

Wednesday, 6th December, 1950

Par. S. II. V. 50 (1)

940



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT



THIRD SESSION (FIRST PART)

of the

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

(1950)

Price Rs. 2 or 3s.

CONTENTS

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

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

CONTENTS

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

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

653

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Wednesday, 6th December, 1950

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

BAGGE COMMISSION AWARD

*663. **Shri B. K. Das:** (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state what progress has been made towards the demarcation of the boundaries between India and Pakistan in accordance with the award of the Bagge Commission?

(b) What machinery has been set up for the implementation of the said Award?

The Minister of Transport and Railways (Shri Gopaldaswami): (a) Four disputes were referred to the Bagge Tribunal, two of which related to a portion of the boundary between West Bengal and East Bengal and the other two to the boundary, between Assam and East Bengal. A joint aerial and hydrographic survey of the area in dispute between West Bengal and East Bengal is expected to be made early in January, 1951, after which the actual demarcation of the boundary will be carried out.

The demarcation of the Assam East Bengal boundary referred to the Bagge Tribunal is awaiting settlement of certain points on which negotiations are still proceeding between the two Governments.

(b) No special machinery has been set up for the implementation of the Award nor is any necessary. The Surveyor General of India and the Central Water Power Navigation and Irrigation Commission have been entrusted with the survey work and the hydrographic survey respectively for the demarcation of the disputed portion of the West-East Bengal boundary jointly with their opposite numbers in Pakistan.

654

Shri B. K. Das: In view of the fact that the demarcation of the boundary between East and West Bengal will be done in accordance with the Radcliffe Award and the Bagge Tribunal's decision, has any discrepancy been found as regards the map of the Radcliffe Award and the description in that Award, during the course of the survey that has been done?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The aerial survey is to be done in January 1951. I do not know what the hon. Member is referring to.

Shri B. K. Das: I understood that the aerial survey was being done now.

Shri Gopaldaswami: It will be done in January 1951.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know what sort of demarcation will be provided in land and in water?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The idea is to plant posts. Whether they are going to be masonry pillars or other kinds of posts has yet to be decided.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know whether the *status quo* will be maintained as regards the possession and administration of the disputed areas?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The disputed area has been settled by the Bagge Award. It is only the demarcation that is still pending.

Shri B. K. Das: I wanted to know about the administration and the possession of those areas. Before the Award was given there were some portions which were under the administration of the East Bengal Government and some under the administration of the West Bengal Government. I wanted to know whether that condition still continues or whether any change has been effected since the Award was given?

Shri Gopaldaswami: After the area is demarcated the administration will be ours in the area which has been allocated to us and it will be Pakistan's administration in the area beyond the line.

Shri B. K. Das: Do I understand that the old position is being maintained as regards the administration and the possession?

Shri Gopaldaswami: It cannot possibly be maintained because certain areas which were within our limits, which really belonged to us, were under the administration of certain officers belonging to the Pakistan Government, and *vice versa*. That will be altered when the demarcation is completed.

Shri Hussain Imam: Is it a fact that in connection with the Matabhanga river between Eastern and Western Bengal the boundary is to be in the river; if so may I know how the demarcation will be made?

Shri Gopaldaswami: Part of the boundary will be in the river.

Shri Hussain Imam: But how will the demarcation be made in the river?

Shri Gopaldaswami: The Bagge Tribunal has referred to the main stream of the river and that main stream has to be determined. We are discussing that matter with the Pakistan Government.

CLOTH AND YARN (IMPORTS)

*664. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state:

(a) the value of foreign cloth and yarn (cotton, silk and woollen) imported into India this year; and

(b) the countries from which they were imported?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). I place on the Table of the House a statement giving the value of import of cloth and yarn (cotton, silk and woollen) during eight months from January—August 1950, from various foreign countries. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 16.]

Shri B. K. Das: Out of the cotton cloth that has been imported from foreign countries may I know whether there are any dhoties, sarees or other sort of cloth which will be of daily use?

Shri Karmarkar: No, Sir.

Shri Kishorimohan Tripathi: May I know what part of these imports were as a result of trade or barter agreements?

Shri Karmarkar: In accordance with the Trade Agreements the imports were made from Czechoslovakia and Switzerland, so far as I can say off-hand.

Shri Tyagi: Are we importing cotton and woollen cloth only with a view to cater to the taste of the fashionable gentry in India or because we are short of such cloth in India?

Shri Karmarkar: The position is this. We do cater to the fashionable part of the population also. But we import for the actual requirements of the country, as a whole.

Prof. Ranga: In view of the great shortage in the supply of yarn for the handloom weavers, is it proposed to increase the imports of yarn from abroad?

Shri Karmarkar: That question is under consideration.

Shri Tyagi: Was the question of imports and exports ever referred to the Planning Commission?

Shri Karmarkar: Sir, I have no information readily on that point.

Shri Kamath: Are any figures available to show what part of the population is fashionable, and what is not?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know what is the extent of the increase in the imports of these things as compared with the previous year, for the same period?

Shri Karmarkar: The imports as a matter of fact are on the decrease on account of our policy of restricted imports of these articles.

Pandit Maltra: In view of the shortage of yarn, do Government propose to stop the export of yarn to foreign countries?

Shri Karmarkar: Yes, Sir, we have already taken action to reduce it to one-fourth of the indigenous production and the question of stoppage of even the one-fourth part is under our active consideration.

ANNECY AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS

*665. **Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state whether the Government of India have intimated to the U.N.O. their intention to implement the Ancey Agreement on Tariffs?

(b) How many countries are parties to this Agreement?

(c) What articles of export will benefit by this Agreement?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) Yes, Sir, the intimation to the Secretary General of U.N.O. was given on the 20th April, 1950 and the concessions agreed to at

Anney were given effect to from the 20th May 1950.

(b) Out of 33 countries who participated in the tariff negotiations at Anney, 32 countries are now parties to the Agreement.

(c) A list of articles, on which concessions have been secured at Anney is laid on the Table. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 17.]

Briefly speaking these are Tea, Shellac, Mica, Cashew Kernals, Coir mats and matings, Jute cloth and bags and Linseed oil. It is expected that other conditions remaining constant, exports of these articles would show some improvement as a result of these concessions.

IMPORT LICENSES

*666. **Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to refer to his reply to my supplementary question raised on starred question No. 355 asked on 14th August, 1950 and state whether any decision has been taken regarding the issue of import licenses to new-comers who belong to the category of displaced persons?

(b) If so, with what result?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The matter has been considered by the Government and it has not yet been possible to make any special provision or adopt any procedure for the benefit of displaced persons who are new-comers in the trade. For displaced persons who were established importers in the past in Pakistan, there is already a special procedure which is contained in para. 33 of the Commerce Ministry Public Notice No. 14-ITC. (P.N.)/50, dated the 15th June, 1950, a copy of which is in the Library of the House. I may add that the matter of displaced persons and new-comers generally continues to engage my attention. I am myself most anxious to do what I can to help such persons. There are, however, many practical difficulties in the way of implementing my wishes in this behalf, but I am considering the whole question most carefully and hope that some satisfactory solution may soon be found.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether displaced persons or new-comers who want to open new business will be allowed any quota, in view of the business that they had lost in Pakistan?

Shri Sri Prakasa: So far as persons who have lost their business in Pakistan are concerned, we exempt

them from many formalities, because it is likely that they had lost their papers also. Such displaced persons, if they produce indirect evidence such as bankers' certificates etc. then we grant them the necessary licenses. As regards new-comers, Sir, I might say straightaway that I have myself been very anxious that new persons should come into the trade and that no monopolies of any sort should be created, but I want my hon. friends' active co-operation in the matter so that when we grant a license to a new-comer, he will not traffic in it and pass it on to some one else. If I could be assured of that, I could do my business very much better. I may also add for the satisfaction of the House—because this matter has been exercising my mind also very considerably that at the last meeting of the Import Advisory Council, we discussed the question thoroughly and I am hoping that we could perhaps reserve 10 per cent. of the import trade for new-comers.

Shri Sidhva: May I know, Sir, when the decision to reserve 10 per cent. of the import trade to new-comers will come into effect?

Mr. Speaker: Many questions were put on the matter in the absence of the hon. Member here and this was one of them.

Prof. Banga: May I ask for some elucidation? Does the term 'new-comers' comprehend not only the displaced persons but also the others in the country?

Shri Sri Prakasa: That is so, Sir.

Shri Raj Bahadur: May I know whether any displaced persons have been allotted permits out of the quota for the new-comers so far?

Shri Sri Prakasa: I fear I could not give the details straight off.

Shri A. C. Guha: Will the Government consider the desirability of taking up this question of displaced persons being given special facilities as new-comers as a part of the programme of rehabilitation?

Shri Sri Prakasa: Sir, my colleague the Rehabilitation Minister would be able to answer that question better than myself. When the displaced persons are able to produce indirect evidence of their having been in the trade in Pakistan, my Ministry has no difficulty in granting them the requisite licenses. Otherwise, they have to take their chance with new-comers.

Shrimati Durgabai: May I know whether Government have set up any machinery to detect such cases where

an unauthorized use has been made of the license?

Shri Sri Prakasa: I think that will be a very complicated process to have a special machinery to catch these people? If anything comes to our notice, we naturally take the necessary action.

श्री पन्नालाल बंसीलाल : न्यू कमर्स के आवेदन पत्र देने की अवधि ३० सितम्बर तक की थी। क्या उसमें कोई वृद्धि की गई है ?

[**Shri Pannalal Bansilal:** 30th September was fixed as the last date for receiving applications from new-comers. Has the last date been extended?]

श्री श्रीप्रकाश : जी नहीं।

[**Shri Sri Prakasa:** No, Sir.]

TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTRE

*667. **Shri Sidhva:** (a) Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state the number of displaced persons trained by technicians imported from Japan in the Arab-ki-Serai Technical Training Centre?

(b) How many of them have become self-supporting?

(c) Do Government intend to import more mechanics from Japan for such purposes?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) 117.

(b) 97.

(c) Yes. The Government of India are in correspondence with the Indian Liaison Mission in Tokyo on the subject.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether Government intend to place this machinery in some of the other centres where there are refugees in large numbers?

Shri A. P. Jain: I have said in this House more than once that some more centres have already been opened; one in West Bengal and another is going to be opened in Assam-Bamboo section and several others.

Shri Sidhva: May I know whether any centre has been opened in Bombay where there are 1 lakh of refugees in the Kalyan camp?

Shri A. P. Jain: There is a vocational centre there, but I am not sure that

any Japanese machine has been sent there.

Shri Sidhva: What are the reasons for the hon. Minister thinking that the Japanese machinery will not be suitable in Bombay, where there are a large number of persons who are actually trained in these various jobs?

Shri A. P. Jain: I never said that Japanese machinery will not be suitable in Bombay. That is a large presumption which my hon. friend has made.

Mr. Speaker: He says that he does not know. He cannot say whether those centres contain Japanese machinery.

Shri Sidhva: He does not say that. I want to know.....

Mr. Speaker: He is not sure. It may or may not.

Prof. Ranga: Are there any proposals before the Government to place this Arab-ki-Serai on a permanent footing and what are they trying to do in order to develop full work on all the machines that they have and especially the starch-making machinery?

Shri A. P. Jain: The question of placing Arab-ki-Serai on a permanent basis is under consideration and we have already developed Arab-ki-Serai in certain directions, namely, we have already started the manufacturing of machines there, the printing press oil press and the like.

श्री भट्ट : क्या माननीय मंत्री जी को यह मालूम है कि काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज बोर्ड के सदस्यों ने इस सेंटर का निरीक्षण किया था, और क्या उन्होंने कोई रिपोर्ट पेश की है?

[**Shri Bhatt:** Is the hon. Minister aware that the members of the Cottage Industries Board had inspected this centre, have they submitted any report on it?]

श्री जैन : अभी तक कोई ऐसी रिपोर्ट मेरी निगाह से नहीं गुजरी है।

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** So far, I have not come across any such report.]

Shri A. C. Guha: How many such centres have been established now and how many of them are in West Bengal?

Shri A. P. Jain: One in West Bengal where Japanese machine has been set up or is being set up.

Shri A. C. Guha: Do Government intend setting up more centres in West

Bengal in view of the large number of refugees there?

Shri A. P. Jain: The question of setting up vocational training centres in West Bengal is under our active consideration.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is it a fact that some of these Japanese technicians who have been brought here in Arabki-Serai have left because they found the conditions here unsatisfactory?

Shri A. P. Jain: Originally they were seven. One was Mr. Kokubun. He came for a period of three months only for the purpose of installing the machinery for shoe laces and braids and training the workers. He was able to do this by early April when he left. Another was Mr. Kosuge. He came to install and run the machinery for toys. His contract expired on the 21st May, 1950 and he has also been discharged. The third was Mr. A. Hosen. He also came to assist in the installation of bamboo machinery. He left for Japan on the 21st November, 1950 on the expiry of his contract. Two more Japanese have been discharged. One was Enomoto. He was not a technician; he was only an interpreter and knew both Japanese and English. The fifth one was Kudo and he was not found to be particularly useful and there was no use in renewing his contract which had expired. There are now two Japanese technicians.

Prof. Ranga: In view of the fact that three Ministries are interested in developing these training centres i.e., the Industry and Supply, Labour and Rehabilitation, is any effort being made to co-ordinate their efforts and see that economy is effected and also efficiency?

Shri A. P. Jain: I have a feeling that the kind of research work that we are doing on the Japanese machines is actually the work of the Industry Ministry and I have made a request to that effect to the hon. Minister for Industry. He is considering the matter. I hope there will be some sort of arrangement between us whereby I think the introduction of Japanese machinery will be possible on a much larger scale and not confined only to refugees.

Prof. Ranga: Is it not a fact that this consideration has been going on for more than one year and no decision has been reached yet?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: What are the industries in which training is being imparted?

Shri A. P. Jain: It is a list of 14 industries.

Spinning from waste rags, shoe laces and braids, weaving of cloth, durries and carpets, tool press section and spray painting, nail making, oil and confectionery, carpentry, foundry, machine shop and fitting, paper-thread and cane work, sheet metal work, printing, pattern making, and blacksmithy.

Mr. Speaker: Let us go to the next question.

STEEL FACTORY IN MADHYA PRADESH

*668. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether any steps have been taken towards the establishment of a Steel factory in Madhya Pradesh; and
(b) if not, why not?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The main obstacle is finance.

Shri Kamath: Is it as a part of the recent economy drive and the consequent axing and suspension of various projects that this also has been held in abeyance?

Shri Mahtab: We are really considering this, and as soon as finances are available, we will start it.

Shri Kamath: Has this matter, and generally speaking, the question of steel production, been referred to the Planning Commission and has it been considered by the Planning Commission?

Shri Mahtab: It must have been considered by the Planning Commission. It is admittedly one of the basic industries.

Shri Kamath: What, Sir, is the estimated capital required for this steel plant?

Shri Mahtab: According to the present estimate the capital required is about 70 crores for each plant. According to the revised estimate, 51 crores will be required for the plant in Orissa.

Shri Kamath: Does this project figure in the recent Financial Aid Scheme under the Colombo Six-year Plan?

Shri Mahtab: No; figure for only one plant has been included.

Shri D. D. Pant: Is it proposed to give a grant to the Tatas to extend their steel production?

Mr. Speaker: I think this question has been answered before. Order, order.

Dr. R. S. Singh: May I know whether the Government of India is in consultation with some American firm for the establishment of a new steel plant in some other States in India other than Madhya Pradesh?

Shri Mahtab: We are in consultation with the Koppers firm, who have submitted a revised estimate for one steel plant.

Dr. R. S. Singh: Is it a fact that one steel plant is going to be established in Bihar also?

Shri Mahtab: There is no question of having a steel plant in Bihar. According to expert opinion, two plants can be started, one in Madhya Pradesh and one in Orissa.

Shri Sarangdhar Das: May I know whether the Orissa installation will be taken up after the other is completed, or will both of them be taken up simultaneously?

Shri Mahtab: The two are on the same footing. Wherever it is more convenient, the work will be taken up.

Shri Hussain Imam: Was the capital offered to the public; if so, what amount was offered and if not, what is the financial difficulty?

Shri Mahtab: Capital has not yet been offered to the public.

Shri Raj Bahadur: May I know what progress has been achieved towards the establishment of the steel factory as a result of the steps taken?

Shri Mahtab: No tangible result has been achieved yet.

Shri Kamath: What, Sir, is the total steel production needed for the achievement of self-sufficiency in steel in India?

Mr. Speaker: I think that question was replied last week.

Shri Mahtab: Approximately, I think, about four times the production that we have now.

REGISTRATION OF UNEMPLOYED

*669. **Shri V. K. Reddy:** (a) Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state what is the number of persons registered for employment during 1949-50?

(b) What is the number during the last six months?

(c) How many of those who were registered in 1949-50 have been employed during 1949-50?

(d) How many of those registered during the last six months have been employed?

(e) Is it a fact that the different State Governments have not been co-operating in notifying vacancies to the Employment Exchanges?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) During the period April, 1949 to March, 1950, 10,44,895 persons have been registered for employment at the Employment Exchanges.

(b) During the six months ending September, 1950, 6,53,036 persons were registered for employment.

(c) 2,51,175 persons were placed in employment during April, 1949 to March, 1950.

(d) 1,70,912 persons were placed in employment during the six months ending September, 1950.

(e) No, Sir. Offices and establishments under the different State Governments generally notify their vacancies to Employment Exchanges.

Shri V. K. Reddy: May I know how far State Governments are co-operating with the Employment Exchanges?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I have already replied to that.

Shri V. K. Reddy: It was not audible, Sir.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Offices and establishments under the different State Governments generally notify their vacancies to Employment Exchanges.

Shri V. K. Reddy: Is there any proposal to hand over these Employment Exchanges to the State Governments?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: There is no such proposal.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: What is the total number of displaced persons from Eastern Pakistan who have registered at the Employment Exchanges, and how many of them have got employment?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am afraid I have not got separate figures for Eastern Pakistan. But, I can give the figures of displaced persons registered. Their number during the period is 6,26,440 and the placing is 1,47,858. Placing means, those who have been placed in employment.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Is any priority given to the refugees in getting employment, or have they to go through the same procedure as others?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Some State Governments have given some preference to the displaced persons and

Employment Exchanges follow the procedure laid down by the State Governments.

Shri Rathnaswamy: May I know whether there is any rule or order to compel the State Governments to employ the persons recommended by these Employment Exchanges, and whether Government contemplate bringing in legislative measures...

Mr. Speaker: He may put one question.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: At present, there is no compulsion on the part of Government by reason of which employers have to recruit their labour force only through the Employment Exchanges. I must make it clear that we are getting satisfactory co-operation from the employers in recruiting their labour force through the Employment exchanges. At present we do not contemplate to bring any legislation for forcing the employers to recruit only through the Employment Exchanges, because, due to financial stringency, we have not developed Employment Exchanges to the requisite number.

Sardar B. S. Man: Apart from these unemployed people who have been registered in the Exchanges, have any statistics been taken as to the number of unemployed people in the country?

Shri A. C. Guha: Can the hon. Minister state how the Indian Jute Mills Association co-operated with the Employment Exchange office at Calcutta in getting their employees?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I have not heard any thing particular against the Jute Mills Association in this respect.

Shri Chattopadhyay: Could you give us some idea as to whether unemployment is on the increase or decrease, particularly in the rural areas in India?

Mr. Speaker: He is putting too general a question. I do not think it can be allowed. Next question.

REHABILITATION IN ORISSA

*670. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) how many displaced persons were sent to the State of Orissa for rehabilitation up to September, 1950; and

(b) how many have been rehabilitated or otherwise employed?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) 20,930.

(b) 3,342 rehabilitated; 309 employed.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Sir, may I know how many more displaced persons from Eastern Pakistan is proposed to be rehabilitated in the State of Orissa?

Shri A. P. Jain: Originally it was intended to rehabilitate 31,945 displaced persons in Orissa. Out of that number, 20,930 were sent. Our effort will be to complete the number.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know how much agricultural land has been placed at the disposal of the rehabilitated persons?

Shri A. P. Jain: I cannot give the total acreage. But to each agricultural family about 10 acres of land is given.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Sir, may I know how much money has been sanctioned from the Rehabilitation Finance Administration and from the Industrial Rehabilitation Board to these displaced persons for industrial purposes?

Shri A. P. Jain: Most of the families settled in Orissa are agricultural families. There are about 4,000 ordinary agriculturists. And there are 400 families of betel leaf growers, 100 families of fishermen and 400 families of weavers. Therefore the question of granting any loan from the Rehabilitation Financial Administration hardly arises. But if any of them wants bigger loans from the Rehabilitation Financial Administration, he is at liberty to apply.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Sir, may I know how many houses have been built for these displaced persons by the State Government, and in how many cases has money been sanctioned to these displaced persons for building houses?

Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister got this information?

Shri A. P. Jain: Sir, in fact the State Government builds the houses out of the money that we supply them. For 4,000 families of agriculturists one house for each family has either been built or is being built. For 400 betel growers so far I remember, no house has so far been built, but sanction has been given. And for the urban people, we are building 1,000 hutments and 200 stalls.

Shri B. K. Das: Sir, arising out of part (a), I would like to know whether the number given by the hon. Minister, of 20,930, includes those who have come away from Orissa?

Shri A. P. Jain: It includes the deserters.

Shri Jagannath Mishra: Sir, is it a fact that 600 refugees left an Orissa

Camp in a body and if so, what is the reason for it?

Shri A. P. Jain: This question has been answered in this House more than once.

Mr. Speaker: I have not been able to hear the question

Shri A. P. Jain: The question is about 600 persons who deserted from Orissa Camp.

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is being repeated.

Dr. R. S. Singh: Sir, may I know whether any of the displaced persons sent to Orissa have so far returned to their original homes in East Pakistan?

