

Monday,
8th March, 1948

THE
CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY OF INDIA
(LEGISLATIVE DEBATES)

Official Report

VOLUME III, 1948
(5th March to 18th March, 1948)

SECOND SESSION
of the
CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY OF INDIA (LEGISLATIVE)
1948



CONTENTS

Volume III—5th March to 18th March, 1948

FRIDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1948—	PAGES
Declaration by Members	1633
Starred Questions and Answers	1633—48
Death of Dr. B. S. Moonje	1648
Statement on Kashmir.	1648—57
Committee on Petitions	1657
General Budget.—List of Demands	1657—96
Change in Procedure <i>re</i> Moving of Demands	1657—58
Demand No. 22—Ministry of Labour	1658, 1682—96
Implementing of Labour Policy and Legislation.	
Labour Policy of Government and the manner of observance of Industrial truce.	
Policy <i>re</i> Better Co-operation between Labour and Capital.	
Demand No. 29—Ministry of Industry and Supply	1658—82
Stepping of Production of Large and Small Scale Industries	
Disposal Policy	
Creation of a Commercial and Industrial Service and Pooling up of Technicians	
Administration of State Industries in general and Sindhri Factory in particular	
Demand No. 55—Industries and Supplies	1658—82
Director General of Disposals, Textiles Commissioner and India Stores Department, London	
MONDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1948—	
Starred Questions and Answers	1697—1720
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	1720—23
Statements laid on the table	1723—40
Portrait of Late President Vithalbai J. Patel	1740—43
General Budget—List of Demands	1743—86
Demand No. 10—Cabinet	1744, 1772—86
Inadequate Number of Ministers and consequent lack of Effective Control over Departments	
Planning Policy of Government	
Demand No. 19—Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations	1744, 1746—72
Foreign Policy of India	
Condition of Indians in Commonwealth Relations Countries	
Taxation on Income (Investigation Commission) (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee	1778
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1948—	
Declaration by Members	1787
Starred Questions and Answers	1787—1818
Election to Standing Committee for Ministry of Education	1818
General Budget—List of Demands	1819—67
Demand No. 21.—Ministry of Commerce.	1819—47
International Trade Agreements	
Export and Import Policy and establishment of Indian Commercial Corporation	
Appointment of Trade Commissioners	
Coastal Shipping and Insurance	
Demand No. 18.—Ministry of Health	1819, 1848—67
Public Health Policy	
Demand No. 51.—Medical Services.	1819, 1848—67
Need of encouraging Ayurvedic system of medicine and registration of Ayurvedic practitioners	
Inadequacy of medical relief	

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY OF INDIA (LEGISLATIVE)

Monday, 8th March, 1913

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at a Quarter to Eleven of the Clock, Mr. Speaker (The Honourable Mr. G. V. Mavalankar) in the Chair.

STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ORAL ANSWERS

HOME GUARDS AND RIFLE CLUBS FOR DELHI

636. *Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the resolution passed by the Chief Commissioner's Advisory Council, Delhi, recommending to Government the organisation of 10,000 Home Guards for Delhi; and

(b) whether Government are aware of another resolution passed by the Advisory Council for the establishment of Rifle Clubs in Delhi and if so, what action has been taken by Government on the same?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. In regard to Rifle Clubs, the Deputy Commissioner has not yet received any application for permission to open a Rifle Club. When such application is received appropriate action will be taken by him.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: With regard to reply to part (a) may I know, Sir, what action has been taken by Government on the resolution passed by the Advisory Council?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I think some correspondence has gone on. There is no difficulty about the principle, because Government wants to encourage the formation of Home Guards in all the Provinces and in Delhi. Certain draft was sent and I think the Home Ministry sent them back to be amended in a particular way to bring them in line with the U. P. Home Guards Act, which we consider preferable. As soon as that is done, effect will be given to it.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Will Government direct the Local Government not to delay taking action in the matter?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly.

Shri H. V. Kamath: For recruitment to Home Guards, will Government give preference to those who have taken active part in our country's freedom struggle, specially to Congress volunteers, Congressmen and Members of the I. N. A., provided they are otherwise suitable for the job?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly. The first consideration, obviously, as the Honourable Member said, is fitness and suitability. Now fitness and suitability means that they have received previous training also. Members of the I. N. A. should normally be eminently suitable for this, but I am not quite sure if every political worker has had such training. It is a question of suitability.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: In view of the fact that no provision has been made in the present Budget for the Home Guards, will Government give an assurance that when the scheme is ready, they will provide for the necessary expenses in the supplementary Budget?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: You mean for Delhi: Certainly.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Will Government give an assurance that they will not exclude suitable girls and women too?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: If there is a separate section of the Home Guard, they will be there; if not, they will not be there. Personally, I hope, there will be a women's section.

Shri E. E. Diwakar: May I know if such Rifle Clubs are being encouraged in the Provinces also?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as we are concerned, we should like to encourage them. It is for the Provinces to do it.

Shri E. E. Diwakar: May I know, in view of the reply just now given, the official position and status of the Home Guard and their relationship with the magistracy and the Police and the authority that would exercise control over these institutions?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid, it will require a long statement.

Shri E. E. Diwakar: But, Sir, we require some reply.

Mr. Speaker: That will be for another occasion.

DACOITIES, HOLD-UPS AND THEFTS, ETC. BY ARMED GANGS IN DELHI

637. *Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the big increase in the number of dacoities, hold-ups by armed gangs and daring thefts on organised scale during the last few months in Delhi area;

(b) if so, what steps have been taken by Government to combat the growing menace; and

(c) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a Delhi hold-up which occurred on 2nd February 1948 and in which a sum of Rs. 19,000 belonging to the Ministry of Food was snatched away from an employee of the Ministry of Food in New Delhi, and if so, what action Government have taken in this respect?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) There have been a number of cases of dacoities, hold-ups by armed gangs and daring thefts during recent months

(b) Daudas and bad characters are being rounded up; intensive patrolling has been introduced. Watch is being kept on undesirable persons and their likely resorts are raided. Vigilance Committees of respectable members of the public have been formed to assist the police.

(c) Yes, the case is under investigation.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: May I know Sir, whether it is a fact that no special branch of the Intelligence Department has been set up to deal with such crimes, and will Government consider the desirability of directing the Intelligence Branch to set up a separate Department to prepare the character rolls of all such persons as have come here recently from other provinces and to keep a strict watch on them in as much as they are considered mainly responsible for such hold-ups and dacoities, etc.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: The point is that this matter should be investigated fully. Whether it is to be done by calling a few persons

a separate Department or labelling them otherwise, I do not know. The Honourable Member's point is that investigation should be thorough and rapid. I have no doubt that is appreciated. I cannot say off-hand whether that will be done by calling it a separate Department, but that is one of the main functions of the Intelligence Branch in Delhi.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Apart from the particular case, I want to ask whether in view of the fact that there have been so many cases, Government will consider the desirability of setting up a special branch of the C. I. D. to take preventive measure.

Mr. Speaker: I think the explanation is already given.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: Is it not a fact that the lack of telephone facilities for the common people is acting as a great handicap in giving prompt information to the Police?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: It may be so.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: If it is so, will Government consider the establishment of telephone booths in the various circles?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I suggest to the Honourable Member to point out the various places which he thinks might have such telephones and to communicate to the Communications Minister. We shall certainly try to put in telephones wherever possible.

Mr. R. K. Sidhva: May I know, Sir, whether Government's attention has been drawn to a dacoity in which a lakh and twenty-five thousand rupees have been taken away from the Lloyd's Bank? If so, what steps have been taken?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Government's attention has been drawn to this matter. So far as we are aware, many of these dacoities have been committed by a certain particular gang functioning and so far as our knowledge goes it is a gang which has come from the direction of Rohtak.

NATIONAL MILITIA FOR INDIA

638. *Seth Govinddas: Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether any scheme has so far been worked out for establishing a National Militia; and

(b) what steps are being taken to give compulsory military training to all adults in India?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) and (b). As the House is aware, this matter has been engaging the urgent attention of Government, and I hope to be able to make an announcement of Government's decision in this regard during this session.

Seth Govinddas: Has Government received any recommendations in this respect from different Provinces?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I do not think so. We have not received any recommendation from the Provinces.

