

[Dr. Katju]

terms of the Prime Minister's statement made in this House on the 19th December, 1952.

It is hoped to place Justice Wanchoo's Report, together with Government's recommendations, on the table of the House in the course of this month. On the approval of the House being obtained, legislation will have to be undertaken.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants, Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 25, relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. The Time-table showing the dates on which the Demands in respect of the various Ministries will be taken up has already been circulated. Today, the House will deal with the External Affairs Ministry. Regarding the time limit for speeches, the usual practice has been to fix a time limit of 15 minutes for all Members including Movers of cut motions and 20 minutes, if necessary, for Leaders of Groups, subject to that time being cut out in the whole time allotted to that group. The time taken, as usual, by the Ministers in the reply in the end will be excluded. Demand No. 22 relates to Tribal Areas, Demand No. 23 relates to External Affairs, Demand No. 24 relates to Chandernagore and Demand No. 25 relates to Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs.

So far as cut motions are concerned, I have here a number of cut motions to these various Demands. I would urge upon hon. Members and Leaders of Groups to hand over the numbers of those cut motions which they select, to the Secretary in 15 minutes. I will treat them as moved if those hon. Members in whose names those cut motions stand, are present in the House and they are otherwise in order.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I have given.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They will be tabulated.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): What about the cut motions of the unattached Independent Members?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any hon. Member who wants his cut motion to be placed before the House may indicate the number and hand it over to

the Secretary. I will treat them as moved provided the Member is in the House.

I shall now place the Demands formally before the House.

DEMAND No. 22—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,46,99,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND No. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,16,28,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 24—CHANDERNAGORE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,33,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Chandernagore'."

DEMAND No. 25—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,46,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I rise to take part in this debate with some perturbation, because, it has happened too often in this House that I tread upon the Prime Minister's corns, and I do not enjoy

the experience. What happens is that the Prime Minister pitches on a point or so, ignores everything else and then he gives what I am constrained to call an orchestration of platitudes that answer no problems. I hope that my experience this time will be different.

I would like to refer at the outset to a point, on which, I am sure, every section of this House will agree, and ask Government to find out all the relevant information and let us know. I have already passed on to Government certain papers which we received from Bangkok, which indicated that towards the end of the last war, there appeared to have been serious disagreements between Shri Subhas Chandra Bose and the Japanese Government, that Indians in South Asia and East Asia question the veracity of the reports regarding the alleged death of Subhas Chandra Bose, and that certain persons of Indian nationality, whose names were mentioned in the papers which I have already given over to the Government, were alleged to have misappropriated certain funds, large sums, as a matter of fact, belonging to the Indian Independence League which were with Subhas Chandra Bose. When we remember that the Japanese Government seems to be very keen that we accept what is termed to be the ashes of Subhas Chandra Bose, we realise how important it is that all necessary investigations are made into this matter, for this affects the memory of one who, in spite of the controversy which he evoked, is surely one of the most outstanding and never-to-be-forgotten figures in the history of our freedom movement.

3 P.M.

Now, the other day, the Prime Minister spoke very feelingly on the passing away of Stalin. It was a speech which made some of us summon up remembrance of things past when the Prime Minister, not so very long ago, could rouse our people against Mussolini and Hitler and Franco and the Japanese aggressors of China. We were no stronger at that time than we are now, but he never told us in those days that we were not strong enough to try and arrest the drive towards a world war. He had faith in his own people and confidence in himself, but now, perhaps burdened by office, he says, as he did on the occasion of his reply to the debate on the President's Address, that we are a weak country and can do precious little indeed to influence the course of international events. I know that we cannot work

wonders, but surely, we can do something; and there, I would like to pin the Prime Minister down to what he said himself. We can, as the Prime Minister said himself, help in creating a climate of peace. In regard to this I would refer to what was, perhaps, the last public testament of Stalin—the interviews with our own Ambassador and also with the ambassador of our people's peace movement, Dr. Kitchlew; and, on both occasions, he underlined the obligation of all who care for the world's people and their future, to see that peace was won, that trade on conditions of honour and national self-respect continued among the nations, and that imperialism could not cry havoc and let slip the dogs of war. Are we facing up to this obligation to create what the Prime Minister called "a climate of peace"? Perhaps I spy a sort of irritation and impatience in the Prime Minister's face, but I will tell him in words which are quite parliamentary because they were used by Oliver Cromwell, "I beseech thee, in the bowels of Christ, think for a moment that you might be wrong"; think for a moment that you might be pursuing policies today which really do not represent the ideals which you yourself had before you.

We are told often enough that India these days has very great prestige in the counsels of the world. We are told also that we follow an independent foreign policy, a policy of non-alignment with the power blocs. I know that we get pats on the back from dubious visitors from Anglo-America, but are we following a really independent foreign policy, a policy of peace and freedom? In regard to this I would like to refer to what the Prime Minister said to the Constituent Assembly on the 4th of December, 1947. He said:

"Ultimately foreign policy is the outcome of economic policy, and until India has properly evolved her economic policy, her foreign policy will be rather vague, rather inchoate, and will be groping..... I regret that we have not produced any constructive economic scheme or economic policy so far... When we do so, that will govern our foreign policy more than all the speeches in this House."

A very unexceptionable statement since then, the economic policy of the Indian Government has been evolved, principally in accordance with the requirements of the United States and of Britain. The Prime Minister himself admitted on the 7th of July, 1950 that our economy is obviously tied to England and other Western

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

powers. We know our plan, and we know how very dependent we are for the most strategic sectors of our economic front upon the Anglo-American suppliers of goodwill, of aid and trade facilities etc., etc., to us. Of course, the Prime Minister, in 1950, hastened to aid that "political policy is another matter." I do not know why, he gave no reason to suppose that the theory he had enunciated regarding the dependence of political policy on economic policy had gone through a complete sea-change and had become completely obsolete.

In this connection, I would like to refer in particular to the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Agreement, and I would invite the House to make a study of its provisions. I do not know how the Prime Minister could append his signature to that document, a document which has been dissected by a well-known Gandhian economist, Shri Suresh Rambhai; and he said it was not an agreement, but a slavery bond. And he said this because in this document we find how we are bartering away our independence, so to speak. We are allowing the American Director to rule the roost; we are giving him a veto on expenditure; we are allowing even the American money to be mixed up with Indian money in such fashion that Mr. Chester Bowles, the outgoing Ambassador from the United States, could say that "we know exactly how and where and why every cent of the American aid to this country is spent". This is a kind of thing which has been going on.

In a speech in this House last February, the Prime Minister pointed out very correctly that there were certain fundamental things which were necessary for world peace. For example, he said the United States of America and the Soviet Union which are entirely different in outlook and ways, should function together. Now who prevents it? Let us find out who prevents it. As early as 1922, Lenin had spoken about the co-existence of the Socialist and the Capitalist systems, and this point regarding co-existence has been repeated over and over again by Stalin. Who puts an embargo on trade with the Soviet Union, with People's China, with the Eastern European democracies? Is it the United States of America, or is it the Soviet Union? And what is our record? The Czechoslovak Trade Mission, for example, was here quite some time, had tried for a trade agreement and failed. The Soviet Ambassador spoke umpteen times regarding the supply of capital goods and all

kinds of goods to this country. The Moscow International Economic Conference amplified that offer. The International Exhibition at Bombay gave a visual demonstration of the Soviet's capacity to supply these things to us. But our Government came forward over and over again in this particular House, and said our business people are free to have some kind of arrangement with the Soviet business people, forgetting that the Soviet country has a planned economy, that if we are really serious about economic relations with the Soviet Union, we have got to negotiate at a Government level, and we have got to do it at once.

We see also that we cannot expand trade with these countries. Look at Ceylon. Ceylon has sold rubber in exchange for rice, and Ceylon is being refused aid under the Point Four system. Point Four is there for us, and because of Point Four, because of Mutual Security, because of these foreign experts who are all over the place, supping in our cup and dipping in our dish—we find them, all these people, lordling it over the place, and making it impossible for our economic development to continue.

The Prime Minister was emphatic that China is not recognized by some great countries, and this is a violation of the universality of the United Nations. Now, who has departed from this basic principle of the United Nations? Is it the Soviet Union, or is it the American Government? Our Government certainly did very well in supporting China, standing by China, but are we being consistent? The Prime Minister has said that terrific weapons of mass destruction are such today that even if a war is won, it cannot secure the objectives for which it is fought. Well, who has been persistently fighting to secure that these weapons are renounced for all time? Who has been fighting to renounce these weapons of mass destruction? and there again, we find that ex-President Truman declared in the American Senate that he was going to secure—and he did secure—larger budgetary appropriations for research and production in germ warfare. In the United Nations Commission on Disarmament, the American delegate shamelessly declared that he would reserve the right to practise germ warfare against countries whom he considered to be the aggressor. The Soviet Union repeatedly brought motions in order to renounce the application of these weapons of warfare. There was nothing to prevent our Prime Minister from doing something of that sort. If

we were really independent, we would have come forward with this kind of proposal. We would have said: "We want a stop to this kind of thing, to this kind of unspeakable violation of the principles of international morality."

The Prime Minister had said many times that support to colonial countries in their fight against colonialism is a great plant in our foreign policy. Now, who keeps up colonialism today? Who, is fighting ruthlessly for colonialism? Certainly not People's China or the Soviet Union but it is the United Kingdom, the United States, France and all the other imperialists, but why should we help this tribe of imperialists? The shame of Gurkha recruitment on Indian soil is not yet effaced. We do not know when the camps will be finally and definitely closed. The tripartite agreement which allows transit facilities to Gurkha recruits across our country continues. My question on the floor of this House regarding the reported employment of Indian armymen in the Gurkha units of the British Army in Malaya and Hongkong—I named two of them—remains unanswered. The External Affairs Ministry report admits that they have copiously advised the Government of Nepal but they do not do a thing to efface this shame of colonialism. In the New York Times of 18th February, 1953, there is an article by Robert Trumbull which says:

"The Indian Army is constructing the new road from a fund set up by New Delhi where the strategic importance of Nepal as a buffer against Communist China is deeply appreciated. An Indian Military Team is modernising the Kingdom's armed forces, consisting largely of famed Gurkha troops. Other Indians are consultants in various administrative fields."

Now wonder that Shri B. P. Koirala, who was brought up in India, who participated in India's freedom movement, has given a statement to the Amrita Bazar Patrika dated 8th March, 1953, saying that Nepal is extremely sensitive on the question of her independence and India messing about with Nepal's policy. And that is why this morning we see a report in the papers that the Indian Military Mission is being asked to withdraw. Why can't we use our real good offices in regard to Nepal? Why don't we tell them "Do not allow your men to go as mercenaries and join the army of Great Britain in order to kill with blood and torture the people of Malaya and the people of other parts of

the world fighting for freedom." You are obviously making a mess of things in Nepal and that is why it is necessary for us to revise our actions as far as the External Affairs Ministry is concerned.

Now, the rulers of the United States, certainly,—I do not comprise in that statement the common working people of the United States,—men like Eisenhower and Dulles do not make any bones about their position. They have stated categorically, not only that they want Asians to fight Asians, not only that they want a blockade of China, not only that they would assist the hordes of Chiang-ke-Shek to land on Chinese territory but also that they are going to increase the aid or assistance to British and French and other imperialists to conduct their bloody wars against the freedom-loving people of Vietnam, Malaya, Tunisia, Kenya and elsewhere.

It is in this context that we read to our consternation a Reuter report on the 13th March that our Ambassador in Washington met Mr. Dulles on the 12th March and it says:

"Informed officials reported that the topic of discussion was Mr. Dulles' proposed visit to India. It was understood that Mr. Dulles would reach India just after the middle of May."

This kind of person is not a welcome visitor to our country in spite of our hospitality.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: There is racialism in South Africa. We have to find out who supports this racialism in South Africa? Who supported us in the United Nations in the fight against racialism? Was it the United States, was it Great Britain, was it France or was it the Soviet Union? What about Korea? The agony of the people there is so visible, the excruciating agony about which our Prime Minister has spoken so movingly before; our record there is bad, and I repeat it is a bad record which we have got over Korea. I quote from a publication called "India-Oriental Third Force," (with a question mark) published by the Armed Forces Information and Education Division of the United Nations of the Office of the Secretary of Defence. It says:

"Until October, 1950, India never voted against the United States on Korea. At what history will probably consider the most crucial point in postwar world affairs, so far, India was with the U.S."

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

On the 19th of September, 1951, Mrs. Pandit, who was then our Ambassador in New York categorically declared her views about India's foreign policy saying it was pro-United Nations, pro-free nations, etc. and then added that recent session of the General Assembly "we voted as you did 38 times out of 51, abstaining 11 times and differing from you only twice." She is now leading our delegation to the United Nations. She was here last month and she made a speech and I am sorry to have to say it she mouthed phrases like "iron curtain countries" and "Soviet satellites"—phrases which are still unrepudiated by the Prime Minister. In Korea, our Prime Minister says, "let us work peacefully". Very good. Let us work peacefully. There is the dispute regarding the prisoners of war. On this issue our position is clear and the Geneva Convention is there unequivocally. The United Nations treatment of prisoners of war in camps like Koje is a horrific scandal without precedent in the history of war. Yet, as China says "put first things first", stop the war at once. Have an immediate and complete armistice. Let us discuss the prisoner-of-war issue later on. I shall refer to the speech which was made by the Chinese Prime Minister on the 4th February before the Chinese People's Consultative Council. He says, "Let us stop the war, stop the fighting, stop this bloody carnage, we will talk about the prisoner of war issue afterwards". Why don't we do something about this? Why don't we tell the United Nations that we are not going to sit quiet in injured vanity because last time we had that Acheson-doctored resolution for peace and it came back as a boomerang. This sort of position certainly has got to be changed. There is a great deal of talk about two blocs. Government says that we do not align ourselves with any bloc. It is only a smoke-screen to cover the inescapable reality that the Government of India constituted as it is today, cannot possibly follow a really independent foreign policy which would fit in with our traditions. I may give some illuminating examples. I will give you only a few. We ban the sale in all our railway book stalls of Soviet literature because it is "tendentious." We did not put a ban when a man called Louis Fisher wrote serially and in a scandalous fashion on the "Life and death of Stalin", at a time when Stalin was very much alive, in reputable papers like the *Times of India* and the *Hindu*. There are glaring examples of vulgar American literature which are on sale everywhere but we do not

do a thing about it. There is, for example, a book called "I killed Stalin" which was sold openly in our book stalls. I have not got it with me now, but I could show it to you if you wish it. This is a thing which is against international courtesy, which is against any idea of international friendship. We go head over heels in welcome to United States destroyers from Korea and notorious Moral Rearmamenters who are agents of "100 per cent. Americanism" but we hinder peace conferences at home and abroad and we think of punishing Government servants who sign a non-party appeal for peace and for a ban on the atomic bomb. Perverted films from Hollywood have the freedom of our country but I am sorry to say, a short film on peace which was sent to my hon friend, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty—because she happened to go to Berlin to attend a peace conference—was not allowed to be taken delivery of by her because the Customs people thought it was poison. I could give you heaps of instances but I have not the time.

There is, to cap everything, our link with the British Commonwealth and Empire, whose emissaries are specially recently coming in droves to look at our dams, to look at our photogenic Prime Minister's face and to talk perhaps of Medo and Nato and An Zus and of the democracies' civilising mission in Asia and Africa. Their hearts are where their treasure is also. There is so much British capital here and my hon. friend, the Finance Minister is a watchful guardian of that treasure.

The Prime Minister has said in his study of history—a subject which his deputy seems to be shying away from—that Britain's hold over India might go beforelong and yet, the economic control might remain as an invisible Empire. "If that happens, it means that the exploitation of India by Britain continues." That was what he said in his 'Glimpses of World History'. That has happened. His prophecy has proved true. And so he has to be coaxed and cajoled to attend the mediaeval mummery of a British Coronation, to forget in its fumes the reality of his country's vital link-up with Anglo-American imperialism, and to attend Prime Ministers' Conferences,—and Heaven knows, what other contrivances—to keep us yoked to the chariot-wheels of Britain and the United States. The Prime Minister has tried to solve his own riddle. I have a feeling that he justifies himself to himself, because I

fear he is surrounded by people who do not get up and tell him those things which have got to be brought back to his memory, and so he justifies himself to himself. So he repeats, as he has done recently, that imperialism is no problem today and that in the last few years, colonialism has largely been tackled. That might please him, but it does not please the peoples of the world. The fact remains that Asia and also Africa are resurgent against colonialism and the fight goes on, a fight to which we cannot remain indifferent, if we are to treasure our own freedom. Let us not pass off pusillanimity as wisdom, humiliation as virtue, acceptance of British and United States hegemony as moral regeneration. I would remind the Prime Minister of what Gibbon said in his 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire', of how a wise man may deceive himself, how a good man may deceive others, how the conscience may slumber in a mixed state between self-illusion and voluntary deception. I ask him at a crucial moment in the world's history to rise to the full stature of his own being, to outsoar the shadow of our darkness in India, and to tell the world that his people are determined, come what may, to strive for peace and freedom, and never to yield to those mischievous forces of warmongering and imperialism, on whom the peoples of the world have already pronounced their sentence of death.