Shri A. P. Jain: I know that 46 families who were squatting on the Howrah Station preferred to go to East Pakistan.

Shri Biswanath Das: Sir, have Government any information of the number of families who have been rehabilitated or employed privately or employed by the Government of Orissa and rehabilitated in Orissa before this number?

Shri A. P. Jain: Sir, I have not been able to catch the question.

Mr. Speaker: I was not able to follow it either, though I caught something of it.

Shri Biswanath Das: Sir, have Government any information as to the number of families that have been rehabilitated in Orissa before this through private effort or by the Government of Orissa officially offering them employment?

Shri A. P. Jain: This is but repetition of the answer to part (b) of the question. These figures are given there.

UNATTACHED CHILDREN (HOMES AND SCHOOLS)

*671. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to lay on the Table a statement showing:

(a) the names of special Homes and Schools for displaced unattached children (State by State);

(b) the number of such children who receive education in other institutions; and

(c) the number of children who are already self-supporting and have left Homes and Schools to lead independent life?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) A statement showing the number and names of special Homes, Schools and Orphanages etc. for unattached displaced children in the various States is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 18.]

(b) Figure is not available.

(c) No unattached children have so far become self-sufficient. Hence the question of their leaving Homes and Schools does not arise.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Sir, may I know whether the expenditure incurred on these homes and schools are met from the Rehabilitation Ministry or from General Revenues?

Shri A. P. Jain: From the Rehabilitation Ministry's allotment.

Shrimati Durgabai: Sir, arising out of part (b), may I know whether applications for grants-in-aid have been received from the private institutions which have taken care of these unattached children?

Shri A. P. Jain: In fact, we have been sending some of these unattached children to the institutions already existing, and to each of these institutions we pay for each child a certain amount per month. I do not know of any applications that have been received from any institutions which have taken any children voluntarily.

Dr. R. S. Singh: Sir, what is the total number of unattached children who are in such homes?

Shri A. P. Jain: Separate figures of unattached children are not available, as many of them are living in ordinary homes for unattached women and children also. But I might inform the hon. Member that altogether 40,043 old and unattached women and their dependents and also unattached children are living in Government homes.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, if these unattached children are entitled for scholarships from general funds i.e. from the Education Ministry?

Shri A. P. Jain: They are not debarred.

UNATTACHED WOMEN AND CHILDREN

*672. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to lay on the Table a statement showing:

(a) the number of unattached women and children whose permanent maintenance is at present the responsibility of the Government of India;

(b) how much was spent last year for them and how much has been set apart for them for the current year;

(c) how many of them are expected to be rehabilitated in the near future, and

(d) the names and number of Homes where they are residing at present?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) There are about 40,043 unattached women and children whose permanent maintenance is at present the responsibility of the Government of India.

(b) Rs. 70,90,045 were spent last year; this does not include the expenditure in Punjab, Assam, West Bengal, Mysore, Vindhya Pradesh, Saurashtra and Tripura, where the figures were not booked separately. Rs. 94,47,907 have been set apart for the current year; this does not include West Bengal, Mysore, Saurashtra and Orissa, where separate allotments specifically for this purpose are not made.

(c) About 4489, not including those that might be rehabilitated in Assam and Bombay; in respect of these two States, the information is not available.

(d) There are about 43 Homes where these unattached women and children are residing at present. The names and location of Homes specifically set up for unattached women and children are given in the statement laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, *annexure No. 19*.]

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, the total number of unattached women and children at present maintained by Government?

Shri A. P. Jain: Separate figures are not available. The total figure has been given in the answer to the question.

Shri Kamath: Sir, have any representations or proposals been made to Government for the imposition of a capital levy or other tax for financing rehabilitation?

Mr. Speaker: I don't think the question arises.

Shri Kamath: But, the financing of...

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I understand the question, but I don't think it arises out of the main question.

گھائی جی - ایس - مسافر : کلکس
وے کیمپ دہلی میں ان اتھچت
وی من کی تعداد کتنی ہے ؟

[**Giani G. S. Musafir:** What is the number of unattached women in the Kingsway Camp, Delhi?]

آئی اے۔ پی۔ جین : ہم نے ان اٹچت
ویمن کی تारीف کر دی ہے اور وہ یہ
ہے کہ وہ بےوا جسکے کوئی کماई کرنے
والا نہ ہو، ان سب کو ہم ان کیمپوں میں
بھرتی کرنے کے لیے تیار ہے جینکو کہ
گورنمنٹ نے کام کر رکھا ہے۔ ایسی
کبھی اورت نہ جسکے کہ کوئی دستمال
کرنے والا نہ ہو، داخیل ہونے کی درکھا
نہیں دی۔ اگر ایسی کوئی اورت ہوں، جینکا
کہ کوئی کماई کرنے والا نہ ہو، اسے
اپنے کیمپ میں بھرتی کرنے کے لیے تیار
ہے۔

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** We have already defined 'unattached woman' and according to it any widow who has not got anybody to support her is an unattached woman. We are ready to admit all such women in the camps maintained by the Government. No such woman who has not got anybody to look after her, has applied for admission. I am prepared to admit such women in our camps who have nobody to support them.]

گھائی جی - ایس - مسافر :
مندی صاحب کو اس بات کا پتہ ہے
کہ کلکس وے کیمپ میں تین سو
کی تعداد میں ایسی ان اتھچت
ویمن ہیں جنک کوئی بھی کمانے والا
نہیں ہے ؟

[**Giani G. S. Musafir:** Is the Minister aware of the fact that there are as many as three hundred unattached women in the Kingsway Camp, who have none to support them?]

آئی اے۔ پی۔ جین : ایسی ان اٹچت
ویمن نہیں ہے جینکا کہ کوئی کماई
کرنے والا نہ ہو۔ انکی لیڈر رام
پتوئی سے میں نے کہا تھا کہ میں
ایسی اورتوں کو بھرتی کرنے کو تیار
ہے، لیکن انہوں نے
اک بھی نام نہیں دیا۔

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** There are no such unattached women who have no one

to support them. I had told their leader Ram Patoli that I was prepared to admit such women in the camp but no names were suggested.]

کیاتی جی - ایس - مسافر :
ان کے انتظام کے واسطے آپ نے کلنگس
وے کیمپ میں کوئی روک سہلتر
کہول رکھا ہے ؟

[Shri G. S. Musafir: Have you opened any work centre in the Kingsway Camp for their maintenance?]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : हमने काम औरतों
के वास्ते वर्क सेन्टर खोला हुआ है ।

[Shri A. P. Jain: We have opened a work centre for women in general.]

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE SCHEME

*673. Shri Kamath: Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that implementation of the Employees' State Insurance scheme has been indefinitely postponed;

(b) if so, the reasons for the decision;

(c) the expenditure so far incurred on the spade work undertaken throughout the country, including the cost of buildings acquired and the staff employed; and

(d) what Government propose to do about these buildings and the staff in the immediate future?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The expenditure incurred by the Corporation on the spade work undertaken throughout the country, including payments towards the price of buildings and the staff employed, has been till 31st October 1950, Rs. 10,34,400 approximately. It is proposed to acquire a building at Bombay at an approximate cost of Rs. 9½ Lacs.

(d) Does not arise.

Shri Kamath: Is it a fact that the State Employees' Insurance Scheme has met with opposition from a large number of employers? Have they offered to co-operate whole-heartedly or are they obstructing?

Mr. Speaker: The latter part of the question is not admissible.

Shri Kamath: All right, Sir: the first part of it.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: As the hon. Member is aware the intention was to introduce a pilot scheme in Delhi and Kanpur. There was some objection from the employers at Kanpur on the ground that if the scheme is introduced only in one centre it would increase their prices of commodities and it would be unfavourable to them to compete with others. When this protest came to the Government we started examining how we can spread the incidence of this cost throughout the country. That scheme is under consideration and is likely to be finalised very soon.

Shri Kamath: When do Government propose to launch the pilot scheme at Kanpur and Delhi?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I think it will take about three months to actually implement the scheme.

Shri Kamath: Has the implementation of the entire scheme throughout the country been worked out by stages?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: We have got some picture of the various stages in which the scheme will be worked out throughout the country.

Shri Tyagi: Is it a fact that more than a year ago a number of high-paid officers and staff were engaged in accordance with the scheme and they have not yet been able to do any work yet?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: It is a fact that a number of principal officers have been appointed. They are doing work and it is not a fact that they have not been able to do any work. The hon. Member should know that before the actual implementation of the scheme a lot of preliminaries have to be worked out and the officers are working out these preliminaries.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: What is the attitude of the State Governments? Are they helpful and are they trying to implement the scheme?

Mr. Speaker: The question, I think, is hardly justified.

CAPITAL LEVY ON ENHANCED PRICE OF LANDS

*674. Shri Tyagi: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Planning Commission has recommended to the State Governments to enforce a capital levy at a rate of 50 per cent. on the enhanced price of the lands, which will be irrigated by Bhakhra, Damodar Valley and Hirakud Dam Projects?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The Planning Commission has suggested to State Governments the consideration of the question of levying a betterment fee from areas benefited by new irrigation projects. Problems which arise in connection with the levy of betterment fees have been examined in a note which has been sent to State Governments. No specific rates have been proposed by the Commission.

Shri Tyagi: What is the reaction of the State Governments? Are they willing?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know.

Shrimati Durgabai: What is the total sum expected to be raised from such levy and if levied, may I know whether the sum will be sufficient to cover the estimated cost of these projects?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can I give any figure about the total sum? I have not the ghost of a nation, nor do I suppose the Planning Commission has. To finance all such schemes it is a very well known method to charge a betterment fee.

Shri Tyagi: Will there be any reduction made in the realisation of rents and other charges from the tenants on account of the levy of the betterment fund?

Mr. Speaker: That is hypothetical at this stage.

Shri Tyagi: When this betterment fee is being realised from the tenants will they be shown any concession?

Mr. Speaker: There is yet time for it. The whole scheme is under consideration.

Shri Tyagi: Therefore I want to understand the scheme.

Mr. Speaker: There is no scheme to understand: that is the difficulty.

Shri Tyagi: What will be the concessions the tenantry of these places will get in exchange for this levy?

Mr. Speaker: That could be settled afterwards.

Shri Tyagi: How will they benefit?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Water.

Dr. R. S. Singh: May I know whether the recommendation to enforce a capital levy.....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no capital levy.

Mr. Speaker: It is a betterment tax.

Dr. R. S. Singh: Before any actual advantages are derived by the people what is the incentive to the producer...

Mr. Speaker: These questions are premature.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They are not only premature; they have nothing to do with the subject.

Shri Tyagi: Sir, the significance has not been fully realised. If 50 per cent. of the land will be taken away, I want to know what the tenants will get in exchange?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member has not understood the thing. The principles of a betterment tax are well known. It means 50 per cent. of the enhanced price of land: not 50 per cent. of the lands. Supposing land value in the area has risen from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 50,000. The question is whether that private owner should be allowed to take away all the Rs. 49,000 or he must share it with the State. That is the principle involved and it is a matter for consideration.

Shri Tyagi: May I know if all such lands along canals also.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

I. N. A. OFFICERS ABROAD

*675. **Dr. M. M. Das:** (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that he, when in Rangoon in June 1950, received a deputation of some I.N.A. officers abroad, complaining of some difficulties that they are confronted with and asking for help from the Government of India?

(b) If so, what were the difficulties mentioned by the deputation and what kind of help was asked from the Government of India?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes. I received a large number of deputations during my brief stay in Rangoon. Among these was one consisting of ex-I.N.A. personnel, who had a ten minute interview.

(b) The deputationists mentioned various difficulties experienced by the ex-I.N.A. personnel in Burma such as lack of gainful employment, etc. The Government's general policy in regard to the ex-I.N.A. personnel was explained to them. Within the terms of that policy our Ambassador has instructions to render assistance.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether the very fact that they were ex-I.N.A.

soldiers was acting as a disqualification and preventing them from getting the normal facilities?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The very opposite was the case: because they were ex-I.N.A. soldiers we mean to help them specially.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether those people who met our hon. Prime Minister were Indian nationals or domiciled Indians in countries like Burma and neighbouring lands?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I just do not know. I presume they were Indian nationals; otherwise they would not have come to me.

Dr. M. M. Das: How far has our Government been able to meet their request?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There was no particular request made except a general complaint of the difficulties of life.

Shri Kamath: Did this deputation of ex-I.N.A. officers and men make any representation about the utilisation or disposal of the huge money and properties left behind in Malaya and East Asia by the Provisional Azad Hind Government of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose after its unfortunate defeat?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They made no mention of it. If they had I would have been very glad. In fact I have been trying to find out where this money is for a long time past.

Shri Kamath: Have any enquiries been made?

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

INDUSTRIAL MANUFACTURERS' EXHIBITION

*676. **Dr. M. M. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state whether the authorities of the Industrial Manufacturers' Exhibition held in Delhi during March and April 1950 approached Government for financial or any other kind of help?

(b) If so, how far was the request conceded by Government?

(c) What were the total quantities of iron and steel building materials (beams, angles etc.) and C. I. sheets, sanctioned by Government for the exhibition?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) to (c). The Exhibition was arranged by the All India Manufacturers' Organisation. This Body did not ask for any assistance from Government, except in securing supplies of Steel, rail

priorities and import licences. The Government helped the Organisation to the extent indicated below:

(i) Steel.—A quota of 500 tons was sanctioned.

(ii) Rail priorities.—Rail priorities were accorded to the transport of exhibits.

(iii) Import licences.—Licences were granted to the extent of Ruppes fifty lacs.

(iv) Electricity.—500 KW were made available.

Dr. M. M. Das: From the answer it appears that a request was made to the transport authorities for giving rail priorities. Did the transport authorities make any special arrangements for the stall-holders?

Shri Mahtab: Must have because rail priorities were accorded to the transport of exhibits.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether it is a fact that the Delhi Electric Supply Company informed the Government that due to the precarious supply position of electric current it would not be possible for them to supply current to the Exhibition?

Shri Mahtab: As a matter of fact, they supplied 500 KW to the Exhibition.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether Government is aware that a good deal of ill-feeling and resentment were caused among certain sections of the public because when building materials were not available for more useful purposes, Government sanctioned huge quantities of building materials for amusement, that is *tamasha*.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Joachim Alva: Will the same facilities be accorded to the All-India Manufacturers' Organisation this year as well?

Shri Mahtab: That will be considered when they apply for it.

CONTROL OF SPECULATION

*677. **Dr. M. M. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in order to stop speculation, the Government of India are contemplating to bring a comprehensive central legislation covering the whole of India and the entire range of commodities in respect of which control of speculation has become necessary?

(b) Is it a fact that futures trading in raw jute and jute goods has already been banned in West Bengal?

(c) Has any step been taken by other jute-growing States in this direction?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) The attention of hon. Member is invited to the answer given by me to part (b) of Shri R. K. Sidhva's Starred Question No. 425 on the 28th November 1950.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes, by Bihar. The other States did not consider it necessary to take similar action on the ground that there was no likelihood of speculative markets being developed there.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether Government thinks it really necessary that some measure should be adopted for the control of this speculation?

Shri Karmarkar: Government think it necessary and propose to introduce necessary legislation during the current session.

Dr. M. M. Das: Is it not a fact, Sir, that as the jute trade involves inter-State trade, some permission was necessary from the Centre for West Bengal Government to legislate in that particular matter?

Shri Karmarkar: It is purely a question of opinion.

Shri Hussain Imam: When do the Government propose to bring a Futures Bill before the Parliament?

Shri Karmarkar: As early as possible.

MIGRATION FROM EAST AND WEST BENGAL

***678. Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state what is the present daily average rate of migration from East to West Bengal and vice versa?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): During October-November 1950, on an average about 5,687 Hindus and 2,679 Muslims travelled daily from East Bengal to West Bengal, while about 7,170 Hindus and 2,463 Muslims travelled daily in the opposite direction i.e. from West Bengal to East Bengal. These figures include all kinds of travellers. It is not possible to give the daily average of migrants only travelling between the two Bengals.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Are separate figures available of those Hindus who once migrated and then returned to their homes in East Bengal?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They are not available. What happens is that sometimes a very close daily check is carried out and for that particular day or two we can get separate figures according to their own statements. But the normal figures don't show that.

Sardar Hukam Singh: May I know whether the number of such persons who migrated and then returned to their homes has been on the increase during the last two months?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I may tell the hon. Member that ultimately there are various factors in this. One is ordinary travellers. Then, whenever a check was made we found a considerable number of smugglers travelling—there is a large smuggling traffic going on across the border on both sides. Then there are people going backwards and forwards. Some people we have found have gone backwards and forwards seven or eight times getting their things, or for whatever it was. The real test, the simple test, is to take the balance of the two figures because then these common features cancel out. Take the balance: if more go on the one side, that is the balance.

Shri J. N. Hazarika: May I know the average rate of migration from Assam to East Bengal and vice-versa during the same period?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give that offhand.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Sir, I want to know the actual results—whether there has been any increase, whether the Government think that the number of persons who are returning to their homes in East Bengal is on the increase?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member might remember that I had given exact figures—daily, weekly, and monthly. It is not a question of increase—an avalanche, an overwhelming number of people are going to East Bengal.

Shri Kamath: Has, Sir, the East Pakistan Government restored the properties and houses to the returning migrants?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have answered these questions in great detail.

Mr. Speaker: I don't think it arises out of this.

AMERICAN COTTON (IMPORT)

***679. Sardar Hukam Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased

to state whether any American cotton was imported into India during the last six months?

(b) If so, what was the quantity imported?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes.

(b) 3,81,316 bales (of 400 lbs. each) during the six month period May—October 1950. Imports during the first fortnight of November 1950, were nil.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is there any target fixed for self-sufficiency in cotton as well?

Shri Karmarkar: Yes, Sir.

Sardar Hukam Singh: What is that?

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to have notice.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: Do the Government come in at any stage in importing this cotton from America?

Shri Karmarkar: They come in at all stages.

Shri Raj Bahadur: May I know whether any portion of the imported cotton is being supplied to the mills in Rajasthan which are about to close down?

Shri Karmarkar: With regard to Rajasthan I should like to have notice.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: Do the Government make any negotiations? The hon. Member said that Government come in at all stages

Shri Karmarkar: By "all stages" I meant that negotiations are made for import of a particular amount of cotton from any foreign country and the Government comes in in permitting its imports here. Apart from that it allows the private parties to go and buy the cotton.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: Do the Government make negotiations or the private parties do it? And do the Government take responsibility in getting the proper amount of cotton?

Shri Karmarkar: It is not a question of responsibility. Government have an estimate of the amount required for the internal production and Government try to see to it that as much as possible of our requirements is arranged to be imported into this country.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: Do the Government intervene in the matter of the price of cotton? Do they negotiate

and fix the prices or the private parties themselves do it?

Shri Karmarkar: No, Sir.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: The private parties do it?

Mr. Speaker: We will go to the next question.

CHINESE INVASION OF TIBET

***680. Prof. Ranga:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the latest position regarding the invasion of Tibet by China's Peoples Government; and

(b) whether the Government of India have made any proposals to China in regard to the status of Tibet?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) There has been no change since my reply to question No. 43 on the 15th November, 1950.

(b) The notes exchanged between Peking and New Delhi in the matter have already been released to the Press.

Prof. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the so-called People's Liberation Army is still on the March and was reported to be only 320 miles East of Lhasa a few days ago?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe it was there a few weeks ago also.

Prof. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the New China News Agency has itself put out a message from Sikiang on the Tibetan front, dated 2nd December, that the forces liberated the town on November 12th and captured Chapadium, and so on, and that they are on the march?—not that they are staying in one particular place and watching the situation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is rather difficult to have precise information, but generally speaking, our information leads us to think that there has been no marked advance of the major forces. It is possible, of course, that small bands or groups might have gone further in some directions.

Prof. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the delegation sent by the Tibetan Government has again renewed its appeal to the U.N.O. to take immediate action and save their country from this invasion? And what is the attitude of Government in regard to that appeal made by the Tibetan Government to U.N.O.?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't know if they have renewed any appeal—we have no information. I believe a small news item appeared in the papers which I also saw. If and when the matter comes up there, we shall no doubt determine our attitude in regard to that particular matter in relation to other events too.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PLANNING COMMISSION'S MILLION HOUSE SCHEME

*681. **Shri D. S. Seth:** Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Planning Commission have recommended a levy on Industrial Production for working out a scheme of building a million houses;

(b) if so, whether the scheme in the first instance is to be introduced in the Textile Industry only; and

(c) whether Government have considered the question of consequential immediate rise in cloth per bale as also of other commodities of daily consumption?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c). I shall invite the attention of my hon. friend to the reply given by the hon. the Prime Minister to his Question No. 568 on the 1st December 1950. The Scheme for Industrial Housing drawn by the Planning Commission is still under consideration, and until it is finalised, it will not be possible to give specific answers to the points raised in the question.

COTTAGE INDUSTRIES

*682. **Shri Poonacha:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken by the Government of India for the Development of Cottage Industries in Part C States;

(b) whether separate Cottage Industries Boards have been set up in each of the Part C States to advise the Local Administration in this respect;

(c) what financial aid has been given to these States for this purpose and what is the amount so given for each State; and

(d) whether any financial aid was given to Coorg in this behalf?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) It has been decided to place funds at the disposal of the Chief Commissioners for the grant of loans and other financial assistance to cottage and small-scale industries. Model Rules governing the grant of loans have been framed by the Government of India and forwarded to the Chief Commissioners

for their guidance. The question as to what amount should be placed at the disposal of each Chief Commissioner is still under consideration.

Besides the above, it is proposed to give financial assistance to the States for the implementation of specific schemes for the development of cottage industries, especially in regard to the marketing of cottage industries' products at home and abroad. All the States have been requested to furnish specific schemes, and the schemes received so far, are under examination.

(b) Only Kutch has so far set up a Cottage Industries Board in accordance with the advice of the Government of India.