Seth Govinddas: What practical steps have been taken by Government since the Honourable Minister gave an assurance to the House during the last Budget session on the Resolution of Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya that something definite would be done during the two months and the Assembly would be apprised of the same?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: The Honourable Member is referring to the assurances that I gave in connection with the report of the National Cadet Corps Committee; a decision has been taken and it will be released to the Press in the next few days.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Do Government mean to publish the report of the National Cadet Corps Committee or not?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: Yes, Sir.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: When do they propose to publish it? They have been saying so for months.

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: It will be published along with the announcement.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: When will that be?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: In the next two or three days before the 13th, I hope.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Is there any scheme under the consideration of Government to give military training to Government officials just as it is being done in Pakistan?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: There is no such scheme, Sir. But this question refers to the Territorial Force and I have already said in reply to this question that Government have a scheme under consideration.

LOSSES IN MEN AND PROPERTY DUE TO BORDER INCIDENTS

639. *Seth Govinddas: Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the number of border incidents so far occurred since the partition of India, and the loss incurred in men and material by the Union Government thereby; and

(b) what are the defence measures taken to safeguard the integrity of Indian territory and to prevent loss of life and property?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) and (b). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my answers to Starred Question Nos. 491 and 616 asked on the 26th February, 1948 and 4th March, 1948 respectively.

Seth Govinddas: With respect to clause (a) of the question, Sir, does the Honourable Minister remember that as far as the riots of Jaisalmer State are concerned, the Honourable Minister assured me that enquiries would be made from the Jaisalmer State about the compensation and has any enquiry been made whether the Jaisalmer State has given compensation to the persons who have suffered in these riots?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I have no information whether the Jaisalmer State has given any compensation, but a representation has been made to the Pakistan Government.

Seth Govinddas: Are Government aware that in Jaisalmer State only Rs. 7 per head has been given as compensation which is most inadequate? In these circumstances will Government

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the question relates to the internal administration of the State for which the Government of India do not seem to be responsible.

Seth Govinddas: The Honourable Minister assured me last time that he is going to induce the Jaisalmer State to give adequate compensation to sufferers in that raid. I am therefore asking him whether he knows that adequate compensation has not been given to the sufferers and whether he will make a move in this matter?

Mr. Speaker: The question in short is whether he has given any advice to the Jaisalmer Government.

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: As far as I remember, the question raised by the Honourable Member last time was whether any compensation has been demanded from Pakistan.

Seth Govinddas: No, Sir, that was not my question.

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: With regard to the question about the Jaisalmer Government having given Rs. 7 per head, I know nothing; I will make inquiries.

Shri H. V. Kamath: With reference to part (a) of the question, does the number of incidents include the incidents that have taken place on the borders of Eastern Pakistan?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: The previous answers given by me to which I referred all relate to the border raids in East Punjab.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Did any incidents take place on the East and West Bengal border?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: They are not included in this list.

Shri H. V. Kamath: May I know who took part in these raids,—army men, policemen or civilian goondas?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: It is alleged that every one in the categories mentioned took part.

Shri Biswanath Das: In view of the serious nature of these raids, as reported in the press, have Government insisted upon the Pakistan Government to compensate for the loss that has accrued? If so, with what result?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: We have made representations to the Pakistan Government, but without any result so far. The matter is under consideration.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did the Pakistan Government admit the responsibility of their people in this respect?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I do not think the Pakistan Government have admitted their responsibility.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did the Government of India try to impress on them that these were not sporadic cases but part of a definite programme?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: We have impressed upon the Pakistan Government that they must take effective steps to check these raids.

Mr. Tajamul Hosain: Have the Pakistan Government been impressed?

Mr. Speaker: That is a matter of opinion. Next question.

TERMS OF SERVICE OF BRITISH PERSONNEL IN INDIAN ARMY

640. ***Seth Govinddas:** (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state what special terms have been given to British military officers who preferred to serve in the Indian Army voluntarily?

(b) In view of the shortage of Indian officers in the army, do Government propose to consider the advisability of recruiting the members of the U. T. C. as officers of the Indian Army?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my reply to part (c) of Starred Question No. 268 asked by him on the 25th November 1947.

(b) This is already being done.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: Does the Honourable Minister admit that there is shortage of Indian officers? If so, will he be pleased to state why he has released the Gurkha officers to join the British army and why he has discharged the Emergency Commissioned officers who were recruited from Assam?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: To my knowledge no Gurkha officers have been discharged.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: It was stated the other day that some Gurkha officers have joined the British army.

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: That is quite a different matter.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: Does the Honourable Minister admit that there is a shortage of Indian officers?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I have already stated in my reply that there is a shortage of officers. As regards Gurkha officers none of them has been released.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: As regards the Assamese Emergency Commissioned officers, may I know why they have been discharged and not taken back again?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: If the Honourable Member will let me have the particulars about the officers concerned, I will look into the matter.

Shri H. V. Kamath: With reference to part (b) of the question, will Government take steps to recruit individual officers of the I.N.A. on their own merits if they are suitable?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: That is a separate question and the Honourable Member knows that it will be dealt with separately.

Shri S. V. Krishnamurthy Rao: May I know how many officers have been recruited from among the officers of the U.T.C.?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I cannot say without notice.

Seth Govinddas: May I know if Government have written to the different U.T.C. centres and inquired as to who are fit persons among them to be recruited in the Indian army as officers?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I am afraid we cannot proceed otherwise than on the opinion of the local authorities. The selection is to be made by the military authorities and there is a selection board and all the candidates have to appear before that board.

Seth Govinddas: May I take it then that the recommendations of bodies like the U.T.C. are not considered?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that does not logically follow.

Shri Ramnarayan Singh: What steps are Government taking to increase the number of officers?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: If my Honourable friend will see the reply to the question mentioned in my answer he will get all the information that he requires.

STRENGTH OF INDIAN AIR FORCE AND LOSSES IN KASHMIR OPERATIONS

641. ***Seth Govinddas:** (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state the present strength of the Indian Air Force?

(b) How many of our Aircraft have been destroyed or damaged in the Kashmir operations?

(c) What steps are being taken to strengthen the Indian Air Force?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a), (b) and (c). It would not be in the public interest to answer this question at this stage.

LISTENER RESEARCH SECTION OF ALL-INDIA RADIO

622. *Seth Govinddas: Will the Honourable Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state what is the work done, so far, by the Listeners Research Section of the All-India Radio?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: A note on the work of the Listener Research Section of All-India Radio is placed on the table of the House.

Shrimati G. Durgabai: May I know whether the Government of India have any proposal under consideration to have their own news agency operating under their own control?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I am afraid the Honourable Member is thinking of some other question; it does not relate to this question.

ALL INDIA NEWS AGENCIES

643. *Shri R. B. Dwarak: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state how many All India News Agencies are operating in India? What are their names?

(b) What are the facilities given to these News Agencies by Government?

(c) On what conditions are these facilities given?

(d) Which of these Agencies are operating outside India as well?

(e) Are Government aware that some of these Agencies are carrying on anti-Indian propaganda?

(f) If so, what steps do Government contemplate to take in such cases?

(g) Which of these Agencies are foreign-owned?

(h) What steps are being taken to make all these news agencies Indian-owned?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) and (b). A list of news agencies operating in India and a statement of facilities extended to them are placed on the table of the House.

(c) No specific conditions are imposed on news agencies as such.

(d) Government have no information about Orient Press of India. All other agencies are operating outside India as well.

(e) Some such instances have come to the notice of the Government.

(f) Government are taking all possible measures to counteract this propaganda.

(g) All except (ii), (iii), and (iv), mentioned in reply to part (a) above.

(h) It is for non-official news agencies and newspapers to make efforts in this direction.