सेठ गोबिन्द दास (मंडला-जबलपुर—

दक्षिण) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मालम नहीं यह अनेक बार किस प्रकार होता है कि जब जब साम्यवादी दल के नेता या उपनेता महोदय कुछ कहने को खड़े होते हैं उसके बाद ही आप मुझे पुकारते हैं। जो कुछ हो, इस वर्ष जिस समय राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण पर बहस आरम्भ हुई थी उस वक्त भी ऐसा ही हुआ और आज भी ऐसा ही हुआ।

अभी मैंने श्री मुखर्जी का जो भाषण सुना उसमें आरम्भ से अन्त तक मुझे एक ही बात सुनायी देता रही, वह यह कि हम जिस वैदेशिक नीति का अनुसरण कर रहे हैं वह नीति यथार्थ में अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन का

समर्थन करने वाली नीति है। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि उनका कहा माना जाय और जिस नीति पर चलने के लिये वे हमें कह रहे हैं अगर हम उस पर चलें तो वह नीति सोवियट यूनियन का समर्थन करने वाली नीति होगी।

हमने इस बात को न जाने कितनी बार स्पष्ट किया है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति किसी भी गुट का समर्थन करने वाली नीति नहीं है और यदि श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी थोड़ा सा भी पक्षपात रहित होकर इस सम्बन्ध में विचार करेंगे तो उन्हें मालूम हो जायगा कि उनका सोचना कितना गलत है। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी नीति का समर्थन अमरीका करता है, अमरीका के साथी संगी करते हैं। पर वे इस बात को भूल जाते हैं कि भारत में जो साम्यवादी दल है यदि हम उस दल को छोड़ें तो हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का समर्थन चीन भी करता है और अनेक बार रूस भी। यह हमारी दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि जब अन्य साम्यवादी देश भी हमारी नीति का समर्थन करते हैं तब हमारे देश में ही जो साम्यवादी दल निर्मित हुआ है उसके पास हमारी नीति के या हमारे किसी कार्य के सम्बन्ध में एक भी शुभ विचार नहीं है, एक भी शुभ शब्द नहीं है। श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी ने कहा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि किसी भी वैदेशिक नीति के लिये आर्थिक नीति का स्पष्टीकरण होना चाहिये। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी आर्थिक नीति बहुत स्पष्ट है और अगर वे हमारी पंच वर्षीय

[सेठ गोविंद दास]

योजना को थोड़ा ध्यानपूर्वक पढ़ेंगे तो उन्हें शान्त होगा कि हमारी आर्थिक नीति बहुत दूर तक उस पंच वर्षीय योजना में स्पष्ट की गयी है। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी आर्थिक नीति अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन से प्रभावित है, इसका प्रमाण यह है कि हम वहां से आर्थिक सहायतायें मंजूर करते हैं। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने किसी देश से किसी भी आर्थिक सहायता को किसी भी शर्त पर स्वीकार नहीं किया है। जब हमें अनाज अमरीका से मुफ्त में मिलता था तब, मैं उन्हें स्मरण दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि, वह तब हमने स्वीकार नहीं किया। यदि कोई भी देश कोई शर्त हमारे सामने अपनी सहायता देने के पूर्व रखना चाहता है तो वह शर्त हम कदापि स्वीकार नहीं करते।

फिर उन्होंने एक बड़ी विचित्र बात कही। उन्होंने कहा कि सुरक्षा परिषद् में हमने कितनी बार अमरीका के साथ वोट किया, कितने बार हम तटस्थ रहे और कितनी बार हमारा मत रूस और चीन के साथ गया। यह तो बड़ी विचित्र दलील है। कितने बार हमने किसके साथ वोट किया यह प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता। हमने जब भी जो बातें सही समझीं उनके पक्ष में वोट किया चाहे वे बातें अमरीका की हों, चाहे वे बातें रूस की हों चाहे वे बातें किसी भी देश की हों

फिर उन्होंने एक और अद्भुत बात कही कि यहां पर अमरीका का बहुत अधिक साहित्य मिलता है। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ

कि अमरीका और यूरोप का जितना यहां साहित्य मिलता है उससे कदाचित् रूस का अधिक मिलता है और रूस का उससे बहुत अधिक सस्ता भी मिलता है जिस वजह से वह अधिक खरीदा भी जाता है। यदि हमारी नीति रूस के साहित्य को रोकने की होती तो उनकी पार्टी का जो पुस्तकालय है वह भी बन्द हो गया होता। इसलिये यह कहना कि हम किसी देश के विशेष साहित्य को प्रोत्सहान देते हैं बिल्कुल गलत है। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी का सारा भाषण एक ही बात से भरा हुआ था कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति ऐसी नीति है कि जिस नीति से अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन का समर्थन होता है। यह बात सही नहीं है। हमारी नीति एक ऐसी नीति है कि जिस नीति का मर्थन आज एक ओर यदि अमरीका करता है तो दूसरी ओर रूस और चीन भी करते हैं। यह अलग बात है कि हमारी यह नीति यदि किसी के विरुद्ध जातों है तो वह हम पर एक दुलत्ती झाड़ देता है। जैसे जब हमने कहा कि कोरिया में राष्ट्र संघ की सेनाओं द्वारा ३८वीं अक्षांश को पार न किया जाय या चीन को सुरक्षा परिषद् में लिया जाय तब अमरीका ने हमारा विरोध किया था और अभी जब हमने कोरिया के युद्ध बन्द करने के सम्बन्ध में एक प्रस्ताव रखा तब रूस और चीन ने हमारा विरोध किया। किसी भी ऐसी नीति का कि जिस नीति का हम अनुसरण कर रहे हैं हमेशा इस ही प्रकार का विरोध होता रहेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदा से इस नीति का समर्थक रहा हूँ और अब जब कि मैं ने दुनिया के प्रायः सभी देश देख लिये तब मैं इसका और बड़ा समर्थक हो गया हूँ। मैं आज यह मानने लगा हूँ कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति से केवल हमारा कल्याण है इतना ही नहीं पर सारे संसार का कल्याण है। और जब मैं यह कहता हूँ तब मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि सारे संसार की क्या स्थिति है इसको थोड़ा समझने का प्रयत्न किया जाय इसके लिये संसार के मुख्य मुख्य देशों की अवस्था क्या है इस पर ध्यान देना जरूरी है।

पहले आप यूरोपीय देशों की ओर देखिये यूरोपीय देशों में ग्रेट ब्रिटेन एक अलग स्थान रखता है। वह अलग स्थान इसलिये रखता है कि उस के कुछ उपनिवेश हैं। फिर यूरोप के वे देश हैं जिन में प्रजातंत्र चल रहा है, जैसे इटली, फ्रांस, पश्चिमी जर्मनी। आज ये देश बड़े जर्जर हो गये हैं और आप को यह बात मालूम होगी कि जिस प्रकार युनाइटेड स्टेट्स आफ अमेरिका (संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका) है, उसी प्रकार आजकल युनाइटेड स्टेट्स आफ यूरोप (संयुक्त राज्य यूरोप) के बनाने की चर्चा भी चल रही है। इसके बाद यूरोप के ही कुछ साम्यवादी देश आते हैं। फिर एशिया के देश हैं उन देशों में चीन, जापान और भारत का मुख्य स्थान है। चीन रूस के साथ है। जापान इस समय किस के साथ है यह कहना बड़ा कठिन है। जब मैं अभी जापान गया तब मुझे यह भास हुआ था कि इस समय की जापानी सरकार बहुत समय तक नहीं रह सकेगी। जापान में

मैंने यह भी महसूस किया था कि भारत ने जो सैन फ्रांसिस्को में सुलहनामा हुआ उसका विरोध किया था, उस का जापान निवासी यथार्थ में समर्थन करते हैं। जहाँ तक भारत का सम्बन्ध है, इस विषय में मैं बाद में कहूंगा। फिर अफ्रीका के कुछ देश आते हैं। अफ्रीका के इन देशों में यदि हम देखें तो सब से बड़ा प्रश्न इस समय दक्षिण अफ्रीका का है। वहाँ पर रंग भेद जिस परिमाण में बरता जा रहा है, संसार में कहीं भी नहीं है। इस के पश्चात उपनिवेशों के तीन देश कनाडा, आस्ट्रेलिया और न्यूजीलैंड आते हैं। यहाँ पर बहुत भूमि है बहुत से नैसर्गिक साधन हैं, परन्तु आबादी बहुत कम है। इन तीन उपनिवेशों की अवस्था संसार से एक बिल्कुल अलग अवस्था है। उस के बाद आते हैं अमेरिका और रूस।

अब यदि आप अमेरिका और रूस के सिवा इन सारे मुख्य मुख्य देशों को देखें, उन की परिस्थिति को देखें उनकी इस समय को जो आर्थिक अड़चनें हैं उन को देखें, तो आप को मालूम होगा कि यथार्थ में यह सारे देश अपनी नाजुक परिस्थिति के कारण जो दो गुट बन गये हैं, एक अमेरिका का और दूसरा रूस का, इन में से किसी गुट में सम्मिलित हैं। वे इसलिये सम्मिलित हैं कि कुछ देश यदि अमेरिका के साथ न हों तो जो आज उन की जो अवस्था है वह और भी खराब हो जायेगी। इसी तरह कुछ देश अगर रूस के साथ न हों तो उन की जो आज दशा है वह इस से भी खराब हो जायेगी। और सारे देशों की

[सेठ गोबिन्द दास]

वैदेशिक नीति इन के स्वार्थ के अनुसार चलती है। मैं यह दावा करता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष की वैदेशिक नीति किसी स्वार्थ के साथ नहीं चलती। वह चलती है हमारी परम्परा के अनुसार वह चलती है महात्मा गान्धी ने जो हमें मार्ग बतलाया है उस मार्ग के अनुसार।

लड़ाई इस समय जो नहीं हो रही है इसका कारण कोई यह न समझे कि वह अमेरिका या रूस की किसी सद्भावना या किसी मैत्री या किसी प्रेम के कारण नहीं हो रही है। ऐसी बात नहीं है। अमेरिका अगर नहीं लड़ता है और रूस यदि नहीं लड़ता है, या इन के गुट वाले जो दूसरे देश हैं, वे एक दूसरे से नहीं लड़ते हैं तो वह इसलिये कि दोनों गुट एक दूसरे से भयभीत हैं। इन में से एक गुट को भी यह विश्वास नहीं है कि यदि लड़ाई हुई तो कौन जीतेगा। जो बड़े बड़े भाषण होते हैं जैसे अभी मालेनकाव का हुआ कि वे शान्ति चाहते हैं, या आइजन हावर का होता है कि वे शान्ति चाहते हैं, या चर्चिल साहब का होता है कि वे शान्ति के उपासक हैं और इस प्रकार शान्ति की जो बड़ी बड़ी बातें कही जाती हैं इन में बहुत कम तथ्य है इनमें यदि सच्चाई होती तो यह जो नित नयी लड़ाई की तैयारियां हो रही हैं, वह क्यों होतीं। अभी श्री हीरेन मुल्जर्जी ने बताया कि अमेरिका में नाना प्रकार के अस्त्र शस्त्र बन रहे हैं। अभी मैं चीन गया था और चीन जाने से यह बात मालूम हो जाती है कि रूस में भी किस प्रकार के हथियार बन रहे हैं। अमेरिका की बातें जल्दी प्रकट हो जाती हैं, क्योंकि वहां प्रजातन्त्र पद्धति चल रही है। रूस और चीन की बातें इस लिए प्रकट नहीं होने पाती कि वहां डिक्टेटरशिप है। डिक्टेटरशिप में इस

प्रकार की चीजें प्रकट होना कठिन बात होती है। इसके अतिरिक्त अगर कोई यह समझते हैं कि मार्शल स्टालिन के स्वर्गवास के कारण या अमेरिका में डिमाक्रैट्स नहीं जीते और रिपब्लिकन्स जीते हैं और आइजनहावर प्रेसीडेंट हो गये हैं, इस से सारे वायुमंडल में कोई परिवर्तन होने वाला है, तो यह भी असम्भव बात है। अमेरिका के साथ जो देश हैं वे सदा यह सोचा करते हैं कि रूस और चीन में कभी न कभी झगड़ा होने वाला है। रूस के साथ जो हैं वे सोचा करते हैं कि अमेरिका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन में झगड़ा होने वाला है। मैं ने जो कुछ देखा उस के आधार पर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बिल्कुल गलत है। न कभी रूस और चीन में झगड़ा होगा और न कभी अमेरिका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन में। तो जो आज लड़ाई का वायुमंडल है, वह वायुमंडल यदि भारतवर्ष में नहीं है, और भारतवर्ष ही एक मात्र ऐसा देश है कि जिसमें हमें लड़ाई का वायुमंडल दिखाई नहीं देता तो वह हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के कारण है।

जो यह कहते हैं कि हमारी यह नीति असफल हो गई है, यह बात भी गलत है। इस नीति का कितना प्रभाव इस समय सारे संसार पर है, वह इसी से प्रकट है कि इस नीति के कारण ही आज दुनिया में भारतवर्ष की प्रतिष्ठा है। हम कोरिया के युद्ध को नहीं रोक सके, इस में सन्देह नहीं। परन्तु कोरिया के युद्ध को रोकने के लिये हम ने जो दो प्रयत्न किये, एक प्रयत्न यह कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सेनाएँ ३८वें अक्षांस को पार न करें और दूसरा प्रयत्न अभी जो प्रस्ताव रखा, कोरिया के युद्ध का अन्त करने के लिये, वे ऐतिहासिक प्रयत्न थे। और संसार के वर्तमान इतिहास का जब कभी निष्पत्ता से लेखन होगा तो इन

प्रयत्नों को बहुत बड़ा स्थान मिलने वाला है। तो फिर हमारे खुद के लाभ की दृष्टि से भी जो लोग कहते हैं कि हम गलत रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं, वे भी ऐसा सोच कर भूल कर रहे हैं। जहां तक हमारे देश का सम्बन्ध है अगर हम अपनी पंच-वर्षीय योजना को देखें और यह देखें कि उस में हम कितना धन लगा रहे हैं, तो ज्ञात हो जायगा कि यदि हम किसी गुट में शामिल हो भी जायें तो हमें कोई बहुत बड़ा फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। अगर हम किसी गुट में शामिल हो कर क्षणिक आर्थिक लाभ प्राप्त भी कर लें तो उस आर्थिक लाभ के साथ में जो जंजीरें हम पर बंधेंगी, उनका आगे चल कर क्या नतीजा निकलेगा, यह भी नहीं कहा जा सकता। इसलिये अन्तराष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से और हमारी राष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से दोनों दृष्टियों से हमारी यह वैदेशिक नीति सफल नीति रही है। और यदि कभी भी संसार में सच्चा शान्ति स्थापित हो सकी, तो वह इसी नीति के कारण हो सकेगी।

इस वैदेशिक नीति का हमारे दूतावासों से भी बहुत सम्बन्ध है। मैं बहुत थोड़े-थोड़े में दूतावासों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मैंने अधिकांश देशों के इन दूतावासों को देखा है और मुझे इस बात पर हर्ष है कि हमारे अधिकांश दूतावास बहुत अच्छी तरह चल रहे हैं। लोग कहते हैं कि इन पर बहुत अधिक खर्च होता है। यह भूल है कोई भी जा कर इन दूतावासों को देखे और देखे कि हम उन पर कितना खर्च करते हैं तो उसे ज्ञात हो जायगा कि दूसरे देशों के दूतावासों पर जो खर्च हो रहा है, हमारा छोटा सा पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान भी अपने दूतावासों पर जो खर्च करता है, उस के सामने हमारा खर्च नगण्य है। चार सौ करोड़ रुपये के बजट में वैदेशिक विभाग पर हम आठ करोड़ रुपये खर्च करते हैं। इन आठ करोड़ रुपये का भी बहुत सा अंश असाम में और

अन्य बहुत से कामों में निकल जाता है। हमें इस विभाग की जो रिपोर्ट मिली है इससे ज्ञात होता है कि इस आठ करोड़ में केवल २७३ लाख रुपया हमारी ६१ दूतावासों पर खर्च होता है। इस समय दुनिया जितनी छोटी होगी है उसको देखते हुए और भारतवर्ष की जो प्रतिष्ठा है उसको देखते हुए चाहे और मदों में भले ही कुछ कम खर्च किया जाय लेकिन हमारे दूतावासों पर कुछ अधिक खर्च किया जाना चाहिये, यह मेरा नम्र निवेदन है। अन्त में मैं केवल एक ही बात और कहूंगा। इन दूतावासों को दो बातों की तरफ अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिये, एक तो प्रचार की ओर और दूसरे भारतीय संस्कृति की ओर। जहां तक संस्कृति का मामला है उसका भाषा से बड़ा अनिष्ट सम्बन्ध है। मैंने राष्ट्रसंघ में देखा कि वहां पर भिन्न २ भाषाएं बोली जाती हैं जैसे स्पेनिश, फ्रेंच रूसी और अंग्रेजी। क्या वह समय नहीं आ सकता जब वहां पर हिन्दी भी बोली जाय में तो उस दिन का स्वप्न देख रहा हूँ जब चालीस करोड़ मानवों की यह हिन्दी भाषा भी वहां पर बोली जायगी और जिस प्रकार दूसरी भाषाओं का वहां पर अनुवाद होता है, उसी प्रकार हिन्दी भाषा का भी वहां पर अनुवाद होगा। अन्त में मैं और अधिक न कह कर अपनी वैदेशिक नीति का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): We have listened to speeches just now which have dealt with the foreign policy of our Government more or less from the point of view of what is happening outside. I would not like to say much on that aspect, but I would like to judge our foreign policy from another test. Undoubtedly, no country says today that it is working for war. We read a statement today issued by Stalin's successor and he emphasised that the greatest need of the world today was peace and there was no problem which could not be solved through peaceful

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

methods. In fact, whenever statements are issued on behalf of all countries, they are more or less of a similar nature. In spite of these, the conditions now obtaining in the world are giving us anxiety. What can we do under these circumstances? Obviously, if we shout from the housetops that we want peace and raise our voice higher and higher, peace is not necessarily to come. We may make our contribution, as I suppose we have been doing in some measure or other, that we do not want war, because war, if it comes, will not confine itself to one particular sphere of the globe but will spread to all parts. From that point of view our foreign policy has been applauded and the Prime Minister has taken credit that he is trying to adhere to that policy of peace.