(c) The answer is in the negative.

(d) No, Sir.

EXPORT OF CHILLIES

*683. **Shri Poonacha:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state what is the quantity of chillies exported from India during the years 1947-48, 1948-49 and 1949-50?

(b) Which are the countries that import chillies from India and what is the amount of purchase made by each country in the years 1947-48, 1948-49 and 1949-50?

(c) What is the effect on the prices of chillies in Indian Market on account of these exports?

(d) Are Government aware of the soaring prices of chillies in India and do they intend restricting exports of chillies?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) The quantity of Chillies exported during the years in question was as follows:

| 1947-48. | 1948-49 | 1949-50- |
|----------|----------|----------|
| cwts. | cwts. | cwts. |
| 1,78,652 | 1,03,226 | 1,92,875 |

(b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, *annexure No. 20*]. Ceylon and Pakistan are the principal importers.

(c) The prices of Chillies in the Indian Market have increased from January, 1950 not solely due to exports but also on account of the general rise in prices of other spices and also the outbreak of the Korean-war.

(d) The Government are aware of the increase in the prices of Chillies in India. The present position is that exports of this commodity are subject to overall quotas fixed for different

ports. It is not proposed to impose further restrictions on these exports at present.

IMPORT OF TEA CHESTS

*684. **Shri Poonacha:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state what is the total number of Tea Chests imported from foreign countries into India annually?

(b) Which is the principal market where these purchases are generally made?

(c) Is Finland, the principal producer of Tea Chests, directly exporting Tea Chests to India?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Statistics as to the number of tea chests imported are not available; but the values of annual imports of tea chests have been as follows:

| Year | Value in Rs. |
|---------|--------------|
| 1945-46 | 1,90,53,326 |
| 1946-47 | 1,38,61,653 |
| 1947-48 | 1,08,77,403 |
| 1948-49 | 1,88,76,937 |
| 1949-50 | 1,26,59,847. |

(b) Finland is the principal market from where tea chests are being purchased.

(c) Yes.

CEMENT PRODUCTION IN SINDRI FERTILISER FACTORY

*685. **Shri E. L. Malviya:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the sludge, a refuse of the Sindri Fertiliser Factory, could be used for the manufacture of cement?

(b) If so, what quantity of sludge is estimated to be produced daily and how much cement could be produced out of it?

(c) What would be the cost of cement per ton produced from the sludge and to what extent would it help in reducing the cost of fertilisers?

(d) Has any proposal been made by the Administration of the factory to establish the cement factory and if so, what would be the estimated cost of the factory?

(e) Have Government taken any decision in the matter?

(f) Is it a fact that private firms and individuals offered to undertake the project and if so, who were they and what decision have Government taken in this matter?

(g) If the cement factory is not proposed to be established, how do

Government propose to dispose of the sludge?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) About 900 to 1000 tons per day of sludge from which about 600-650 tons per day of cement can be manufactured.

(c) While production of cement by the Fertiliser Factory will undoubtedly help in bringing down the cost of fertilizer, it is not possible to say, without detailed examination, either the extent of such reduction or the cost of production of cement.

(d) Yes; the cost of the plant estimated 5 years ago was about Rs. 123 lakhs.

(e) Not yet, Sir.

(f) and (g). The Associated Cement Co. have offered to purchase the sludge. If Government decide not to put up the plant themselves but to sell the sludge, offers from all those who are interested will be invited.

पेनीसिलीन (आयात)

*६८६. डा० देवी सिंह: क्या उद्योग तथा रसद मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि १ अप्रैल से ३१ अक्टूबर, १९५० तक भारत में कुल कितने रूपयों की पेनीसिलीन विदेशों से आयात की गयी ?

PENICILLIN (IMPORT)

*686. **Dr. Devi Singh:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state the total value in rupees of Penicillin imported into India from abroad during the period 1st April to 31st October, 1950?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): Rs. 1,50,45,720/-.

COMMONWEALTH AID

*687. **Prof. K. T. Shah:** (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the details of the Commonwealth programme of aid to member countries?

(b) What concrete steps have been taken, or specific aid been given, to any member country up to date in accordance with the Commonwealth Conference recommendations in that behalf?

(c) What proportion, if any, of such aid is to be received by India?

(d) To what extent has India been committed to offer such aid herself, and to what countries?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (d). This has already been done. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to 'The Colombo Plan for Co-operative Economic Development in South and South-East Asia', which was laid on the Table of the House on the 28th November, 1950. [Placed in the Library—See No. IV S.O. (III).]

INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

*688. **Prof. K. T. Shah:** (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state what response has been made by the Government of India to the suggestion for the establishment of an International Police Force, or a Standing Armed Force under the command and control of the United Nations to maintain the Peace of the World?

(b) Have the Government of India been approached to join such an arrangement?

(c) What contribution, if any, in men, money, or materials, has been promised by the Government of India towards the institution and maintenance of such a Force?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) The hon. Member, presumably refers to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations during its current session on the 3rd November 1950. India did not support this resolution primarily on the ground that efforts to ensure world peace are not helped by action that is liable to be regarded, in many parts of the world, as a preparation for war. In any case, India is in no position to earmark any units in her armed forces, which are maintained exclusively to meet India's defensive needs, for the kind of task envisaged in the resolution.

(b) No.

(c) In view of what I have explained in answer to part (a) of the question, none.

PROTECTION TO INDUSTRIES

*689. **Prof. K. T. Shah:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state what industries have been recommended for fiscal or other protection by the Tariff Board in the last four years?

(b) What steps have been taken by Government in each case to give effect to those recommendations?

(c) What has been the loss of revenue by the operation of protective fiscal duties in all such cases?

(d) How far have the protected industries yielded anticipated results in each case?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) and (b). A list of industries which were recommended for protection by the Tariff Board in the last four years, is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, *annexure No. 21.*] Government have accepted the recommendations of the Tariff Board in all cases except in those of machine tools, caustic soda and bleaching powder industries. Effect to these recommendations was given under various Indian Tariff (Amendment) Acts passed since 1947.

(c) Presumably the hon. Member refers to the loss of customs revenue. It is difficult to estimate this loss. Firstly the available statistical data is inadequate, and then various factors operate which affect the volume of competitive imports, e.g. import control. I would, however, mention that in several cases, protection has been granted to industries by the conversion of pre-existing revenue duties into protective duties at the same level. In such cases, *prima facie* the grant of protection to these industries would not, in itself, have caused any loss of customs revenue. In a few cases, again, for reasons not connected with the grant of protection, there has been an increase of customs revenue.

(d) As the hon. Member is aware, the success of any scheme of protection depends on its effects on the output, quality and the price of the products of the protected industries. In several of these cases output has considerably increased; in a few others the quality of the products has improved and the cost of production has been gradually coming down. In most of these cases, however, it would be premature to attempt an assessment of the results of protection. In this connection I would invite the attention of the hon. Member to para. 89 of the Report of the Fiscal Commission, which went into this subject at considerable length, where they conclude that "it is as yet too early to assess the results of protection granted to new industries since 1945", for the reasons mentioned by them.

मध्यप्रदेश में पुनर्वासि

*६९० श्री जांगड़े: क्या पुनर्वासि मंत्री

यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि मध्य प्रदेश में विस्थापितों के पुनर्वासि के हेतु कितनी भूमि कृषि के अन्तर्गत लाई गयी है ?

REHABILITATION IN MADHYA PRADESH

[*690. **Shri Jangde:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to

state how much land has been brought under cultivation in Madhya Pradesh for the rehabilitation of displaced persons?]

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. F. Jain): 3,177 acres.

TEXTILE MILLS

*691. **Dr. V. Subramaniam:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of Textile Mills in India, State-wise; and

(b) the places and Mills where strikes took place and the loss of man-days and in production from the beginning of 1950 to the end of October 1950?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) and (b). A statement is placed on the table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 22.]

MACHINE TOOL FACTORY

*692. **Prof. S. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state the exact time when the actual work of construction of the proposed Government Machine Tool Factory will commence?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): By about April next.

EXPORT OF SALT FROM BENGAL

*693. **Dr. R. S. Singh:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state whether the Government of India propose to lift the ban on the export of salt from Bengal to Bihar?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): There is no ban on the movement of salt from West Bengal to Bihar.

MEDICINAL HERBS

*694. **Shri Jnani Ram:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state the name of factory, if any, manufacturing chemicals from medicinal herbs available in Chota Nagpur?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): There is no such factory in Chota Nagpur.

HARIJAN SECTION

*696. **Shri Chandrika Ram:** (a) Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state whether there is any Harijan Section of the Ministry of Rehabilitation?

(b) If so, what percentage of the amount allotted to this Ministry is spent over the Harijan Section?

(c) What is the amount of loans which has been given to the displaced Harijan applicants?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. F. Jain): (a) No. There is no separate Harijan Section of the Ministry. Harijans are entitled to all rehabilitation benefits like others. However, with a view to render additional assistance to Harijans, a Displaced Harijans Rehabilitation Board has been set up under the aegis of the All India Harijan Sevak Sangh since 1st June 1949.

(b) No separate allotment for rehabilitation is made to this Board, but a sum of rupees one lac has been sanctioned in 1950-51 for meeting administrative expenditure at the headquarters and regional centres.

(c) Since no separate accounts have been maintained for loans granted to Harijans and others, it is not possible to give the amount of loans advanced to Harijans under general Rehabilitation Schemes. The total amount of urban and rural loans given to Harijans who had applied through the Displaced Harijans Rehabilitation Board and its five Regional Offices, amount to Rs. 5,12,783 and Rs. 37,49,600 respectively.

BIMLI JUTE (CONTROL PRICE)

*697. **Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state:

(a) the Calcutta control price for Bimli jute f.o.r. Vizianagram and the Madras control price for the same quality of jute f.o.r. Vizianagram; and

(b) if there is any difference, the reason therefor?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) The Calcutta controlled price of Bimli jute is Rs. 33 per maund for delivery free at mills in Calcutta, while the Madras controlled price for the same quality of jute is Rs. 31 per maund F.O.R. Vizianagram, or F.A.S. Visakhapatnam.

(b) The price difference of two rupees is intended to cover transport, insurance and other incidental charges for the movement of the goods from Vizianagram to the mills in West Bengal.

DESTITUTE DISPLACED PERSONS

*698. **Shri Balmiki:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of destitute displaced persons State-wise; and

(b) what steps Government are going to take to make them self-supporting?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) State-wise number of destitute displaced persons on doles is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure 23.] Information regarding such persons not on doles is not available.

(b) The able-bodied displaced persons who are at present destitute and getting relief in camps will be dispersed to places of their ultimate rehabilitation as soon as schemes of rehabilitation are ready and arrangements are completed for their resettlement. Destitute displaced women and children are being looked after in Homes specially set up for the purpose, where they are being taught a number of useful crafts.

PERIODICALS PUBLISHED BY EMBASSIES

***699. Shri Deshbandhu Gupta:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some Foreign Embassies in India are publishing regularly some periodicals and if so, the names of the same and the number of copies of each publication printed and published; and

(b) the names of countries in which similar facilities are available to our Embassies?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) The number of periodicals printed and published by foreign missions in India is extremely limited. In fact there are only three, viz., "Merdeka", issued by the Embassy of Indonesia, and "South-West Pacific" and "Austral News", issued by the Australian High Commission. In addition, however, a very large number of cyclostyled bulletins is issued by foreign missions; most of these are put out by the United States Information Services, although Pakistan, United Kingdom, Australia, France, Belgium and Indonesia also issue certain releases, most of these being published without any regularity. They are circulated according to the special interest which different missions may take on certain topics. Some other missions also issue publicity material from time to time. The Tass Agency, which is the official Soviet agency, issues some periodicals regularly, but this agency is not supposed to be part of the Soviet Embassy.

We have no information as to how many copies of all these publications are actually made or distributed. In fact, it will be undesirable to try to find this out as it relates to the internal working of the missions.

(b) As a rule our missions abroad enjoy full facilities to distribute pamphlets or to bring out periodicals. In certain places, however, there are local

restrictions as regards presentation, language and the broad questions of policy. For example, in certain Middle Eastern countries none of the foreign missions is allowed to undertake propaganda against the Government concerned or against other Governments which have representation in the country. In one case we have been asked to take out a licence for periodical publications, but this is entirely a formality under the local laws. In one or two cases the question of reciprocity has been raised, but there has been no discrimination as between the Indian Mission and other Missions in any area.

RELIEF CAMPS IN JAMMU

***700. Dr. R. S. Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state whether the Government of India are having any Displaced Persons Relief Camps in Jammu?

(b) If so, what is the number of those relief camps?

(c) How many displaced persons are still living in those camps?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) One.

(c) 21,000.

RUBBER

***701. Shri Alexander:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state in which year protector was given to rubber industry in India?

(b) What was the price then fixed, the principle on which that price was computed, and the price then prevailing in the world market?

(c) How is the balance of requirement of rubber in India (over and above that produced in India) met?

(d) What is the present world price of rubber?

(e) Is it a fact that small planters in India have now begun to cut down rubber trees to raise more profitable crops?

(f) How are Government going to meet this situation?

(g) Is it a fact that, at a meeting of Producers and Industrialists convened by the Ministry of Industry and Supply, the industrialists have agreed upon a price of Re. 1 per lb. and that they have also agreed not to raise the price of manufactured goods?

(h) What is the objection of Government to accept this decision?

(i) Is it a fact that now the prices of Indian manufactured tyres are very

much higher than that of American and United Kingdom manufactures?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) In 1947.

(b) A price of Rs. 72/- per 100 lbs. of Group I rubber F.O.B. Cochin was fixed in accordance with the recommendation of the Rubber Price Advisory Committee constituted under the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, and pending an enquiry into the cost of production of rubber. The world price was about Rs. 50/- per 100 lbs.

(c) By imports.

(d) The London Price of rubber on the 18th November 1950 was Rs. 342/- per 100 lbs. approximately.

(e) It has been reported that a few acres of rubber trees have been cut down.

(f) The question of fixing a fair price for rubber is being placed before the Indian Tariff Board.

(g) The industrialists agreed to a price of Re. 1/- per lb.; but no definite undertaking was given that the price of manufactured goods would not be increased.

(h) The matter is under consideration of Government.

(i) No, Sir.

ATOMIC RESEARCH

***702. Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of scientists working on Research on Atomic Energy in India;

(b) the expenses incurred so far on this research; and

(c) what progress has so far been made in this direction?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). It will not be in the public interest to give this information at present.

(c) The Instrument Section of the Atomic Energy Commission makes and designs most of the equipment required for the detection of atomic particles, radio-active survey meters, etc. Steps have been taken for the mass production of certain of these instruments.

The Rare Mineral Survey Section of the Atomic Energy Commission has made considerable progress in locating deposits of beryl, uranium, etc.

Fundamental and experimental research are being carried out in various

fields of nuclear science and important results have been obtained particularly in the study of cosmic rays. A factory for the processing of monazite sands is being set up at Alwaye in Travancore-Cochin State and it is due to be in production by 1951.

Thorium and Uranium will also be extracted.

MANGANESE ORE (REFINING AND CRUSHING)

***703. Shri Kishorimohan Tripathi:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government propose to instal a plant for the crushing and refining of manganese ore?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): No, Sir.

COAL (EXPORT)

***704. Shri Rathnaswamy:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state the names of countries to which coal is exported from India?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): Ceylon, Singapore, Hong Kong, Burma, Australia, Japan, Aden and Egypt.

BRITISH SCIENTIST INVITED TO INDIA

***705. Shri Abul Hasan:** (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a British Scientist, Sir Edward Mellanby, has been invited by the Government of India to advise on Medical Research in the Central Drug Institute at Lucknow?

(b) How long will he stay in India?

(c) What expenditure will Government have to incur during his stay?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes.

(b) Three months.

(c) Sir Edward Mellanby, FRS., will draw a salary of Rs. 3,000/- p.m. during his stay in India.

REPORT ON METALLURGICAL COAL

***706. Shri Naziruddin Ahmad:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to lay on the Table of the House the report of Dr. Krishnan Committee on Metallurgical Coal and State Government's decision on the same?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): The recommendations made in the Report are under consideration; the Report will be laid on the Table of the House after Government have taken a final decision on the recommendations.

RAILWAY COLLIERIES

***707. Shri Naziruddin Ahmad:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the different Railway-owned collieries;

(b) their respective grades and the section of the seams from which samples were drawn and their present working section;

(c) the latest available f.o.r. cost per ton of each colliery separately with the respective output for that particular financial year as also the control price of similar grades of market coal; and

(d) whether the Railway collieries cost per ton includes income tax, road cess and other provincial cesses as are paid by market collieries?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) to (c). Two statements are laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 24.]

(d) Cost per ton includes road cess and other provincial cesses but not income tax, in the case of collieries in Bihar.

OLD CROP INDIAN COTTON (EXPORT)

***708. Shri Kannamwar:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government have permitted one firm to export certain quantities of old crop Indian cotton to England?

(b) If so, what is the reason for granting such export permission in the case of only one firm?

(c) Has any loss resulted by this and if so, how much?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The permission was given on a special request from the U.K. Raw Cotton Commission. The Commission wanted cotton urgently for the surgical dressing industry in U.K. and they requested a licence for 6,500 bales to be issued in favour of a Bombay firm with whom they had placed an order. The Commission had been helpful in the matter of securing supplies for India of East African cotton. In view of this as well as the urgency and importance of the purpose for which the small amount cotton was required, a licence was issued to the Bombay firm as requested by the Commission.

(c) No loss has been incurred.

ENGAGEMENTS OF LAWYERS IN CASES AGAINST THE UNION

***709. Shri Kazmi:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to state:

(a) the procedure for the engagement of legal practitioners in the proceedings in Courts of the cases against the Union of India;

(b) the rate of remuneration; and

(c) whether the Attorney General for India, the Advocate General of State or Government Pleader of locality is consulted on such appointments, and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Law (Dr. Ambedkar): (a) In all Part A States, the legal business of the Central Government is generally undertaken by the State Governments, by mutual agreement, and is conducted by the Legal Remembrancer of the State and other law officers under his control such as the District Government Pleaders. In the Presidency towns of Bombay and Calcutta, we have our own Solicitors to attend to this work. Certain departments like the Railway and Income-tax departments also make their own arrangements for conducting their cases in the courts. The Central Government have appointed all District Government Pleaders in Part A States as Government Pleaders in relation to any suit by or against the Central Government, excluding cases relating to railways. No standing arrangements have yet been made in Part B States, while in Part C States, the Chief Commissioners are authorised to make the necessary arrangements.

(b) Except where special rates are agreed upon, the Government Pleaders conducting the Central Government cases are paid fees at the same rates as are admissible to them for conducting cases on behalf of the State Governments which employ them.

(c) As stated in the reply to part (a) of the question, as a general rule, the District Government Pleaders also act as Government Pleaders in cases against the Government of India in Part A States and hence the question of consultation in making the appointment of such Pleaders does not arise.

PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT

***710. Shri Kazmi:** Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state the steps taken by the Government of India to expedite the proceedings in the case of applications under the Payment of Wages Act presented to the Authority appointed for Delhi Area since the 15th August, 1947, and if no steps have been taken the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Jagjivan Ram): Attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to the un-starred question No. 115 asked by Chaudhari Ranbir Singh in the Constituent Assembly of India (Legislative) on the 23rd March, 1949. The Government have nothing further to add to that answer.

**GOVERNMENT SALT WORKS
(MANAGEMENT)**

***711. Shri Jajoo:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Government propose to transfer the Government-owned salt works at Sambhar, Pachbhadra, Didwana and Kharagora to company management?

(b) If so, do Government propose to appoint some Managing Agents for the same?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) and (b). The Salt Experts Committee have recommended that the Government salt works should be treated as a commercial venture and have suggested that its management should be entrusted to a statutory corporation jointly owned by the Governments of India and Rajasthan. The whole question is under examination and no final decision has been taken.

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE

***712. Shri Jajoo:** Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state what staff has so far been recruited in connection with the Employees' State Insurance scheme with or without the approval of the Public Service Commission?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Jagjivan Ram): The information is as follows:

(i) Officers recruited through the Union Public Service Commission—28.

(ii) Officers recruited by the Central Government—5 (Principal Officers).

(iii) Officers and staff recruited without the approval of the Union Public Service Commission—303.

SYNTHETIC OIL PLANT IN EAST RANIGANJ

***713. Shri P. K. Ramiah:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state whether the opinion that the establishment of a synthetic oil plant is a practical proposition in the Ondal area in East Raniganj has been expressed by geologists of the Government of India who were asked to undertake a survey of coal resources suitable for the manufacture of synthetic oil?

(b) If so, what is the estimated quarriable coal with varying ash content which will be available in this area?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) Yes.

(b) 200 million tons with ash content varying between 13.1 per cent. to 30.3 per cent.

INDIAN TEXTILES IN U.S.A.

***714. Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Indian Textiles have made their appearance in U. S. Markets?

(b) If so, how much worth of textiles were imported by U.S.A. up till now?

(c) What sort of textiles is mostly demanded there?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes.

(b) Before August 1950, exports of cotton textiles to United States of America were negligible. The quantity exported since August 1950, is about 3.3 million yards, and the value of this would be about Rs. 24,00,000/- (Twenty four lakhs).

(c) Grey sheeting.

Bed-ticking.

Long cloth.

COTTAGE INDUSTRIES PRODUCTS

***715. Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state what are the Cottage Industries products which we export to hard currency areas?

(b) Has our trade in these products increased or decreased within last three years?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Sri Prakasa): (a) A list of the cottage industries products for which there is demand in the hard currency countries is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VI, *annexure No. 25.*]

(b) The demand for our cottage industry products in foreign countries is on the increase but detailed statistics of actual exports for the last three years are not available. It has however been estimated that during the 12 months ending March 1950, we exported cottage industries products worth nearly Rs. 21 lakhs to all foreign destinations out of which goods worth approximately Rs. 6,66,000/- were exported to the United States of America.