(a) List of News agencies operating in India:

(i) The Associated Press of India;

(ii) The United Press of India;

(iii) Orient Press of India;

(iv) Press News Features;

(v) Reuter;

(vi) Globe, U. K.;

(vii) Exchange Telegraph, U. K.;

(viii) Associated Press of America, U. S. A.;

- (ix) United Press of America, U. S. A.;
 - (x) Agence France Presse, France;
 - (xi) Central News Agency, of China, China;
 - (xii) Indonesian News Agency, Indonesia;
 - (xiii) Arab News Agency, Egypt;
 - (xiv) Tass Agency, U. S. S. R.
- (b) The following facilities are given to news agencies:
- (1) Allotment of teleprinter circuits
 - (2) On accreditation the correspondents of the news agencies are given the following facilities:
 - (i) access, for the purpose of eliciting information, to the Ministers and Secretaries of Government as well as the Principal Information Officer and Information Officers of the Press Information Bureau.
 - (ii) supply of publicity material issued by the Press Information Bureau.
 - (iii) use of the Bureau's Press Room and library for collecting background information,
 - (iv) booking a special class of inland press telegram known as "FLASH" at double the ordinary rate for inland private telegrams if addressed to a newspaper or news agency, the indicator "FLASH" being transmitted free. This category of telegram is given priority in transmission over express telegrams from the public,
 - (v) booking press telegrams at reduced rates.

Shri B. E. Diwakar: With regard to parts (e) and (f) of the question, what are the particular steps taken to counteract such attempts?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the House expects Government to do in the way of propaganda. Normally speaking, Government gives publicity to certain facts. If it indulges in propaganda it does not carry matters very far. Government official propaganda is always supposed to be tainted propaganda.

Shri B. E. Diwakar: My question was, what steps are Government taking against those agencies which carry on propaganda against us?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Normally the representatives of these agencies are called and the error of their ways pointed out to them, and so on. Ultimately the last step would be banning it or removing the representative.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Do the Government of India grant any special concessions or facilities to these news agencies?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: The statement that I am laying on the table of the House give the facilities that are afforded to them.

Shri B. Das: What action did Government take against those British agencies that circulated false news when India and Pakistan had separated and also in connection with the Kashmir incident? Were the representatives called and censored by the Government?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: As far as I know in many instances the representatives of those agencies were called upon to explain why those wrong statements had been made, and they gave some kind of explanation or excuse. It was not considered necessary by Government, even under provocation to take extreme measures against the propaganda of news even when it was not news.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: May I know whether Government has received an application on behalf of the Press Trust of India Limited, formed by the leading newspapers of India for the grant of teleprinter lines for running a news agency? If so, may I know what action has been taken by Government?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I cannot give an answer to that straight off. I do not know all the facts. I will have to find out.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: May I know whether any of these agencies which are given these facilities are also receiving subsidies from Government?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I am suffering under a disability having to deal with my Honourable colleague's question. But I imagine there are no such agencies, unless the buying of a certain number of copies is considered a subsidy.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Is the Honourable the Prime Minister aware that subsequent to the martyrdom of Mahatma Gandhi many London newspapers carried on vigorous propaganda against our Government in India, and may I present to him this newspaper extract which suggested

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member can only put a question.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Is the Honourable Minister aware that many London newspapers carried on propaganda against our Government subsequent to the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government is fully aware that there are misguided people in the world that do not feel in a friendly way towards this Government.

Seth Govinddas: Is the Government aware that in this propaganda certain news agencies which are being helped by the Government were also involved?

Mr. Speaker: I think it has been sufficiently discussed. Let us go on to the next question.

POST OF JOINT DIRECTOR GENERAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY

644. *Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Education be pleased to state when the post of Joint Director-General of Archaeology was created, and for what period?

(b) What were the reasons for the creation of this post?

(c) Is it proposed to abolish this post after the termination of the present period, or is it proposed to continue it or to make it permanent?

آنرپبل مولانا ابولکلام آزاد : (a) ڈائریکٹر جنرل آرکھالوجی قیہارتمت کی پوسٹ پہلے ۲۸ دسمبر سنہ ۱۹۳۵ ع سے ۲۸ فروری ۱۹۳۷ ع تک کھلتے بدائی گئی تھی پھر جون سنہ ۱۹۳۸ ع کے آخر تک بوہادی گئی -

(b) - اس پوسٹ کو پیدا کرنے کا جو کارن اسوقت گورنمنٹ نے خیال کہا تھا وہ یہ ہے - آرکھالوجی قیہارتمت کو ری آرگنائز کیا جا رہا تھا اس لئے ڈائریکٹر جنرل کے لئے سب سے بڑا کام یہ ہوگیا تھا کہ نئے آدمیوں کو تربیت کیا جائے۔ کام کے سولکل نئے سڑے سے تعالے جائیں اور تمام ملک میں پھیلے ہوئے مہدائی کاموں کی دیکھ بھال کی جائے - ظاہر ہے کہ ایسی حالت میں انتظامی کاموں کے لئے پورا وقت نہیں دیا جا سکتا تھا اور یہ ضروری ہوگیا تھا کہ ایک نئے آفسر کی جگہ بوسا دیکھتے جو نیشنل کے ساتھ ایڈمنسٹریٹو قیوتی پورا کرنے میں مدد دے سکے - خرچ کم کرنے کا یہ قصلک غلط ہوتا کہ پہلے ایک آدمی کو جو خاص طرح کا تھکلھکل کوالیدیکشن رکھتا ہو بلایا جاتا

[آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد]

اور پھر اسے معذور کیا جاتا کہ اپنا اصلی ٹیکنیکل کام چھوڑ کر ڈیپارٹمنٹ کے انتظامی کاموں میں اپنا وقت خرچ کرے۔ سنہ ۱۹۳۹ء کی وولی رپورٹ نے بھی اس بات پر زور دیا تھا کہ ڈیپارٹمنٹ کے ہیڈ کوارٹر کا استغاف بڑھانا چاہیئے۔

(c) - بہت جلد اس بات کا آخری فیصلہ کیا جائیگا۔

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: (a) The post of the Joint Director General of Archaeology was first created temporarily from 28th December 1945 to 28th February, 1947, but the tenure of the post was subsequently extended upto the end of June, 1948.

(b) The reasons for the creation of the post of Joint Director General of Archaeology were:

(1) It was considered necessary to have at headquarters during the general re-organisation of the Archaeological Department an Officer with extensive experience to assist the Director General of Archaeology in his task, relieve him of a number of exacting administrative duties which prevented him from carrying out his primary and urgent task of training new entrants and re-modelling the Circles, and to enable him to maintain sufficiently close contact both with work in field throughout India and with the Government at New Delhi.

(2) It was false economy to bring out as a short-term Director General of Archaeology an Officer with special technical qualifications and experience and then to compel him to devote the greater part of his time to administrative duties.

(3) The Woolley Report of 1939 strongly stressed the need for a larger departmental headquarters.

(c) A final decision will be taken shortly.

شری دیش بندھو گپتا : کہا یہ امر واقعہ ہے کہ جو جوانت ڈائریکٹر بنائے گئے تھے وہ لسٹ میں سینئرٹی کے لحاظ سے سینئر نہ تھے۔

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Is it a fact that the appointment of joint directors was not made according to the seniority list?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : اس وقت میرے سامنے جو معلومات ہیں میں ان کی بناء پر اس کے جواب میں وہاں، نہیں کہہ سکتا۔ اس کے لئے نوٹس کی ضرورت ہے۔

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: On the basis of the information, available to me at the moment, I am not in a position to say 'yes'. I want notice of this question.

श्री एच० वी० कामत : क्या माननीय वज़ीर साहिब यह बतला सकते हैं कि मोहनजोदारो और हड़प्पा के वाद कौन कौन काम हाथ में लिया गया ।

Shri H. V. Kamath: Will the Honourable Minister be pleased to state what work has been taken in hand after the excavations at Mohenjadaro and Harappa?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : لیکن سوال سے اس کا کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے۔

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: But this has no reference to the question.

MAINTENANCE OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL GARDENS BY ARCHÆOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT

645. *Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor: Will the Honourable Minister of Education be pleased to state whether it is proposed that the Archæological Department should assume responsibility for the maintenance of Archæological gardens which have hitherto been maintained by the Provincial Governments?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : ملک کی پرانی یادگاروں کے ساتھ جو باغ ہیں ان کی دیکھ بھال کی ذمہ داری ابھی تک پراونشل گورنمنٹ پر تھی اب سنٹرل گورنمنٹ نے یہ پرنسپل مان لیا ہے کہ اس کی ذمہ داری آرکیالاجیکل ڈیپارٹمنٹ اپنے ہاتھ میں لے لے - اس بات کا فیصلہ کرنا ابھی باقی ہے کہ کس تاریخ سے یہ نیا انتظام شروع کیا جائیگا -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: The Government of India have already accepted in principle the responsibility for the maintenance by the Department of Archæology of gardens attached to ancient monuments which at present rests with the Provincial Governments. The date from which the Archæological Department should assume this responsibility has not yet been determined.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it a fact that this post was created after a European came to be appointed as a Director-General in order to help him?