I shall not dilate on that aspect. The fears which have been expressed that if there is too much dependence on economic matters on big foreign powers, it may lead to serious consequences, are not entirely unfounded. Whether there is any conscious attempt to have such consequences followed in actual practice or not, is not possible for us to say. But that is a matter which naturally should be kept in view at every possible stage.

But, I would like to judge our foreign policy in regard to the success or failure that has come with regard to matters concerning India in international relationship. And, if we examine those five or six outstanding matters which have been hanging before India during the last five years, undoubtedly ours is a history of dismal and dynamic failure. What are these cases? We have the case of the Indians in South Africa. Have we been able to contribute anything for the purpose of saving the interests of those people, who are obviously being oppressed? What about the cases of Indians in Ceylon? Have we succeeded in doing anything in that sphere? What about liquidation of foreign pockets in India? The Prime Minister announced on the floor of this House a few months ago that there can be only one basis for negotiation and that was the re-union of those parts with India. We were extremely glad to hear such a bold announcement. But what has been done? The report which has been circulated to us is distinguished in its meagreness. It is even worse than a time-table. We do not get any information here and we would have liked to know something about the working of the Embassies and various other matters. I am pre-

pared to agree with the Prime Minister that there are many matters regarding foreign policy which cannot be discussed openly, but still the report might have been a little more informative and interesting. With regard to all such matters we do not get any inspiration except that communications have again been sent for the liquidation of such foreign pockets in India.

Then again there is the question of Indo-Pakistan relationship. The other day—I was not here,—the Prime Minister described us as helping the enemy of the country. I do not know which enemy he was thinking of. If it was Pakistan, I am glad to find that at least even while attacking us he regarded Pakistan as the enemy of India. What exactly is, the basis of our Indo-Pakistan relationship? There are so many matters which are pending for solution. There is the question of East Bengal minorities, which I know the Prime Minister himself has referred to as one of the outstanding problems that have got to be settled with Pakistan. There is the question of the passport system and the tremendous difficulty which has arisen as a result thereof. There is the question of Canal water and the campaign of vilification that is going on against India in respect of this matter. There is the question of the Evacuee property and there is the question of Kashmir.

Now, with regard to all these matters what we find is that practically our policy has failed. I do not advocate that you should declare war on all these countries which have been unfair to India, but even in sphere of diplomacy there might have been a little more imagination, a little more strength shown so that India could have got what India really deserved to get. So, if you judge our foreign policy in respect of the vital matters which concern India's self-respect, India's honour and India's dignity, India's interest there, unfortunately, you find that our success is nil. It is not a question that I am merely saying that India's foreign policy is bad. Foreign policy, of course, changes in relation to events that are changing in the entire world. But, it would be much better for us, instead of talking loosely about the rest of the world, to look at our own home problems, problems affecting our international relationship and ensuring conditions so that we may be able to remove the causes of fears and grievances which we may honestly entertain. With regard to this Indo-Pakistan relationship, I find from the report that there

was this Bagge Tribunal. You know, Sir, there was the Radcliffe Award and there was difficulty in the interpretation of certain recommendations of the Radcliffe Award. So the Bagge Tribunal came. We understand that no effect has been given to the recommendations of the Bagge Tribunal because Pakistan has not agreed to play its part. So, I suppose after Bagge, I do not know which Tagge or Ragge will come. I do not know who that some other gentleman will be who will study facts and adjudicate between the conflicting claims of India and Pakistan. I read in the Calcutta papers, and also from the proceedings of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly, that raids have become frequent, almost every day there are raids on the district of Nadia, murder, taking away of properties, taking away of women and all sorts of atrocities are being committed. There the Government gets up and says that we are sending protests but, unfortunately, we have not been able to prevent East Pakistan from doing this. The Pakistan Budget has been announced today. Our own Budget is dependent upon our getting Rs. 18 crores from Pakistan during this year, and that is how we expect to get a surplus of about Rs. 48 lakhs, but from the Pakistan Budget which has been announced today we find that it makes allowance for no contribution to be paid to India during this year. These are vital matters which have to be considered by us, and I would like to know from the Prime Minister what exactly is the policy that he proposes to pursue for the purpose of securing the just rights and claims of India.

In the Report it is said that in regard to the recovery of abducted women, while 1289 were recovered in India during the last year, we could recover only 474 from Pakistan.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): Out of?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Out of how many thousands, we do not know. That figure has not been given. It was about ten thousand or fifteen thousand, as given by the late Mr. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar two years ago. I do not know how many thousands still remain to be recovered there. So, in regard to that matter—and I am taking some at random and collecting them from the report which has been circulated—we find that although it is a vital matter, in respect of it there has been complete failure.

Now with regard to Nepal, I wish to say a few words. My hon. friend spoke about Nepal. Of course, he re-

ferred to Nepal from one point of view, that is, the possibility of infiltration. I am not thinking of infiltration from America alone. There is the possibility of infiltration from the other side, i.e. Tibet also, about which reports have been published in the newspapers. I agree that our handling of Nepal has somehow been unfortunate. The resolution passed by the Nepal Congress and published today is a rather sad commentary on the manner in which we have handled the affairs of Nepal. Somehow, our frontiers on the northern side, namely, the impregnable Himalayas, have today broken down and there is no reference in the Report as to what steps the Government are taking for the purpose of securing the strategic importance of that particular area. These are matters which vitally concern us. Undoubtedly, we shall think of internationalism. We shall think of all the rest of the world. But unless we are prepared to stand on our own feet and are prepared to create conditions in which our just rights and privileges are not encroached upon either in this country or in respect of our people who are living outside—unless we do that, obviously we will fail to create the enthusiasm which we must have in the country in order to carry any strong foreign policy governing our relationship with the rest of the world.

I looked up this Report where there is reference to Kashmir. In beautiful language, reference is made to Dr. Graham's Report, and the language is typical of the mentality that governs our relationship with countries which are giving us a good kick in the back and with whom we cannot deal properly. It reads like this:

"India did not accept the resolution. . . ."

Very good—

" . . . as it was wholly opposed to her basic position on fundamental issues, but expressed her willingness to continue negotiations with a view to explore all avenues for peaceful settlement."

So, repeatedly we have said that the resolutions which are passed by this mediator are against fundamental principles or principles which we consider to be basic, and yet we proceed to carry on negotiations for a peaceful settlement. If it is the policy of the Prime Minister that although he has to deal with people who may be opposed to him in respect of his basic position and on fundamental issues,

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

yet there should not be any quarrel with them but an attempt should be made to carry on negotiations for the purpose of exploring avenues for a peaceful settlement,—if this is his policy, then I would like this to be applied in all cases, specially on the home-front also. What is going to be ultimate solution of this Kashmir issue? I expressed this view over and again, that we cannot expect anything from the Security Council. We went to the Security Council on the question of aggression, not on the question of accession. So far as the question of aggression goes, although aggression has been proved, yet the Security Council is not prepared to stand by us. So far as accession goes, as we have repeatedly made it clear right from the very beginning, it is a matter between Kashmir and India. Undoubtedly, the Prime Minister offered a plebiscite, but there is no question of a plebiscite now. If you wish to ascertain the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, the only manner in which you can do so is through the Constituent Assembly which is functioning in that State, and a curtain must be drawn on this drama. The more we go on dealing with Dr. Graham's Report or with the issues which have been raised in that Report, the more complicated they will become and it would be extremely difficult for India to extricate herself from that position. I am not suggesting that the Prime Minister will eat his own words. What he said was that he will act according to the will of the people. That will can be ascertained in more than one way. Plebiscite is one way to ascertain the will of the people. Who ascertained the will of the people of India when India was partitioned? There was no plebiscite taken. The will of the people was ascertained through the views of the Members of the Legislatures who were elected on a limited franchise in Bengal, Punjab, Sind and other places. If India could be partitioned on the decision of people who had been elected to Legislatures on a limited franchise, why cannot the finality of the accession of Jammu and Kashmir be decided on the decision of the Constituent Assembly which has been formed on adult franchise? It is a matter which has to be seriously considered by the Government. We must come out of this mess. I am not blaming anybody. It may be that with the best of motives we went to the Security Council, but when we find that the door is shut completely, we expect no remedy, then the curtain should be drawn and a decision—a firm decision—should be taken so that this matter may go beyond all controversy

amongst ourselves. Of course, so far as the U.N.O. is concerned and so far as Pakistan is concerned, an unfortunate situation may develop in some other ways. We will be able to take full cognisance of these developments: if the situation arises.

Now, take the movement which is going on. This is not the occasion when I am going to refer to the details. In fact, I was looking forward to a special debate on that question which the Prime Minister very kindly offered a few days ago when we were absent from this House. It would have been better if that debate could have taken place when we were present here, so that we could have spoken to each other, not in private but on the floor of this House, and understood each other's viewpoints. But the crux of the problem on the basis of which the movement is going on is the finality of the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State to India. And that question has got to be settled in a manner which is fair and just not only to the people of Jammu and Kashmir but also to the people of India.

One aspect of the matter that I would like to emphasise is that the country was partitioned five years ago, because some people did not want to live here. But time has come when it must be declared, specially when the British power has been removed from India, that if any section of the people of this country do not wish to live here, they can go to whichever part of the world they like; but they cannot and will not carry any portion of the country with them. This land belongs not to any particular State. It does not belong to Delhi, to U. P., to Bengal or to Jammu and Kashmir. I claim that the land belongs to the people of India as such, and there is no question of any portion of the land belonging to India passing out of India's hands because some people in some part of this country do not wish to live in a united India. We must be able to take up that stand, now that the British power is not here. After all, this will of the people in a compartmental sense—how does it arise? It arises out of that legal fiction of lapse of paramountcy. India was one country, but as the Prime Minister knows, and we too know very well, that one of the conditions of the transfer of power was that not only was India to be partitioned, but also the 560 odd States were suddenly to regain their sovereignty and independence. That was not done for the purpose of helping India. That was done for the purpose of putting more difficulties in

the path of consolidating India, but we have proceeded on that basis, because that was the condition on which the transfer of power was made. Now, regarding this question, it is no use taking a wrong view of the situation. The way in which attempt is made or is being made by the Government to resort to a policy of repression for the purpose of crushing the movement will not succeed. I am not saying anything else here, because I want to quarrel with nobody. But serious questions have been raised and it is no use our abusing each other. I can abuse somebody, and somebody can abuse me. We can call names of each other. Somebody can call me names by saying that I am communal or reactionary. I can also call him some other name. But that is not the point. Let us consider the issues which have been raised with regard to Jammu and Kashmir—the issues are political; the issues are economic; the issues are administrative. Let us discuss these issues with a cool and dispassionate mind, and let us see whether it is possible for us to come to some agreement, so that we can prevent any serious international difficulty arising and so that we can avoid difficulties and commotion for the whole of this country.

Here, the Prime Minister says that although he disagrees on fundamental issues with the Graham Report—I think he says that he disagrees wholly—yet he is willing to carry on negotiations for a peaceful settlement. Why can he not take up this same attitude with regard to the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir movement? Even though he wholly disagrees, why can he not carry on negotiations and explore peaceful methods for the purpose of settling this issue? I am only asking him to follow the Gandhian technique, which he says that he has been following in his deliberations not only for the governance of the internal affairs but also for the governance of the external affairs?

With regard to Pakistan, I was reading a book last night and I found that there, exactly the same wording was used by the Prime Minister of the U.K., Mr. Chamberlain, and the French Prime Minister, in 1938, when dealing with Hitler. Mr. Chamberlain's policy was called the umbrella politics. That is how his policy was described, and the note which he issued for the information of the world was that they were "engaged in the great common task of promoting international appeasement by methods of free and peaceful negotiations". Now, what the fateful result of that policy of appeasement was we know to our

cost, and the world knows to its cost today. I am not suggesting that there should be a spirit of bravado. I am not suggesting that we should go out with open swords, or naked swords, or anything, and dealing with the rest of the world in such manner as we like.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): That is what you want.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is what the hon. interruptor wants.

Shri Tyagi: No. That is what you want.

4 P.M.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: What is needed is firmness. What is needed is a decisive policy. What is needed is a clear enunciation of the interest of our own Motherland. And bearing all these in mind, if we proceed to act, I am sure it will be possible for us to do much more than what we have hitherto achieved.

One last word I shall say about the expenditure. My hon. friend who spoke last said that the expenses on the External Affairs Ministry should be increased. I would have liked to know something more of the working of the embassies. It may be we get false reports or exaggerated reports about their working. We are anxious to know the facts. The Prime Minister promised last time that with regard to our foreign policy he would occasionally call leaders of the Opposition groups and have informal consultations. But unfortunately barring one occasion he had not the time to do so.

Now, with regard to this expenditure I find so far as India is concerned, we are spending about Rs. eight crores out of Rs. 438 crores of our Budget. Of course, the Rs. eight crores includes a little more than Rs. three crores for the protection of the North-Eastern frontier. Only this morning a Reuter news was published that in Great Britain, the budget of which was introduced in the House of Commons, they are reducing their expenses on the External Affairs Ministry to the tune of £ 24 million; in other words about Rs. 33 crores. Of course, in what manner this reduction is coming it is very difficult to say. But that is what has been announced today.

Seth Govind Das: How much are they spending at present—you know?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: No, I do not know. I know it with regard to another country and that will pacify my hon. friend Seth Govind Das.

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

The current year's budget of the Federal Government of Australia is Rs. 1,000 crores and they are spending Rs. two crores on their External Affairs Ministry. I hope the hon. Member is satisfied now.

Seth Govind Das: There are only 70 lakhs persons in Australia.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: But the country is there and the problems are there.

Seth Govind Das: Is there any comparison between Australia and our country?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I do not like idea of increasing the expenditure unless there is ground for doing so. I think there is room for economy in the manner in which the embassies are being run. There is this question of publicity for instance which is very defective. I myself had been to some places in South-East Asia a few months ago and saw some parts of Thailand, Cambodia and Viet Nam. There I found that there was tremendous scope for India's increasing her influence, her cultural influence, to which the people of those countries were looking forward intensely. But unfortunately there are very little activities in this direction. I am very glad to find that this year a leading historian is being sent to Thailand for delivering a course of lectures. Now, those are countries with which India had contacts for the last thousands and thousands of years. The ruined temple city of Angkor Vat there recalls the close contact which India had with those countries nearly 1,500 years ago. Those countries are now regaining their independence and they are anxious—the words which they used to me were—they are anxious to come back to their spiritual mother. There is no question of economic or political imposition. India can play a leading role in re-establishing her contact with all those countries, provided a policy is adopted by our Government of regular, cultural and other contacts with those countries. I would very much like that in the interest of re-establishing India's position in the hearts of those countries that our Government does consider the desirability of re-establishing those contacts in some measure or other.

So far as the present situation is concerned, we are undoubtedly living in an explosive state. As I have said over and over again, however much

we may differ from the Government with regard to internal matters, the assurance that I can give without any condition or hesitation is that if the situation worsens in this country which may endanger the security or the safety of our motherland, there will be no question of any political difference on any issue, however controversial it may be, and all parties in this country will be prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder for the purpose of protecting the safety and integrity of India. But there cannot be any effective foreign policy, unless you create conditions in this country whereby all sections of the people may feel that they are getting their dues and there is a real functioning of democracy based on just consideration of the various view-points on matters administrative, political and economic, on the solution of which the safety and prosperity of this country depends.

Shri B. Shiva Rao (South Kanara—South): I am intervening in this debate mainly for one purpose and that is to place before the House certain aspects of the work of the United Nations with which this country and its foreign policy are intimately concerned, and also to make a very frank statement about some of the inner trends behind that world organisation, not all of which are of a pleasant or agreeable character. Incidentally I hope my statement will serve to some extent to answer some of the questions which the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party raised in his speech. To quote his own words: "How are we really facing up to the obligations of creating a climate of peace and secondly are we really following an independent policy?" Before I proceed further, I would like to say, not in any spirit of criticism that it does seem to me to lack a due sense of respect and courtesy to the House that after making a speech which was not particularly polite in many passages, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party should walk out of the House. But that apart, he referred to Korea. I am not going to deal with that point because so far as Korea is concerned the Prime Minister has made on more than one occasion authoritative statements and in the recent debate that we had on the President's Address, there was an explanation by the Leader of the Indian Delegation, Shrimati Vijayalakshmi, of the reasons which led the Indian Delegation to put forward that resolution. Therefore, there is nothing new that I can say so far as Korea is concerned. The deadlock continues, judging from the reports in the Press, in the resumed session of the General

Assembly, and this deadlock seems likely to continue. Until the right of the Government of Communist China is conceded in regard to the claim that she has made of admission into the United Nations, this deadlock is likely to continue.

I would like to make one general observation, not so much on Korea, as in connection with Korea. When the Indian Delegation introduced that resolution on Korea in the first part of the General Assembly's session, there was widespread approval and appreciation of the Prime Minister's constructive statesmanship, of his wisdom in instructing the Indian Delegation to sponsor that resolution. With that chorus of tributes was also an expression of regret that the Soviet Union and Communist China could not join the rest of the world in accepting the terms of the Indian resolution. But taking part in the General Assembly and in the various committees, it seemed to me an odd and somewhat remarkable fact that these very Powers which were so lavish in their praise of the wisdom and statesmanship of India's Prime Minister were strangely silent when it came to discussing other questions. For instance, there are problems of colonialism to which Prof. Mukerjee referred in his speech. He said in his speech that we have a bad record. It was an astonishing statement to make. It has been my privilege for the last five years, as a Member of the Indian Delegation to the General Assembly, to deal only with problems of colonialism. I say without hesitation that there is no country in the world which has such a magnificent, such an unblemished record as this country, and that is more than Prof. Mukerjee can say in respect of any other power, not excluding Soviet Russia. It is to problems of colonialism with which are linked in a peculiar way the regional defence organisations like the NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, that I propose to devote most of the time allotted to me in this debate.