PRODUCTION AND IMPORT OF CLOTH

***716. Shri Shiv Charan Lal:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and

Supply be pleased to state what was the total production of mill cloth in yards in 1949 and how much was imported in that year?

(b) What is the average consumption of cloth in the country per year?

(c) How much cloth is expected to be manufactured in mills in 1950?

(d) How much long staple cotton is needed for the mills in one year?

(e) How much long staple cotton was produced last year and how much is expected this year?

(f) How are Government going to meet the deficiency?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) to (e) A statement is placed on the Table of the House. (See Appendix VI, annexure No. 25.)

(f) By imports from countries abroad, such as U.S.A., East Africa, Sudan and Egypt.

EXPORT OF COTTON

*717. **Shri Rudrappa:** Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India have banned the export of cotton and if so, from what date;

(b) whether Government have allowed any quantity of cotton to be exported after the ban was imposed;

(c) if so, what is the quantity of cotton permitted to be exported; and

(d) what procedure was adopted in giving permission to export?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) No, Sir. Exports of raw cotton are allowed against licences within quotas fixed by Government from time to time for different varieties and different countries.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

IMPORT OF BRANDY

*718. **Shri Tyagi:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state whether it is a fact that recently the Government imported Brandy worth Rs. 50,00,000 (fifty lakhs) from foreign countries?

(b) Was it imported after consulting the Ministry of Finance?

(c) What was the total amount of import duty earned by Government from such imports?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) No import of Brandy was recently made on Government account. Presumably the hon.

Member is referring to the imports of Brandy made on commercial account. The import of Brandy from soft currency areas is permitted during the July-December 1950 licensing period on the basis of a quota of 50 per cent. of imports made during any one complete financial year during 1937-38 and 1949-50, both years inclusive.

(b) The monetary ceiling for commercial imports was fixed in consultation with the Ministry of Finance.

(c) Separate figures of Customs duty realised on imports of Brandy are not available. Total import duty realised on spirits falling under Item 22(4) (a) of Indian Custom Tariff which covers imports of Brandy, during the period April to August 1950 was Rs. 37,22,086/-.

CONFERENCE OF REHABILITATION, MINISTERS

*719. **Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to convene a conference of Rehabilitation Ministers of certain States to consider the question of rehabilitating displaced persons from Western Pakistan and to frame the future programme for that; and

(b) if so, why Government have decided not to include the question of rehabilitating the displaced persons from Eastern Pakistan?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) The problem of rehabilitating displaced persons from East Pakistan has not been included on the agenda as the situation in the East is still in a fluid state whereas in the West it has crystallised considerably. Moreover there is a Joint Rehabilitation Board on which all the States where East Bengal Refugees are living are represented through their Rehabilitation Ministers and as and when need arises this Board will be consulted.

Arab-ki-Serai TRAINING CENTRE

*720. **Shri Deogirikar:** (a) Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state whether the Refugee Training Centre in Arab-ki-Serai, New Delhi, undertake to supply small machines to outsiders?

(b) If so, were any orders for such machinery received and executed?

(c) How many displaced persons were trained so far in the Centre and sent out?

(d) What is the expenditure incurred in the current year on account of this Training Centre and what were the receipts?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) 299 including 117 trained on Japanese machinery.

(d) From 1st April 1950 to 31st October 1950.

(i) Total expenditure—Rs. 2.34 lakhs.

(ii) Rs. 40.5 thousand worth of goods sold and Rs. 38 thousand worth in hand.

CEMENT

*721. **Shri K. Vaidya:** (a) Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state what was the total production of Cement in India in the years 1948, 1949 and the first nine months of 1950?

(b) What was the total consumption of Cement in India during the above periods?

(c) Is Cement exported from India?

(d) Do Government propose to raise its price?

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahab): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

(c) Yes, Sir, in small quantities.

(d) There is no such proposal now.

STATEMENT

Cement

| Year | Production (tons) | Consumption (tons) |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1948 | 15,56,450 | 16,24,495 |
| 1949 | 20,91,695 | 24,63,454 |
| 1950 up to Sept.) | 19,09,822 | 19,30,415 |

UNAUTHORISED CONSTRUCTIONS

*722. **Giani G. S. Musafir:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of displaced persons from Pakistan who have been forcibly ejected and removed from unauthorisedly constructed houses during the period 1st January 1950 up to date in Delhi State;

(b) the number of such displaced persons who have been provided with alternative accommodation; and

(c) the number of residential houses constructed unauthorisedly still existing and the number of persons occupying the same?

The Minister of State for Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (c). Information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

*723. **Giani G. S. Musafir:** Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state the total expenditure of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation from its incorporation up to date?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Jagjivan Ram): The total expenditure incurred upto 31st October 1950 was Rs. 10,34,400.

The attention of the hon. Member is in this connection invited to the answer already given to Question No. 673 to-day.

सूत का मूल्य

*७२४ श्री पन्नालाल बंसोलाल : उद्योग तथा रसद मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

[क] क्या यह तथ्य है कि अमरीकी रुई से काने गये सूत का मूल्य भारतीय रुई से काने गये सूत के मूल्य से दुगना है ?

(ख) क्या अमरीकी रुई से काने गये सूत का विक्रय भारत में होता है ; तथा

(ग) क्या सरकार भारतीय रुई से काने गये बढ़िया सूत के निर्यात पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने का विचार करती है ?

PRICE OF YARN

[*724. **Shri Pannalal Bansilal:** Will the Minister of Industry and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the price of yarn spun from American cotton is double the price of the yarn spun from Indian cotton;

(b) whether the yarn spun from American cotton is sold in India or exported; and

(c) whether Government propose to impose a ban on the export of fine yarn spun from Indian cotton?]

The Minister of Industry and Supply (Shri Mahtab): (a) No. The price of yarn manufactured from subsidised American cotton is the same as that of yarn manufactured from Indian cotton. Price of the yarn manufactured from non-subsidised American cotton of the staple length of 1-1/16", which is of 40s counts is, however, 33 per cent. higher than that of the yarn of the same count spun from the Indian cotton.

(b) Yarn manufactured wholly or partly from subsidised American cotton is not exported. Yarn manufactured from other American cotton can be exported subject to export regulations in force at the time.

(c) The question of imposing ban on export of all counts of yarn is under consideration.

नेपाली सेना की शौलियों द्वारा घायल भारतीय

*७२५. श्री बी० ऐस० आर्यः (क)

क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बखलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या यह तथ्य है कि भारतीय सीमा पर स्थित उत्तर प्रदेश के ग्रामों के कुछ व्यक्तियों को नेपाल सरकार के सैनिकों द्वारा चलाई गई गोलियों के परिणाम स्वरूप चोटें आई हैं ?

(ख) यदि ऐसा है तो नेपाली सैनिकों द्वारा गोली चलाये जाने के परिणाम स्वरूप आहत तथा अन्य प्रकार की क्षति उठाने वाले भारतीय नागरिकों की संख्या कितनी है ?

(ग) क्या भारत सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई कार्यवाही की है ?

INDIANS INJURED BY FIRING BY NEPALESE TROOPS

[*725. **Shri B. S. Arya:** (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state if it is a fact that some people of those villages of Uttar Pradesh that are situated on the Indian Border have received injuries as a result of firing by the soldiers of Nepal Government?

(b) If so, what is the number of those Indian nationals who have been killed or injured or have suffered in some other way as a result of this firing by the Nepal soldiers?

(c) Have the Government of India taken any steps in this matter?]

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (c). The Government have seen the press report of a statement by Shri Shibbanlal Saxena to this effect but have had no official confirmation of the facts stated therein. Official reports merely speak of stray bullets reaching Indian territory but of no casualty. The Nepalese Government have been informed of this and asked to take steps to prevent it.

Volume VI

No. 1 — 19



सत्यमेव जयते

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

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

OFFICIAL REPORT

Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers.

CONTENTS

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

Price Five Annas

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers.)
OFFICIAL REPORT

1255

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Wednesday, 6th December, 1950

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

11-45 A.M.

**DEATH OF SHRI AUROBINDO
GHOSH**

Mr. Speaker: Before the House proceeds with its normal business, I have to invite its attention to a very sad event, namely, the demise of Shri Aurobindo Ghosh, who passed away in the early hours of yesterday. I am making this reference, going a little out of the way of the usual practice of this House, which is restricted to references to persons who have been Members of this House at some time or other, but not to others. But in view of the great personality and the esteem in which Shri Aurobindo has been held by millions of our countrymen, I thought that I would be justified in making a reference. From the very early part of his life, he has been a great fighter in the cause of the country's independence, a patriot and lover of the Congress institution. I had the privilege of seeing him and his activities, and hearing his lectures at the time of the memorable Surat Congress in 1907. He was Vice-Principal of the Baroda College and left his service to take part in the agitation against Bengal partition, and thereafter he conducted with ability that great journal *Vande Mataram* which inspired many of us, who were then students and later on we know that he had to suffer at the hands of the Police and was an under-trial prisoner for nearly two years, but fortunately he was acquitted. His contribution to our public life in the struggle for independence, though in old days, is yet very great and the subsequent life that he passed may

1256

appear to be retired life from the point of view of active politics, but he lived the life of a great thinker, a great philosopher and the life of a saint. Pondicherry has become a place of pilgrimage to a large number of our countrymen. He, by his life and philosophy, placed India in a very high estimate of the entire world and it is for this reason that I considered it necessary that we should make a reference to such an exceptional and towering personality in India. We all feel sorry that he left us and I am sure we would all like to show our respect to him by standing for a while.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

**STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE MINISTER
OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to move:

"That this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the hon. the Speaker may direct three Members to serve until the end of the financial year 1950-51 on the Standing Committee to advise on subjects concerning the Ministry of External Affairs vice Shri S. N. Buragohain, Shri M. Thirumala Rao and Major-General Himatsinhji, resigned."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the hon. the Speaker may direct three Members to serve until the end of the financial year 1950-51 on the Standing Committee to advise on subjects concerning the Ministry of External Affairs vice Shri S. N. Buragohain, Shri M. Thirumala Rao and Major-General Himatsinhji, resigned."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform hon. Members that for the purpose of election by means of the single transferable vote of three Members to the Standing

[Mr. Speaker]

Committee for the Ministry of External Affairs the programme of dates will be as follows:

1. Nominations to be filed in the Parliamentary Notice Office up to 12 NOON on Friday the 8th December.
2. Election, if necessary, will be held on Monday the 11th December, in the Assistant Secretary's room No. 21 in the Parliament House between the hours of 10-30 A.M. and 1 P.M.

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to move:

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

I have always welcomed a debate on foreign affairs in this House. Foreign affairs are no longer merely the concern of a few experts and specialists. They concern now almost every person, and any event that happens in distant parts of the world may have consequences which large numbers of people in other parts of the world may have to bear. More especially, they are the concern of this House on whom a very great responsibility rests both in regard to domestic and international affairs. So, I welcome this opportunity of discussing this subject, specially because we are, as the House well knows, in the middle of a very grave crisis in the world.

Though I welcome it, I feel that at this moment more than at any other it is desirable for the fullest understanding to exist between the Government and this House and the country which the House represents, so that we might have full co-operation and full support to any policy that we might undertake. So, I welcome it. Nevertheless, I wish to say that I feel a little hesitant on this occasion and am somewhat overwhelmed by a sense of responsibility. It is a little difficult to talk about these matters without, perhaps, saying things which might hurt someone, some people, some country. By saying things which may be truthful—or which one may believe to be truthful—I am convinced that at this moment it will not only not serve any useful purpose but will actually do harm to our objectives, if we start blaming each other or trying to fasten blame on this country or that, even though we may believe in that argument.

Therefore, I find some difficulty in speaking about this matter, because I wish to avoid saying any word which might hurt any country or any people. I feel that there has been quite enough of recrimination and of blaming countries and peoples, and often enough may be that was justified, but in the state of affairs as they are today, instead of helping to ease the situation it might make it far worse. We have to deal with Governments, but we have also to deal with mass psychology, with millions of people, feeling one way or other, with passions inflamed and aroused. When that is the position, it does not help very much to talk loudly to each other in terms of blame and censure, because that does not enter the mind of the other party and it only inflames him still further. And the question arises whether we are trying to find a peaceful way out of a terrible difficulty, or whether we are only trying to justify the action that we may have taken. Anyway, so far as I am concerned, I do not think I have any particular right to blame anybody and I think that all of us wherever we might be in some measure more or less have to bear the responsibility for this terrible state of the world today.

So, I shall endeavour not to say anything of that kind, and, if I may, with all respect, tell the House to remember that also and not to say words that hurt and words that merely add to the difficulties of the situation, I think it will be easier for us to consider this question. What is required today, perhaps more than at any other time, is not the strife of fierce argument, either of the law court or elsewhere, but rather some charity of thought and the touch of healing. Unfortunately for all of us the great healer under whom we grew up is no more and that is a misfortune not only for us, but the world today.

The House is aware that when we talk today of international affairs, the issue may be described in just one sentence or two or three words. The issue is: peace or war. And not war in a particular corner of the world, but an overwhelming and all-enveloping war, which may well bring uttermost destruction to this world and which may well ruin the proud structure of our present day civilisation. So, it is a matter of the greatest import and consequence that we are discussing. I approach this subject in all earnestness and humility and I wish to say frankly to this House that I have no easy remedy for this. All that we can do is to grope about in this dim twilight trying to seek some light and do something to prevent that dim twilight becoming dark night. Possibly we may succeed—it is difficult to say. But in

any event it is our duty and the duty of everyone to try his utmost to prevent the horror of a third world war from descending upon us.

I am quite sure that people all over the world, in whatever country they might live, are anxious to avoid war and want peace. I am equally sure that every Government wants to avoid war. And yet, in spite of this universal desire for peace and for the avoidance of war, we drift towards that very thing that we seek to avoid. We are in the grip of fear and suspicion and each and every step that one party takes adds to the fear and suspicion of the other. And so like the march of some Greek tragedy we appear to go on to an inevitable catastrophe. I said inevitable: yet, I do not think it is inevitable if we try hard enough and if the peoples of the world and the Governments of the world try hard enough, though it becomes increasingly difficult to do so.

Now, when we discuss foreign affairs there are many subjects that come up before us, subjects intimately concerned with our life here in this country. They include, let us say, one important subject of primary importance for us—our relations with Pakistan. I do not propose to say much, or indeed anything, on that subject in this particular debate, partly because we have often discussed it and I have often given you such information as I have. If and when any new development takes place, I shall certainly take the House into my confidence. Our relations with Pakistan are of extreme importance to us. Our relations with any neighbour country of ours, whatever it may be, are of extreme importance to us; that is obvious.

12 Noon.

Then there is the question which has often agitated and rather excited the House—the question of foreign possessions in India. They are small areas of no very great importance territorially, or in the economic sense; nevertheless, they raise big questions on which we have strong feelings. We have, I think, set, if I may say so, rather an extraordinary example of restraint in regard to these foreign possessions. For the last three years or more we have reasoned, we have argued and we have approached the matter peacefully without much result. We know, of course, that there can be only one ultimate result. We cannot conceive and we can never tolerate that any foreign footholds can remain in India. Nevertheless, I do submit to the House that the way we have proceeded in regard to these foreign possessions shows not only our peaceful approach to such problems, but the enormous patience which we have shown.

Then there is the old question which was recently before the United Nations—the question of Indians in South Africa, which again has raised very vital issues not only for us, but for the whole world, if I may say so; because it raises the vital issue of racialism. We are intimately concerned with those people of Indian origin who settled down in South Africa and who have become South African citizens. As South African citizens we have nothing to do with them politically, although culturally we are connected, because they went from India. But because it involves these questions of racialism, because it involves not only the self-respect of India and the Indian people, but of every people in Asia and for every people in the world, this has become a vital matter. Again you will observe the patience we have shown in this matter, how we have proceeded year after year arguing patiently, trying to make the other people understand, going to the United Nations, the United Nations passing resolutions and our trying to fulfil the directions of the U.N.O. Now another resolution has been passed. As the resolutions go, we welcome this. What it will lead to I do not know. But again one thing is certain. Whether it takes a month or a year or more, we shall not submit to any racialism in any part of the world.

Now, I come to the main theme of my address: that is, the situation as it has arisen in the Far East. The House knows the history of it more or less—how there was an incursion from North Korea into South Korea. There was an invasion and this matter was brought up before the United Nations. It was described by the Security Council as an aggression over South Korea. We supported that decision and voted for it. Subsequently other developments took place. We could not support every step that was taken, for a variety of reasons which, I think, I have placed before the House from time to time. So I need not go into them.

But the basic fact that aggression had taken place of South Korea by North Korea seemed to us to be patent, and we supported it. And the policy which we laid down for us then, we have continued ever since. The question came up before the United Nations in various ways. There was what is called the Six-Power Resolution and the Seven-Power Resolution, and we could not support all these resolutions for a variety of reasons.

But before that the House will remember that, thinking hard as to whether we could perhaps be helpful in this situation which was ever growing more and more difficult, I had the temerity to address an appeal to Marshal Stalin on the one hand and Mr. Acheson on the other. That was no

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

attempt at mediation. We have never thought in terms of mediation. But it was an appeal in the vague hope, in the faint hope, that perhaps it might lead to some positive result. In that appeal I had suggested various things, including that China might be brought into the United Nations and the U.S.S.R. might also return to the Security Council. Now, we had of course been in favour of China being taken into the United Nations, ever since we had recognized China—the People's Government of China. The fact of our recognition led inevitably to the conclusion that, so far as we were concerned, they should come to the United Nations. That was so. But in the context in which I suggested it then to Marshal Stalin and Mr. Acheson, it had become a rather urgent and immediate issue, quite apart from the rights and wrongs of the matter, because we thought that this situation in the Far East could only be dealt with satisfactorily if the principal parties concerned were also round the conference table.

The United Nations is a great and powerful organisation, and it has got a Charter which lays down, I think in very impressive language which can hardly be bettered, its ideals and objectives. But the United Nations was founded with the intention of the great nations as well as the small, meeting together and finding a way of co-operative effort. We felt that in this crisis in Korea it was very necessary that these approaches should be made with the representatives of those great countries most concerned being able to meet together in the United Nations as well as outside. Otherwise, there was the danger that the position might worsen, as indeed it has done. So it was with that objective that I had made that appeal to Russia and to the United States of America. Unfortunately that did not lead to any fruitful results.

Subsequently developments took place in the fortunes of war and the aggression by North Korea was checked and pushed back and it appeared that the North Korean armies had been broken up completely and the forces of the United Nations seemed to be completely victorious, as they indeed were. The question arose then as to what should be done, whether they should go on, and how far they should go. At that time we were in intimate touch with our Ambassador in Peking, and we asked him, as we asked our representatives in other countries, to tell us how the various Governments were viewing the scene. We had perhaps a rather special responsibility in regard to China, because we were one of the very few countries represented there, and, we were the only country, apart from the countries of the Soviet group, which

could find out through its Ambassador what the reactions of the Chinese Government were to the developing events. Our Ambassador sent us full reports containing the views of the Chinese Government, not his views; he merely told us how the Chinese Government felt about it. Because we were anxious that the other countries with whom we were co-operating should know about these views, we sent them on to the United Kingdom and the United States Governments.

Now, these views indicated that if the 38th Parallel was crossed the Chinese Government, rightly or wrongly is not the point, would consider it as a grave danger to their own security and that they would not tolerate it. Well nevertheless, a decision was taken for the United Nations forces to advance beyond that. They did advance beyond that, and at some later stage they came into conflict with re-organized North Korean troops and, later with the forces from China. The Chinese Government described them as volunteers, but other information said that they were regular Chinese troops. The distinction is not very important; it has little bearing because there can be little doubt that large forces—call them volunteers, call them what you like—came across the Manchurian border into North Korea and threatened the U. N. troops to this extent that these latter forces are in grave danger at the moment, and they did withdraw and are withdrawing.

Now that is the position. It would not do us much good to think of what might have been done and of the errors or mistakes committed either in the political or in any other field. And now we have to face a situation which is so rapidly changing that it is very difficult for any person even to suggest from a distance what should be done. It is conceived that if I had spoken in this House four, five or six days ago I might have put forward some suggestions. I find today that the suggestions I had in mind four, five or six days ago are out of date. They do not fit in with the circumstances. Something else has to be thought of. We did as a matter of fact, convey our views to some other Governments, because we are in constant touch with the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America as well as some Governments in Asia. We have been putting forward what we thought might be the approach. Some of these Governments are good enough to tell us what they propose to do or what they have in their minds but the situation changes so rapidly, and every step that we may envisage today becomes obsolete and impracticable of being given effect to the next day.

The general approach that we made to this problem, that is, in the course of the last ten days or so, since the situation became so bad, was first of all that it will serve little purpose, and indeed it would be very harmful if this matter was considered in the United Nations in a formal way, of passing resolutions of condemnation of each other. The House will remember that one of the first things that was suggested by the Chinese delegation there was a resolution of condemnation of the United Nations itself or of the U.S.A. On the other hand resolutions condemning China and calling her an aggressor etc., have also been suggested repeatedly.

Well, quite apart from the rights and wrongs of it, the point is that when you are on the verge of world war, it seems obvious to me that it does not help in the slightest people calling each other names there. Unless you want a war to come sooner rather than later, unless one wants merely to have a background of political justification for an action to be taken in the military field, that may be right; but if we seek to avoid war, then that kind of approach becomes harmful. The only possible approach could be one of an attempt at negotiation. That negotiation may fail but there is no other way. The other course is war. So we felt that an attempt should be made at negotiation between the great Powers, between the powers most concerned with this matter. It was clear that no negotiation would have any particular value unless China was associated with it, because China, apart from being a great Power in the real sense of the word was most intimately concerned with the events happening next door to her. Indeed, the whole difficulty has arisen because things have also happened elsewhere. So we suggested negotiations. We suggested then that there should be a cease-fire and, if possible, some kind of demilitarized zone which was a natural consequence to this cease-fire and then negotiations among the parties most concerned, including China; negotiations not merely about what should follow the cease-fire but rather about the whole question of Korea.