Mr. Speaker: That relates to another question!

EXPENDITURE ON UNIFORMS OF JAMADARS AND PEONS, ETC. IN GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

†646. *R. B. Lala Raj Kanwar: Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the annual cost of liveries, uniforms, gold lace belts, crossbelts and other paraphernalia of the Jemadars, orderly peons and other public attendants of high officers of the Government of India and attached offices;

(b) whether there is any proposal to reduce this cost by eliminating expensive articles such as gold lace from the make-up of the livery; and

(c) if not, whether Government propose to consider the advisability of taking action in the matter?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) The information asked for is not readily available and the time and labour involved in collecting it would be incommensurate with the value of the results.

(b) and (c). The matter is under consideration.

INDIANS JAILED IN ANDAMANS FOR JOINING JAPANESE

647. *Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafar: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state whether Government are aware that some Indians in Andaman Islands who joined the Japanese forces and fought against the Allied Forces, are still serving their terms in the jails of Andaman?

(b) Is it a fact that they were tried as ordinary criminals and not as political offenders? If so, why?

(c) Is it a fact that they are not allowed to submit their appeals to any High Court or the Federal Court of India? If so, why?

(d) What is the policy of Government regarding the further detention of the persons in question?

(c) Have Government paid or propose to pay any compensation to their dependants?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) No.

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

RECRUITMENT AS GOVERNMENT OFFICERS OF PERSONS WHO PARTICIPATED IN FREEDOM MOVEMENTS.

648. *Shri S. M. Ghosh: Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state whether, while recruiting officers for the Government of India, any preference or special facilities are given to those who have taken active parts in the movements for the freedom of the country provided they satisfy other requirements?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Sri Arun Chandra Guha: May I know the reason why?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: There are no disqualifications. The question is whether in recruiting officers any very special facilities are given to those who have taken active parts in the movements for the freedom of the country. One prefers them, but the real test being suitability and merit, the other factors do not come into the picture quite so much. Either suitability and merit are the essential things to be seen to or they are not. If they are, then other factors, although we may like to consider them, take a secondary place.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: In countries like America war veterans are given special preferences.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe so. But the question is whether preference should go beyond suitability for a particular post?

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Will Government consider, other things being equal that preference will be given to those who took part in the freedom movement of this country? There are two candidates: one who took part in the freedom movement and the other who did not. Will the Government consider the desirability of encouraging the man who took part in the freedom movement?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly, other things being equal!

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Will Government consider issuing necessary instructions. At present these people are being tabooed even though they may have superior qualifications. Will the Honourable the Prime Minister take steps to see that the necessary instructions are sent to the departments?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I am prepared to do that, but qualifications do not mean merely educational qualifications. Qualifications mean experience, temperament, psychology; and it sometimes happens that a person who is eminently desirable in many ways and who has taken part in the movement for freedom is temperamentally not suited for that particular business. If I may give an instance: he is used to public meetings and not suited to an office.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: Has anyone with these qualifications and being a war veteran been so far appointed at all?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Many of them must have been. I cannot give an answer off hand.

Pandit Lakshmi Kantu Maltra: Is the Government aware that there were many persons in the employ of the Government of India who had been dismissed

during their service as police reports relating to their political activities. Has Government decided to remove the ban in respect of them so that they may be eligible for reappointment in Government service?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I think many such bans have been removed. If the Honourable Member will bring to our notice any particular case, I will consider it.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I want to know whether the Government has issued any specific instructions that the ban which previously existed in respect of these persons, who had been dismissed on police reports about their political activities has been removed and that these people are eligible for re-appointment in Government service? How many have actually been re-instated?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: The Honourable Member must appreciate the fact that not even the previous Government removed any person ostensibly for a political reason. That may have been the real reason but the reason they gave was some other reason. Therefore in fact there has been no such order unless you go into each case and find out the real reason. No general order to that effect will have any value.

Shri Mihir Lal Chattopadhyay: Does any disqualification attach to a candidate by reason of his having participated in the freedom movement?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I hope not.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Is Government aware, Sir, that preference is being given to many people who have really obstructed the freedom movement?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes; Government is aware of these unfortunate anomalies.

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena: Will Government take steps to remove those anomalies?

Shri Arun Chandra Guha: Is the Honourable Minister aware of the fact that very often irrelevant considerations, such as too much insistence on age-limits, office experience, etc., are brought in while recruiting new officers, with the result that political workers are naturally excluded from the range of recruitment?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Certain conditions are laid down in regard to recruitment and I should not think that age is an irrelevant consideration in regard to recruitment to an appointment.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: Is the Honourable Minister aware that before any Government appointment is finally made the case of each candidate is referred to the Criminal Investigation Department for a report, and if so, will the Honourable Minister instruct the C.I.D. not to disqualify a particular candidate on the ground that he had taken active part in the freedom movement?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I was not aware that every case is referred to the Criminal Investigation Department; may be some special cases might be referred. But it is not for the Criminal Investigation Department to bar a candidate. They may report as to what they know about a person. The decision has to come from higher levels, and the suggestions which Honourable Members have made will be taken into consideration.

BRITISH OTHER RANKS HOLDING DEPARTMENTAL COMMISSIONS.

649. ***Pandit Hriday Nath Kundra:** (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state what was the total number of posts to which promoted British Other Ranks holding Departmental Commissions were appointed before the 15th of August 1947?

(b) What is the number of posts to which men holding Departmental Commissions are proposed to be appointed in future?

(c) How many promoted British Other Ranks holding such commissions are employed at present in the Indian Army?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) 1,088.

(b) In future there will be no class of officers known as Departmental Commissioned Officers. Promoted other ranks and direct recruits will be granted the same type of commission. No fixed quota of posts will be reserved for promoted other ranks.

(c) There are now 56 Departmental Officers serving with the Indian Army for three months from 1st January 1948, and 84 for longer periods not exceeding two years.

COMMISSIONS FOR V.C.O. MILITARY ASSISTANT STORE KEEPERS.

650. Pandit Hriday Nath Kunru: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state the total number of V. C. O. Military Assistant Store-keepers?

(b) How many of them have been informed that their services will soon be dispensed with?

(c) In view of their high educational qualifications do Government propose to consider the desirability of granting them departmental commissions and employing them in larger numbers?

(d) Have any of them been granted departmental commissions? If so, how many?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) The total number is 1,807.

(b) None.

(c) and (d). Departmental commissions do not now exist, and the question of their grant does not, therefore arise. These V.C.Os are, however, eligible to apply for direct regular and short service regular commissions.

Pandit Hriday Nath Kunru: Will they have to appear before Selection Boards.

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: The usual procedure will be followed.

Pandit Hriday Nath Kunru: Is it proposed to give them any preference in regard to commissioned posts relating to arsenals and similar posts which were formerly held by promoted British other ranks?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I could not give a reply to that question off-hand. I will have to make enquiries and let the Honourable Member know.

Diwan Ohaman Lal: Certain vacancies exist on account of the departure of British other ranks. Are the V.C.O's eligible for them?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: The following reservations have been made for the V.C.O's:

Direct Regular Commission—15.

Short Service Regular Commission—55.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that there is no longer a Viceroy in the country, will Government consider the advisability of changing the designation of V.C.O's?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: That matter is under consideration.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Arising out of answer to part (c), how many of these V.C.O's in all will be retrenched?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I could not give the number of V.C.O's who have been retrenched, but the number of V.C.O's, which is surplus to our requirements is 1,500.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: The total number of V.C.O's was given as 1,307 and the number surplus to requirements as 1,500. How does the Honourable Minister reconcile these figures?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: 1,307 is the total number of V.C.O's who are employed as Military Assistant Store Keepers.

