain is that the second suggestion in the resolution that members should be elected directly by the people means the establishment of a World State.

Shri M. S. Gurugadaswamy: Abolish all Governments.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Technically I do plead for the revision of the Charter of the U.N.O. but if my suggestions are accepted, the Charter will become the constitution. The U.N.O. will cease to be U.N.O. It will become a World State.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Surreptitious World State!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I will quote a passage from the book *Anatomy of Peace* by Emery Reves. He deals with the question how far the World State is practicable in the present circumstances:

"Anatole France tells this wise and profound story in *Sur La Pierre Blanche*:"

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Is it French?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Yes, it is a French book.

"In the days of Nero, in the prosperous Greek city of Corinth....

Shri Sadash All Khan: This has nothing to do with the resolution.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: My hon. friend being Parliamentary Secretary ought to be more careful.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Let us have the story.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. He has only five minutes.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I will finish. I will not answer the other arguments.

"In the old days of Nero, in the prosperous Greek city of Corinth, the Roman proconsul, Gallion, was discussing the future of the world with some of his Roman and Greek friends, statesmen and scientists. They all agreed that nobody believed any longer in the old gods, neither in Egyptian, nor Babylonian, nor Greek, nor Roman gods. The question was raised: What will be the new religion? Who will succeed Jupiter? The distinguished and cultured gathering spiritedly debated the chances of about a dozen new gods, when the delightful conversation was interrupted by a noisy quarrel between a strange, haggard Jew—one Saul or Paul of Tarsus—and a rabbi of the synagogue who accused Paul of revolutionizing the existing law. After the unpleasant incident, Gallion and his friends spent a few moments discussing the queer and ridiculous faith that this Paul was spreading, the teaching of an obscure Jewish prophet called Chrestus, or Chereustus, who had caused so much trouble to another Roman proconsul in Judea. One of the guests jokingly wondered if this Chrestus...."

Mr. Speaker: Such long extracts are not allowed in the House.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I shall quote just one sentence more.

"...might not succeed Jupiter. The idea greatly amused everyone. They unanimously agreed that this would be absurd indeed. The chances were all in favour of Hercules...."

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the amendments to vote. First, I shall take up Shri M. S. Gurugadaswamy's

[Mr. Speaker]

amendment. Does the hon. Member want me to put it to vote?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That for the original resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House urges upon the Government of India to make efforts for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations so as to provide, among other things, for the prohibition of the manufacture and experiment of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the setting up of an international police force, the abolition of the veto power of the Big Five, the elimination of all colonialism in the world and election of popular representatives of peoples to the U.N. General Assembly."

*The motion was negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: Then, there is Shri D. C. Sharma's amendment. Does the hon. Member want to press it?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I would ask for leave of the House to withdraw it.

"The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I also beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolution re Control and Regulation of Production and Exhibition of Films

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I come to the original Resolution. Is the hon. mover withdrawing it?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I withdraw it, but I do not see the wisdom of withdrawing it.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his Resolution?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

#### RESOLUTION RE CONTROL AND REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND EXHIBITION OF FILMS

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that Government should introduce legislation to amend article 19 (2) of the Constitution, so as to enable the Government to effectively control and regulate the production and exhibition of films in the country."

May I continue my speech next time? If I speak for five minutes now, I shall be neither here nor there.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. The hon. Member may continue his speech next time.

5-55 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 6th August, 1956.