That also had seemed necessary and essential to us, if not at this stage but at some later stage those negotiations should include the question of Formosa. Otherwise all these danger spots would remain. Now, one can hardly have negotiations or go far enough without the fighting stopping. Therefore, a cease-fire appeared desirable and whether it is possible or not is another matter now. It may be possible some time or other. Anyhow what we thought of a cease-fire does not appear to be possible at the present moment and some other type of cease-fire might perhaps be possible.

That is what we had in mind and we welcomed it when the Prime Minister of England decided to go to the United States to meet President Truman. We welcomed that decision and wished him godspeed in his endeavours to prevent war and find some way out of this tangle—some way of peace. We found that generally speaking there was a good deal in common between what the Prime Minister of England had said in regard to the present situation, in common between him and us. So we gave him our own viewpoint fully, so that he may be acquainted with it in his discussions with President Truman and we informed also other friendly Governments about it, in Asia as well as elsewhere.

Now during the last few months a great deal has happened in Korea. We talk about Korea and say that there must be unanimity. Every side talks about the freedom in Korea, about the unity and independence of Korea. The United Nations stands for that. The forces that are fighting the United Nations more or less say the same thing, but the result of this unanimity of approach, if I may say so, is this: that Korea is a dying country. It is dying and desolate. Only this morning I had a letter from Seoul, the capital city of Korea, from a Korean lady who has gone through all kinds of horrors which happened during these many months; and there is a phrase in it: "My country is sick and dying of cold, disease and starvation."

It is a strange thing that we seek to find remedies to help our friends in ways which kill or destroy them. It is a strange commentary on the way of violence which all of us, all countries including our own country, somehow are forced to adopt in the present world and that commentary will be complete when the third world war comes and we all sink into ruin and oblivion. So it is about time that we thought in some other directions. I wish we did not get lost in our passion and anger at the critical time but looked perhaps to our own actions and in a way learn the old lesson that wrong doings cannot be cured by wrong doing nor can violence be ultimately conquered by violence. It is difficult, of course, and it is easy to talk piously in platitudes like this.

But there is something more which is the bitter truth that we have to understand and realize today. In this fighting that has taken place in Korea the main burden on the part of the United Nations has fallen on the forces of the United States. They have suffered greatly and at the present moment they are suffering greatly and, I think, our sympathy should go out to them in this present predicament. We have, as I have pointed out, taken a certain atti-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

tude about the aggression of North Korea, and although we did not wholly support the various other resolutions of the United Nations or the Security Council, that basic attitude has remained the same. We did not support some of those other resolutions—the Six-Power or Seven-Power resolutions—because we felt that they would not help in the solution of the problem; because we felt that they would only increase the tension and the passion of each State and that it was not the way to find a solution. Therefore, also, we did not join the Seven-Power Commission that was set up by one of those Resolutions. Not that we wished to shirk our responsibility or duty; but we felt that duty and responsibility could only be discharged adequately if the approach or mood, if I may say so, was somewhat different from the one merely of condemnation.

That has been our attitude. I wish you to remember also that whatever happens in Korea is of the utmost significance to the Chinese people. One cannot ignore that fact, unless one is prepared to ignore completely China and the Chinese people, which also one cannot do because they are more than a mere handful. So, our approach has always been that this problem of Korea can only be solved in co-operation with the Chinese, or if you like, at least with their acquiescence. Whatever the military result might be, however the United Nations forces might succeed in the military sense, the problem would not have been solved without the acquiescence of China ultimately. So, right from the beginning, we laid stress on this. That was the reason why we felt, apart from other reasons, that China should be represented in the United Nations. But, this became an urgency.

Now, again, the military situation has undergone a considerable change and I just cannot make a profitable suggestion as to what should be done here and now. I can only hope that the conversations that are taking place between President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee will bear fruit and will lead to some peaceful way out of this situation. But whatever that might be, I cannot conceive again of any peaceful solution in the Far East, if I may say so, even if there is war, any solution after the war, which does not take fully into consideration this great country of China in regard to those problems. Therefore, all I can suggest is that we should try to find some way for peaceful negotiation and consideration of these problems of Korea and Formosa, not together, but a little later; for Formosa also has to come into the picture by the great Powers, including China.

I said Formosa. Formosa is not what might be called an immediate issue in the sense that it must be settled immediately. Formosa is also tied up with these other problems; and that question has also to be considered. You will remember that on Formosa some of the great Powers made declarations in Cairo and Potsdam, and later President Truman made a very forthright declaration earlier in this year, I think. I feel that it is only on the general basis of these declarations that we can proceed. How to proceed, in what manner, is something for careful consideration.

One thing more I would like to say. There has been a good deal of talk about the atomic bomb. Well, it is not necessary for me in this House to say much about it, because I am sure there is no one in this House who at all likes the idea of the use of the atomic bomb, anywhere at any time. More so in this particular context of the war in the Far East. Perhaps you might have seen in this morning's newspapers a statement made by Mr. Pearson, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Canada. That statement speaks particularly about the use of the atomic bomb. I cannot say anything more forceful than what Mr. Pearson has said in this matter. He has pointed out the grave dangers, more particularly of the use of it in Asia, and the reaction of it in Asia and the world. Because, the atomic bomb, apart from the inherent horrors that go with it, and the destruction that it might cause, it has become a symbol too, a symbol of incarnate evil. If the force of circumstances compel us, compel the world to use it, it means that the world has surrendered to evil completely. Therefore, I earnestly hope that there will be no question now or hereafter of the use of the atomic bomb.

✓ I should like to say a few words about two other neighbouring countries, Tibet and Nepal. Some questions were asked earlier this morning in regard to the advance of the Chinese forces in Tibet. I could not give much information, nor can I give that information now. The story of Tibet so far as we are concerned in this matter is very simple. I am not going into past history. Ever since the People's Government of China talked about Tibet and about the liberation of Tibet, our Ambassador, acting on our behalf, told them how we felt about it. We told them that we earnestly hoped that this matter would be settled peacefully by China and Tibet. We told them that we had no territorial or political ambitions in regard to Tibet, that we had trade and cultural relations, which naturally we would like to preserve, and they came in the way of nobody, neither Tibet nor China, that we were interested in Tibet maintaining her

autonomy which she had had for the last forty or fifty years at least. We did not challenge or deny the suzerainty of China over Tibet.

But, we did lay considerable stress on the autonomy of Tibet. So, we pointed out all these in a friendly way to the Chinese Government and in their replies, they always said that they would very much like to settle this peacefully but in any event that they were going to liberate Tibet. It is not quite clear from whom they were going to liberate it. However, their replies made us to understand that a peaceful solution would be found, though I must say that they gave no assurance or guarantee about it to us. They always put the two together: "We are prepared for a peaceful solution; but anyhow we are going to liberate". So that, when we heard about their armies marching into Tibet, it did come as a surprise to us and a shock.

We had come to believe that the matter will be settled by peaceful negotiations. And indeed, one can hardly talk about war between China and Tibet. Tibet is not in a position to carry on a war. There is no threat from Tibet to China, obviously. They say, there might be foreign intrigues in Tibet; I do not know. Anyhow, there was no immediate threat. Violence might perhaps be justified in the modern world; but naturally, one should not indulge in violence unless there is no other way. Well there was a way in Tibet as we had pointed out. So it was a surprise.

The House knows and has seen the correspondence that was exchanged between the Chinese Government and our Government. Even so, we have gone on pressing them that it would be desirable to halt their advance and settle the matter peacefully with Tibetan representatives. As a matter of fact, there can be no doubt that for the last several weeks the main advance has been halted. But I cannot definitely say what they intend doing or whether some small groups have not gone in various directions or advanced in various directions. So far as we know, towards Lhasa there has been no advance and conditions in Lhasa at present are still normal. That, of course, does not solve the problem. All I can say is that I earnestly hope that even now, the Government of China will try to settle the matter peacefully.

Now, coming to Nepal. The last fortnight—or is it a little more?—there have been strange developments in this country. Ever since I have been associated with this Government, I have taken a great deal of interest in Nepal. We have desired not only to continue our old friendship with that country,

but to put it, if I may say so, on a firmer basis. We have been inheritors of many good things from the days of British rule, and many bad things also; and our relations with our neighbouring countries grew up sometimes in an expansive phase of British policy, of British imperialism. And so they developed a kind of mixed relationship. Now, Nepal in the old days, that is to say, the British days of India, was an independent country, called so. But strictly speaking, it was not very independent, except internally. The test of the independence of a country is, normally speaking, that it has relationship with other countries. Nepal was completely autonomous and independent internally. But her foreign relations were strictly limited to its relations with the Government of India, that is to say, the British Government functioning in India. That was a very limited outlook or approach to international relations.

Now, when we came into the picture, we assured Nepal that we would not only respect her independence, but we wanted to see Nepal develop into a strong and progressive country. We went further in this respect than the British Government had done; that is to say, Nepal began to develop other foreign relations. We welcomed it. We did not come in the way, although that was something far in addition to what had been the position in British times. Naturally, and quite frankly, we do not like, and we do not propose to like, any foreign interference in Nepal. We recognise Nepal as an independent country. We wish it well. But any child knows that you cannot go to Nepal without passing through India. So our relationship is intimate and no other country's relationship with Nepal can be as intimate, and every other country must have to realise and appreciate this intimate geographical, cultural and other relationship of India and Nepal. There is no way out except by realising this fact.

So, three years ago or more, we assured Nepal of our desire that Nepal should be a strong country and an independent country; and we always added, a progressive country.

We added that because in the nature of things, we stood not only for progressive democracy in our own country, but round about also. We talk about it not only in Nepal but also in distant quarters of the world, and we are not going to forget it when our neighbouring countries, when a country on our doorsteps was concerned. But our advice was friendly and was given in as friendly a way as possible. We pointed out that while the world was changing, rather rapidly, if Nepal did not make some effort to keep pace go

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

in that direction, there may be some pushing about later. But it was rather a difficult thing for us, because we did not wish to interfere in Nepal in any way.

We wished to treat Nepal as an independent country and at the same time, we saw that unless something was done in the internal sphere there, difficulties might arise. This process was going on and the advice we gave in all friendship did not produce much result. Then, in the last fortnight or it may be three weeks, these sudden developments have taken place there. And now our interest in the internal conditions of Nepal became still more acute and personal, if I may say so, because of the developments across our borders, because of the developments in China and Tibet, to be frank. And regardless of our feelings about Nepal, we were interested in our own country's security, in our own country's borders. Now we have had from immemorial times, a magnificent frontier that is to say, the Himalayas. It is not quite so difficult as it used to be, still it is difficult, very difficult. Now so far as the Himalayas are concerned, they lie on the other side of Nepal, mostly, not on this side. Therefore, the principal barrier to India lies on the other side of Nepal and we are not going to tolerate any person coming over that barrier. Therefore, much as we appreciate the independence of Nepal, we cannot risk our own security by anything going wrong in Nepal which permits either that barrier to be crossed or otherwise weakens our frontier. So that recent developments made us think even more furiously about this Nepal situation than previously we had done. Previously we had gone on in our own patient way, advising in a friendly way, pointing out the difficulties, pointing out what should be done and what should not be done but with no great result.

Now the present position has arisen and as the House knows the King of Nepal is at the present moment in Delhi. Also two Ministers or members of the Nepalese Government are in Delhi at present and we have been having certain talks with them. Those talks have thus far yielded no result. And may I in this connection warn this House not to rely too much on all sorts of statements that appear in the newspapers. They have seldom any basis in fact, nowadays.

Again we pointed out to the present Government of Nepal and to the Ministers who have come here that we desire above all a strong and progressive, independent Nepal. In fact, if I may put it in order of priority, our chief need—not only our need but also the world's need—is peace and stability

in Nepal at present. But having said that, I should also like to add that we are convinced that there can be no peace or stability in Nepal by going back to the old order completely. That is a matter of judgment, not of desire. Probably any Member who has any knowledge of the situation can realise it himself that there can be no going back exactly to the old order.

We are anxious, as I said, to have peace and stability there. Therefore, we have tried, in so far as our advice is of any worth, to advise in a way so as to prevent any major upset there: we have tried to find a way, a middle way if you like which ensures the progress of Nepal, the introduction of or some advance in the ways of democracy in Nepal and at the same time, a way which does not uproot the old completely. We want some way like that. Whether it is possible or not I do not know. We have suggested these things and that is the position in regard to Nepal.

One thing more and that is in regard to the King of Nepal. There has been a good deal also of talk and reference in the newspapers about the recognition of this King or that King. The fact of the matter is that the moment we came as Government, as soon as our Ambassador went there,—we in common with other countries associated with Nepal—our Ambassador naturally went to the King; although the House will remember that the Constitution of Nepal—I use a strange phrase 'Constitution of Nepal', for Nepal has no Constitution. Nevertheless, the practice that has governed Nepal during the last nearly one hundred years or so has been the practice in which the King has no say—not little say but no say. Nevertheless, because of international conventions our Ambassador had to go to the King as the head of the State: and so did other Ambassadors. So somehow or other, because of these factors and because of Nepal coming into contact in the diplomatic field with some other nations, a slight difference came in with regard to the position of the King in relation to other nations, regardless of the internal situation. To say that we recognise the King has no meaning. We went to the King and he was considered the head of the State: we recognise the King that way, if you like.

We continue to recognise the King and we have no reason why we should do anything else and we propose to continue doing so. So this question in the way or shape in which it has arisen does not arise at all so far as we are concerned.

We are a patient Government, perhaps too patient occasionally; and we are trying hard to find a way out by

friendly talk, by friendly counsel and we shall continue to do so. But I do feel that if this matter goes on being dragged along without some way out being found in the near future, it will not be good for Nepal and it might possibly become a little more difficult to find that middle way which we have been advising and advocating all this time.

We speak of foreign affairs in this country and we give our advice, for what it is worth, sometimes to other countries. But the fact remains that such value, as our advice or views might have, has, if you like, a moral value, a psychological value. But the fate of the world depends far more to-day on some of the great Powers, on what they do and what they do not do—on the U.S.A., on the United Kingdom, on the Soviet Union and on China. Perhaps the fate of the world depends more on them than on all the others put together at the present moment. And I would on my behalf—I am sure the House will join with me—make an earnest appeal to these great countries to make every effort to solve the present tangle by a peaceful approach, by negotiation or any other way they could find, provided it is peaceful; because the consequences of not doing so are very terrible to contemplate. The tragedy of it is, as I said, that people in every country desire peace: I have no doubt about it. I would say that Governments also desire peace. But some evil fate seems to pursue humanity at the present moment and driving it more and more in a direction which can only end in stark ruin. So I hope that these great countries will apply themselves to securing peace and I can assure them and pledge my Government and if I may say so, this House, that we shall do every thing in our power to promote peace and to avoid war.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

There are a large number of amendments.

Shri Frank Anthony (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I wanted a clarification. I was under the impression that there is an understanding that the amendments given to the motion on the President's address, in respect of foreign affairs, would be carried over to the discussion on foreign affairs. But I find that a different procedure has been adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, there was no such understanding. At least, I did not understand it that way, because at

that time, all that was said was that the foreign affairs would be discussed at a later date, and the amendments would properly be—as a matter of procedure, proper and good procedure—to the motion as tabled by the hon. Prime Minister. But the hon. Members who wish to speak on it will get an opportunity provided, of course, time permits.

Now, there are very few minutes left. So, we shall take up the amendments later on. We may better adjourn now and re-assemble at 2-30 P.M.

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

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker: We shall take up the amendments.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Bihar): I beg to move:

(i) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House suggests that the Government of India should withdraw from the U.N.O. and its various Committees and sub-Committees".

(ii) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House suggests that the Government of India should enter into non-aggression pacts with the U.S.S.R. and China".

(iii) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House expresses the hope that the Government of India will conduct its foreign policy in such a manner as to lead to the establishment of a league of Asian nations to be known as the U.N.O. of the Peoples of Asia."

(iv) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House expresses the hope that the Government of India will exert influence in such a manner that Japan once again becomes a free country."

Mr. Speaker: Amendments moved:

(i) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House suggests that the Government of India should withdraw from the U.N.O. and its various Committees and sub-Committees".

[Mr. Speaker]

(ii) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House suggests that the Government of India should enter into non-aggression pacts with the U.S.S.R. and China".

(iii) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House expresses the hope that the Government of India will conduct its foreign policy in such a manner as to lead to the establishment of a league of Asian nations to be known as the U.N.O. of the Peoples of Asia."

(iv) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House expresses the hope that the Government of India will exert influence in such a manner that Japan once again becomes a free country."

Prof. K. T. Shah (Bihar): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House realises the extreme gravity of the present international situation, and regrets to note that the policy pursued by the Government of India in their international relations has failed to maintain world peace."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House realises the extreme gravity of the present international situation, and regrets to note that the policy pursued by the Government of India in their international relations has failed to maintain world peace."

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Bihar): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the international situation being highly inflammable, it is desirable that immediate steps be taken to strengthen the land, sea and air forces of India to be able to meet any emergency."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the international situation being highly inflammable, it is desirable that immediate steps be taken to strengthen the land, sea and air forces of India to be able to meet any emergency."

Shri Naziruddin Ahmad (West Bengal): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

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

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

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

We shall now proceed with the discussion. In view of the large number of Members who wish to speak, I think it will be necessary to impose a time-limit. I would suggest fifteen minutes for each speaker, but that should be taken as the maximum. I understand the difficulty of covering all points in that limit, but, with a view to giving opportunity to the largest number of Members possible, I would urge that an individual Member, instead of trying to cover all the points, may cover just a point or two which he thinks to be most important and on which he could give his ideas in the best manner as he thinks.

Shri Naziruddin Ahmad: May I submit that the Members who have submitted amendments should be allowed to speak first? Otherwise, the cart would be put before the horse.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the motive of the suggestion, but if we accept that proposition, namely, that the giving of an amendment can be used as a means of getting a right to speak, it would be a very difficult job later on.

Shri Naziruddin Ahmad: The rules allow it.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh): Will the debate continue tomorrow also?

Mr. Speaker: I shall be able to say that after a few minutes.

Shri T. Husain (Bihar): Have we to catch your eye or is there a list, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Suggestions come in the form of lists, in the form of chits and in the form of requests.

Shri T. Husain: But the eye is the most important.

Mr. Speaker: It is the only factor.

Shri Bharati (Madras): May I suggest that we may have another day also?

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, the difficulty is that while one Member is asking a question, others are engaged in some conversation and the same question is being repeated. I would request Members to be very attentive.

Shri Sondhi (Punjab): He is hard of hearing.

Mr. Speaker: When I say that Members should be very attentive, I do not say so with reference to this occasion, but generally.

Prof. Ranga (Madras): Sir.....
(*Interruption*).

Shri Hanumanthalya (Mysore): On a point of order, Sir. Is it necessary that the concerned Minister should be present, or would it be in the interests of the debate if the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is present?

The Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): The Prime Minister will be here in a few minutes. Meanwhile, he has asked me to take notes and I am doing so.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order in that, but I think that it has been the established convention here that the Minister concerned is expected to be present in the House and on important occasions as many Ministers as possible. Incidentally, it also involves a corresponding duty on the part of Members. They should, after delivering their own speeches, remain in the House and hear what the other Members have to say and also hear the reply which the hon. Minister gives. In spite of this convention, some latitude has to be given, in respect of Ministers, for the simple reason that they have to attend to many duties and it is not possible for the Chair to come to a conclusion on the importance of the business which detains them. Some arrangement seems to have been made to take notes of the debate that is being carried on in the unavoidable absence of the Minister, and in any case, the hon. the Prime Minister has just now come. The matter is settled.

Shri T. Husain: Now that the Prime Minister is here, may we know whether the debate will continue tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: There is no hurry. The announcement will be made shortly. Yes, Prof. Ranga.

Prof. Ranga: Sir, I am sure the House and the country are keenly conscious of the gravity of the national as well as international situation with which we are faced. I am also conscious of the grave tone in which the hon. the Prime Minister has introduced this subject this morning in this House. We are all anxious to offer our co-operation as well as support to the foreign policy that our Foreign Minister has been pursuing. It is very easy for me to narrate a number of things in his foreign policy with which myself and most Members in this House are in full agreement. But I certainly would not be performing my duty by this House and by the country by detailing those items in his foreign policy with which we are in agreement at present. I am sure the Foreign Minister also does not desire us to do that. What we ought to do—what at least I feel I ought to do, if I were to be sincere in the support that I wish to give to our Foreign Minister—is to try and draw his attention in a fearless manner to some of the aspects of the foreign policy in which our country does not feel very happy, about which our people do not feel so very satisfied and in regard to which we can expect our Foreign Minister to try to give a better account of the manner in which our foreign affairs are managed in the interests of our country and also in the interests of the world.

As the Foreign Minister was developing his subject this morning, I began to wonder what his conception could possibly be in regard to the strategic importance of the things that are happening all around us. Could he be indifferent to the gathering clouds of threats of insecurity to our own safety in our own country, to our much-prized liberties and freedom,—threats which are all around us, especially in the north and north-east sides of our country and our borders? It is very easy indeed for us to grow sentimental as well as eloquent whenever anything concerning Asia is mentioned to us. But can we be indifferent to the change that has been coming over the minds of large numbers of the leaders who are today in charge of great masses of geographical areas of the world, especially in the East? Can we be quite so confident that the China that we talk about is the same today as it used to be ten years ago, one hundred years ago, two thousand years ago when Lord Buddha's teachings were being carried to China through our missionaries? Chinese people, we have all great respect for them; Chinese people, we like to love them. But at the same time we should also realise who today are the leaders of the Chinese people. Who

[Prof. Ranga]

is in charge of the Chinese Government today? Could we be indifferent to the fact that only the other day it was none else than the Chinese Government which had hinted that India was the foreign power in Tibet which was supposed to be queering the pitch? Could we be also indifferent to the fact that China, the modern China, the present day China was sending her own troops in order to assert her sovereignty over Tibet? And in the mind of people on that side of the world, sovereignty makes no other meaning than expansion of their own control, political, economic and social over other peoples. Now, when we talk again and again of the sovereignty of the Chinese people over the Tibetan Government or country what is it that we are doing? Are we not giving a blank cheque to be signed on our behalf by somebody else in order to spread their own imperialist tentacles?