Diwan Ohaman Lall: May I ask my Honourable friend, how, in view of the fact that the strength of the Indian army has not yet been fixed, could give this figure of 1,000 and odd as the number who are liable to be discharged?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: On the present structure of the Army there are in all about 1,500 V.C.O's who are considered to be surplus. This number includes besides Military Assistant Storekeepers those employed on general duties such as office clerks, etc.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: On what basis has this figure been arrived at?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I could not give a reply to that question off-hand.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: What is the strength of the army for which the V.C.O's are required?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: The strength of the army has not yet been fixed.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: How then does the Honourable the Defence Minister come to know the number of V.C.O's who will be surplus to their requirements?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: These figures are based on the estimated strength of the army that was under consideration some time ago. They are, as I have already said, guess figures and the exact number cannot be given at present.

USE OF TEMPORARY STRUCTURES BUILT FOR ARMY DURING WAR.

651. *Shri V. C. Kesava Rao: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state the policy of Government in the matter of disposal of the temporary structures built during the war for the Army?

(b) Is it a fact that the Provincial Governments have made representations that the buildings in their respective Provinces may be handed over to them?

(c) Have Government considered the possibilities of using these structures as hostels and if not, do Government propose to consider the question?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) The policy of Government in the matter of the disposal of temporary structures built during the war for the Army is to offer such structures in the order noted below:

- (i) Other Ministries of Central Government;
- (ii) Provincial Governments or Indian States in which the property is situated; and
- (iii) Owners of land.

Structures not required by these are sold by public auction.

(b) From time to time representations have been received from Provincial Governments in respect of individual properties and have been dealt with on the basis of the policy outlined above, i.e., the property is offered to the Provincial Government concerned if not required by the Central Government.

(c) No; but Government have at the request of Provincial Governments transferred to them many vacant properties temporarily for housing refugees. It is for the Provincial Governments to decide to what use they should put the properties transferred to them.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: May I know whether it is a fact that it is proposed to auction off the aerodrome and its buildings at Bahadurgarh and also it is proposed to dismantle the structures? Could it not be used for housing the refugees?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I require notice of that question; I have no information at present.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Will the Honourable Minister make enquiries into the matter and stop the dismantling of these buildings if they could be used for housing refugees?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I shall consider it.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know if any representations were made to the Honourable Minister's Department requesting the government to prevent the dismantling of buildings which were specifically erected for military purposes, so that the acute housing shortage may be relieved? Was such a representation received from the Government of West Bengal?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I cannot say off-hand whether such representations were received but I can say this for the information of the Honourable Members, that no buildings belonging to the Defence Department are being dismantled at present.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is the Honourable Minister aware that most of these buildings put up in air fields have been sold to contractors, who are dismantling them and taking the materials away?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I have already stated that according to the accepted policy of the Government some buildings were auctioned and they were bought by contractors and they may have been demolished.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not proposed to stop that demolition?

Shri V. O. Kesava Rao: May I know whether any of these buildings are being used as hospitals?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: Some may be used.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: May I know whether the policy referred to by the Honourable Minister was laid down by the previous Government or it is the policy of the present Government? May I further know whether in view of the changed conditions, Government is prepared to revise its policy and keep the air fields intact?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: Originally the policy was laid down by the previous Government. It was revised by the present Government and suitable changes have been made.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know if any steps are being taken by the Government in the Defence Department to see that those buildings which have not been handed over to contractors and which are still under their ownership or management are kept in proper repairs and are handed over to the refugees for temporary occupation?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: That is the policy.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that several houses and camps also are in a very bad state of repairs and are not being attended to nor allotted to the refugees?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: In the last two or three months we received applications for the allotment of these surplus buildings to refugees. These surplus buildings were handed over to the provincial governments and I believe they are being utilised and the necessary repairs are being carried out by the provincial governments.

Mr. E. K. Sidhva: Arising out of part (b), may I know how many such properties have been transferred to the Provincial Government of Bombay?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: I want notice.

Mr. E. K. Sidhva: Is it not a fact that the Bombay Government asked for the Kalyan camps for the purpose of accommodating the refugees and they have been refused?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: As regards the Kalyan Camp I do not think my Honourable friend's information is correct. I cannot give a definite reply but I think it has been handed over to the Bombay Government.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chandhuri: May I know who pays the compensation to the landowner (a) when the buildings are purchased by Government and (b) when the buildings are purchased by other persons? Some of these buildings are on private lands and who pays the compensation to the owners?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: The compensation is paid by the Government of India.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Does the policy outlined by the Honourable Minister apply to British and American structures alike or is there any discrimination?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: There are no British or American structures: all the structures belong to the Government of India.

CANDIDATES RETURNED FROM ABROAD AFTER COMPLETION OF STUDIES.

652. *Shri V. C. Kesava Rao: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Education be pleased to state the number of candidates who have returned to India after completing their studies under the overseas scholarship scheme, subject-wise?

(b) Have any of these candidates applied for assistance to find suitable jobs and if so, what have Government done in the matter?

(c) How many of them are unemployed at present and what steps do Government propose to take to suitably employ them?

انریمل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : (a) اس وقت تک ۴۲ اسکالر گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کے بھجے ہوئے اپنی تعلیم یا کر واپس آچکے ہیں ایک سٹیٹمنٹ (Statement) ہاؤس کی توہیل پر دکھایا جاتا ہے اس سے معلوم ہوجاتا ہے کہ کس کس سبکدوش کے لئے یہ بھجے گئے تھے۔

(b) - پوسٹ وار ڈولپمنٹ پلان (Post-war Development Plan) کو سامنے رکھ کر گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی منسٹریوں نے یہ پلٹ سوچی تھی کہ انہیں آگے چلکر کس کس سبکدوش کے لئے آدمیوں کی ضرورت ہوگی اور پھر اسکالرشپ اسکیم کے اندر جو اسکالرز آئے ہیں وہ اسی پلان کو سامنے رکھ کر بھجے گئے تھے۔ پس جو اسکالرز اب اپنی تعلیم پوری کر کے واپس آ رہے ہیں ان کے لئے یہ سوال پیدا نہیں ہونا کہ

[آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد]

وہ نوکری کھانے گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے درخواست کریں خود گورنمنٹ کا یہ کام ہے کہ وہ انکو کام پر لگائے۔

(c) ۲۲ اسکالرز میں سے ۲۲ کام پر لگائے جا چکے ہیں ۲۰ کا معاملہ ابھی باقی ہے جو ابھی حال میں آئے ہیں۔ امید ہے کہ بہت جلد یہ بھی کام پر لگ جائیں گے۔ ان لوگوں کا معاملہ دوسرے معاملوں سے الگ رکھا جاتا ہے اور ایک خاص کلاس کی طرح دیکھا جاتا ہے۔ اگر کسی اسکالر کے لئے معلوم ہوا کہ اسے فوراً یہاں کام پر نہیں لگایا جا سکتا تو اس صورت میں کوشش کی جائے گی کہ پروانوں کی گورنمنٹوں میں، یونیورسٹیوں میں، ریسرچ انسٹیٹیوٹوں میں اور انڈسٹری میں ان کے لئے جگہ نکالی جائے۔ اس مطلب سے ایک خاص رجسٹر رکھا جاتا ہے اس رجسٹر میں لکھا جاتا ہے کہ کس جگہ کس طرح کے آدمی کی مانگ ہے اور کہاں کہاں انکی کھپت ہو سکتی ہے۔

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: (a) 42 Government of India scholars have so far returned to India after completing their studies under the Overseas Scholarships Scheme. A statement showing the number, subject-wise, is placed on the table of the House.

(b) The scholars under this scheme are sponsored for advanced studies abroad mainly to meet the anticipated needs of the various Ministries of the Government of India in connection with their post-war development plans. A scholar who returns does not, therefore, have to ask for assistance to find a suitable job. Government take up the question of his employment of their own accord.

(c) Of the total number of 42 Government of India scholars who have returned so far, twenty, most of whom have very recently arrived in India, are at present unemployed. Their cases have been taken up with the sponsoring Ministries and a number of them are expected to get employment soon. The question of employment of these scholars is treated as a special case and is given high priority. If, however, for any reason, Government find that the services of a particular scholar are not immediately required by them, these will be offered to Provincial Governments, Universities, Research Institutions, Industry and Indian States according to their requirements. For this purpose Government maintain a register of the requirements of these authorities and organisations.

Statement

Showing Subject-wise the Number of Government of India Overseas Scholars who have so far Returned to India after completion of their studies.