The Hyderabad session of the Congress, in its Resolution on India's foreign policy, devoted one or two passages to the problems of colonialism and said that these problems are not being solved as quickly as they should be. A similar view was also expressed by the Asian Socialist Congress which met in Rangoon. I think, as is evident from the speeches which have been made in this debate today, it is quite obvious that so far as the liquidation of colonialism is concerned, there is no difference whatsoever between this side

of the House and the Opposition. But this view in regard to colonial problems, which is almost universal in Asia, is, frankly, not shared by the colonial powers. In regard to some colonies at least, there is a fear which has been expressed in the United Nations that the withdrawal of colonial authority immediately might mean the extension of communist influence in those areas. Let me take an instance: Indo-China. Both inside the United Nations and outside in Washington, I was asked why it was that the Prime Minister of India was not taking an active interest in seeking a solution of the problem of Indo-China. My answer always was that I had no authority to speak for the Prime Minister on Indo-China. I ventured to add on my own responsibility that no one, neither our Prime Minister, nor any one else, could find a solution for the problems of Indo-China until certain basic conditions are fulfilled. If France would pull out of Indo-China, and secondly, if the United Nations would undertake, as it did in the case of Indonesia, to bring an independent Indo-China, as a full fledged Member of the United Nations, peace might be possible in that little country: but not on any other conditions.

Unfortunately, the powers of Western Europe do not see these or many other problems as we do. So far as the United States is concerned, she is frank about the problems of Indo-China. She is afraid that if France withdraws today from Indo-China, the sphere of communist influence might spread into that country. What is the result? We have in that country an unedifying spectacle, and a situation of growing complexity. France is admittedly incapable of holding her own in Indo-China. Very frequently her troops are in a desperate plight. But she will not withdraw from an untenable position, untenable from every point of view: politically, militarily and morally.

Concern has been expressed in this House at Question time on more than one occasion in recent weeks about the MEDO, the Middle East Defence Organisation, with particular reference to Pakistan's intentions, if and when that Organisation is established. So far as MEDO is concerned, it is in a pre-natal stage. But there is already in existence a Defence Organisation in Europe, the NATO. Only a few days ago, I obtained from London a volume entitled The Atlantic Alliance, with the Sub-title, NATO's role in the Free World. This volume was prepared by a group of distinguished

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

research scholars working in Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs; and among the authors of this volume are a number of distinguished economists and a military man, who has since joined the military staff of the NATO, working under the Chairmanship of Lord Brand. I want to invite the attention of the House to the implications of the establishment of this Defence Organisation in Europe. When it was first established, Mr. Bevin, not to be confused with Mr. Bevan who recently visited India, who was the Foreign Secretary in the Labour Government, said that this Organisation was intended for the collective self-defence of its Members. But, the writers of this volume, in analysing the terms of the constitution of the NATO, observe,—I am quoting from this volume:

“The expressed purpose of the NATO is to create an Atlantic community for purposes going beyond the defence of Western Europe.”

I want the House to realise the implications of the phrase, ‘for purposes going beyond the defence of Western Europe’. Regarding the long term aims of the NATO, the writers of this volume go further and say,—I am quoting another passage:

“The Western world has both a duty and an interest to protect, assist and develop the territories whence it draws its raw materials and to which it sells its goods. There is no reason why given military security, Belgium, Britain, France and Portugal should not continue to exercise their political responsibility as independent Nations. But, (these writers warn) these countries will be increasingly under pressure in the United Nations and outside from organised Arab, African and Indian opinion, to say nothing of the North and Latin Americans.”

These two passages faithfully and correctly represent the outlook of the powers of Western Europe.

Regional pacts are, of course, permissible under the Charter. But the real question is, do these Pacts strengthen or weaken the United Nations. I seem to remember that similar Pacts were started under the League of Nations, beginning with the Locarno Pact of 1924. It was these Pacts which undermined the authority of the League and finally disrupted the League. Therefore, we have serious-

ly to ask this question: are the purposes and objectives of the NATO or any other similar Defence Organisation that may be set up hereafter, entirely consistent with purposes and objectives of the United Nations? I have just read out to the House two passages from this volume which indicate in the words used by the writers of this report both the expressed purpose of the NATO and its long term aims. Neither of these, I submit, can be reconciled with all the principles of the Charter. There is reference in the expressed purpose of the NATO to the Atlantic community. Do you know what that means or what it can mean? At the last session of the General Assembly, I was greatly surprised when the delegate for France declared that it was France's mission to uphold and spread French culture and French traditions in all parts of metropolitan France. To understand the significance of that statement, I must also quote what he said, that overseas territories, though separated by thousands of miles of land or sea from France, are, nevertheless, integral parts of France. In other words it means this: that Pondicherry is a part of metropolitan France, and therefore, according to the French argument, the interests of the Atlantic community include a part of the Bay of Bengal. A similar statement was made by a responsible spokesman of the Portuguese Government, for Portugal is not a Member of the United Nations, with particular reference to Goa; and therefore, according to the Portuguese argument, Goa also comes within the ambit of the Atlantic community. That is the clear implication of these statements and, therefore, in the General Assembly I ventured promptly to challenge the validity of the claim made by the French delegate, and I was able to quote two or three passages from a speech which the Prime Minister had made in Madras last October in support of the view that I put forward. The plain fact is that the colonial powers of Western Europe are acting on the principle, as some one put it, that if they do not hang together, they may hang separately. They realise that the imperial authority and influence that they have exercised over vast areas of the world during the last two centuries and more are now slipping from their grip. They fear, in the words of the writers of NATO:

“What the French do in Indo-China may affect their position in North Africa. How the British

and the Americans fare in Malaya and Korea is being watched in the oil-producing countries of the Middle East and in the dependencies of Africa.”

Amongst the Colonial Powers Britain, at any rate, can say that she has gone some way towards divesting herself of imperial authority. Mr. Dean Acheson, who was the Secretary of State in the American Government in the Truman Administration, said not long ago in the General Assembly as an indication of the rapidity of the progress made by the world since the end of the Second World War; that of 800 million dependent peoples, no less than 600 million had achieved their freedom in the last five or six years. The majority of those were formerly living in British dependencies. But the position today is that Britain is feeling the embarrassment caused by the attitude of the Continental colonial powers, and in particular, France, Belgium and Portugal, who are adopting a new device of avoiding their responsibilities to the United Nations. They deny that they have any colonies because those colonies, according to their argument, are parts of metropolitan France or metropolitan Portugal. Inside the United Nations, these colonial powers are trying to prevent the world organization from claiming greater influence in debating the administration of colonial areas even in a general way. And I detected at the last session of the General Assembly a note of regret on the part of some of these colonial powers that perhaps in the early years after the establishment of this world organization they had yielded too much, they had entered into commitments which are now proving embarrassing to them. They do not like to be reminded frequently of the pledges they have taken under the Charter, that the peoples of dependent areas, whether they live in colonies or in Trust territories, have been promised full self-government or independence, and that in the transitional stage, while they are still being administered by the colonial powers, the guiding principle should be the welfare and the progress of the indigenous peoples concerned.

Such are some of the contradictions in the world of today, and I would like to remind the House that we are only one of 60 Members of the United Nations. I was not surprised at the speech Prof. Mukerjee made, because we are by now accustomed to the fiercely partisan

character of the hon. Member's speeches; but I would suggest that his speeches would be more interesting if he dropped some of those adjectives which are becoming stale and introduced a few facts into his speeches. At any rate, his speeches would gain a little in dignity and in weight. But I must confess I was astonished by one of the statements made by Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee. The Prime Minister's policy, according to him, is one series of failure over the last five or six years. I do not know what he expects the Prime Minister to do in South Africa or in any other part of the world because he promptly said: "I do not want him to go to war with any of these countries. I only want him to exercise a little more imagination." I wish he had been a little more specific in his suggestion and told the Prime Minister how he could exercise that imagination purposefully in regard to all the problems regarding which he has been such an unredeemed failure according to Dr. Mookerjee.

We have to take note of these contradictions in the world of today because, as I said, India has to function as one of 60 Members of the United Nations. I have had to play my part in the United Nations. It has been my business to understand the Prime Minister's foreign policy and to interpret it in the limited spheres that were allotted to me in the United Nations. And it seemed to me that our foreign policy, if I may describe it in one sentence, implies the acceptance of the principles and the objectives of the United Nations without any reservations. As a people who believe sincerely in the democratic approach, as a people who accept non-violence as an article both of faith and of conviction, we cannot do otherwise than what we have done in the last five or six years. And I assert that wherever an opportunity has offered itself, we have done our best, patiently and modestly, if I may say so, to further the creation of a world co-operative order. We may succeed in a limited fashion here and there, but whatever hon. Members opposite may say—Dr. Lanka Sundaram accuses the Prime Minister's foreign policy of being a policy of drift—the enormous respect in which the Prime Minister is held throughout the world, and the greatly enhanced prestige that India enjoys today and has built up for herself year after year in the United Nations—that fact indicates far more conclusively than any speeches made from the benches

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

opposite that the policy of the Prime Minister is the right one.

Shri D. N. Singh (Muzaffarpur North-East): We are discussing foreign affairs under the shadow of fast-changing events, deepening crisis and a sense of uncertainty and a feeling of impotent perplexity that has gripped the fear and distrust laid in chancelleries of the world. The death of Marshal Stalin marks the end of an era, and so alters the balance of international relationship, that the big powers will be justified in shaping their policies anew unfettered by past promises and prejudices. Let us hope that the change will be in the direction of peace and mutual goodwill. Any attempt to exploit his death is sure to do more harm than good. The most significant development in the field of foreign affairs in the 20th century has been the concept of security in terms of territory. This concept has made the policy makers of the world military in their approach. They have ceased to be political and are out to dominate the largest area possible. It is in this light that we have got to view the recent developments regarding the MEDO, the Korean conflict, and the so-called liberation of Tibet by Red China. Fortunately, our foreign policy is free from this vice and the Prime Minister who is the architect of our foreign policy deserves congratulations for it. The greatest challenge to the peace of the world is presented by Korea. If a lasting peace settlement has got to be arrived at, it must begin by ending the Korean stalemate. No solution of Korea can endure which ignores Red China for Government of Peking in the regime with which the rest of the world will have to deal in the matter. Therefore, the Prime Minister has rightly expressed the fact that any lasting settlement of the Far Eastern question must begin by ending the Korean stalemate based on an agreement of the major powers concerned in it. The House has had the opportunity to hear my friend Mr. Shiva Rao about the resolution which was sponsored by the Indian Delegation at the last session of the UNO and about other activities of our Delegation. I do not want to take the time of the House on that issue.

Our foreign policy has been criticised by some of the Members of the Opposition on the false charge that it is tied down to the apron strings of Anglo-American imperialism. Prof.

Mukerjee suggested that we should join whole hog with the Soviet Bloc. What I would like to point out here is that the peace of the world is in a precarious position today and any fresh addition to either of the power bloc is sure to affect the balance adversely and endanger the world peace. More so of a country like India which though militarily weak at the moment is strategically very important because of the size, population, geographic location, and economic potentialities. Therefore, it is in our national self interest as well as in the larger interests of the world peace that we should maintain our freedom of action and judgment in judging each international issue on its merits and not commit ourselves in advance by joining the power bloc. Any realistic foreign policy is formulated according to the past traditions and present needs. Our tradition is one of peace and tolerance and we badly need peace today to be able to tear ourselves away from the economic backwardness which is the direct result of our former colonial dependence.

Prof. Mukerjee pointed out that we are gradually playing, rather progressively playing into the hands of Anglo-American power blocs. It is an outrageous lie to suggest that we are anybody's tool. I think the House has not forgotten the part played by the Prime Minister for the recognition of the People's regime of China. Did he not take a very strong stand on the Yalu bombing? What about his refusal to sign the Japanese Peace Treaty? Not only that. Even the strong stand that the Indian Government took at the recent change in the foreign policy of the new United States Administration speaks about the non-partisanship of our foreign policy. A few days ago, I was reading some newspapers and there I came across a statement by the Leader of the Indian Peace Delegation, Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew where he said that a lot of misunderstanding which has been created between India and Soviet Russia has been cleared as a result of the talk which the late Marshal Stalin had with the Indian Ambassador and Dr. Kitchlew. I scratched my head. I thought what was the cause of the misunderstandings. To-day while listening to the speech of Prof. Mookerjee I have discovered the cause. Mr. Burke has rightly said that "a very great part of the mischiefs that vex this world arises from words".

Before I conclude, I would like to say a few words about our relationship with Pakistan with particular reference to MEDO. That is indeed a very serious development for it will not only bring the cold war to our frontiers but is sure to have strong impact on our relationship with Pakistan, more so on Kashmir question. But what I would like to point out here is that the differences between India and Pakistan are a source of temptation to other nations for intrigue in this sub-continent. The prime need of the hour today is the creation of healthy relationship based on friendship between India and Pakistan. That is why an atmosphere should be treated for peace and friendship. Without a closer defence and economic pact between India and Pakistan, there is the danger of this sub-continent becoming a helpless pawn in the chess board of international power politics. Let us not forget that there are people in Pakistan, quite a number of them, who want to come closer to us. The light of friendship, though dim, is still burning and the result is not doubtful. If we stand firm, we shall not fail for the logic of history and geographical considerations always prove far more stronger than party propaganda and party programme.

Today I was reading an editorial of one of the important newspapers in Pakistan *Nawai waqut*. This is what the newspaper has got to say on the subject:

"The need of the hour is statesmanship and courage to face the facts ignoring all reactionary elements in the two countries. The path of friendship is the path of safety for both nations. Any other way cannot but lead to destruction."

Therefore, we should try to maintain the closest possible relationship with Pakistan if not from any other point of view at least from the point of view of the security of this sub-continent which was fashioned by its friendly mountains as a single defence system. There is no use imputing to nations the qualities that properly speaking belong to individuals or to a particular political party. I hope the foreign policy that the Government is pursuing is sure to bear fruit and that the Government will not deflect either by praise or blame from the policy it is pursuing.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: During the last few months, two important events have taken place, which are of very great significance in international politics—firstly the return of the Republican Party in the United States of America with General Eisenhower as President, and secondly the death of Marshal Stalin. Both these events may have far reaching effects on world politics, and inasmuch as they will affect world politics, they affect us also.

General Eisenhower, as soon as he came to power, enunciated his policy regarding Asia, and regarding the economic assistance that the United States is giving to undeveloped countries. I gave at length my own reaction to his Asiatic policy *vis-à-vis* the Korean war, during my last speech in the House. I do not therefore want to elaborate on that point again. But some of us have been rather apprehensive of the amount of foreign assistance that we are taking in order to develop our country. The hon. Prime Minister has been assuring us that he will not allow the acceptance of economic assistance to influence our politics in any way, though I have more than once pointed out on the floor of this House that acceptance of this kind of assistance cannot be without any implications of political obligation.

Now, after Eisenhower came to power, he has made it quite clear that the assistance they are giving to the undeveloped countries is part of the over all policy that is being pursued, for strengthening the anti-communist bloc. When this policy has been clarified, I should think that it is time for us to pause and think. In our anxiety to get foreign assistance we have been giving concession after concession to Anglo-American trade and commercial interests. There has been considerable inroad of commercial and trade interests into India from England and America. Therefore I think it is time for us now to review the position and see whether we would not like to bring about some change in the policy.

The death of Marshal Stalin has given rise to a good deal of speculation, as to whether this incident will reduce the threat of war or increase it. We welcome the statement made by the successors of Marshal Stalin, wherein they have said that they want to follow a positive policy of peace.

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

I do hope and trust that the policy statement made by them would be followed up in practice also. I also hope and pray that this would evoke some response of goodwill from the other side.

The difficulty, is that the dominant impulse governing the foreign policy of the big powers is one of conformism. Very few of them really believe in co-existence, though some may talk of it. Conformism inevitably leads to the creation of spheres of influence,—or we may call them—situations of strength, which would naturally give rise to a war psychosis and war tension. Against this background unfortunately, we have to build up our foreign policy. We have declared our policy to be a policy of non-alignment, of peace and friendliness with all. There are these two blocs on either side. We have now very warily to chalk out our path. It is almost like tight-rope dancing. Some times, we succeed in pleasing one party, and sometimes we please the other party, but the crucial test of our policy will come when actually a show-down comes between the two blocs, and we succeed in keeping out of the war.

I think we have been depending too much on the big powers. All our attention has been focussed on to the big powers, and all our appeals too have been to the big powers. Very recently the Congress has passed a resolution appealing to the big four to find a peaceful solution of the problem. I feel that if we focus our attention not so much on the big powers, but on the smaller powers, perhaps we might be able to strengthen our position, and find a corrective to the existing international situation. We find that there are small nations who earnestly believe in peace, whose intentions are very sincere and honest. If we try to collect these nations and weld them together, we might be able to balance the world situation more in favour of peace. The Socialist Party in India has been describing this as the creation of the third force. We believe that if we appeal to the people of the different nations who really want to work for peace, and organise them together, then we can exert influence even on the bigger powers, and it can go a long way towards the maintenance and protection of peace in the world. I am very glad to note that in a recent speech the hon. Prime Minister spoke of the creation of a third area. By whatever language you may describe it, call it the third force

or the third area, we have no objection to it. But what we want is that India should follow a more positive policy and play a positive role in world politics, by actively sponsoring such a movement. Countries which are free from the influence of either of the blocs should be got together, countries that can work together, that can have a common foreign policy, a common economic policy, as for instance countries like Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and other contiguous Middle East countries. We have basically the same problems. We will have to organise ourselves and get together. If we do that, we can act as a big bulwark against the aggressive instincts of the bigger powers. Then we can also work for a World Development Pool, or a World Grain Bank or other such international institutions, which are free from the wranglings of both the blocs. In short, we have to tell the world and place before them the fact that there can be an ideology different from that of the two blocs. Such an ideology must be sponsored, brought forward, and strengthened by us. Only then we can get away from the wranglings that we see in the world's picture today. Our role in Asia can be very important. I believe we hold a very strategic position in Asia, because we are the only big nation outside the two blocs. Therefore we have a special responsibility in forming public opinion on international affairs in Asia. Already the two blocs are trying to have under their control, some of the Asian nations. China has already veered round towards the Soviet Government. Japan for all practical purposes is under the United States. In Indo-China we see a peculiar picture. The nationalist movement is in the hands of the communists, while France with the help of Australia and the United States is trying to perpetuate colonialism there. Therefore, we must take up the initiative, and try to collect the nations that have not already gone into the orbit of these power blocs, weld them together and strengthen them and work in favour of peace.