We should in all seriousness be prepared to realise the strength of the people who are there on that side in charge of that Government. True, the United Nations troops are bearing the brunt of their attack in Korea. Millions of people are supposed to have poured into Korea. It is something like an avalanche sweep. Is it impossible for those people, under more or less similar circumstances, to pour into India too under the same pressure of ideological and imperialistic urges? Should we not keep these things in our mind?

Instead of that I found, to my utter surprise, our Government and their spokesmen both in India as well as abroad, repeatedly professing their friendship not only to China's people, not only to the Chinese Government, but to China's sovereignty over Tibet. This beats anybody and everybody. These are days when we should be ready with the aid of the United Nations and other factors to counter this menace of sovereignty of one country over another. Instead of that we go about accepting it, admitting it and apologising to it. This is one criticism that I am obliged to make against our foreign policy.

Secondly, my hon. friend the Prime Minister was speaking this morning in ringing and eloquent terms about our policy towards Nepal. We all approve his attitude towards Nepal. Why do we insist that Nepal should pursue a progressive policy, although we admit that Nepal is an independent country? Because we are her neighbour, because we alone could possibly be her neighbour, because we have strategic interest. All that is true. I admit. Now in the same way, have not the Reds argued in favour of their ideology when it came to their relations with their

neighbouring peoples in South-West Europe, and would they not be prepared to do the same thing also in regard to India when her turn comes? Now that is where it is most necessary for us to take into account the mind of those people. No amount of our emotional feeling for peace, justified as it is, could possibly blind us or blind any country to what is happening in the world. There is a war already. The war on the ideological plane is several years old. Now this war is trying to take a physical shape. We want to prevent this physical war. All glory and all support also to our Prime Minister for the heroic efforts that he has been making, so consistently and so fearlessly during the last two years in order to ward off this war. But at the same time would it be wrong on our part, on the part of our people and on the part of this House to expect him to take cognizance of the existing war on an ideological plane between two ways of looking at things and two ways of living in this world? Could it be possible for him to ignore the fact that there are people in this world, there are countries and parties in this world who are not tolerant of other peoples' way of living and who are anxious to spread the tentacles of their own ideological strength and power? There are fifth columnists in every country and these powerful columns are being regulated, ruled and controlled by one power, one ideological power and one ideological people who follow one ideological approach. But what are we doing? We seem to be doing nothing.

Then there is the spectre of war. We are trying to prevent it. But supposing it takes place? What is the preparation that we are making in our country? What is the warning that our Prime Minister has been giving to our people and helping them to prepare themselves? I am wholeheartedly in agreement with what has fallen the other day from the lips of my hon. friend Mr. Kunzru when he warned us in grave terms and tones about the great necessity of improving our armed forces. But are we doing anything? I agree with the Prime Minister that we have not got the necessary economic power. In that case, would it not be necessary for us to go about and tell our own people about these threats to our peace, as well as the world's peace; threats that may be coming from this end or that end, so that we may prepare ourselves to face these threats. We have not done it. I do hope that the hon. the Prime Minister would hasten to give the necessary warning as well as exhortations to our people.

I come to the next point, that is our long-standing anxiety to remain un-

attached to this or that side. I admit that: but do the other two parties accept our professions of non-attachment policy? I am afraid, it would be impossible even for the Prime Minister to say to himself, not to speak of saying it to us, that they do accept our policy of non-attachment. One section has already put us down as their enemy and they do not want us to remain, even to our own satisfaction, in an unattached manner. They want us to go with them. They know that we have not gone with them. They know also that we are not likely to go with them. And they are told again and again by their own agents here, whose numbers are unfortunately increasing on account of our own policies, that we are not likely to be on their side.

Shri Tyagi (Uttar Pradesh): Which is that?

Prof. Ranga: Don't be impatient. You yourself know it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Prof. Ranga: They come and tell the Prime Minister—that we are moderates? No. That we are reactionaries? Not even that—that we are capitalist-minded and that we are war-mongers. They said fifteen months ago that we are imperialistic. They wanted to anticipate what China is trying to do in regard to Tibet. They wanted to keep us away as far as possible, blind-folded also, and make us defeatist, and so they called us war-mongers. These are the people who are not going to treat us under any circumstances as friends.

We are afraid of becoming satellites of the other, of becoming their dependents. To be a satellite, or to be a slave or a dependent is bad. It is inhuman, and it is a thing impossible for us to contemplate. None of us is prepared to ask our Prime Minister to accept that sort of thing *vis-a-vis* the other power. Admitted. But at the same time are we prepared to allow our country, in a willy-nilly fashion, to become a slave, an agent or, to be absolutely ashes under the feet of the other power? That is the real danger today. Let us be conscious of that. Whether we try to prevent it or not, on an ideological plane it is going on, and it may translate itself into the physical plane too in spite of our efforts.

There was King Edward VII. He got a Nobel Prize. Why? Because he was supposed to be the "peace-maker". He prevented a war breaking out.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: When was it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He is entitled to his views.

Prof. Ranga: Look into history. A few years later the World War came. There was a Prime Minister of England

who went back to his country after a shameful treaty and then warned his people against war. He brought back along with his umbrella, peace for the people. A few months thereafter there was war. It was not his fault that war came. But it was his fault not to have prepared his country to face the situation that had overcome at Dunkirk and other places.

Shri Sidhva (Madhya Pradesh): He won the war.

Prof. Ranga: Not that man. In our country we today are told that war is coming. Let us help them to avoid war. Are all prepared to co-operate with the Prime Minister in avoiding this war? But let us also be quite clear how long it will be possible for us to maintain this peace, this risky peace, this slippery peace. This peace can be made sound, strong and stable only when we are in a position to make ourselves strong strategically as well as industrially, when we are in a position to know our friends and develop that friendship as strongly and as sincerely as we possibly can, even if we cannot cement that friendship by formal political treaties or alliance or liaison.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (West Bengal): In rising to speak on the foreign policy of the Government of India one would naturally feel overwhelmed by the critical situation with which the whole world is faced today. I would like to deal with the problem not only from the point of view of the world situation but from the point of view of the security and safety of our own country, because I feel that the latter consideration is of as much importance as the former one.

There will be none in this House or in this country who will not re-echo what the Prime Minister has said about the desirability of avoiding war. In fact, as he has pointed out, there is hardly any country in the world or people residing in any country who are not saying the same thing. Yet we are drifting towards a war. The Prime Minister has also asked the House that we should be very careful in choosing our language, specially in dealing with the affairs of other countries and should not add to the explosive nature of the present situation. At the same time I think it is essential that we should speak frankly, specially in respect of the points where we feel that a change is called for in the policy of the Government of India.

We want peace. We want to avoid war. We would like to follow the policy of negotiations. We would like to be patient, though not, as the Prime Minister said, too patient always. At the same time we must guard ourselves against not following a policy of drift. We must be able to arrive at

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

decisions—we hope correct decisions—at the right time. We must also guard against the possibility of trying to please everyone. That is a dangerous pastime and very often we are reminded of the fate that overtook the old traveller—who was no doubt guided by moral principles—who tried to cross over a rickety bridge with his son and donkey, sometimes rode on the donkey himself, then persuaded by others put the son on the donkey, then placed both himself and the son on the donkey, and ultimately carried the donkey on his shoulders, with the result that he lost the donkey. In this case, if we try to follow the same policy, we may or may not lose any donkey, but we may lose our country. In any case, we must be able to make up our minds, especially at this critical juncture, as to what should be our outlook and our policy with regard to international matters.

I shall not deal in detail with Korea. But I must say that we have noticed certain inconsistencies with regard to our approach even to this problem, which it is very difficult to explain. The Prime Minister today emphasized that no settlement with regard to Korea was possible, ignoring China. That is certainly a point of view worthy of serious consideration. But when India decided to support the Resolution before the Security Council, declaring North Korea as an aggressor, obviously it was known who was behind North Korea. North Korea had no independent status of her own. North Korea was backed by China and, maybe, ultimately supported by Soviet Russia. But we did not hesitate in declaring North Korea as an aggressor and we also took our plunge into the war. If today China has to be satisfied with regard to North Korea, then obviously China will dictate her own terms. When we discussed the Korean issue in Parliament some months ago, this was the point which I touched in my speech. Is the fighting between North Korea and South Korea just a localized affair or is it something bigger? I did appreciate the position which the United States took up. The United States did not regard it as just a simple case of aggression on the part of North Korea against South Korea but it also kept the ideological conflict which was in the background.

3 P.M.

Today naturally attempts are being made to keep the Korean Conflict confined to its limited circle. We all hope that that will be so but here again, somebody has to eat the humble pie. China today has shown that she does not exactly represent the despised Orientals and whatever the reason may be, she

has acquired enormous strength and she is able to meet on the battle-ground the finest forces that the United States and other allied powers could have sent. Naturally our deepest sympathy will go to the U.S.A. because one half of her peace-time army today is on the battle-fields of Korea and the United States is claiming that she is not fighting her own battle, but she is fighting the battle on behalf of Democracy. Here we have to make our mind exactly as to what we stand for. The Prime Minister referred to China. We have no quarrel with China, so long as China is anxious for the liberation of her own people. Everyone will have sympathy with the Chinese people but if China takes upon herself the task of liberating other peoples also who may not be anxious to obtain liberation at her hands, naturally that creates complications which will affect not China alone, but the rest of the world, particularly Asia. The proceedings in the House of Commons in London are rather interesting reading. There even a great fighter and patriot like Mr. Churchill has been thinking not in terms of saving Asia, not even thinking so much in terms of making Korea the real testing ground but he has quite realistically been thinking of the possible repercussions on Europe and particularly England, if by any means Korea is allowed to develop into a theatre of world war. That is a realistic, a strategic approach. We have got to look at these problems undoubtedly from the point of view of world peace but principally also from the manner in which our own position may be affected.

Along with China, we have to take up the question of Tibet because both are inter-linked. Now the Prime Minister naturally reminded the House of the part which India had played progressively in the matter of recognition of the legitimate rights of the present Chinese Government. How has China reciprocated? When it comes to the question of Tibet, there may or may not be some sort of loose suzerainty of China over Tibet, but historically this is not so easy a matter and yet, what is the reply that China sent to India, when India asked China not to proceed on the path of violence in the matter of Tibet? The reply that China has sent has shocked, surprised and has given sorrow to the Government of India. I do not know whether it has made any difference with regard to China's settled policy in respect of Tibet, but here again, what is the definite policy of the Government of India with regard to Tibet? The Prime Minister just glossed over it. He said: We have sent another request asking them to be peaceful, but has that made any difference? Just as in the case of Korea, each country for which this so-called libera-

tion starts is the worst sufferer. It is like the old story of the operation being fully successful and the patient succumbing. The sufferings of the people themselves are indescribable. Only in this morning's papers we had a graphic account of the last British Correspondent who left the North Korean capital, stating how he found the whole place burning, reminding him of some performances of Sir Guy Fawkes. Similarly with regard to Tibet, we sent frantic appeals to China asking her not to be violent but did China listen? What is the policy behind China's action? It is no use our trying to gloss over things because these are matters which affect not only the people of Tibet but also the security of India. It is a fact that the boundary between India and Tibet is yet to be definitely defined. The Prime Minister said the other day that we stand by the Mac Mohan Line but the maps of China which are in circulation even now include portions of Assam, Ladakh and Leh and territories in which India is vitally interested. The reply which China has sent to India on the question of Tibet definitely indicates that China will do everything necessary for the purpose of keeping in tact what it considers to be China's border and when it refers to Chinese border, it includes Tibet as well and the undefined boundary of Tibet so far as it touches the Indian border. Similarly with regard to Nepal. The Prime Minister spoke very calmly the whole time—he did not use strong words—a few strong sentences were however used by him, when he warmed up in connection with Nepal. We must follow a patient policy with regard to Pakistan; we must follow a friendly policy with regard to China; we must follow a surrendering policy with regard to Tibet but with regard to Nepal, we shall never allow any one not only to enter into Nepal—any foreign power—but also not allow anyone to go over to the other side of the Himalayas. It is perfectly true; we are interested in Nepal. It affects our security to a very considerable measure. Some solution will have to be found with regard to Nepal. Even with regard to Nepal, we have been too long undecided. We do not know exactly what is it we want. We must have a strong and stable Government in Nepal and a Government which has the backing of the people at large. If by any chance civil war continues in Nepal, it is not India that will benefit, it is China through Tibet which may come and play havoc in that part of Asia. (Shri Tyagi: Impossible). The gentleman who says 'impossible' represents that class who thought four years ago that establishment of Pakistan itself was impossible but many impos-

sible things have become possible in this world, particularly in our country, due to our weakness and shortsightedness.

I do not wish to go into details but what I would beg of the Prime Minister to realise is that the time has come when we have got to take decisions with regard to major questions and be prepared to act before it is too late.

I personally feel that this world is big enough for all of us to live in. I do also feel that it is quite possible that there may be different ideologies in different parts of the world. It should be madness for anybody to think that the world must be built on one pattern and one alone. So long as people residing in one country or the Government representing that country decide to confine their activities within their own limits, and apply to their own people whatever doctrines they consider to be favourable or fashionable to them. It should not really concern the rest of the world. But, the trouble arises when ideologies and principles either peacefully or violently penetrate into other territories and disturb the set up in those countries and come as a challenge to the world.

What is happening in the world today? The world is in the grip of lust for power, possession, and prestige. These are the three things which are ruling the world. Naturally, we do not wish to take sides openly, and blatantly. We do not wish it to be known that we are simply the torch-bearers of somebody else; because we have also our own philosophy and our own ideology. The doctrine for which India has stood has been the doctrine of live and let live. At the same time, if the danger signal comes, if the red signal comes, what is it that India will do? Suppose the Himalayas, which were considered to be impregnable, that huge border covering 2,000 miles for which no separate precaution or defence was thought to be necessary, but which has suddenly become an important frontier, happen to be the line through which there is penetration or infiltration into India, how is India going to defend herself? That also is very much connected with the internal conditions prevailing in India. The growing deterioration in our economic conditions is a menace to our internal security and our ability to check infiltration or aggression. I have nothing to say against communist philosophy as such. The Indian people may decide to adopt whatever *ism* they like to adopt. But, we do certainly believe in democracy. We shall tolerate no external interference. I am not referring to the ideologies for which England or America may stand, or their sins of

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

omission and commission. But, there are certain fundamental and basic ideologies for which India has stood, and even stands today. We stand for freedom of expression, for freedom of thought, for freedom of association and religion and our Constitution has been based on the sound principles of democracy. India will not, therefore, and cannot accept any principles attached to totalitarianism or dictatorship. If there is an ultimate conflict between these two ideals, we cannot just sit on the fence. By all means let us try to negotiate; but if there is ultimate conflict, then what will India do? If the possibility of danger comes to India, can India alone, by herself, defend her territory against a big aggression? These are big question marks. It is not my purpose to go into these detailed questions today. But, I would certainly tell the Prime Minister that the people of India expect that there should be a more realistic approach in respect of the foreign policy of India. No doubt, we stand for peace; but the inconsistencies and uncertainties of our foreign policy are making us slowly drift towards something which may bring disaster to India more quickly than what many think.

The last remarks that I would make in the limited time at my disposal will be with regard to Pakistan. The Prime Minister said nothing about Pakistan. In one sentence he has brushed aside Pakistan.

Shri Tyagi: That is very good.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: So far as Pakistan is concerned, what exactly is our policy? As I have stated repeatedly, there must be an overall policy between India and Pakistan. We are supposed to be at the war with Pakistan in Kashmir. Pakistan is the aggressor there although what is true for Korea is not true for Kashmir. In all other matters, we are trying to carry on a conciliatory policy with them. Our policy must be based on reciprocity, complete reciprocity. If we get good treatment from Pakistan, Pakistan gets good treatment from us. If we do not receive good treatment, it is no use our merely saying that we carry on a policy of negotiation with them, and ultimately become weak and humiliated. I shall not refer in detail to Eastern Pakistan. The only ground on which the Prime Minister stands is that on an average about 2,000 people more are going back to East Pakistan every day. But, why are they going there, how they are living there, to what conditions of humiliation they are being subjected are questions which the Prime Minister has not been able to answer. He knows much better than

even myself the life of misery, shame and humiliation which these millions of Hindus in East Bengal are being forced to live. He said in the course of his speech that whatever happens, India will never agree to any discrimination being made, in reference to South Africa, whether it is based on race or religion. When people who had their loyalty fixed upon undivided India, who made Indian freedom possible, and today also naturally look to India for protection and help in emergency, are forced to live in an atmosphere of insecurity and misery and humiliation, then, what is India's policy in respect of them? Are we so weak as merely to watch and appeal? Today, what is needed is that the people of India must get a proper lead from their Government. If, God forbid, the situation worsens, India will have to depend as much on her arms and ammunitions or military strength as on the united moral strength of the people. I was rather perturbed the other day when the Prime Minister excitedly answered a question put by a Member and said that he was reducing defence expenditure. The matter has not been discussed in detail. If reduction in defence expenditure means a weakening of the military position of India, I say, that the Government of India will be doing the greatest possible disservice to India as a whole. Today two things are vitally necessary. We have to strengthen our military position and if we cannot do it alone, we shall have to do it in collaboration with others with whom we can stand on a common platform in defence of a common ideology. Then, we shall have to strengthen internal strength and peace, and satisfactorily solve the economic problem, as much as we can by our own efforts, as with the help of others so that we can create that solidarity and stability which would be impregnable both from the national and international standpoints.

Mr. Speaker: We shall continue this debate tomorrow also.

Acharya Kripalani (Uttar Pradesh): We have listened to the Prime Minister's exposition of his foreign policy with attention. I am glad he said that

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

consideration of foreign policy is not a matter which concerns only the experts, but as all the citizens are involved in it, they also can have an opinion about it. Yet, I must say that so far as internal politics is concerned, this House is in a better position to assess the results of policies pursued by our Government because they affect us intimately. We go among the people and we know their

feelings, and we know how any policy of Government, or any muddle that it may create, be it in regard to sugar, or food or jute affect the people. We know the people's feelings and we can ventilate them here as their representatives. In foreign affairs we have to walk warily. I will, therefore, confine myself to discussing principles rather than find any fault with any acts of commission or omission of the Foreign Department. Even so, it becomes necessary to have a brief survey of our diplomacy so far.

We began our international career by enunciating three propositions. We said that India shall strive her best for world peace. We also said, as between two power blocs, the Anglo-American and the Russian, we shall remain neutral. We have heard it said by a former Ambassador of ours and a Member of this Parliament, that there is only one bloc. I hope the Prime Minister will benefit from this information supplied by one of his ex-diplomats. The third proposition that we enunciated was that though we will be neutral as between those two blocs, we will not allow tyranny and injustice to prosper. These are very laudable and excellent general propositions. But somehow or other, we soon discovered that absolute neutrality was not quite possible. So we modified this proposition and we said that we reserve to ourselves our judgment; and that we shall decide every issue on its merits. Again we soon discovered that there are no abstract, unrelated issues in this world, especially so in the international field. We discovered that issues are followed by acts, and these acts are good or bad. Therefore we modified our proposition and said that we shall judge every act upon its merits. I submit, that this is not a scientific way of judging acts, because acts are not isolated facts. They are correlated, they are inter-related, and they proceed from the character of a particular person and nation. Sometimes acts proceed from the philosophy that a nation or an individual holds. Therefore, I say that this way of judging isolated acts is not scientific. Moreover, there are certain acts which over-ride every other act that an individual or a nation might have done. If a man is charged with murder, it is immaterial whether he was a good father, or a good husband or a generous person. The one act of murder, in human judgment, over-rides all his other acts. Also, we do not use this way of judging while making our friends. We do not judge separately the acts of our friends. We make up our mind about the man's character and then we give him our friendship or we leave him to himself.

To take a concrete example—China. It had a people's Government and that

Government was in charge of the country—practically the whole of it. We, therefore, thought that it was right that it should not be denied the membership of the U.N.O.; and we advocated the cause of China. And why? Because we were thinking in terms of isolated action. This action was right. We said that this Government represents the people of China and is in possession of power, and so it should be allowed to be a member of the U.N.O. But, if we had waited a little, we would have been more cautious in our advocacy. Soon, this nation that was struggling for its own freedom, strangled the freedom of a neighbouring nation, in whose freedom we are intimately connected. I am not thinking about the theoretical right of China over Tibet. In spite of this theoretical claim of China on Tibet, many of our politicians feel that our advocacy of China for the membership of the U.N.O. was premature. We may change our position, because we feel that Tibet is yet far off. But supposing what has happened in Tibet happens on our borders in Nepal? For the sake of argument, suppose the Chinese "liberation" forces come to Nepal, then I am sure the House will agree with me that whether we are well prepared or ill prepared, we will go to war with China, cost what it may. If that is so, at that time what becomes of our advocacy of China to the membership of the United Nations? We cannot be at war with a nation and also advocate its entry into the U.N.O. That would be an absurd position.