Subject	No. of Scholars Returned
1. Agriculture	3
2. Animal Husbandry	3
3. Automobile Engineering	1
4. Civil Engineering	2
5. Chemical Engineering	1
6. Cinematography	1
7. Dairy	1
8. Economics	1
9. Electrical Engineering	2

Subject	No. of Scholars Returned
10. Fisheries	3
11. Forestry.	1
12. Geology.	1
13. Horticulture.	1
14. Industrial and Applied Chemistry.	2
15. Mechanical Engineering.	3
16. Metallurgical Engineering	3
17. Meteorology.	1
18. Plastics.	2
19. Public Health Engineering.	1
20. Radio Engineering.	2
21. Rubber.	1
22. Scientific Instruments.	2
23. Statistics.	1
24. Wood.	3
TOTAL	42

सेठ गोविन्ददास : क्या माननीय मंत्री इस बात का भी विचार करेंगे कि जब अभी भी बीस ऐसे विद्यार्थी बाकी हैं जिन्हें अभी नौकरी नहीं दी जा सकती है तो भविष्य में सिर्फ वैसे ही विद्यार्थी बाहर भेजे जायें जिनके सब्जेक्ट यहां की यूनिवर्सिटीयों में पढ़ाने के लिये मुकर्रर नहीं हैं।

Seth Govinddas: Will the Honourable Minister please consider that as there are about 20 such students who have not so far been provided with jobs, therefore, only such students be sent abroad in future, for whom facilities for education in their subjects are not available in Indian Universities?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : کئی پچھلے سوالوں کے جواب میں آنریبل ممبر کے سامنے یہ چیز آچکی ہے ، کہ اورسولر اسکالرشپ کی یہ اسکیم پرانی گورنمنٹ کی تھی۔ نئی گورنمنٹ نے یہ محسوس کیا کہ کام ٹھیک طریقہ پر نہیں چل رہا ہے۔ اور اس پر نئے سرے سے غور کرنا چاہئے۔ چنانچہ آئندہ کے لئے بھیجا ہوا بلڈ کر دیا گیا۔ اور ایک کمیٹی بتھائی گئی تاکہ پورے معاملہ پر سوچ بچار کر کے رپورٹ پیش کرے۔ گورنمنٹ کو یہ رپورٹ مل گئی ہے اور آئندہ نئے تھلگ پر یہ اسکیم چلائی جائے گی۔

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: In reply to a number of previous questions it has already been brought to the notice of the Honourable Member that the overseas scholarship scheme was a creation of the old Government. The new Government realised that the scheme was not being run properly and the scheme should, therefore, be reconsidered. Accordingly sending of students abroad was stopped for the future. A committee was set up to consider the whole matter and make a report. Government have received the Committee's report, and the scheme will now be run on new lines.

श्री एच० वी० कामय : यह ४२ स्कालर जिनका ट्रिक्लर पार्ट (c) के जवाब में कहा गया है वह दुनियां के किन् मुल्कों में तालीम पाकर वापस आये हैं।

Shri H. V. Kamath: What are the countries where these 42 scholars who have been referred to in reply to part (c), obtained their education?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : جو سٹیٹمنٹ دکھایا گیا ہے اس میں اسکی پوری تفصیل دی گئی ہے - کچھ یو - کے - اور کچھ یو - ایس - اے - بھجھ گئے تھے - اور مخالف سہجھکس کے لئے جیسے ایگریکلچرل کیمسٹری - کیمیکل انڈسٹری وغیرہ -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: Details have been given in the statement placed before the House. Some of these students were sent to U.K. and others to U.S.A. for different subjects such as Agricultural Chemistry, Chemical Industry etc.

Shrimati G. Durgabai: May I know how many out of these 42 students who have returned are women?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : اس میں کوئی وومن (woman) نہیں ہے -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: There is no woman among them.

Shri V. C. Kesava Rao: May I know whether any industrialists have asked for the services of these candidates?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : اس وقت میں اس کا جواب نہیں دے سکتا - جو ہمیں باقی ہیں ان کے لئے کوشش کی جا رہی ہے - اور امید کی جاتی ہے کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا منسٹریوں ہی میں ان کے لئے جگہ نکل آئے گی -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: I cannot reply this question at the moment. Efforts are being made and it is hoped that suitable jobs will be provided for those remaining 20 in the Ministries of the Government of India.

پلڈت ہردے ناتھ کٹرزو : جب گورنمنٹ کے اسکالر واپس سے تعلیم پا کر اور دوسرے ملکوں سے تعلیم پا کر واپس آتے ہیں تو کیا اسات کا لحاظ رکھا جاتا ہے کہ وہ ایسے عہدوں پر مقرر کئے جائیں جہاں ان کی اعلیٰ درجہ کی تعلیم کام آئے -

Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzra: When Government scholars return from abroad after receiving education do Government take care to see that they are placed in jobs where their high education can best be utilised?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : تھک ہے - یہی پلان (Plan) سامنے رکھ کر انہیں بھجھا گیا تھا - اور انہیں ایسی ہی جگہوں پر لگایا جائیگا -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: It is so. They were sent abroad with this end in view. They will be appointed to such posts.

پلڈت ہردے ناتھ کٹرزو : کیا وزیر تعلیم صاحب کو معلوم ہے کہ بعض لوگ جن کو خاص طریقہ کی تعلیم ملی وہ ہندوستان واپس آنے کے بعد ایسے کام پر لگائے گئے جس میں اس تعلیم سے کوئی فائدہ نہیں پہنچ سکتا تھا -

Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzra: Is the Honourable Minister for Education aware that some of the scholars who obtained special kind of education abroad, were appointed on their return to India to posts where no benefit could result from their education?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : مہرے علم میں اس طرح کا کوئی کیس نہیں آیا ہے
 لیکن اگر اس طرح کا کوئی کیس ہے تو اس پر ضرور دھیان دیا جائے گا

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: I am not aware of any such case, but if there is any such instance, it will surely be looked into.

Dr. V. Subramaniam: When there is a round necessity for their employment in the agricultural and scientific departments, what is the necessity for the delay in the appointment of these scholars?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : میں نہیں سمجھا کہ سوال سے اس بات کا کیا تعلق ہے - ۴۲ اسکالر واپس آئے - جن میں سے ۲۰ ابھی حال میں آئے ہیں - ان میں سے لئے انتظام کرنے میں کچھ وقت ضرور لگے گا -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: I do not think the question has any connection with this matter. 42 students have returned, 20 of whom quite recently. It will surely take some time to provide them with jobs.

श्री एच० वी० कामत : क्या आगे चलकर गवर्नमेंट स्त्रियों को भेजने पर गौर करेगी ।

Shri H. V. Kamath: Will Government in future, consider the question of sending women abroad?

آنریبل مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد : گورنمنٹ پہلی کھیوں میں استریاں بھیج چکی ہے اور آئندہ جب کبھی اسکالر بھیجے جائیں گے - تو ضرور عورتیں بھی بھیجی جائیں گی -

The Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad: Government has sent some women in the first batches and in future if students are sent abroad women will also be included.

LICENCED LIQUOR SHOPS IN DELHI AND NEW DELHI

653. *Shri V. C. Kesava Rao: (a) Will the Honourable Minister of Finance be pleased to state the number of licensed liquor shops in Delhi and New Delhi and the income under this head during the last financial year?

(b) Do Government propose to introduce prohibition in the city in the immediate future?

The Honourable Shri B. K. Shanmukham Chetty: (a) The number of licensed liquor shops in Delhi and New Delhi during the financial year 1946-47 was 34 and 39 respectively, and the income derived from the consumption of liquor was Rs. 42,85,730.

(b) The matter is engaging the attention of Government.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: May I know whether the attention of Government has been drawn in this respect to a resolution passed by the Advisory Council of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi asking that there should be progressive prohibition and that no new shops should be opened in any locality?

The Honourable Shri B. K. Shanmukham Chetty: I do not think any new shop has been opened; as a matter of fact during the current year, that is 1947-48, we have closed a number of shops.

Shri K. Santhanam: May I know if the Honourable Minister's reply to part (b) means that the Government have accepted the principle of prohibition and are considering the method of its introduction, or whether they are still considering the question of acceptance of the very principle?