Soon after the achievement of freedom, we took certain steps towards playing a positive role in Asian politics. We called an Asian Relations Conference here in Delhi, and our role in the Indonesian struggle for freedom was something very creditable, and the credit for it goes to our hon. Prime Minister. But I do not know what happened after that. We gave up that line of action gradually,

and our work in the Asiatic field since has not been as positive as it promised to be. Asia's role in world politics has been negligible so far. Asia's politics is not integrated. The Asiatic countries suffer from the same common diseases,—poverty, over-population, etc., and are underdeveloped and under-nourished. There is every reason therefore for us to get together and form ourselves into—I would not say a third 'bloc'—but we can weld ourselves together, and put our pressure positively on the side of peace, and against the warring of the two big blocs. I would now like to say a few words about our position in the Commonwealth. I am one of those who do not see any advantage for us in remaining within the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister has again and again told us that our remaining within the Commonwealth does not affect the independence of our policy. But I have a growing fear, a growing impression, that we are not able to follow such an independent policy as we would like to. The Commonwealth policy is dictated by considerations of Britain, Canada, Australia and South Africa, and willy-nilly we get linked up with it. Our economic, commercial, financial—even military—policies are tagged on to the United Kingdom. Our freedom action is fettered to a great extent. Recently, the Chancellor of the British Exchequer, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Eden met the American authorities and we understand that they have taken certain decisions to tighten up exports to China. This is in line with U.S. policy. I would like to know what would be our policy in this matter.

Then, let us take our Army Administration. To what extent do we depend on the United Kingdom, specially in the matter of supplies and training! More than once on the floor of the House even the Prime Minister has admitted it. Today as I was going through this small report, to which Dr. Mookerjee made a reference, I came across a very interesting figure. How much we depend on the United Kingdom is illustrated here. How much our foreign policy—I should say how much our External Affairs Ministry is depending on U.K. is revealed by this figure. It says that we spend 52:08 lakhs of rupees on the High Commissioner's office in U.K. and our over-all expenditure for the headquarters of External Affairs is 66:85 lakhs, and this also includes the External Affairs Publicity Division. So nearly half is spent in U.K. It is natural that because of our old con-

nection we should have some kind of dependence on U.K. for a little time, but I do not understand why this balance cannot be shifted and why we go on perpetuating that dependence on U.K. and for which we are suspected by others. Our presence in the Commonwealth has compromised our position more than once. It makes us suspect in the eyes of others. For instance, take this Korean Resolution that we brought forth in the U.N., I believe it was done in all sincerity, because genuinely we wanted to bring about a peaceful solution. In that spirit our U.N. representative brought forward that Resolution. But what was the effect? Because we are in the Commonwealth, because we are so much associated with the Anglo-American bloc, our Resolution was suspect and we did not get the support that we should otherwise have got. This has gained further currency by the speeches of Mr. Eden and Mr. Dulles—where they have stressed the fact that it was the Indian Resolution that was thrown out by Soviet Russia. That is why I do not see how we stand to gain by remaining within the Commonwealth.

Here I would like to illustrate it by another case. I refer to it with great hesitation because this matter raised a lot of dust in the House once before, but without meaning any disrespect to anybody, because I have got this genuine doubt in my mind and I would like to raise that point here. We are participating in Queen Elizabeth's Coronation in England. The invitation has gone to the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth countries, and to the heads of Governments of independent countries. Why to the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth countries? Because the heads of the Commonwealth countries are the representatives of the Queen. Therefore, they did not receive the invitation. In India the Prime Minister received the invitation. We are told that our position in the Commonwealth is quite different from that of other countries of the Commonwealth. We are independent. The Head of our Government is the President of the Republic. He has nothing to do with the Queen. If he is the Head of an independent country, if he is not representing the Queen, then why is it that our Prime Minister has received the invitation and not the Head of the State?

An Hon. Member: Personal.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: The explanation given is that this is a per-

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

sonal invitation to the Prime Minister. Well, it may be a personal invitation. But for a foreign, international ceremonial function of this nature, there cannot be a mere personal invitation. The Queen, if she likes, can invite the hon. the Prime Minister at her table. There is no objection to that. But at this kind of international funds in the country is officially represented. In that case, why is it that the Head of this kind of international function the very happy to know as to what is our status within the Commonwealth. In what capacity we received this invitation? Is our status the same as that of the other countries in the Commonwealth?

I would refer to some other aspects of one anomalous position because of our continued presence in the Commonwealth. Now, take the South African issue. Last time I remember somebody raised the issue that though we are in the Commonwealth, we do not get any assistance from there in solving our South African problem. In reply our hon. Prime Minister told us that that itself shows how independent we are because we do not want their assistance in solving this problem. Well, that may be one point of view. But in today's *Hindustan Times* in the front page there is a news item on South Africa. You will see how this ugly race war is being carried on there, and there is a very interesting phrase which will sting everybody sitting in this House. There we have been described, our Republic has been described, as the "coolie Republic" because this is the only Republic within the Commonwealth. That is why I want to know what is our status within the Commonwealth? Why should we go on perpetuating this anomalous position? It hurts our self-respect. After much struggle we have won this independence. Maybe we are a little over-sensitive about our prestige and our position. But I think that is a very legitimate sentiment and I think it is worthwhile considering whether it is any good for us to continue within the Commonwealth.

I do not wish to take much time of the House. I wanted to say something about our policy regarding Pakistan. But much has already been said. It is very unfortunate that we, two neighbouring States, have not found a peaceful solution. Our points of view have not yet been adjusted and the Kashmir issue is being prolonged for such a long time. But we should realise that in world affairs ultimately we two have got to stand together. Our foreign policy and our economic policy should be such that we have to adjust and

we have to protect each other's integrity and each other's economic welfare. I am talking in this vein particularly because of recent happenings in Pakistan. We view the recent happenings in Pakistan with grave concern. We cannot do anything there, it is true. But just in the adjoining State there is chaos and confusion prevailing. We are not getting full reports, but as I heard from some people—we will shortly be in possession of full reports—the description is indeed very terrible. If such things are happening right across the border, it is a matter of great concern to us and I hope our Government is keeping a close watch on the situation.

About Jammu and Kashmir, though it does not come exactly under External Affairs, I would like to say a few words. This movement and the happenings that have been taking place recently are further complicating an already complicated situation. It is not in the larger interests of the country to have this kind of trouble in Jammu and Kashmir. Last time when I had occasion to speak on the floor of the House I appealed to our hon. Prime Minister to find a solution. This movement will do no good to India; it will do no good to Jammu and Kashmir; neither will the continuance of this trouble do good to anybody. If our policy is a policy of peace, if we are pursuing a policy of peace in international affairs, why should it be impossible for the Government to tackle this question also peacefully? That is why I appeal to the Government that they should not stand on prestige; they should not let small things stand in the way; they should rise to the occasion and scotch this trouble now. Otherwise, if it takes larger dimensions, it will do very great injury to the larger interests of the country.

5 P.M.

I have said most of what I had to say. I would just say a few words about the Embassies. In this report we have been given a long list of Embassies that have been opened but there is one notable omission. We have as yet no Embassy in Yugoslavia. This young and vigorous European republic is making new experiments in social and economic affairs and I feel that there is so much for us to give and take that we shall do well to open an Embassy in Yugoslavia.

During my recent tour in Europe, I had occasion to visit some of our Embassies. I have been one who was criticising the External Affairs expenditure and I have been criticising the working of the Embassies. But, here

I would like to put in a good word for the junior staff working in our Embassies. I have seen that most of them, (living in countries where the cost of living is very high) do not have really adequate salaries to look after themselves—they have the housing problem to face and they have other innumerable difficulties—doing a good job, though hardly any credit is given to them.

My criticism about the Publicity Organisation of the External Affairs Department is the same as that of Govind Das or Mookerjee. I have found the publicity work very meagre and literature inadequate. It was neither of the type it should be. Instead of laying emphasis on the glorious past that we have enjoyed, we should tell them what we are doing now and how we are developing the country. One feels this paucity of suitable literature at every step. We do not take even the steps that Pakistan has taken to give proper publicity to their country. I would ask the hon. Minister to look into this matter and put it on a better level. I have criticised the External Affairs policy. There is much to criticise no doubt. But at the same time I would say that on the whole the underlying principles followed are the right principles and I and my party support them.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): The Prime Minister in a magnificent speech the other day lasting for about 20 minutes, paid a great tribute to Marshal Stalin. In a historic phrase, he said, "we are the children of this age." We are the children of this age, who have witnessed two wars, the first war of artillery and infantry and the second war of the atom bomb. And when the atom bomb was dropped, the third war will have started and we are now witnessing the cold war. In this age, let us take note of the declarations by various statesmen in regard to the position of the world, in regard to what the leaders of democracies and the totalitarian states have said and how the fate of millions hangs on the lips of these great statesmen.

I would like to begin straightaway from Franklin Roosevelt. Franklin Roosevelt was indeed one of the great men of the world and when he died a great policy was ended. A great policy was indeed ended, with his successor ushering another policy altogether. Franklin Roosevelt had enunciated and left behind a great policy. I am quoting Franklin Roosevelt's words to say what was that policy. He said:

"Today we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that if civilisation

is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationship, the ability of all people of all kinds to live together and work together in the same world."

The moment Roosevelt died, on the suggestion of his Adviser, Hopkins, Marshal Stalin sent Molotov to convey the feelings of regret of the Russian people to his successor President Truman. However it is recorded that Molotov complained that he had never received such a shabby treatment at the hands of any one as when he conveyed that message. There came a break in the foreign policy of the U.S.A., when the bond of human relationship was snapped—that bond which binds India with the rest of the world, and holds man to man. When Roosevelt died, Stalin echoed his message. What did Marshal Stalin say? He said, "President Roosevelt has died but his cause must live on. We shall support President Truman with all our forces and with all our strength". Thereafter, Sir, you know what came. President Truman enunciated his doctrine which is quite different from the doctrine of his famous predecessor. I would call it one of negation. His doctrine has been confirmed by President Eisenhower. Truman's doctrine is, "It must be the policy of U.S.A. to support the peoples who are resisting the attempted subjugation of any minorities by outside pressure", and thereby he said that people must have the right to work out their own destiny in their own way. This was his doctrine.

As against this doctrine, we have the Nehru doctrine. What is the Nehru doctrine? In his speech on March 8, 1950, the Prime Minister made it clear in this House when he said, that we are not identifying ourselves with any bloc. We are not enemies of any race or nation. We love everyone and we shall not be entangled with binding covenants with any Governments in the Far East but shall have a regional organisation, for co-operation and consultation with our neighbours around. This is what our great Prime Minister said. This doctrine stands out on a line with that of President Roosevelt for it takes note of human relationship.

There have been some distinguished visitors during the last three months in this country. I shall quote their conversation but I shall not give their names; nor will I say from which country they came. I asked them what was their foreign policy. He said it in two words. He said their foreign policy was pure servility to America and his second observation was that it will be

[Shri Joachim Alva]

a great disaster if our Foreign Minister was removed from his scene of office. I was amazed that one from a land under the direct influence of the Anglo-American bloc should have uttered such words. Today we are in a kind of jungle where tigers are being hunted by wolves.

The *Manchester Guardian* in an issue of December, 1950, after the Korean war started, said "Europe is quite willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with Republicans and Democrats" on Far Eastern Policy, "if Europe could find out where the shoulders are". This is the position with the world today. Elliot Roosevelt, the son of Franklin Roosevelt, when his father died, said, "The British and the Americans were first to shake the mailed fist and when the collective principles were abrogated, started the cold war." The cold war started with the atomic bomb and the cold war started with the refusal to communicate that knowledge to others, and the cold war started perhaps when the atom bomb was thrown on helpless Japanese and their cities were laid to ruins; though the Japanese sought peace through the Vatican six months before Hiroshima went to pieces.

Sir, we must not forget the foreign pockets of Goa and Pondicherry in India. We have French pockets, Pondicherry and others, which have 196 sq. miles and a population of 316,425. We have got Goa and other Portuguese pockets extending over 1,200 square miles. I want to mention these two pockets because unless Pondicherry and Goa with their adjuncts are restored, we shall have ever to remind ourselves about these stark facts every year in Parliament, or anywhere where a National Assembly sits to work with these territories as foreign possessions. The Prime Minister should not have a hand in Indo-Chinese affairs. We must say that we cannot even mediate there, unless France first makes a declaration that she shall quit honourably from our territory. Then alone can we put our hands in solving this Indo-China question.

Two years ago, in the Foreign Affairs debate I had said that we should resist with all our might the intrusion of foreign powers in our territory. We must hurl them out. The NATO or the MEDO may take Goa in its embrace. Thereby we shall be in veritable danger. Bombay is near Goa and if Bombay is paralysed, there is danger to the security of India. I have often spoken in this House about the dangers of Radio-Goa; how it may paralyse the morale of India one day in times of

danger to us. No debate on Foreign Affairs in the Indian Parliament should ever take place without our reminding ourselves that there are French and Portuguese pockets in India. Now, I am mentioning this because it is high time that we take this up.

Then let us be warned about our position today. We have to think clearly what we shall do and how we shall get along in this great business, especially when President Truman was warned by the Chiefs of his Defence Staff that the year 1954 is the year of danger. It is high time that we take the matter in hand. Physically we may be short of all weapons; but morally we are strong. Our defence forces are not equal to the world's best. We do not have a Navy which is worth claiming any attention, but it has good men, especially in the lower ranks. Our Army contains the best fighting material. We have an Air Force which may be very young, but its personnel the finest and the best available in our land. In this manner, we are not flourishing our weapons at others, but only pursuing a peaceful policy, one of pure non-aggression.

When we declare our foreign policy, we should not forget our brethren in East Africa. We have no arms to send out to them. We have sent them legal assistance in the shape of a fellow Member of Parliament, Dewan Chamanlal. We have lots of sympathy for them. We extend it to them without fear of any white or brown man. Similarly, our countrymen in Africa should always think in terms of the Africans. They should serve the interests of the Africans better and should not give the slightest occasion for an impression that Indians are trying to establish their sway over the Africans. They should follow Mahatma Gandhi's ideal of love.

I should now like to turn to our external publicity. Our expenditure under the External Affairs Ministry was Rs. eight crores last year. This year, it is Rs. nine crores. Now, let us see how much a single country like the United States is spending on foreign publicity. In the allocation for 1953, we find that they have budgeted for 157 million dollars for overseas information. This sum is equivalent to Rs. 80 crores. Where do they spend this money? From Cairo through India to Tokyo are the strongholds where this money is freely spent. A quarter of that money must, have been drained out in India. I am not afraid to say that the pockets of Americans and Russians are oozing with money for their propaganda. We have to take care, and see that with our moral strength and spiritual values, we resist

temptation from either side. So long as Pandit Nehru is in charge of the Government of India, I know that we shall always think in terms of non-violence and that we shall not utilise the funds from either side, and that we shall try to give a correct picture without being afraid of any party.

Take Japan. It has been occupied by thirteen powers technically, but for all practical purposes, it has been under the control of America. As early as six months back, before the Korean War started, Senator Conally, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that they had no interest in Formosa, but when the clash came, they realised that every piece of land was important for them as a foothold. The Korean hostilities broke out on June 25, 1950, and we know how we held a debate in this House, and how the eyes and ears of the world were rivetted on what took place inside this Chamber. Our Galleries were filled with Ambassadors. Today, there is none. Perhaps, the world tension is not there now. Perhaps, they are not mindful of what India says today. But we shall do our duty unmindful of praise, favour or criticism or fear from our friends and foes alike. We shall go along the path chalked out by Mahatma Gandhi in the sense that we shall always be non-violent and shall always love our neighbours. We shall not think in terms of getting involved in the cobweb of power politics or thinking in terms of trying to fill other countries with our population.

One or two more suggestions. I support the Demand for better salaries for men in our Foreign Service. Our men in the Foreign Service should be well paid. We should not be niggardly with them. Let us spend more, and have less men. They should not fall an easy prey to temptation, and try to make profits for themselves. They should be men of character, ability, and patriotism, and should serve the country well. We shall have less Missions, but better men, who will be excellent representatives of our country abroad. We shall spend well on them indeed.

We should seek early cooperation in North Africa, in the sense of having consular or political representatives in the whole of North Africa. It is a vital zone in the next war. I have in mind Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Libya, Tangier etc. We must send our representatives there. Tangier is now an international area and if the international powers have their representatives there, why should not our men go there? That part of the world must hum with our name and culture and those people should know that India is represented

there and that we extend to them utmost friendship and cordiality.