Take another instance. North Korea attacked South Korea and thus broke international peace. We judged this action in isolation and in a hurry we voted for war on North Korea. I can understand America voting for war, because the American people know that this North Korean action was not an isolated action, but that it was in pursuance of a policy, and that policy emanated from Russia. Therefore, though the land was distant, and though it was difficult to drive the enemy, yet the Americans went to war. When they took this step I do not think that we were so naive as to think that America will stop at the 38th parallel. When a nation begins a war, a costly war and a destructive war, it fights it to the finish. It does not take half measures. Therefore I say that if we had waited and studied properly the character of this Korean war we would not have been wise after the event and said "Though we sanctioned war, we meant so far and no further, only up to the 38th Parallel." Under these circumstances, when the actions of powerful nations and others that have come recently into power are dictated merely by power lust and by aggression, open

[Acharya Kripalani]

or secret, it becomes difficult to take sides. We must therefore allow the atmosphere to clear and as a peace-loving nation remain strictly neutral.

Neutrality in the present circumstances of the world means that so far as possible we must not express any opinion as to who is right and who is wrong. This does not mean that we have no opinions. So far as international diplomacy is concerned we express no opinion and in this I am fortified by what the Prime Minister said this morning and also said a few days back. He said a few days ago: "We must stop this business of slandering each other, irritating each other and pointing out the faults, errors and the sins of the other". I say if we cannot do this, we cannot also lavish any praise, because if we point out the merits of one nation, they come to be the demerits in the eyes of another nation, or at least the other nations take it so. Take the example of North Korea. We condemned its action and therefore approved of the American action or call it U.N. action, it makes no difference what name you give it. We approved this action and considered it good. Then next we blamed America for crossing the 38th Parallel and talking in terms of using the atom bomb, which we heartily despise. Therefore I say that just as some nations in Europe remain strictly neutral, without publicly expressing their views about the rightness or wrongness of powerful and ambitious nations, we must follow a similar policy.

The question arises whether as member of the U.N.O. we shall sit silent. Those nations which decided to remain neutral have not remained silent in the U.N.O. In the U.N.O. there are many social and economic matters in which we can profitably participate. Our representative there is a careful man and is greatly respected. We must instruct him that all his efforts should be towards the establishment of world peace. In sanctioning war against North Korea we have not lent weight to the cause of world peace.

Then from another point of view we cannot at this stage of our national development afford to take sides in international issues. We began our international career very favourably. We were considered, or may I say that we considered ourselves, as the leader of Asia

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Acharya Kripalani: And Asiatic people looked to us for inspiration and guidance, or at least we thought that they looked to us for inspiration and

guidance. I am afraid this position holds good no more. I do not know whether the international world knows about our weaknesses. At any rate, I am sure by this time we know our own weaknesses, especially in the matter of our military and industrial potential. So far as our military position is concerned we have an army but it is only a land army. We have no navy or air force worth the name. Our industrial potential, meagre as it was, has become more meagre in these three years. Under these circumstances is it not proper for us to cultivate our own garden? If we make ourselves strong it would not be possible for our neighbouring nations to insult us. We advocated the cause of China for membership of the United Nations. We thought that we were doing something that Russia would have wanted us to do, because she also wanted the membership of China in the U.N.O. But how did Russia treat us? Russia published the correspondence between our Prime Minister and Stalin. This I say is not done in international diplomacy. They did this because they did not care for us. They want to take advantage of us. Then take the case of China, we advocated its membership in the United Nations and at that time China did not remember that we were inspired by some other nation but when it came to the question of Tibet they tell us that we are inspired by some other nation. America is cold towards us. We have no friend left in the world. The tree must be judged by its fruit. So I say if we make ourselves strong, we shall not get these rebuffs and only in so far as we get strong will we be able to influence world politics and work for peace which is our greatest aim and which is in keeping with our traditions.

I suppose all these things have happened because our basic philosophy is wrong, that is we want to judge every action on its own merits. Another reason for this is that we think that we will fight for just causes, or is it lost causes? Neutrality cannot be combined with the urge to reform the world. I remember when people asked the Father of the Nation to carry his doctrine of non-violence to distant lands, he always said "I must make good at home and unless I make good here I have no right to carry the message of non-violence to other lands."

Nearer home, our policy should not only be just but it should be firm. Because, with it is connected our very existence as an independent nation. This brings me to the question of Nepal. We could have and should have been more helpful to the forces of demo-

cracy. The Raja of Nepal who is our guest, his theoretical claim to the crown of Nepal is greater than the theoretical claim of China on Tibet. And moreover, today every nation has a right to democratic rule. Any way, whatever Prince or Princeling we recognise—and the Prime Minister was very vague about this matter, he merely talked about the recognition of a King, and we know the King never dies, whoever may be on the throne—let us, however, not talk in terms of reform or diarchy. I say today there is no middle path between tyranny and democracy, and there can be no middle path in Nepal. Today I say there is no place for fascist tyranny. That went with the last war. Now there are newer kinds of tyrannies that are possible, there are newer kinds of totalitarian regimes that are possible. Today, if you deny a people democracy, all that they will get will be communism, and if democratic forces are defeated in Nepal, the communist forces are yet alive there and they are underground and soon we may find that People's China has sent an army of "liberation" in Kathmandu. It will be no time then to talk of the old line between Nepal and Tibet. So, I hold, nearer home our policy must not only be just but also firm.

This brings me to Pakistan. I want a firmer attitude towards Pakistan. I believe our neighbours have been taking advantage of our will-to-peace. We want no injustice to be done to the rightful claims of others, but we must make it clear to our neighbours that we shall defend our rights with our life's blood. Our motto cannot be as it was the motto of the Mahatma, loving our enemies and non-violence. We have an army, our Government is as much based upon the use of violence as any other Government. We cannot take refuge in saying that violence cannot be answered by violence. Our motto can only be "we shall love our friends and be just to our enemies". The world today has not gone beyond that stage.

Prof. K. T. Shah: I feel the gravity of the situation through which the world is passing as seriously as anybody in this House or anywhere in the world, and I have taken to heart as fully as the Prime Minister himself might desire the need for restraint in anything which we may say, whether by a word or a gesture, which might needlessly cause complications in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Having said this, and having recognised the seriousness of the situation which is on the brink of another world war, I feel, however, that there is much in the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country in the last three or four

years which may admit of improvement. That is not to say that one would like to condemn entirely the foreign policy as it has been conducted. Nor am I going to dissociate myself completely with all that has been done in regard to our endeavours for the maintenance of world peace. Nevertheless, we have to recognise, in the face of facts as they are, that notwithstanding the sincerity of all the efforts for maintaining world peace, we have not succeeded in preserving it. And while we are not trying to allocate blame or apportion merit for whatever has happened in the past, or is happening now, we must at least search ourselves sufficiently to realise where, in our own conduct there may be lurking pitfalls, there may be lurking causes that may be adding to the malaise of the world.

As suggested by the hon. Speaker, it is not my intention to cover all the points that necessarily the Prime Minister had to cover while dealing with a general review of the foreign affairs of this country. I would confine myself only to things—and in the reverse order—very near our home, such as Nepal, and the situation which is boding another world war, namely that in Korea, and the part of the United Nations therein.

In regard to Nepal, I recognise the existence of international conventions and diplomatic etiquette which would perhaps not permit a responsible Minister of a great country like this to say anything more categorical than is conventionally permissible. But one would have expected from a convinced, life-long democrat as our Prime Minister has proved himself to be, a much greater warmth and cordiality in support of the popular forces which have risen in revolt, after a century of oppression and tyranny, against the Rana regime in that country. There is no denying the fact that it is as great an anachronism as it is unpopular, and therefore, its legalistic theories apart, the recognition of this or that King apart, one would have expected that all those forces which are striving in that country to organise or reorganise the governance of that country on a more constitutional, more stable, more popularly supported basis would have received a more warm, more cordial, more unmitigated support from the Foreign Office of this country. It seems to me that we are, on the one hand, convinced that any instability or danger in Nepal may mean danger or threat to the peace of this country itself, and on the other, we seem to be wondering whether in our relations with the present authorities in Nepal we should do anything that may rub them on the wrong shoulder, even though that is in support of a good cause—a cause which we ourselves have taken to heart.

[Prof. K. T. Shah]

Those in power will never admit the righteousness or correctness of those who want to establish a government on a popular basis, and therefore it is that one would have expected—I for one did expect—the Prime Minister, notwithstanding the sense of responsibility that he naturally must have, to utter a more cheering word in the cause of the popular revolt than he did, but perhaps by the time he comes to reply he may be able to offer a word of hope and encouragement to those forces, in which case I would certainly feel that he would be acting like himself and vindicating all that he has stood for in the public life of this country and in the world.

As regards the situation in Korea, there is no denying the fact that the United Nations, or rather the United States, have gone far beyond the original resolution of the United Nations. Even granting that China, or rather North Korea supported by China, may have been the aggressor, even supposing that the initial impetus came from that source, in the resolution which we supported, so far as I recollect, we distinctly thought it necessary only to use armed force for the repulsion of the aggression. When, however, that objective was achieved, there was no stopping there, but the forces rushed on with such authority as they were always able to obtain from the United Nations in this regard. Neither India nor even the United Kingdom have been listened to in this regard, and the Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Forces in the Far East seems to have taken the bit in his mouth and has made statements which Generals Commanding are not expected to make. There had been, only a few weeks ago, a strong agitation against the utterances of the Commander-in-Chief in regard to the Formosan question, for instance. I for one am convinced that the conduct of the affairs, as it is being done, even though it may be literally and technically in accordance with the United Nations resolution, does not seem to be in accordance with the spirit that ought to move and has moved, in my opinion, these resolutions. The United States itself, in my opinion, is not free from blame in this regard. In my judgment, it is pining for a fight. It has been their tendency to neutralise, subsidise, terrorise, weaker people and then assert the force of their new imperialism. As I have said before now, I have no love either for the red or black or brown or blue imperialism of any sort. But I would say this that so far as we know, the attitude and utterances of responsible people in the United States, from the President downwards, are such that ought to give us a great food for thought—serious

thought—as to whether they mean what they say or they have something up their sleeves. The very fact, for instance, which has forced the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to take a hurried trip to the United States, namely, fact that the President of the United States said that he is seriously considering the use of the atomic bomb when the matter is before an International Commission, so far as I know—that very fact, I say, that they wish to unleash the atomic bomb twice in less than ten years on Asian people shows what is the attitude they have towards the people of this Continent. I personally feel why, though the atomic bomb had been completed before Germany was finally beaten, they did not want to unleash it on a European country, whereas when it came to an Asiatic country, they had no hesitation in doing so, and today in a relatively small war they are talking to that extent there that the junior partner has hurriedly to travel to the United States and declare that the United States alone is not entitled to use the atomic bomb at its discretion. Whatever the gravity of the situation, I only want to draw attention to this fact, that the dollar diplomacy when desperate will not stop at anything. Their whole attitude is to bring the world and the weaker countries of the world so much under their depression, so much under their influence, that the whole world should live the American way of life. The American way of life is seen in the pictures which they send out here, which you may be seeing. Unfortunately, I do not see them—or fortunately, I do not know. If you wish to see more truly and more correctly the attitude they have towards life, you will find it in their behaviour towards their own coloured races in their own country today. There is an element of imperialism nascent somehow in the very blood of the Anglo-Saxon race that it will not rest content while they can afford to leave other people to live their own life, even though they are ready to make any amount of professions in regard to the desire to live and let live. As I said before, I am not very much enamoured of the red imperialism as it is called, nor do I hold any brief for what Russia may be instigating or what China may be doing or what it may be threatening in Korea by the combined might of their forces. But I must say this, that the way in which the United States is treating its partners, its associates, and those who have supported it, merely because it is in a position to provide loans and make as it were cannon fodder out of those people whether in Europe or in Asia, does not justify any hope and belief amongst the weaker countries of the world that the peace of the world, if left in the hands of the United States or

the United Nations as influenced by the United States, would be safe for the world as a whole. The old League of Nations decayed and eventually disappeared, because it had become the tool, the engine, the instrument of only one or two of the leading nations of the world. I, for my part, am seriously afraid that this new edition of the League of Nations is really a registry office for the two important, or perhaps the only one important nation of the world, namely, the United States, where all others are regarded as junior partners, whose assent may be taken for granted. If it is not so, none would be happier than I, but the events so far have proved nothing more than what I am contending, that even in regard to this Korean affair itself, the United States sent its forces before the United Nations had passed a resolution justifying or authorising such attempt at repelling aggression, as it was called. My point is: whether you see in regard to Korea or elsewhere, you find that whereas when it comes to Asian countries or their claims to equality all kinds of legal subterfuges or devices are found to delay and procrastinate and postpone; when it comes to any interest which the United States feels is important, it does not wait even for the nominal authority of the United Nations. If the United Nations, therefore, behaves in the manner in which it has behaved so far, I feel that there would be a great deal of force in one of the amendments tabled here, namely, that India would do well to get out of the United Nations. Let me add, however, that I am not advocating it just now. I am still hopeful of the collective counsel of mankind making both these blocs of power politics to recognise the humanity all over the world and realise at least this much, that each country must be left free to choose the way of life that suits best its own requirements and only on that basis the peace of the world can be founded and maintained.

4 P.M.

Shri Masani (Bombay): I suppose at no stage in recent times has the world been nearer war and in that context we all listened with great feeling and sympathy to the speech made by the Prime Minister this morning. If that had been the only peril that faced the world, I would not have taken the time of this House this afternoon. But I think it is also proper to say that at no recent times since 1938 has the world been nearer another 'Munich' and I crave the indulgence of the House to supplement the anxiety that the Prime Minister has expressed in regard to the possibility of a world war with the anxiety that I feel should equally be expressed against the possibility of another Far-Eastern Munich.

The issue stated by the Prime Minister was peace or war. May I suggest that there is also the other issue of peace or appeasement leading to war? To me that is an equally pertinent and relevant issue and, as I listened to the Prime Minister's speech, I wondered whether he was heading for what might be called a 'peace at any price' stand. I was relieved, therefore, when he came out with a positive statement at two points and in particular when he assured the House that we shall not tolerate anyone crossing the Himalayas. That certainly was not a pacifist stand and I am sure the entire House and the country agree with him. But then, if the independence of the peoples of India or of Nepal justify the use of force to meet force, then I am sure we cannot put the liberties of the independent peoples of Korea or the people of Formosa or the people of Tibet any lower than the interest of the people of India.

We now have our eyes fixed, those of us who love freedom, on the meeting that is proceeding between the two leaders of world Democracy, President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee. We are told that the Governments of Britain and France desire that the defence of Europe should be put first. We have a strange unanimity on this point, that the Western forces should not be bogged in Korea or the Far East, between people like Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Bertrand Russell, the Prime Minister of France and the Prime Minister of Western Germany. They all agree that Europe must come first. I would not blame them. If we were in the same position, we would have been equally insistent that our defence should take priority over other people's. But in their understandable anxiety to protect themselves from what they regard as an unmitigated menace and evil, they cannot forget the interest of this part of the globe. And it is for us to claim also, those of us who are Democracies and believe in the democratic way of life, that appeasement in the Far East, that the jettisoning of the liberties of the people of Asia, is no way to secure the liberties of the peoples of Europe.

Once before, this has all been gone through when a British Prime Minister told a cheering House of Commons that at the cost and sacrifice of a "distant country", Czechoslovakia, he had brought back "peace in his time". At that time, our present Prime Minister was among that brave band of people who refused to be a party to that appeasement and who warned the world that this was no way to peace, that appeasement of aggression would lead to further aggression, and sure enough within one year the great war came.

[Shri Masani]

I am equally convinced that if by any misfortune, President Truman and Mr. Attlee were to agree to do a deal with the aggressor, with the Chinese aggressors in Korea and elsewhere, then the same fate will overtake the world. I am confident they will do nothing of the kind. I would rather wish that faced with overwhelming military force, they may withdraw from Korea and take a military defeat. That would be infinitely better than doing a deal with the Chinese Communist aggressors and handing over to them Formosa, Indo-China and Tibet, along with a seat on the Security Council. That would mean disaster for us in Asia and ultimately for the world.

We must, therefore, hope that the words of our President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, will echo on this occasion. These are his words:

"It has been India's policy not to submit to aggression, for submission to aggression in any part of the world is to invite its repetition in other parts, and thus to imperil peace and freedom."

I belong to a political movement which has been brought up on the thesis that peace can come, not through appeasement, but through collective security. Certainly let us stave off war, if we can; but the breathing-time we may gain will only be useful if we utilise the interval to build up a system of Collective Security that is stronger than all the aggressors put together. The misfortune today is that, while on the one hand the totalitarian dictatorship has gone on arming since the end of the last war, the Democracies of the world, led by America, Britain and France have relaxed and have dropped their armaments to such a low danger level that today in Korea we see hordes of men being used as cannon fodder against mechanised armies which simply have not got man power. That tremendous unbalance of strength or military force is the world's tragedy, and that tremendous unbalance of strength has to be rectified soon, if the peace of the world is to be preserved.

I would like this House to consider, not in a spirit of criticism, but in a spirit of humility, whether we in this country have done all we can to bolster the Collective Security of this part of the world. Have we joined with our colleagues, the free nations of Asia, to come together on a regional pact—call it a Pacific Pact, or anything else—by which an attack on one would be regarded as an attack on all? Have we, even today, in spite of two notes from Tibet, taken up their case in the Security Council and sponsored their

plea that the United Nations should give at least moral support to them in the aggression they are facing? And if we do not do these things, as I said last time in the debate on Korea, we shall be strengthening those forces of isolationism in the West which will be prepared to write off Asia, because Asia is not prepared under its present leadership to defend its own freedom and its own collective security.

Acharya Kripalani invited me to expand on a point which I made recently elsewhere, namely that there are not two blocs. I wish the time permitted of an analysis of this kind. But I shall respond to his invitation to say that one of the reasons why we have been inhibited in our country, despite a basically sound foreign policy of independence of judgment, from defending this part of the world and building up a system of Collective Security, is a misconception on which the implementation of our policy is based, namely, that there are two power blocs, that both are of the same quality and level and that we can, therefore, be equally independent or detached from both. I believe that is a basic fallacy that lies at the root of the deviations that we indulge in and the distortions that are taking place in the correct policy of independence of judgment and of deciding each issue on its merits. Where are the two blocs? We can certainly see the Soviet bloc made up of the Soviet Union and its satellites, Czechoslovakia, before it became fully a satellite, accepted the invitation to a Conference in Paris to discuss Marshall Aid. A telephone call early in the morning from Moscow to Prague was sufficient to make the Czechoslovakian Cabinet meet a second time and cancel its acceptance of the invitation! Can we imagine that happening anywhere outside the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc? Can we imagine India or Egypt or Brazil or any other country which is supposed to belong to the Anglo-American bloc being bullied in that manner? (*Several Hon. Members:* We do not belong to the Anglo-American bloc). I am told, that we do not belong to the Anglo-American bloc. I entirely agree. I myself am saying that there is no such thing. But the enemies of Democracy are today saying, and among them are Russia and China, that India does belong to the Anglo-American bloc.

Shri Sidhva: So many people proclaim like that.

Shri Masani: My hon. friend is agreeing with me without knowing it. I am pointing out the absurdity of such a thing as an Anglo-American bloc. If we are not members of it, who are

members? Is Egypt a member? Is Sweden a member? Is Argentina a member? Then who are the members of the Anglo-American bloc? If we are members of the British Commonwealth, then obviously among members of the Anglo-American bloc the countries of the Commonwealth will be naturally there. This conception of an Anglo-American bloc and of its voting together is not true. I will give evidence for this. The British Commonwealth is a group within the so-called bloc. There were 429 votes taken in the United Nations recently. On all these occasions, the Soviet bloc voted solidly behind Russia. But out of these 429 occasions, only on 101 occasions did the countries of the Commonwealth vote solidly together. On 328 occasions the countries of the Commonwealth disagreed with Britain and among themselves. In only 23 per cent. of the cases did the British Commonwealth behave like what may be called a bloc.

Shri Raj Bahadur (Rajasthan): That simply proves the conclusion.

Shri Masani: That simply proves the confusion that there is such a thing as an Anglo-American bloc. It is true that these fifty and odd nations, which are free and independent in their dealings, agree most of the time. It is because they are democratic and believe in a free way of life. For instance, when fifty-three countries voted along with us that North Korea had aggressed, they were not voting as a bloc. They were all countries like ourselves with an independent judgment. If we put these fifty odd members of the United Nations and the Soviet Bloc in the same pair of scales, we are bound to go wrong in our assessment of what our attitude should be.

The second assumption on which I think we should reconsider our stand is as regards the nature of the Chinese Communist regime. One year ago, when we recognized Communist China, it was possible to take two different views. There were those who argued that every Communist government must be a satellite of Soviet Russia and must be of a predatory and imperialistic character. There were others who argued that Communist China was a new government and should be given a chance to prove its own quality. And for one year this country has been Communist China's best friend. A year has passed and we are able to judge in what way our friendship has been reciprocated and whether she has lived up to her reputation of being a freedom-loving and democratic country. The facts are that in three separate directions the Chinese Communist regime has shown its aggressive character: in Korea, where it is at war with United

Nations forces which are seeking to establish a free and united Korea; in Indo-China, where they have armed and sent Communist guerillas across the frontier, as was done in Greece some years ago; and our own neighbours of Tibet are now having an invasion of their country.