The Honourable Shri R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: I think it may be taken for granted that the Government accept the principle of prohibition.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: Will the contemplated prohibition extend to Europeans, Sikhs and Parsis and will it also prevent the distillation of liquor for domestic and private purposes; or will they be exempted with a view to saving revenue to Government?

Mr. Speaker: I think he is asking for details of the prohibition.

Srimati G. Durgabai: When some of the Provincial Governments have made rapid progress in the matter of prohibition may I know what are the reasons which prevent the Government of India from introducing it?

The Honourable Shri R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: The question relates to Delhi and New Delhi. One of the practical points to be taken into consideration is the proximity of other areas where prohibition has not been introduced. We have therefore to adopt our policy in such a manner that anything that we do is really effective.

Shri Khurshed Lal: Is it a fact that the income from this source is increasing every year?

The Honourable Shri R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: I think in many cases the income increases. That shows that people who want to drink do pay more even when we tax them more.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Is not it the reply of the Honourable Minister that "it may be taken for granted that Government is in favour of prohibition" somewhat evasive? Can the Honourable Minister not give a more definite reply?

The Honourable Shri R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: It is very positive.

Shri H. V. Kamath: Has the Honourable Minister any information in his possession to show which class or section of the community patronise these liquor shops in Delhi and New Delhi?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it arises.

PROVISIONS FOR STUDY OF AYURVEDIC SYSTEM OF MEDICINE

654. *Shri V. G. Kesava Rao: Will the Honourable Minister of Health be pleased to state:

(a) what steps Government propose to take to promote the study of Ayurvedic system of medicine; and

(b) whether Government propose to consider the question of instituting a chair for the comparative study of Ayurvedic and Allopathic systems in one of the centrally administered universities?

The Honourable Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: (a) Government have appointed a Committee on Indigenous Systems of Medicine to report on the steps to be taken to promote the usefulness of the indigenous systems of medicine.

(b) This is a matter for the Universities concerned.

Seth Govinddas: Is the Committee considering the advisability of opening a separate Ayurvedic College in Delhi and work it as a model college for the whole of India?

The Honourable Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I have to wait for the Report of the Committee.

Seth Govinddas: But has this subject also been suggested to the Committee?

The Honourable Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: The Committee has received advice and heard witnesses from all the Provinces and all these things will be considered when the Report is ready. I have already stated on the floor of this House that the Report is delayed owing to the illness of the Chairman.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Is the Honourable Minister aware of the fact that the Ayurvedic and Unani Tibbi College, Delhi which was started by the late-Hakim Ajmal Khan which is in a bad condition today? Has the Honourable Minister's attention been drawn to it and is Government taking steps to see that this college, which was an all-India institution, is made to function properly?

The Honourable Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Government is aware of the existence of the Tibbi College and representations have been made to Government. The matter will receive consideration when the question is taken up in its entirety.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say something in regard to this question to supplement what my colleague has said? Government look upon this matter not as one of supporting Ayurvedic, Unani, Allopathic, Homoeopathic or any system: they look upon it as supporting science and the method of science. If by supporting the method of science, Unani prospers, well and good and Government will support it. But if Unani or Ayurveda is opposed to science, it will not be supported. It is the method that counts. These names are labels for various types of medicines. The whole progress of the last two hundred years in medicine, which has been labelled in various ways, has been owing to the application of the method of science. Any system might have failed occasionally, but Government does not propose to swerve by a hair's breadth from that principle. In so far as the application of that method of science to Allopathy, Homoeopathy, Ayurvedic or Unani system helps them, we shall help them to the uttermost limit. But in so far as the system is opposed to the method of science it will not be helped by Government. Government has no doubt that the Unani and Ayurvedic medicines are very good and therefore they can be used. But any system having secret medicines is bad and we are not going to encourage such a system whether it is Ayurved, Unani or the rest. The subject should therefore be looked upon from the point of view of bringing in all methods of approach in regard to the curing or prevention of disease from the scientific viewpoint and taking full advantage of all that Ayurved or Unani system or any other system has to offer.

Shri Biswanath Das: May I know whether Government is aware of the fact that the Ayurvedic system of treatment is a science full in itself and stands by itself? May I ask why while the other systems of treatment, namely allopathy and other systems, are having State patronage in this country by instituting graduate, post graduate and research courses and studies and Ayurved is having nothing?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid this is going into an argument.

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: In view of the fact that even now the allopathic system has not been extended far and wide on account of various considerations, may I ask whether a research institute will be started immediately to find out how far the Ayurved and other indigenous systems may be encouraged provided they come to the scientific standards? The Honourable Minister said it is left to the Universities to do this. May I ask the Prime Minister whether institutes sponsored by Government will be started to investigate how far these systems can be encouraged if they come up to the required scientific standards?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: That, I take it, is one of the functions of the Committee that has been appointed.

Shri H. V. Karpath: Is it not a fact that there are many magnificent scientific treatises on these indigenous systems, the only hiatus being that they have fallen into neglect owing to the lack of State patronage?

Mr. Speaker: It is an argument. The question need not be answered.

श्री राम सहाय : चीजों के गुण अवगुण जानने का जो प्राचीन तरीका आयुर्वेद में था उसके जानने की कोई स्कीम मिनिस्ट्री के ज़रे गौर है क्या।

Shri Ram Sahai: Have Government any scheme under consideration for the study of ancient Ayurvedic system for the determination of efficacy of derivatives from which medicine were prepared?

आमरेबल राजकुमारी अमृत कौर : मैं जानने भी आपसे कह चुकी हूँ कि कमेटी मुकर्रर की गई थी और इस की रिपोर्ट जब आएगी तो उस पर गौर किया जाएगा।

The Honourable Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I have already stated that a committee was appointed and this matter will be considered on receipt of the report of this committee.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON ENTRY TO SOME HOTELS AND CLUBS IN INDIAN UNION

655. **Shri V. C. Kesava Rao:** Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government are aware that in some public hotels and clubs within the Indian Union, admission is restricted to people who wear the European type of dress; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, whether Government propose to take steps to remove the restriction?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: (a) Government is not aware of any such instance in so far as Centrally administered areas are concerned.

(b) Does not arise.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF SURVEYORS OF M. E. S.

4. **Shri Deshbandhu Gupta:** Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state the minimum technical qualifications and the grades of pay fixed for the various categories of the Surveyors of Works Cadre and the corresponding appointments in the Buildings and Roads Cadre of the Military Engineering Services?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) I lay a statement on the table of the House.

Statements

Buildings and Roads Cadre.

Surveyors of Works Cadre.

Serial No.	Category	Basic Technical qualifications	Grades of pay	Category	Basic Technical qualifications	Grades of pay
1	Surveyors Assistant Grade II.	(i) Engineering degree from a recognised University unless selected from Overseer. & (ii) A 'Pass' in the S. W. M. E. S. First professional examination. (i) Engineering degree as for surveyor Assistant Grade II unless selected from S.D.O. &	<i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 60.4-100-EB-5-150-EB-5-175 plus Technical Allowance. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 100.8-140-10-200-EB-10-300. <i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 150-10-300-EB-25/2-400 plus Technical Allowance.	Overseer Superintendent B/R Grade II. S. D. O. B/R Superintendent B/R Grade I.	Overseer Diploma from any recognised Engineering Institution. Engineering degree from a recognised University or departmental examination for S. D. Os. B/R. Engineering Degree from a recognised University.	<i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 60.4-100-EB-5-150-EB-5-175. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 100.8-140-10-200-EB-10-300. <i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 150-10-300-EB-25/2-400. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 250-15-340-EB-15-400. <i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 400-25-550-EB-25-650-40-730-EB-40-850. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 350-350-380-380-30-590-EB-30-770-40-850.
2	Surveyors Assistant Grade I.	(i) As for S. A. Grade I. & (ii) A 'Pass' in the S. W. M. E. S. intermediate examination.	<i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 400-25-550-EB-25-650-40-730-EB-40-850. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 350-350-380-380-30-590-EB-30-770-40-850.	Assistant Engineer Assistant Frequentive Engineer/ Assistant Garrison Engineer/ Resident Engineer.	Engineering Degree from a recognised University.	<i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 400-25-550-EB-25-650-40-730-EB-40-850. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 350-350-380-380-30-590-EB-30-770-40-850.
3	Surveyor of works/ Assistant Technical Examiner.	(i) As for S. A. Grade I. & (ii) A 'Pass' in the S. W. M. E. S. Final Examination.	<i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 400-25-550-EB-25-650-40-730-EB-40-850. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 350-350-380-380-30-590-EB-30-770-40-850.	Assistant Engineer Assistant Frequentive Engineer/ Assistant Garrison Engineer/ Resident Engineer.	Engineering Degree from a recognised University.	<i>Old Scale</i> Rs. 400-25-550-EB-25-650-40-730-EB-40-850. <i>New Scale</i> Rs. 350-350-380-380-30-590-EB-30-770-40-850.