One more point. Sooner or later, this Parliament will have to have a Committee which will approve of all appointments of Ambassadors. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the United States approves everyone who is listed or nominated as an Ambassador on behalf of the United States. Similarly, we shall have to have our own Committee. It may come today, or three years or four years hence, but this House must have a Committee. In this connection, I wish to reiterate the suggestion that I made last year during the foreign affairs debate. To about twelve major Embassies we have got, we should not send representatives who are either servicemen or I.C.S. men, but men drawn from public life, men whose names are not associated with scandals, men who would deliver the goods, men of character and patriotism, integrity and ability.

Shri Sadath Ali Khan (Ibrahimpatnam): While discussing the foreign policy of this country, it will be well to remember that it is only six years since we gained our independence. During this short span of time, we have been able to build up our foreign service from scratch. It has been an uphill task. We had to find men of ability who would carry out the foreign policy of this country faithfully. It is entirely due to the efforts of our Prime Minister that in the world today we have gained a very high place, and we are looked upon by other nations with respect. It has been the policy of this country to support the freedom struggles in all parts of the world, especially in colonial countries, and our contribution to international peace and amity has been out of all proportion to our status as a young nation. We can say with justifiable pride that no other nation placed in a similar situation has done so much to enhance her prestige and the cause of international peace.

My hon. friend just now referred to one aspect of our foreign policy, namely, the administrative side. I believe that we would do well to strengthen our administration on foreign affairs. As I said earlier, we started in 1947 from scratch, but we have slowly been able to build up an efficient foreign service which is doing excellent work. But we must expand this service and further strengthen it, so that it becomes a body fully able to deal with the other nations of the world. The success of our foreign policy is evident by the fact that today there

[Shri Sadath Ali Khan]

are various nations that are looking up to us for guidance in matters of foreign relations. A friend of mine who has just returned from Japan was telling me that the people of Japan are taking an increasing interest in India's stand in the United Nations. Similarly, another friend who went to the United States and stayed there for six months admitted that, though the people there criticise certain aspects of our policy, on the whole there is an increasing appreciation of it. That is a fact which is always there to face. It is our policy to safeguard the borders of our country and to strengthen our frontiers, so that we are able to implement the various plans which are before us. To attain this aim peace and friendship with neighbouring countries are essential. I welcome the proposal of Dr. Mahmud that India should have a joint defence with Pakistan. In the sphere of foreign policy there has been more or less a similar approach by both the countries. For instance, on the question of Indonesian freedom, Indo-South African dispute, the status of South-West Africa, the functions of the Trusteeship Council, relations with China and Korean Affairs, Pakistan and India have been more or less working together. The main hurdles which are preventing both our countries coming together are purely internal matters, such as Kashmir, canal waters and evacuee property. These can be solved amicably, given the goodwill and mutual understanding. We on our part are willing to come to terms, but I do not know how Pakistan will react to a suggestion of this kind for a joint defence of our two countries. Since there is a campaign of abuse against us going on in Pakistan, it is difficult for us to come together and talk in a friendly manner.

Several speakers referred to MEDO. I do not know what the policy of Pakistan Government is. But I cannot help saying that if she is inclined to join an organisation such as the Middle East Defence Organisation, she will be committing a mistake because here destiny lies with the people of South-East Asia rather than the Middle East. But it is not for us to say what they will do. On our part we will do well to safeguard against any such measure which might be taken in future. I suggest that we consider a mutual security pact among the nations of Asia in case of a third world conflict, so that this will strengthen us and we will be able to develop ourselves economically and socially.

There is then the question of our relations with the Middle-Eastern countries. It is a fact that in recent times

we have done some good work in that area and at present I hear from people who have visited these countries that India's stand is appreciated and the propaganda of countries against us does not carry so much weight. But still we will do well to send a Delegation to these countries, so that our mutual bonds are further strengthened.

Then there is the question of developing our resources with the help of other nations by importing capital goods and the know-how. We desire to create a third force so that it might work to bring together the two warring blocs.

With regard to the working of our Embassies, much has been said. But the fact is that, as I said, earlier, we started only recently and will take time for us to develop these Embassies fully. At the same time we must lay greater emphasis on the work of the publicity side of the administration. It is a fact that the case of India is not fully represented in foreign countries and there is a good deal of misunderstanding. Therefore, we would do well to strengthen this side of our administration.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Frankly speaking, I am not satisfied with our foreign policy. It may have raised high the status of our popular Prime Minister in the international field, but it has failed to bring any benefit, or add any strength to our country. This is my firm opinion and cannot be changed even by joy rides round the world at Government cost!

Two important world events have occurred during the last few months. The first is the election of Eisenhower and the second the death of Stalin. I will not go into the effects of these two events on world politics or the peace or war position in the world, because frankly speaking, I do not understand all the intricacies, complexities and perplexities of the problem. I know only this much that world events do not move on personalities, but move on policies. I will be content with making a few observations with regard to matters nearer home than far away from home.

Nearer home, so far as our North-East frontier is concerned, the situation there is certainly enough to make one uneasy. On the one hand, there is infiltration from the bordering areas of Pakistan. On the other hand the tribal people there, the Nagas who live in the territory between our Assam border and Burma border are a peculiar people and are under peculiar

influence, the influence of Christian missionaries. I have nothing to say against any religion; it is a matter of freedom of conscience and I believe in it. But the effect of the activities of these missionaries on the Tribal Naga people is such that it creates sentiments of separatism in the minds of those simple people and alienates their sympathies or removes the love of the motherland from their heart and they become more or less aliens in the heart of the country. It was surprising to hear or read in the papers that one of them is trying to raise the question of Naga independence in the United Nations. I hope he does not do it. But if he does it our Prime Minister must deal with it.

I must also refer to another matter of a similar nature—the activities of foreign missionaries and Christian missionaries. I am constrained to say that during the Congress regime the number of foreign missionaries has increased by 25 per cent, and the number of daily conversions has also increased by 25 per cent. Under British regime about one hundred people were being converted and under Congress rule it has now risen to 125. It is not a trifling matter at all: it is a grave matter. It is not a question of religion.

شکھشا پر اکرتک سلسلہ میں تنہا ویگیا تک
انسدادہان سلسلہ (مولانا آزاد): یہ فیگور
کس سے معلوم ہوا؟

[The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): How has this figure been known?]

डा० एन० बी० खरे : अल्लबारां में
पढते हैं. साहब, और कैसे मालूम हुआ?

مولانا آزاد: معلوم تو ابھی تک
نہیں پڑھا۔

[Maulana Azad: I have not yet read it.]

Dr. N. B. Khare: आप ने बराबर पढ़ा
नहीं होगा। It is not a matter for
laughter at all.

Shri Tyagi: Are these conversions
forcible?

Dr. N. B. Khare: If these are allowed
to go unchecked, I do not know if our
secularism will remain in the field: we
will be converted into something else.
Therefore, I warn this Government
against this.

Last year a conference of missionaries was held in South India where the President of that conference, a foreign missionary whose name I forget at the moment, said that they were very happy under the Congress regime, because the number of conversions has increased.

Then I come to Nepal, our honourable neighbour. In 1950 December, I warned the country from the platform of the Hindu Mahasabha, when I was presiding at Poona, against our meddling in the affairs of Nepal. I gave a clear warning that by persisting in this, you will pave the way for the entry of communism. At that time, I was condemned by the Press and called a reactionary and a protagonist of the Rana Shahi and all that sort of thing. I endured all that and I will continue to endure that. But, I will always speak and forecast what I think is the truth in my own judgment. What do we find now? There is imminent danger of communism infiltrating or invading Nepal through Tibet.

Our policy is neutrality. What do we find? We are still in the Commonwealth bound by silken ties. The Commonwealth is a friend of the U.S.A. which is helping us, whether benevolently or with some other motive, I cannot say. On account of this help, somehow or other, we cannot say 'No' to these two nations. Therefore, we have to be subservient to them or yield to them on account of their goodness or benevolence, help or kindness. On the other hand, our neighbour China is trying to infiltrate into Nepal through Tibet, which is our neighbour, on account of pressure tactics. So, it is a fine neutrality that to one bloc we are yielding by goodness and to another bloc we are yielding by pressure. This is fine neutrality and I congratulate the Government for that.

With regard to East Bengal, our neighbour, much has been said. Only the other day, my hon. friend Sardar Amar Singh of the Congress Party asked a question about attacks in Nadia or somewhere else by Pakistan. The routine answer was given for the nth time that we have registered a protest. We have only got to protest, more emphatically protest and most emphatically protest. The whole thing ends there, because our policy is to use sole force against friends at home—I spell the word 'sole' and not 'soul'—and to use the healing touch for our confirmed enemies abroad, we are afraid or we are diffident or we cannot think of using any stick small or big against East Bengal or Pakistan. I would strongly recommend that if you cannot raise any stick, then, for God's sake—

[Dr. N. B. Khare]

use lipstick so that by this healing touch, the hirsute lips of Pakistan may be softened or mollified. What can be said more? One is tired of saying. It is breaking our heads against a stone wall. But we cannot help saying it.

Another province is Jammu and Kashmir. On that also much has been said here as well as outside. I do not want to say much. I will illustrate this by an example in practical life. In July last, there was a contractual marriage between Kashmir and Bharat. The terms of the contract were, Bharat has to arrange for food, for raiment, for health, for medicine.....

Mr. Chairman: May I just remind the hon. Member that we are only discussing External Affairs today?

Dr. N. B. Khare: Kashmir is an External Affair. It is with the UNO.

Mr. Chairman: That does not matter.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I will finish by giving a very small instance.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is going to make irrelevant remarks; I will not allow it. The hon. Member is referring to Jammu and Kashmir which has reference to our internal policy. If he could bring it under External Affairs.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: UNO is an External Affairs matter, I submit. It is within the portfolio of the External Affairs Ministry.

Mr. Chairman: I will request the hon. Member to resume his seat. The point is very clear. We are discussing External Affairs today. If he can anyhow bring all these matters on the plane of External Affairs, he is perfectly entitled to make any remarks that he pleases. If he wants just to discuss the internal policy of India, I am afraid I will not be able to allow him.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I will bow to your ruling, Sir. I cannot help otherwise. Anyway, what I have said has made the point clear and I am satisfied. It is an ethereal marriage with no nuptials.

With regard to South Africa, the latest law, or if not a law, the agitation is there, it is to prevent the wives of the Indian settlers there from entering that country. We are actually helpless,—that is our foreign policy—to do anything in the matter. It is very good that by this enforced separation and celibacy, our Indian brethren there will have a quicker salvation for their souls. I congratulate the Government on their inaction.

We are getting, as I said before, foreign aid for our community projects. The word community is there. I will recommend that this word should be boycotted. It is a communal word and divides India. We have got for that what is called Marshall Aid. This term Marshall Aid is very popular in this country; not only in this country, it is popular in this House also, this Marshall Aid.

Shri Tyagi: Do not be afraid.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid the hon. Member is roaming about and referring to extraneous and irrelevant matters.

Shri Sashagiri Rao (Nandyal): The foreign policy that we are following today is a policy of peace and friendship. This is not a new policy or a policy that has been invented. But, it is the obvious and inevitable result of our position in 1947.

To say that we are following a policy of peace and friendship means clearly two factors: that there are two blocs directly in conflict with each other and that we do not want to involve ourselves by joining any party. If we do not want to join any party and if we want to stand by ourselves, it requires a certain amount of stamina, and a certain amount of strength. It is this sort of strength or our own stamina that gives power to our dynamic neutrality.

Now, we have been following this policy of peace and friendship during the last five years. We may have achieved certain results or we may not have achieved any success at all. That does not matter. As long as we are striving for peace, if we are on the right path, we need not worry ourselves about the success that we may achieve or may not about a particular matter. When we say that we are following a policy of non-alignment, it means that we are not closely following the war-mongering spirit of this or that bloc. Till 1949, the American Government wanted to draw our Government into their fold and to make India one of their principal friends. It has failed. But, after 1949, it has changed its policy, and is trying to penetrate into India in a different way. Till 1949 they patted and placated India, and invited our Prime Minister to America so that a policy of friendship may result. But what happened? Our Government, true to its policy of neutrality, refused to align itself, and even said that we do not want any aid if it is going to interfere with our neutrality. Here I would like to refer

to certain statements from the American press. As early as December 7, 1947, Ambassador Grady had declared:

"It is tremendously important to keep India on our side in the world struggle."

And in October, 1949, this is what the *New York Times* said:

"The United States is seeking a way to reassert Western influence and thus prevent a further spread of communism in the Far East. To this end, Washington is trying to enlist the support of Prime Minister Nehru, the unofficial spokesman for most of South East Asia."

Again, Sir, on August 29, 1950, the *New York Times* wrote like this:

"To have Pandit Nehru as an ally in the struggle for Asiatic support is worth many divisions; to have him as an opponent or even a critic would jeopardize the position of Western democracy throughout Asia."

So, till 1950, America wanted somehow to keep India's support as a friend and ally, but India has been refusing in so many words that it does not want to align itself. Then, they seem to have changed their policy. Even till the date of elections, they were not so very fond of giving aid except on conditions of alignment. But, after the elections, we see a change. They are trying to penetrate into India in a different way, i.e., by a policy of technical aid and technical assistance. I know what this technical assistance means, but there is no word like technical aid. But, I call it technical because I find that it is with a purpose that they are giving this aid and this assistance. Why are the Americans trying to give loans and assistance? The biggest item of all the aid is the food item—the wheat loan, and when they gave it, they passed legislation in their Parliament—the Indian Emergency Food Act of 1951.—Section 2 of it says:

"provided that part of the payment by India should be in the form of supply of substantial quantities of strategic and critical materials needed by the United States."

So, for every aid that they give, they want certain strategic and important materials from India. That is because they find that India is full of raw materials which are very important. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the American House of Representatives noted in 1948:

"India is the major source of many strategic materials vitally needed and imported by the United States, materials including beryl, castor oil seed, chromite, coconut oil, cyanite....."

Even when they promised help for the Damodar Valley Corporation, it was not due to any charitable feeling that prompted them to give aid, but because they thought that they could get certain imports from the Damodar Valley Project. I shall refer to that portion:

"It is a commonplace that the war potential of a country depends above all on key industries like coal, iron and steel, aluminium etc. The Damodar Valley, because of the abundant deposits of the key minerals, is destined to be the centre of most of the industries vital to national defence. Indeed, it may well be regarded as India's potential arsenal of democracy."

So, it is because they wanted certain raw materials and very important things that they wanted to capture somehow or other the Government of India in the guise of charity. That is why they give these aids and assistance.

More than that, they want to spread a network of experts throughout India. They want to use this for a sort of propaganda value. When we say that we are following a policy of non-alignment with both countries and yet subject ourselves to this sort of treatment by America, are we following a policy of non-alignment at all is the question. So, this is something which I want the Government to take notice of. I think it is really a matter that our Government has not considered fully. The American Government want somehow or other to push their dollars into India so that they may have a hold on us. If it is said that Communism is entering India from the people, I think the American dollar is trying to use its influence at the Government level.

Nothing prevents us from taking aid, but when we take aid and assistance, we have to protect ourselves and see that we do not send them any raw materials in case of war or in any emergency that arises. By our policy of trying to keep friendship with both power blocs, we may please none at all.

Another point I would like to mention is about the colonies. When we are talking about such a policy as this and when we consider ourselves to be in the centre of the international field, how is it that we are unable to do any-

[Shri Sashagiri Rao]

thing about foreign pockets in India itself? These pockets are very small and very few, but I find from reports that Government have sent some proposals or notes to Portugal and France. This is not the way of winning over the Governments of Portugal and France. Our Government seems to be fond of sending proposals and notes and also some missions. If we want to achieve anything, we must be more strong and we must follow a policy which is more dynamic than dynamic neutrality itself. We are not going to brook this sort of interference in India, and if they do not yield, we have to see that the people in those places launch what is called the "national movement" and make it irksome for the Governments there so that they may find it impossible to run the administration.

One other point which I would like to urge is this. If we want our foreign policy to be appreciated, there should be more advertising staff for us in other places. We see that whenever External Affairs come in here, the only spokesman is our Prime Minister. We should see that there are some others properly trained so that he need not be the only man that can speak about it.

Prof. Mathew (Kottayam): The strongest consideration that I would wish to urge in support of our foreign policy is that it is essentially morally right. How far others understand it is not of mean importance, but I would give it only a secondary place. I hope that in no part of this House will the reference to morality be received with derision or scorn. Twenty centuries ago, a Roman Procurator, sneeringly exclaimed: "What is truth?" I hope we shall not modify it in a more objectionable manner and exclaim, "What is this morality?" I stress this not out of any theoretical consideration, but for a very practical reason. Questions have been asked: What has this policy achieved? Has it achieved concrete results? We must be able to justify our policy before the bar of reason by the concrete results. I do admit it, but we must take a long slice of history, so to say; stress on immediate results is rather misleading. I knew an eminent professor of history who used to say that shortcuts are really, as judged by history, rather round-about paths. Therefore, let us not be impatient. Let us not go on asking what have we achieved. Have we got what we wanted. I am not saying that these questions cannot be answered but that these do not con-

stitute the first question that should be put. The first question is "Is the moral basis of our policy essentially rights? What is this policy? I want to say in very simple words what it implies and what it does not imply. It does imply that we refuse to permanently align ourselves with either of the two well-known blocs in the world, that we reserve our right to form an independent judgment on every question as it comes up. Again, I am prepared to concede that this independent judgment may sometimes go wrong. I am not saying it has gone wrong, but even if occasionally it goes wrong, it does not belie the independent character of that judgment. We shall not align ourselves with any power bloc but we reserve our right to form our judgment on every question as it comes up. Now, it has been said that the very essence of rationality consists in this, the mind's unhampered going into a question and I do maintain that our policy is independent and rational if at that point or at this point, it may not have led to that success which we would have liked to see. While this is what the policy means, I should also briefly explain, as it seems to me what it does not mean, what it does not necessarily imply. It does not mean that in certain matters we are not nearer certain Nations than we are to other Nations. The parliamentary democracy that we have accepted and the freedom that we give to all citizens to practice whatever religion that they believe in or irreligion that they believe in, these kinds of freedom certainly make us nearer to certain Nations than to certain other Nations. Again, the economic planning which we have adopted, the principle of it, brings us nearer, it may be, to certain other Nations. Therefore the fact that we are in certain matters closer to certain Nations, in other matters we are closer to some other Nations does not, in any way, impugn the independence of our policy. Again it does not mean that we shall not enter into alliance with particular Nations for particular reasons, economic or cultural. No individual can live an isolated life and what the individual is to a nation, a nation is to the world at large. That conception of independence which is based on a kind of isolation is a false kind of independence. Therefore, even if our policy has not brought us as near our goal in any particular sphere as we would have expected, that does not mean the failure of our moral basic principles. I am sure, in the long run, the right policy that we pursue will also be justified, in the truest sense of

the word by expediency. The right and the true are ultimately also the most expedient.