Even this country has not received very much friendship. May I remind the House that some months ago, after we had shown our friendliness to Communist China, a message was sent by Mao Tse Tung to Ranadive, the Secretary of the Communist Party, which was engaged in trying to overthrow our Government by force—a message of greetings and good wishes “for the liberation” of India and their hope that India would soon go the Chinese way. When diplomatic relations are established between two Governments, to sympathise with a Fifth Column working in this country certainly does not constitute an act of friendship. Therefore, it should not be a matter for surprise that we should also be attacked in the two notes that have been sent to us in the matter of Tibet. In fact, there is more than an insinuation in these Notes. There is a suggestion that we have been responsible for instigating the Tibetans to resist Chinese suzerainty. We know that is entirely false. If anything, our Prime Minister was trying to persuade the Tibetan leaders to accommodate the Chinese claims to suzerainty. I read a statement of the *New China News Agency* a few months ago that the “Anglo-American imperialists and their running dog, Pandit Nehru, were plotting a coup in Lhasa for the annexation of Tibet”. (*Several Hon. Members*: Shame). If this is the reward that comes to this country from one year's friendship and advocacy, surely the least that we can do is to reconsider our estimate of the Chinese Communist regime. What that estimate should be I leave it to Government of the day to decide. While we might maintain diplomatic relations with the Chinese Government on a basis of reciprocity, there can be no longer any illusions about friendship, about cordiality and about comradeship in Asia. By the one act of attacking Tibet and deceiving the Indian Government after their assurances given repeatedly, they have shown utter contempt for the idea that we embraced, namely, of a free and united Asia. They have cut Asia into two—Communist and non-Communist Asia. Those of us who are not prepared to go all the way with them must fall on the other side of the fence. In that setting and in the face of this remark which comes from the *New China News Agency* in the last few weeks, that “the Chinese People's Liberation Army will hoist the Red Flag over the Himalayas”, what are we

[Shri Masani]

to think of the friendship that we may expect from them?

The Prime Minister has pointed out today, and the House welcomed his assurance, that we would not tolerate anyone crossing the Himalayas. We have been accustomed to look upon the Himalayas as our sentinels from ages past. I would like to cite here the words of the Poet Iqbal in that great poem:

*Sare Jahan Se Achha Hindustan
Hamara:*

*Parvat Woh Sab Se Uncha Hamsayn
Asman Ku*

*Woh Santri Hamara, Woh Pasban
Hamara.*

That is a noble sentiment, and it is true that people in this country have looked upon the Himalayas as their guardians. But we are living in an age of air power and mechanization. And military experts assure us that not only can aircraft fly over the Himalayas and come and bomb our cities in North India with safety, but also that even mechanised armies can go through the Himalayan passes and come into our country. In the light of that, it would be dangerous if we were to rest behind the Himalayas and be content that we would be secure. In the last war, France had built a strong line of defence, the Maginot Line, and the people of France thought they were safe from German attack because of this artificial fortress and boundary they had created. Yet when the time came the Maginot Line crumbled, it was outflanked, and the whole country went under German occupation. Therefore, let us not build up a Maginot Line conception in our minds. Let us guard our frontiers ideologically and militarily to the best of our abilities.

I believe that the foreign policy of India based on independence of judgment is a sound one. The conceptions I have mentioned have, however, made it deviate from the line that is dictated by India's vital national interests.

I would conclude by suggesting that India's foreign policy should have two pillars. One should be a hundred per cent. and unstinted support of the United Nations and their decisions taken democratically. Some days back, Marshal Tito declared—he also, like us, said that he was not joining any bloc—that he would abide by the decision of the majority of the United Nations taken democratically. I suggest that is a line we might adopt in the future. And no less a person than the Congress President, Mr. Purushottamdas Tandon, declared the other day that in the un-

fortunate event of a war coming, this country must line up with the United Nations, because India believes in the Charter and the principles of the United Nations.

The second pillar should be our own national interests. Our national interests dictate that this country needs food, needs economic assistance from countries that can supply it. Those are the democracies of the West. They are our own colleagues in the Commonwealth, they are the United States, the countries of Scandinavia and those other Democracies from which we need raw material, food and capital goods. We have so far been so keen to please the Russian and Chinese Communist dictatorship that we have not availed ourselves fully of the possibilities in that direction. I would conclude with the words of our Deputy Prime Minister, Sardar Patel, when he said in Ahmedabad the other day:

"Our foreign policy is not to align with any bloc. The American Ambassador recently declared in Bombay that America was desirous of helping India in her economic recovery. Free India is in her infancy in spite of her ancient culture. We should not reject the offer of American aid for fear of arousing the suspicions of other countries. America does not aspire to be a colonial power. We have won freedom by our own efforts and with the grace of God. If America helps us to increase our power for world peace, we should accept it."

I am confident that in these words lies a more realistic approach to the problems of the day—that we should act and strengthen ourselves against both the political and the economic dangers that threaten us and should do so in the company and comradeship of the other free nations of the world.

Rev. D'Souza (Madras): I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to say a few words on this very grave matter and on this very important occasion. I have been listening with very great interest to the speeches which my hon. and most respected colleagues have been making this afternoon and the most weighty pronouncement of the hon. Prime Minister. I think, they already represent a consensus of opinion from different sections of the House, which indicates in what way the opinion of this House is moving and what is the sense of gravity and urgency which all of us are feeling. I trust that nothing that I am going to say will be out of keeping with that sense of gravity and

tension. All of us, as my colleagues have said, feel the importance of the warning given by the Prime Minister, and nothing, no ill-considered statement or reflection or condemnation should make his very heavy burden heavier than it is. Surely the attention and the ears of the world are directed to what Parliament of India, the spokesmen of this new Democracy of 350 million people, are going to say. I venture to say that if today, they are willing to listen to us and are turning their attention to what we are saying with respect as well as with a certain amount of anxiety as to the ultimate outcome, it is because of the difficult, but at the same time, the courageous policies followed by the Prime Minister.

I listened to two aspects or rather two types of criticism of that policy; on the one hand there were the weighty, and to a considerable extent plausible criticism by my dear friend Prof. Ranga and our most respected Dr. Mookerjee. They found in the policy of Government and of the Prime Minister a certain hesitancy, a certain lack of vigour and directness and they called out for a more clear and a more uncompromising statement on issues as well as on acts that are before us. On the other hand, if I understood our very respected Acharya Kripalani correctly, he seemed to say that far from being hesitant, we have gone too far and that even a greater degree of neutrality or silence on certain matters is necessary for us. I think, from the very nature of these opposed criticisms, you could reasonably conclude that the middle way, the safe way, the golden mean has been followed by those who are in charge of our foreign policy. If I may venture like Acharya Kripalani, to speak in abstract principle, nothing is so difficult for those in conduct of immediate world affairs, internal political affairs or external affairs, so to conduct themselves as to act with a detachment which in reality comes only by distance of time and space, so to act as people would wish to act, if they had the knowledge and the absence of passion which 20 or 30 years of distance could give to them. Now, it seems to me that any attempt by a responsible and conscientious statesman, in spite of the insistent calls of party slogans and the passionate implications of party alignments, to cultivate patiently, gropingly as he himself said—that word need not be used in a derogatory sense, but in the sense of trying to find out the next step, the policy of acting with that detachment which would stand justified, not today or tomorrow, or in the passion of these immediate days but 20 or 30 or 40 years hence, I think that statesman is entitled to the respect and sympathy not only of his countrymen and his colleagues but of the entire

world. I do not imply by this that every effort at groping, at the detachment, has been absolutely successful. Groping must necessarily mean sometimes floundering and it is not possible to pass immediate judgment on every act. I think that the desire of not aligning oneself completely and definitely with a bloc has been acceptable to this country and is necessary in its many implications both because we are not prepared for war and also because of our ideological background. Apart from the conditions in our country and the sentiments of our people, there is a very real danger that such an alignment might hasten that which you wish to avoid. To-day, I believe, that the very special position which India has acquired and the very exceptional respect with which she is heard, with which the other nations are willing to hear her, is due precisely to this non-alignment, non-alignment which nevertheless does not mean as Acharya Kripalani carefully pointed out, absolute and meaningless neutrality but strength and readiness to decide issues as they come. Everybody will agree that there has been caution and patience, as has been pointed out by our Prime Minister, not only in regard to the larger international question that is coming before us now but in the many other matters which have confronted us in the domestic history of our country during the last ten or twelve years, in our dealings with Pakistan, in our dealings with the foreign settlements that still remain, in our dealings on the South African question. But in spite of that patience, that long suffering desire to pursue the path of negotiation, everybody has recognised that in the choice of objectives and in the persistence with which we have followed these objectives, there has been no weakness but there has been great vigour and there has been great courage. Therefore, finding that so far this policy has succeeded, I think, that this House will in general agree that our Prime Minister is entitled to a continued support along that line in its broadest outlines.

Nevertheless, I must in all honesty and frankness say that while that broad outline and that general spirit must continue to animate us—it has yielded us, we might say handsome dividends—if you will excuse that expression—surely within these broad outlines, the necessity for shifting the emphasis and for readiness to take cognizance of later developments, I am sure will not escape the hon. Prime Minister. Again and again attention has been drawn to the fact of our continued friendship with China, our persistent patience and utterly unselfish attempts to get our point of view understood. It is not because we are

[Rev. D'Souza]

ideologically in sympathy with her, as the Prime Minister has repeatedly declared, but because we believe in the United Nations, and because we think that the United Nations will be all the more effective with as many nations as possible, whatever their internal ideologies may be, sitting round a common table and hammering out their problems. We have consistently maintained this point and in spite of many criticisms people have made, that was a perfectly legitimate stand. Now, that in spite of that stand, we have in recent months received such unhandsome, such shabby recognition of what we have done, I say that the events in Tibet have so astonished and grieved the country that if not a complete change of policy, at least a change of emphasis, of outlook or attitude, seems to be called for.

Therefore, while continuing to work for peace, as the Prime Minister so insistently, so rightly said, continuing to express our belief in negotiation round a common table such as the U.N.O. affords, we cannot forget that certain nations or group of nations have given out no encouragement whatever that that method of negotiation will be appreciated or will yield results. I speak with hesitation in regard to this. I recognise the possibility of other people looking at it in a different way. The Prime Minister called upon all nations to give up the useless, painful and unhelpful task of passing judgments. Indeed that was a noble and wise appeal and we hope that it will be needed. But, when international complaints, and crises of this kind are discussed round a table, through questions abstract right or wrong may be avoided. The correctness of the legal position, or the more becoming manner of procedure and comments and conclusions on this, cannot possibly be avoided. When they are made, India with her moral standing, and her unhesitating attachment to high moral standards of conduct in international affairs cannot possibly remain neutral or silent. Expressions of opinion, of sympathy, of moral adhesion—I will not say alignment—are not only inevitable, but will be necessary for the honour of India. Therefore, while appealing to the different sections of this House to respond to the Prime Minister's call for support in his desire for continued negotiation, we hope that Government will understand that we have reached a stage where negotiations may break down and action may well become necessary. Today, the Prime Minister owing to the immense weight of responsibility that is on his shoulders, did not say anything as to what would be India's action or conduct or method of

procedure if these negotiations, which he and his very brilliant and very able Ambassador in the U.N., Shri Benegal Narsing Rau, are so patiently carrying out, unhappily break down. Many, indeed, fear that they may not yield fruit at this stage and that we may be confronted with the tremendous problem of war or peace in a manner which is even more insistent or urgent than it is today. It seems to me, that if that should happen, though the Prime Minister himself, as I said, with the weight of responsibility on his shoulders, could not speak out on this occasion, the sentiment of this House, I am sure, is that India, however much she may be discreet, and unfortunately limited by internal conditions in her freedom of action, should act fearlessly. India is not the "Hamlet" of Asia; she has not lost her capacity and readiness for action where action is necessary. The Father of this country has taught us, in spite of his love of peace, the spirit of readiness for action and he himself demonstrated his capacity to intervene in public affairs by direct action in a manner that was dramatic and shattering. We hope that we, and I venture to say, the Prime Minister himself, more than anybody else, will not be lacking in that spirit of immediate, decisive action if action is necessary.

Secondly, if this action is necessary, I hope and pray, and I am sure everyone in this House will support me when I say this, that that action must be in keeping with the high moral standards on which the ancient past and recent past of India have been based. Again, and again, attention has been drawn, and I am grateful to the magnificent manner in which Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has done it, to the principles of our Constitution, to the fact that we stand for certain fundamental principles of the democratic way of life and that we have given our adhesion to the United Nations. Let me recall to the House the magnificent part that we have played in the doings of the United Nations on the basis of that ideology, on the basis of our firm and indestructible belief in democracy and in our community of interest with other democratic nations. Acharya Kripalani said that it is better for us to remain completely silent on political issues in the U.N.O. and that there are economic and social matters in the United Nations, in which we could take part. Are we to forget the dramatic, successful interference of India in regard to the Indonesian problem, in regard to the Italian colonies, and in regard to so many other questions in which we have made our voice and our ideals felt, by slipping back into silence, which would make us look more helpless than

we really are? I cannot believe that that is the convinced opinion of this House. Therefore we are for action along the lines in which our Constitution, our traditions and the spirit of our people, the principles for which we have stood in the U.N.O., principles which in broad outline animate the nations which are friendly to us and with whom we are standing now by virtue of our freely chosen membership of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Lastly, I shall no longer tire the patience of this House, I should like to say that that action and readiness for action implies, what many of the previous speakers have emphasised, readiness on the military side. On that point, everybody, Prof. Ranga, my hon. friend Mr. Masani, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, and Acharya Kripalani were agreed; it is incumbent upon us to increase our strength, to consolidate it in every way. I was myself wanting to allude to a point which, fortunately, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has raised, namely, what the Prime Minister, a few days ago, said in reply to a question in regard to general retrenchment that even the Defence Department was being touched. If that retrenchment refers to cutting down of duplicated efforts or unnecessary organisation, we entirely understand and we applaud that effort. I hope that it was that kind of retrenchment which was intended and which was referred to. But, if it means a reduction in our strength or a modification of our programme, or unwillingness to expand that programme, I hope and pray that that matter will be reconsidered. I think that the unanimous view of this House is that a programme of rigorous armament within the limits possible for us should be carried out. It is in connection with that, much against the sentiments of many sections of this House, that I may be permitted to say one word about our outstanding difficulties with Pakistan. As the Prime Minister so well said, this question of foreign difficulties has an immediate bearing upon our relations with Pakistan. I think the gravity of the foreign situation and the magnitude of the external danger is another argument for the policy of the Prime Minister and of this Government, of a friendly approach and an attempt to end our differences in an amicable manner and to consolidate the defence of the entire continent of India, the geographical and general unity of which we shall never cease to proclaim. Therefore, if we have to face this external danger, it is necessary, even at the risk of minor sacrifices or the wounding of susceptibilities here and there, to pursue persistently, courageously and consistently that policy of patient negotiation and

understanding with our next door neighbour, so that minor difficulties of this kind—not minor and small, speaking from the internal point of view, but minor in the context of the world situation—may be overcome and our strength increased; increased, may I also venture to say, by the silencing of the different elements of division and opposition which are growing within our own country. We must confront the foreign danger with unity in our ranks, with understanding with our neighbours, with the courage of our convictions and the strength which they impart to us. In this way, we shall lighten the burden upon the Prime Minister and help him in maintaining the honour of our country, and the strength and independence of our people.

Shri Madhava Rau (Orissa): I noticed that often in this debate Government have been exhorted to be firmer. I was wondering what exactly was meant. This was particularly said in the case of our relations with Pakistan. Recently Government circulated the correspondence which has taken place between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan. One thing that was noticeable there was the absence of any acrimony in the correspondence though it was of a highly controversial character. From that one could judge that if the matters which still remain unsettled are to be brought to a decision, this could be done by means of correspondence or negotiations. One point of difference arose, namely that the Pakistan Prime Minister did not consider that a "No War" declaration would serve any purpose, and he has pointed out that by the mere fact of both these countries being members of the U.N.O. they had already virtually made that declaration. He has suggested in most cases, negotiations, mediation and arbitration in the last resort, should be the methods adopted for solving these disputes. Well, he was a little far too definite about the time that would be required at each stage. We cannot settle international disputes with a stop-watch in one hand and a Bradshaw in the other. But apart from that, there is no reason why the various disputes referred to, including those to which specific reference has been made, should not be settled by these means. I also think that if the two Prime Ministers meet, if the Prime Minister of India who has been invited to Pakistan were to confer with the Pakistan authorities, a distinctly better atmosphere would be created both here and there. At the same time, one cannot but regret that the Muslim leaders in India who could do a great deal to influence the attitude of Pakistan towards its own minorities are not exerting their influence a little more

[Shri Madhava Rau]

vigorously. The Prime Minister has in his statement pointed out that traversing the past it is always easy to point out where mistakes had been made or where mistakes could have been avoided. For instance in this very question which is now occupying the attention of the world, in this very serious situation which is facing the world to-day, one could point to things that might have been done or might have been done differently. At the very outset, the Prime Minister of India took it upon himself to approach both Russia and the United States of America with a view to seating Red China on the Security Council and allowing the matter of the Korean dispute being settled by the Security Council so constituted. This was, at that time, considered to be undue appeasement, that it was offering to the Soviet authorities on a plate just the very thing that they wanted. On the second occasion, when it was pointed out that the United Nations' troops should not go beyond the 38th Parallel, then again great surprise was expressed at what was considered to be our indecision. The military authorities could not understand how it was possible to clear North Korea and make it immune from invasion if operations were to stop at a particular geographical line. It was easy for them to say that the troops who had been driven out would reform and attack again. And the strategy of retreat is peculiar to the Soviet. Lenin said, "The revolutionary parties must complete their education. They have learned to attack. Now they must understand that they must supplement this by a knowledge of how best to retreat. The object of this strategy is to give time to discompose the enemy and to assemble the forces so as to take the offensive later." Well, this might be perfectly true from a military point of view. What India had in mind in advising the stopping of operations at the 38th Parallel, had reference to political considerations. Definitely, it was due to the fear that the U.N.O. would get involved with Republican China. And that is precisely what has now happened. Well, it is possible to say that if that advice had been taken, and if military operations had been halted and political negotiations had been commenced, the world would not have been brought to the very sorry pass in which the U.N.O. now finds itself.

In an international situation that is changing rapidly, it is not easy to provide any ready remedies or to lay down rigid formulae that may solve the troubles that may arise from time to time. Nor is it intended that in this Parliament or in the country at large, any such remedy or concrete suggestion would be forthcoming. But what we

think is very necessary is that the fundamental background should be kept clear and that should admit of no uncertainty. Some of the high officials of our External Affairs Department are sometimes fond of saying that they have no objection to communism as such, but they object to communist methods. Now, if by this was meant that we had no objection, that we do not treat those who believe in communism as a creed as criminals,—that nobody's belief is penalised, that there is liberty of conscience in this country, then we have no quarrel. But on the other hand if it conveys a hint that Government themselves have communist leanings, ideologically or any such thing, then it would become a somewhat serious matter. These statements that have been made by high officials as to their own attitude towards communism require, I think, clarification. Perhaps as I said, they meant no more than that those views are tolerated and that this is a free country. Communism may be a very good thing. It may be as good as gold. But just as there is no El Dorado here in which gold occurs in all its purity, so also there is no Utopia on earth in which communism, pure and undefiled exists.

It may be true that Communism in certain countries has helped their economic advancement, has actually raised the people's standards of living or has to some extent alleviated distress and poverty. But like gold it always comes mixed with the dross of fascism. Wherever it has spread it has meant that freedom of conscience and human individuality have been sacrificed. In a country like ours, where religion exists still and is an important force, anything like Communism would mean spiritual ruin.

What about Soviet Russia's intentions? Nobody knows what those intentions are. But from the evidence of events, from what we can gather from what is happening all over the world, it is obvious that Russia is on the march. It is probing here or probing there trying to find out a weak spot here or a weak spot there but it has kept its own hand quite hidden. It is Korea today, tomorrow it might be Indo-China, on the third day it is Tibet and on the fourth it may be India itself not to speak of Europe. The important question is that we should know at least who are our friends, where do our sympathies ought to lie and what is it we are fighting for.

Then what about China. At one time we were disposed to regard China as a country very much allied to us in outlook, in religion, philosophy and so on. But there is no doubt that the present

regime is a creature of the Soviet Union. It is one more pawn of the Kremlin on the political chessboard of Asia. Can we treat Red China as a Government which is disposed in a friendly manner towards us? Only this one instance would suffice to show what their attitude is. They are attempting now not only to interfere in Korea but have launched a campaign for the so-called liberation of Tibet. In this matter the very friendly and well-mannered advice that was given to them by India was repulsed.

There are some few among us who believe that more than the Red peril or the Yellow peril, there is the Yankee peril. They believe that today America has taken the role of England and France in the past. It is economic imperialism in disguise and that is the real motive power behind all its policy. I for one have no reason to believe that there can be any foundation for this. It required two world wars to move America from its isolationism and it would be very hard indeed to believe that at this stage it would reverse its role and adopt a policy of imperialistic expansion.

If we are clear about these things our policy cannot flounder. The policy of detachment, the policy of doing the right as we see the right—these things are bound to have their own good effect.

We were glad to hear this morning the Prime Minister's views (which are shared by all Members of this House) regarding the use of the atom bomb. There is a school of thought among scientists which regards the use of the atom bomb as something in the ordinary course. In a recent article a distinguished British scientist wrote as follows:

"To my mind the U. bomb, terrible as it is, spectacular as it is,

is really in the rank of what I would describe as ordinary weapons. The damage done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was not in fact as great as the damage done by incendiary bombs in the biggest raids on Tokyo. The main difference between the attack by a thousand bombers carrying chemical bombs and a single bomber carrying a U. bomb is a military one, because it is easier to organise an attack by a single aeroplane. But the effect is much the same. In fact I would regard the U. bomb really as a military convenience rather than a revolution in the art of war."

In the West these are the views that prevail among very influential sections, both in the scientific and military spheres.

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

Shri Madhava Rau: I would again plead that we do have proper background. Our international career started under very good auspices. We had the gospel of peace, which had been taught to us by the greatest apostle of peace. And we incorporated in our Constitution some of the main principles of the United Nations Charter in article 51. This article we have adopted not merely as empty words, not as a constitutional flourish but as India's ideal of conduct. I think every attempt has been made in the past to follow this in spirit. Despite failures now and again, despite hesitations now and again, India has shown that these really are the sentiments by which our policy has been and will be guided.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter to Eleven of the Clock on Thursday the 7th December, 1950.