Coming to particular questions, I do not want to touch on many matters because they have been touched upon and I know they will be touched on again. There is this very urgent question of the relationship with Pakistan. It is a subject on which our feelings are roused and personally I would not mind feelings being roused upto a point. Human beings are feelingful but I will only say that our feelings would mislead us if they cloud our reason. Even when our feelings are roused, it is right and proper and necessary that we should keep the sense of reality and our sense of logic. It has been alleged from the other side by a most distinguished Member—he is not there now—that there is some contradiction in the statement in the Report regarding our external relations that while we refused to accept the last resolution of the Security Council on the Kashmir question, we were nevertheless prepared at the same time to continue negotiations. I fail to see what the contradiction in this is. We refused to accept the latest resolution of the Security Council, but there was a history prior to that and we were prepared to continue the conversations not on the basis of the latest resolution which we rejected, but we were prepared to take it up at the point where it was brought before that. If we grow impatient, our impatience may lead into a wrong policy and later on we might regret it. Of course we should not adopt that kind of patience which is a cloak for cowardice. We may find it necessary to strike back if and when we are struck, but let us not anticipate many steps in that direction now. If we are convinced that we are pursuing a right policy, we can go ahead with it. There are many evils in this wicked world that we are not able to rectify. In South Africa, our countrymen may be having a seriously inconvenient position to put it mildly. While our hearts might go out in sympathy to them, there are limitations under which we have to act.

I did not understand the objection to what is called the moral re-armament movement. It is not a very essential question in the present context but it has been referred to by Members on the opposite side. It has the fundamental principles of absolute purity, absolute truthfulness, absolute charity as its basis. Those who want to cultivate the art, the cruel art of class hatred and violence may feel that the appeal to absolute purity or truthfulness

or charity is not in furtherance of their programme, in furtherance of their wishes.

Again I do not understand the political issue which the hon. Dr. Khare tried to make out of conversions of some people to Christianity. If Christians, out of their own free will, embrace any other religion, I think no political issue can be made out of it. In fact, in Travancore-Cochin State, I heard—I am not sure of the exact figures—that several backward community Christians have embraced Hinduism. Well and good. If they wanted to go back to Hinduism and embrace the Hindu religion, let them do so. But what is the political issue which anybody would like to make out of it? I fail to understand.

6 P.M.

I next come to the question of the membership of India in the Commonwealth. I am not the most competent person to expound it, but from a simple commonsense point of view, I fail to see what is objectionable in that membership. Just as I said a little while ago, as individuals cannot live unto themselves, so also, nations cannot live unto themselves. For particular and limited purposes, it is good, natural, proper and right that we should align ourselves with other people on a footing of equality. What the hon. Prime Minister said on a previous occasion was referred to by a previous speaker, I think, in a slightly distorted way. What the Prime Minister stated was this, that if we are not able to exercise pressure on some other member of the Commonwealth, it means also that other members of the Commonwealth would not be able to exercise pressure on us, unless it be pressure of reasonable persuasiveness, and that this is all to the good. There are people who deplore our friendly alliance with one nation now or with another nation at another time, for limited purposes, but they deplore it for some secret reasons. The secret behind it is that they like to see India align itself with some other bloc. Amongst school children it sometimes happens that if A is friendly towards B then C who is jealous of this relationship between A and B goes on taunting them, and exaggerating and distorting the innocent and honourable relationship between them. He is disappointed that he does not enjoy that friendship. Similarly some people who go on taunting us of our friendly relationship with certain nations are motivated by disappointment in that we have refused to walk into some other parlour of which they are so fond. The analogy that we have discussed is something that is innocent

[Prof. Mathew]

compared with the serious matter we are discussing. If for limited purposes, we align ourselves with particular nations, there is no reasonable ground on which it can be resented, unless there be some secret reason behind such an argument. I would like to repeat that there is nothing wrong in our aligning ourselves with particular nations in this way for limited purposes; now it may be with one bloc, now it may be with another bloc I would like to express my confidence in the policy that we have adopted and say that as long as we persist in this right policy of independence, even if the results that we hope to have do not come to us with that quickness which we would have liked to see, still we may have the assurance and certain conviction that ultimately it will prove to be the successful policy at the bar of history itself, and by reference to the concrete results it will bring about, our policy will stand vindicated.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): I was listening very carefully to the speeches made from the other side. There was a sort of growing unhappiness when I found that a very wrong approach has been made to our foreign policy. The hon. Member opposite said that we were receiving applause, approbation and approval everywhere in the United Nations. The hon. Member who spoke prior to me certainly tried to evaluate our foreign policy by certain moral standards and satisfied himself that we are going on very well. I do not for a moment say that these approaches we should not make. I do not contend for a moment that these are totally irrelevant issues. But for the time being, whether a certain section in the United Nations would look at us with approval or for the matter of that, a certain bloc would not approve of our dealings, is quite immaterial. Also the satisfaction that we have done something morally great, and so there is no hope lost on moral grounds, is a very poor consolation.

What fundamentally matters is how we should try to evaluate our foreign policy. Today there is a grave international situation with which we are faced. There is the question of war or peace. There is the question of colonialism, and there is also the question of certain aggressive nations, and their Governments poking their nose and interfering in the internal conditions of certain countries. The question is whether by the stand that we have taken in the United Nations in our resolution on the Korean question, or by the many good speeches

that our hon. Prime Minister has made, we have been able to avert that grave situation which is alarming and menacing. There is a dangerous feeling of insecurity when we have to keep the balance all right, when we have to keep ourselves on a moral plane. We are at the present moment passing through a period, when war clouds are gathering over us. Suppose it rains, or suppose the spark starts, and the fire is on, what will happen? It is a matter of great importance to every nation, including ourselves. Therefore, the main question before us is how we have been able to affect the international situation. The hon. Member there, Mr. Shiva Rao, brought a sort of U.N.O. atmosphere for the time being, and when I was listening to him, I thought that I was listening to a miniature U.N.O. debate. He said that our approach met with the approval of a major section in the U.N.O. The Korean war was going on. The Pan Mun Jon talks were going on for a long time. There was agreement on 61 points, but when the 62nd point came, what happened? Mr. Shiva Rao knows what happened, and also every Member in this House. The House will remember that there is such a thing as the Geneva Convention. It was a Convention which was accepted by more than 60 nations, and it was the result of four long years of discussion. It was stated clearly in Article 180 of that Convention that prisoners of war shall be released and set free without delay after the cessation of active hostilities. Another Article in that Convention says that prisoners of war may in no circumstances renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them by the present Convention. I would like to ask Prof. Mathew who comes from my place one question in this connection. Is it not moral that they should abide by this Convention which was entered into by more than 60 nations, including the great powers, the U.S. and the U.K., from which moral rearmament now hails? Why should this Convention be thrown out now? After all, what is it that we have suggested? Let us leave alone what other people have said about our proposals. Let us for the time being forget the praise that we got. What was our recommendation in his regard? Let us come to bare facts. We said that the question of the prisoners of war may be referred to the United Nations, which itself is a party to the war, the aggressive war that is being fought on the soil of Korea. At the present moment. I am not so much interested

in the merits or otherwise of our stand. Let us come to realities. Here is the offer, the Chinese offer made by the Prime Minister of China, that let there be a cessation of hostilities, that there shall be no bloodshed from this moment onwards. Only if that is done, will a discussion of the question round the table be possible. I will be very much obliged if my hon. friend Prof. Mathew representing moral rearmament would answer me and say whether this is a moral suggestion or not. Has this proposal the backing of morality or not? Then there is war in Malaya at the present moment. There is the Indo-China question. There is the question of Kenya. What are all these? Are these accidents? In Malaya, to me and to many ordinary men like me, the position of Britain is the most immoral position. They have no business to be there. Let them clear out.

An Hon. Member: They have no morality.

Shri Punnoose: I confess I am a little confused when phrases like 'absolute honesty' etc. are paraded by the moral rearmament gentlemen while they find nothing very much wrong in the position of the British in Malaya, the French in Indo-China and in what the British are just now doing in Kenya and also in the atomic diplomacy which is being practised in the homeland of moral rearmament! That is my difficulty with the moral rearmament.

I know we have limitations. The Prime Minister said—and very correctly said—that we cannot carry all the international events on our shoulders. Quite true. No country has such a broad shoulder as to carry all the international troubles. But what exactly are our principles? I believe the present Prime Minister, the former leader of our anti-imperialist movement had an international policy much earlier. I remember the days when he went to Spain and stood for Republican Spain at a time when certain gentlemen of the moral rearmament group were thanking God for Hitler. Our Prime Minister at that time, the leader of our anti-imperialist movement, stood against war and spoke for Republican Spain. Well, I do not want the Prime Minister now to go about shouting slogans, nor do I want our delegation to U.N. to carry on demonstrations there. But shall we not clearly state where we are? Are we, in the struggle between Malaysians and the British, on the side of the Malaysians? I was a little amused when

the other day Mr. Bevan said in his Constitution Club speech that the difficulty about Malaya was that they did not know exactly to whom to hand over power. Exactly the same apology about which Shri Nehru had made much fun of in former years! This sort of apology, this sort of intervention, aggrandizement and exploitation of colonial countries is at the root of the whole trouble today. So we do not want it. Certainly, I am a Communist,—for good or bad—and I believe that the policies followed by the Soviet country and by the People's Democracy of China are more near to peace than any other. But I do not want the Government of India or any Government for the matter of that to say 'Amen' to everything that this bloc or that says. We shall certainly have our moorings. We shall stand by them and shall not make it appear that from moment to moment we shift our position. The question is whether we shall declare ourselves against all sorts of colonialism and against all sorts of intervention in backward countries? It was said that great armies march on their stomach. It was said some time ago. In modern times it is much more true to say that great armies march on public opinion. No aggressor, no force on earth which wants to drench this world in war can dare do so as long as there is a sound public opinion against it. That is why all the world over we find today issues being distorted and confused. All sorts of distorted versions are given and the public mind is sought to be confused. Therefore, the greatest service that we can do for peace today, and for ourselves, is to state our policy clearly, definitely and precisely on every issue and say that we have nothing to do with anything which steps over our accepted formula of anti-colonialism and for freedom and for the right of every nation to decide its own destiny.

The hon. Member, Mr. Shiva Rao, said that our policy met with approval in the United Nations. Look at the result of our resolution. What is the net result of it? You can see. Of course, the war in Korea still continues. But much more I believe the US Government became much more stiff than ever during these years. 'Asians shall fight Asians'—they have given it out as their policy; and Asian countries were gathered for the time being to vote for the USA. And then the Kojé Island murders increased after the Indian Resolution.

Therefore, to say that we cannot do much is correct. But we can do a great lot. In the first place, we are

[Shri Punnoose]

a big nation, a great number; 350 million people count much. And our position in Asia is decisive and our anti-imperialist traditions give us a position and stature which cannot be overlooked. Therefore, it is high time that we leave no loopholes for the imperialists to make it appear that we are on their side. Several people doubt and I know it that our economic relations, our economic obligations to the U.S.A., our 'friendly relations' as Mr. Mathew would say, with the British and being in the Commonwealth—all these factors are drawing us nearer to a position where in the long run we will not be able to play our role. And when the crisis comes—if it ever comes—we will find ourselves on the wrong side, playing a role which we now do not bargain for.

Therefore, it is my honest conviction, and I appeal to the Prime Minister to wake up before it is too late; make our position clear and let it be understood clearly and let our call become a uniting force, and let our side become a uniting force. I do not know whether we will be able to collect small fry here and there, but the fundamental thing is that our stand must be acceptable to the vast numbers of people everywhere.

Mr. Chairman: In pursuance of the Deputy-Speaker's directions in the morning, intimation has been given by the Members to Secretary in respect of cut motions.

Cut motion No. 298 seeks to discuss appointment of Ambassadors and High Commissioners and Governors belonging to the Scheduled Castes community'. As the appointment of 'Governors' is not the concern of the Ministry, the words 'and Governors' have been omitted from this cut motion and no discussion will be allowed on that subject.

Disproportion between sums spent for social services and for other purposes

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

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Policy of drift in foreign affairs

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I beg to move:

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

(i) *Failure of Government to follow a steady, dynamic and positive neutral foreign policy.*

(ii) *Attitude of India towards M.E.D.O.*

(iii) *Policy of appeasement towards Pakistan.*

Sbri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I beg to move:

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

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

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

Leadership of India in Asia to propagate the message of peace to the Asian people.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I beg to move:

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

Withdrawal from the Commonwealth of Nations.

Shri T. K. Chandhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move:

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

(i) *Failure of Government to safeguard interests of Indians in Ceylon.*

(ii) *Need and desirability of liquidating the French and Portuguese pockets in India.*

Shri N. P. Damodaran (Tellicherry): I beg to move:

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

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

(i) *Composition of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations.*

(ii) *Ascertainment of facts regarding the alleged death of Subhas Chandra Bose.*

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

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

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

Failure to secure facilities for Indians to re-enter South Africa

Shri Nanadas (Ongole—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

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

Failure of Government to follow a consistent peace policy.

Shri Punnoose: I beg to move:

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

Appointment of High Commissioners and Ambassadors belonging to the Scheduled Castes.

Dr. Jatav-vir (Bharatpur-Sawal Madhopur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

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

(i) *Corruption and bureaucratic methods prevailing in the emigration establishments.*

(ii) *Urgent necessity of providing colonising facilities for the people of Kerala in Borneo, Andamans etc.*

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): I beg to move:

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

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

Appointment of Ambassadors and High Commissioners.

Shri N. F. Damodaran: I beg to move:

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

(i) *Appointment of Ambassadors and High Commissioners belonging to the Scheduled Castes community.*

(ii) *Colonising facilities for people from the Scheduled Castes community.*

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

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

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

Undemocratic character of Chandernagore administration

Shri Tushar Chatterjea (Serampore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Chandernagore' (pages 286-300) be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Chairman: Slips were given by the hon. Members and in accordance with the directions, these will be regarded as moved already.

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair: I feel that the foreign policy of India has all along been a weak-kneed policy. As a matter of fact, our policy has been tacked on to the apron strings of mother Britain and we follow that policy whether we like it or not. It is a well known fact that the home policy and the foreign policy are but two faces of the same coin. As such, we know, that when the British divided India and imposed certain conditions on us, we cannot but continue in that line chalked out by the British masters; and as long as we continue that line we are bound to follow the British foreign policy. If there have been one or two exceptions in the past these exceptions only prove the general rule that we follow the British foreign policy. I do not understand the so-called freedom that we follow in our foreign policy. As a matter of fact, if India did really want to be free in her foreign policy, naturally they would have adopted those revolutionary policies at home which one might have expected from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—the erstwhile Socialist. Had he been the socialist that he was in the past, certainly he would have changed the entire line of administration at home which would have found its reactions outside. By this I do not mean that we should side this bloc or that bloc. As a matter of fact, I would only wish, if it were possible, that the Government of India would and should utilise the rivalries between the two blocs to better our own position both internally and internationally. But, unfortunately we have been idealists, empty idealists, very poor practical statesmen. Like Don Quixote with lances levelled, we tilted windmills all the world over. But when we come to our own homeland, when we consider our own problems we find that our women are abducted, our women are raped and our nationals are trampled under the feet everywhere in the world. We always talk in the international plane. I cannot understand how we can be peace-makers for the whole world. *(Interruption)*. Comrade Punnoose said that we are indeed a very substantial force in the international poli-

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

tics. As a matter of fact, our striking strength is very little and that is what counts in the world of today. As such, we ought to confine our attention to things which are immediately our own concern and go ahead with the futherance of our own programmes. Unfortunately, that has never been the case with India. And, so the result has been that Indian national aspirations have been completely given up. Our nationals outside are being kicked about, are insulted all over the world and we go and sit in conferences, Commonwealth Conferences where South Africa is there, where Ceylon is there! We are shaking hands with them, we exchange courtesies with them, we give them succour and they give us kicks on the face, not on the back as hon. Dr. Mookerjee said some time before. This is the attitude we adopt. We ought to follow a policy which is more honourable, which is more real and if we had followed that policy in the past certainly we would have nationalised our industries at home and followed an independent policy abroad. But, unfortunately, as we have surrendered to the capitalists in our own country, we have also surrendered to the capitalists outside and, as my friend, Mr. Punnoose remarked, we may find at the end that we are unwittingly or unknowingly dragged into international conflicts with ourselves entangled with the Capitalist bloc. I would earnestly request this House and the hon. Prime Minister to reconsider our policy and only to concentrate our attention on things which directly concern us and our country and not to pretend that we are a big force in the world politics. Let us be realists, let us be honest about our own strength and our own weaknesses.

Another matter which I want to bring to the notice of the House is the administration of the various sections and departments of our Foreign Affairs Ministry. We have heard a lot in the previous session about the working of the High Commissioner's Office in London and of the so-called scandals in which the High Commissioner was involved. We were also assured of personal enquiries by the Prime Minister. But we find him as one of the leaders of the Delegation to the United Nations Organisation. No action, no material action has as yet been taken on these issues. That is almost the case with every foreign Legation.

So far as the Emigration offices in India are concerned, they have given

rise to the greatest scandals that can be imagined in a democratic country.

I wish to bring to the notice of the House a very serious case, where a man from South India wanted to go to Singapore and earn his living. He was murdered in cold blood in the Emigration Office at Madras. I have brought this to the notice of the Prime Minister by letter and I have not received any reply. I attempted to bring this matter up before this House by a starred question but it was disallowed. I will just give some of the details of this case.

One Ramakrishnan from Travancore-Cochin State has been working in Singapore Naval Base for the last 21 years. Mr. Sadanandam, his brother wanted to join him. Mr. Ramakrishnan sent money and the other preliminary formalities were completed. He got a passport from the Travancore-Cochin State and he came to Madras. In early November, 1952 the Emigration authorities told him that he must deposit Rs. 150. So he wired to his brother in Singapore. That brother sent the deposit of Rs. 150, by a draft from the Overseas Bank—draft No. 0-36710 on 24th November, 1952.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): What is the name?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: K. Sadanandam.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Is not the case *sub-judice*?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I cannot say.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Sir, a serious complaint has been made against the Emigration Officer, Madras, and it is pending before the Fifth Presidency Magistrate, Madras.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I am not going to say anything about the merits of the case. I am only stating certain facts. I was not informed by the hon. Prime Minister that the case has been taken up or that it is *sub-judice*. I am bringing to your notice such facts as do not make it *sub-judice*.

Mr. Chairman: Whatever the hon. Member says does not make the case *sub-judice*. The case is already there. He should avoid any reference to the matters which are pending before courts.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Sir, I do not want to go into the merits of the

case. I am saying what I personally know about it; not by way of comments or by way of going into the merits.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will make observations in his speech about the matters which he considers are true, and established, but when the matter is pending before the court, he is not right in referring to those matters. That is the difficulty.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Sir, that is indeed quite unfortunate because I cannot place all the facts before the House.

Mr. Chairman: He can only refer to the case. So far as that particular matter is concerned, it has already come to the notice of the Government.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I have only to remark that I was travelling on the 12th December, by the Trivandrum Express from Madras to Trivandrum and in that train there were other people who had been to the Emigration Office on the day of the incident, that is the 12th. They thought it better to go home rather than face the rigours and atrocities in the Emigration Office. They thought their lives were more precious than the chances of earning something by going to foreign countries. Therefore those people who wanted to make a living, who wanted to earn their bread by going to foreign countries were actually fleeing. They were legally entitled to get their emigration certificates when they went to the office, but rather than taking the certificates they were actually fleeing. After two or three days there was great agitation in Travancore-Cochin. The Member of the State Legislature for Varkula made a Press statement and he also complained to the authorities. What I wanted to show was that the authorities have received a large number of complaints against the Madras Immigration Officer. That officer has been treating the applicants brutally, insulting them, using very vile language and very often assaulting them. This has been going on for quite a long time, and any number of complaints to the administration at the Centre has been of no avail. These poor citizens want to go outside and earn their living. They do not get a chance, because our Government does not give them the facilities to go outside and colonise. As a matter of fact, we know the position of the population in India. Particularly, in my State the density is very much. We have got perhaps the highest population figure in the whole world. We want breathing space somewhere. We are prepared to go

out of the country to anywhere in any part of the world, provided we can colonise. But we are not given a chance. There are supposed to be possibilities of immigration for the purpose of colonisation in Borneo, Andamans and other places. Hundreds of people from my State have applied, but they do not get a reply. They do not know, when or how, or through what source they can find out whether it is possible to colonise elsewhere.

The Government are talking of idealism and internationalism, but these are the actual sufferings of the poor man and they are not recognised by anybody. After all, our foreign policy is not something of which we can be proud of. Of course, a Member of this House has been deputed to the United Nations, and I am proud of it. But I do not understand why only one Member should be sent off and on. I feel that the Prime Minister does not believe in the capacity or the *bona fides* of the regular diplomats in our country or other people who are equally well versed in foreign affairs. This preferential treatment to certain persons, especially to those who happen to be relatives of the Prime Minister, gives a bad impression and encourages nepotism in the States, whose officials take shelter under the cover of this precedent which the Prime Minister himself is setting up.

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): Sir, I had offered a few remarks with respect to our foreign policy at the time when I made my observations on the President's Address. I would now like to take this full-fledged opportunity to answer some of those who have criticised our present foreign policy. The charge against the present foreign policy of the Government is that it is a policy of neutrality; it is a policy of negation; it is not a positive policy. I would like to remind the critics that our policy is not a policy of mere neutrality and negation. Nor is it a policy of drift, as some hon. Members call it. It is a positive policy, designed to achieve our objective, namely, of keeping ourselves free from and not getting involved in the mess created by several warring forces in the world as they are operating at present. The next object of our foreign policy is to make all possible efforts that we can make to keep peace and try to see that war, which the generality of human beings does not want but which a few people who are in charge of the administrations, whether rightly or wrongly, consciously or unconsciously either want or are taking steps that tend to show that war may be the re-

[Shri Pataskar]

sult of their actions,—that such a war does not come about.

The question before us is not of immediate achievements. Let us see the background. Till 1947, our country's foreign policy was decided by the British. Therefore, we have to be judged by whatever we have tried to do during the last five years after the attainment of our independence. At the time when we attained independence, actually cold war had started. A cold war was already operating. There were forces in the world which though apparently not at war with each other, were trying nevertheless to do things in a manner that each one was trying to extend its sphere of influence. As is well known, there are two blocs in the world today: one headed by the Soviet Union and the other headed by America. If you want to judge our foreign policy, I would suggest to you to look at what we have done during the last five years and also think what would have happened if we had not taken all the care which we have taken to keep ourselves free from being entangled in the mess created by these power blocs. It is no doubt true, and it cannot be denied, that there are forces which are trying to engulf areas to the east of our country in their mess. I would not go into details, because it would serve no useful purpose. It is patent to any reasonable man, however, who wants to take a rational view of things that unmistakably there are attempts being made by certain sections to exploit not only the economic depression and the economic disabilities from which the people in Asia and the East suffer, but also so many other things. There is a psychological war being carried on. There is the other bloc which is trying to influence certain other countries. If you look at the world as it stands today, you will find that to the north of the Himalayas, there are countries which follow one kind of ideology and are now called the iron curtain countries. I do not like to speak in derogation of any of these countries, because I do not think it would be proper for us to say any such thing. Similarly, there are other blocs which are trying to take advantage of what is happening, say, in Egypt, Turkey or Iran. We must take a realistic view and judge our foreign policy. We may not at present be directly concerned with what is happening in Iran, but those things may one day develop into something which might engulf a large section of the world into flames.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There are some forces which want to exploit the situation in Asia. Similarly, there is trouble in the Middle East and the East. In Europe also, if you look at the map, you will find that there is already an Atlantic Pact to defend certain countries. The result is that even though actual war has ceased, still taking into account all the present factors we have tried to keep ourselves aloof.

Some reference was made by Shri-mati Sucheta Kripalani to the fact that instead of our always trying to appeal to the big powers, we might try to appeal to the smaller fries. The least that I can say is that we are trying our best to help these unfortunate small nations and it is these nations which on one ground or other are exploited by one or the other sections of the big powers, whether they be western or eastern. The fact is that any attempt of that nature is likely to result in something which may harm our cause. One should not think lightly of these things. After all, the big powers command vast resources in men, money, material and the power of destruction also. If we try to catch hold of the so-called smaller fries and form a federation, we would put ourselves into a danger from which it would be very difficult to extricate ourselves. Look, for instance, to what is happening in Korea. There was some reference made to our attitude. What is our attitude? We have been making our best efforts to see that the war in Korea ends, because we realise as much as any one else the dangers of the continuance of this conflict. But the war in Korea is not a war between the North Koreans and the South Koreans. It is a war the springs of which are entirely in the hands of different people elsewhere. And, if in spite of the best efforts that we make peace does not come, it is not a fault of ours.

Take, for instance, another case, the inclusion of the Peoples' Republic of China in the United Nations. We always were in favour of China being admitted to the United Nations. We have never tried to make ourselves hostile to any of these big powers, or the warring parties. Nor do we want to take anybody's side so as to make ourselves the target of attack elsewhere. Our policy is clear. We have been making all possible honest efforts to see that peace is restored. As one who has watched the developments in Korea, I think it is clear that both sides do not want peace. That is my personal impression of the matter. Whatever theories they advance and the small points they raise all go to indicate

one thing—that neither side is very much interested in peace being established. The same was the idea underlying a proposal that there should be only Cease-fire and nothing further. I do not want to go into the merits of that case. But I cannot help saying that a proposal coming from one of the participating nations that there should be only Cease-fire and the rest should be left to be considered in future could not have been born out of lofty motives.

Therefore, as I said, our foreign policy is to be decided not by its immediate results, but by the honest efforts, situated as we are and the position which we occupy in the present world, that we have been making in order to secure peace.

Then there was some criticism about what is happening to our citizens in Ceylon and in South Africa. Even Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee when he referred to this matter and said that our policy was not very effective had to say in so many words, that nobody wants war. But then everything, short of war, that could possibly be done is being done. What else is it suggested should have been done by us?

Even in regard to the existence of foreign pockets in India, the critics of our policy said that they do not want war. These matters can, therefore, only be settled by diplomatic and peaceful means. It is no good getting impatient. If you do not want war, you cannot afford to be impatient either. For instance, that small territory of Ceylon is linked up with us. Everybody knows and realises that it should normally have been a part of our territory. But for historical reasons it is not. It is an independent territory. It is also a part of the Commonwealth. There are certain other vested interests and we know that it occupies a strategic position. So, if we look at it from the point of view from which the different contending forces are operating, it is desirable to go slow and though our policy should be one of protecting the prestige of our nation we ought not to do something—as our critics themselves admitted—by which we will get ourselves involved in some conflicts somewhere.

The same is the case with regard to our relations with Pakistan. After all Pakistan is an independent nation now and if we do not want war, then the only method that could be adopted by anyone situated as we are, would be the one we are actually following now. Therefore, our foreign policy should be judged not by what happens here and there, but in the background of the fact that situated as we are in the world of today we have been able to

preserve our freedom. We can count neither on the Soviet bloc nor on the Anglo-American bloc because they will naturally look first to their own interests. Therefore, our policy should be judged by the result that we have been able to achieve during the past four years, with our limited resources. Any wrong step that we might have taken while dealing with the Korean problem, or the South African problem or the Pakistan problem, might have reduced our country to the position of Korea. As I have already said it is not a fight between the Koreans. It is a fight between two forces for the sake of which the Koreans have been made to war against each other. Therefore, our policy should be judged not by the immediate results of some emotional advantage, but by the fact that we have been able to preserve our independence by not getting entangled in the mess that is created by both the forces.

Then, look at our policy from the point of view of the respect that we have been able to command so far as the generality of the public of the nations are concerned. There might be some people in America who may not like us; there may be some or many more in the Soviet who may not like our policies. But in a world which hungers for peace, which does not want war, the policy adopted by a nation of forty crores, which has attained its independence only recently, is the only ray of hope for the maintenance of peace—not peace which is talked of by one bloc and peace which is also talked of by the other bloc, but in different terms. There are so many peace conferences held by both sides. Both say that they want peace. But what do their actions show? They are manufacturing more and more atom bombs; they are manufacturing all possible means of carrying on a destructive war. Therefore we have to beware of any call for peace from either side. That is exactly what we are doing by our present policy. I would, therefore, appeal to our critics to judge our foreign policy not by some emotional advantages, or immediate results, but by the way in which we have been able to preserve to the extent possible the peace of the world. After all the policy that we have followed during the last few years has saved us from being involved in any of the conflicts. That policy has created in the common man of the world a ray of hope that here is a nation which has attained its freedom only recently, but which is trying its level best to see that there is peace in the world. I think that should be the criterion on which our foreign policy should be judged.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): I will just take a few minutes of the House to make a few observations on this Demand. I echo the feelings of several hon. Members in this House who felt that the report that has been placed before us on foreign affairs has been very scrappy and unsatisfactory. It would have been more useful to the House and to the country at large if more information had been forthcoming about our relationship with foreign powers and our economic and other relationships with those powers with which we have some contacts. The mere mention of a few incidents does not help us to look into the actual nature of our foreign relations or the policy that we are adopting with regard to other countries. The sending of two trained army horses or a few elephants here and there, or allowing a few pilgrims to be sent over there, is not the only information that we would be satisfied with. We have got great interests in each country; we have got political interests with other countries. Some knowledge of the political or economic conditions prevailing there in relation to our own country would be more useful and probably, it will be very helpful for the House to give any further useful suggestions, on this Demand. In the absence of any such thing, it is not possible to have a clear idea of our foreign policy, and a clear idea of our activities in other countries.

We all know that we fought for the independence of entire India, and not merely of India without certain foreign pockets. We are every day feeling the pinch of the existence of certain foreign pockets in India, especially the French and Portuguese possessions. We have not been very much satisfied with the way in which these foreign pockets have been dealt with and negotiations have been carried on with the countries that have got hold on these pockets. We see every day how much the country around these foreign pockets is harassed, how much our own nationals are being teased and annoyed, and how much of our own revenue is being sacrificed, how rowdism and other unsocial acts are thriving in these pockets. Even our prohibition policy is being set at naught by the existence of these pockets. By the smuggling of liquor, smuggling of gold, and smuggling of several other articles of import on which this nation would certainly have had some control, some income is being denied to us and a few people are getting the best benefits of this smuggling process. Might I suggest that any more appeals or notes would not be of any use, but that the personal

contact of the hon. Prime Minister arranged through our Embassies with countries like Portugal and France, when he next visits London, would be of greater value, because his personal influence and personal persuasion would have greater effect with on these nations. When we find that we are enjoying independence in the whole of India, we feel that our friends around us, especially in these foreign pockets are finding it difficult even to continue there, in peace and prosperity.

Our policy with regard to Ceylon and South Africa seems to be very much slackening. Ceylon has been flouting the interests of India; so also Africa. No doubt the African question has become very chronic and probably there is no possibility of remedying it. While it is not possible for us to be aggressive, it is probably possible for us to remedy the situation by other persuasive measures. We are in the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth seems to be of no use in regard to the solution of these problems before us. Sometimes we feel that we are strong in the company of Commonwealth nations. Sometimes we feel that we are entrapped as it were. We are unable to get over it. We are not able to protect ourselves against some of these smaller nations which are trying to harass our nationals. It is therefore very necessary that a stronger attitude should be taken by our Government in regard to these foreign countries where our nationals are being harassed, where the citizenship rights of our nationals are being curtailed and jeopardised. I would also suggest in this connection that the hon. Prime Minister during his next visit to London might find it possible to contact those other countries also through our Embassies and discuss with them and find out ways and means of solving these questions as early as possible. We cannot be allowed to go on in this state of affairs for a very long time. Either we protect our nationals in Ceylon and Africa or tell them that we are not going to protect them any more; they are no more our nationals and therefore it is not possible for us to look to their comforts and protect their rights.

It is suggested that unless we allow our nationals to go to foreign countries, they cannot live, because India is not able to provide them with employment, and unless they are employed, they cannot maintain themselves. It is for the purpose of maintaining themselves and earning something that they are going to Ceylon or Africa. One of the solutions that can be thought of

is to provide them employment in the country itself and to see that migration is restricted to a greater extent. I feel that employment can be found by expanding our agricultural operations in the country where we have got 16 crores of acres of land that can be brought under the plough still. Of course, that would be a matter of internal policy. Anyhow, it has close connection with our external policy also.

Unfortunately, the Kashmir problem has been exercising the minds of all politicians in this country. It is neither within the country nor outside the country; it is neither within our Constitution nor outside our Constitution. But, it has inroads on our Budget. It is very difficult now to tell them that we cannot afford to give them any more money. At the same time, it is not easy for us to tell them that they should join us and be one with us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not directly in the field of External Affairs. It is part of India.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I have recognised that and I have remarked on that also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In connection with the Ministry of States, possibly, it will have relevance; not otherwise.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: But, to resolve this peculiar position, it would be better if the matters are expedited and the personal influence of the hon. Prime Minister once again brought to bear upon those concerned. There is a silver lining in the cloud when we notice that provincial autonomy is going to be granted to Jammu. I leave it there.

7 P.M.

Last year, I made a suggestion that as in America and England, a bipartisan policy in regard to consultation

with the Opposition Leaders on questions of External policy and Defence might also be followed in this country. To what extent the suggestion has been taken up seriously I am not able to understand. It will do good both to the Government and to the Opposition Members to understand things *in camera* and to discuss things in such a manner as to see that our national integrity is safeguarded and our foreign policy is also properly understood. If there had been Standing Committees that existed till last year, probably some opportunities could have been taken by Members of this House to explain their viewpoints *in camera* to the Members of the Government and thrash out ways and means of tackling some of these problems which, of course, cannot be publicised and should be kept secret in the interests of the country. It is, therefore, very necessary that some of these problems will have to be taken up very earnestly and more expeditiously, and the policy of mere peace cannot help us any longer. I do not suggest that we should go to war with any one on any one of these questions, but to say that we depend upon peace only and to say that we cannot do anything more than be peaceful with everybody is not saying the last word. It is therefore necessary that some of these things have to be considered more closely and measures not merely based on a policy of peace, be taken and solutions found.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not today. The hon. Member may speak tomorrow. The House will now stand adjourned till Two o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Tuesday, the 17th March, 1953.