Surveyor of Works Cadre			Buildings and Roads Cadre.			
Serial No.	Category	Basic Technical qualifications	Grades of pay	Category	Basic Technical qualifications	Grades of pay
4	Deputy Superintending Surveyor of Works/Technical Examiner.	Same as for surveyor of works.	<p>Old Scale</p> <p>Same as for S. Ws. plus Ra. 100 Technical Allowance.</p> <p>New Scale</p> <p>Ra. 600-60-1,000-1,000-1,000-1,100-1,100-1,100.</p>	Executive Engineer/ Garrison Engineer/ Deputy Superintending Engineer.	As above.	<p>New Scale</p> <p>Ra. 600-40-1,000-1,000-1,000-1,100-1,100-1,100.</p>
5	Superintending Surveyor of Works/ Superintending Technical Examiner.	Same as for S. Ws.	<p>Old Scale</p> <p>Same as for S. Ws. plus Ra. 200 Technical Allowance.</p> <p>New Scale</p> <p>Ra. 1,200-60-1,600</p>	Superintending Engineer	As above.	<p>New Scale</p> <p>Ra. 1,200-60-1,600.</p>

DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATIONS BY ROYAL INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED SURVEYORS

5. Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: Will the Honourable Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount paid to the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors as fees for the departmental examination conducted by them for the Military Engineering Services, and the reasons why such examinations could not be conducted under the aegis of the Institute of Engineers India; and

(b) the necessity of examining the candidates in the following subjects (i) English Law of Contracts, (ii) English Arbitration Act, and (iii) Analysis of Rates?

The Honourable Sardar Baldev Singh: (a) The total amount is approximately Rs. 3,800 of which nearly Rs. 825 are refundable, as some of the candidates have since withdrawn their names. These examinations are peculiar to the profession of Quantity Surveyors, who are at present employed only in the Military Engineer Services. The recognised examination is the one conducted by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, as the Institute of Engineers, India do not hold such examinations at present.

(b) I am advised that these subjects are very useful even to Indian Officers. The general principles governing the Law of Contracts and Arbitration are the same both in England and here. As regards Analysis of Rates, although there may be some variations in the labour constants of different countries, the relative proportions between the various constants remain the same.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE

(INFORMATION PROMISED IN REPLIES TO CERTAIN QUESTIONS—LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE—TODAY).

Mr. Manu Subedar's Supplementary Question to Sir Cowasjee Jehangir's Short Notice Question of 12th November, 1946

REDUCTION IN PRICES OF MATCHES

The Honourable Dr. John Matthai stated in reply to Mr. Manu Subedar's Starred Question No. 382 answered on the 11th November 1946, that the quality of matches depends upon the quality of Potassium Chlorate and of wood.

Good quality Potassium Chlorate is produced in adequate quantities in India but the match manufacturers were not getting the right type of wood in sufficient quantities. The Andaman Islands were an important source of supply of matchwood and this supply was cut off after the occupation of the Island by the Japanese.

In regard to supply of wood, the Government of India addressed Provincial Governments and States, in November, 1946, for assistance in reserving certain species of wood suitable for the manufacture of matches. Almost all the Provinces and States which produce the appropriate species of timber have agreed to reserve them for the manufacture of matches.

Supplies of match timber from the Andamans are also coming in in adequate quantities. From the date of re-occupation to the end of 1946, the Island has supplied 5,329 tons of match logs and 655 tons of match splints to India, which is about 74 per cent. of the total match timber production of the Islands during this period. In 1947 the Islands have supplied 12,230 tons of match logs and 1,287 tons of match splints.

With the improved supply of match wood the quality of matches is also expected to improve.

Pandit Shri Krishna Dutt Paliwal's Starred Question No. 1174 (a) and (b) of 25th March, 1947

I.N.A. OFFICERS EMPLOYED IN PERMANENT SERVICES IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(a) **NS.**

(b) **Two.**

Supplementary Questions to Shri R. R. Dinkar's Starred Question No. 184
of 20th November, 1947

SUPPLY OF FERTILISING MATERIAL

Experiments were started in the Agronomy Division of this institute in the year 1945-46 at the instance of the Ministry of Agriculture to see whether sannhemp grown in another field, such as on the waste land on either side of the Railways and incorporated in the fields of the cultivator, direct or after composting would prove as effective for green manuring purposes as that grown *in situ* or that used as an artificial mulch. Wheat Ph. C. 518 was used as the test crop. The results are given in the table below :—

Yield of wheat grain in mounds per acre

Treatments	Yield.
No green manure (control)	28.5
Sannhemp brought from another field and buried at 200 mds. per acre.	29.5
Sannhemp brought from another field and buried after composting	30.7
Sannhemp brought from another field and used as artificial mulch	29.6
Sannhemp grown <i>in situ</i> and buried at 200 mds. per acre	26.8
Sannhemp grown <i>in situ</i> and used as mulch	33.0
Critical difference (5 per cent.)	3.06

Green manuring with sannhemp brought from outside has been slightly more effective than that with sannhemp grown *in situ* though the difference is not statistically significant.

In 1946-47 the experiment was repeated in another field using fertilizers with green manuring. Wheat Ph. C. 518 was grown and the following results were obtained. Sannhemp was buried at 200 mds. per acre.

Yield of wheat grain in mounds per acre

Treatments per acre	No green manure	Sannhemp <i>in situ</i>	Sannhemp from outside	Sannhemp from outside after composting	Average
A. No manure	17.88	17.51	18.25	17.38	17.76
B. Am Sulph 40 lb. N	16.10	18.25	19.79	17.01	17.79
C. Superphos. 80 lb. P ₂ O ₅	24.99	25.63	23.12	21.61	23.84
D. B plus C	23.25	18.97	20.73	22.73	20.68
Average	20.54	19.34	20.47	19.70	

Critical difference (5 per cent. level) for green manuring treatments 4.42

Critical difference for fertilizers 2.71

Critical difference for treatment combinations 5.43

Here, though green manuring with sannhemp brought from outside, gave slightly increased yields over green manuring with sannhemp grown *in situ*, the results are not statistically significant. Best results have been obtained with green manuring in conjunction with superphosphate.

A summary of results of experiments, which were conducted in different provinces of India, to study the comparative manurial values of green manure crops brought from outside and buried in fields for green manuring.

The green manure crops employed in the field experiments were, with a few exceptions, all leguminous crops. The relative values of such crops were generally compared with either,

(a) No manure,

(b) The same crops grown *in situ*,

or (c) Farmyard manure and other fertilisers.

(a) *Comparison with 'no manure'*.—Joani, N. V. (Pusa, 1922) has reported that green manuring with the leaves of sannhemp, *dhaencha*, guar and cowpea increased the yield of oat grain by more than 50 per cent. on the average, over the control.

According to Hutchinson, C.M. (Pusa, 1916), well fermented sannhemp when applied to the field, the per acre yield of oat grain was 1,540 lbs. while control yielded only 885 lbs.

Harrison, E. H. (Madras) has indicated from tests carried out at Coimbatore and Palur that green leaves and stems of *Calotropis gigantea* and wild indigo (*Tephrosia purpurea*), etc., when trampled in at the same time of puddling, gave an increased yield of paddy grain of about 18 to 20 per cent. and at the same time the cost of manure is small.

Gokhale, V. G. and Habbu, V.S. (Bombay, 1927) have asserted, on the basis of their field experiments that compared with land without manure, there was 113 per cent. increase of rice grain by adding green topping manure of *Tephrosia candida*.

Lander, P. E., Wilson, B. H. and Lal, M. M. (Punjab, 1923), observed that there was substantial increase in the yield of wheat from plots treated with *guara* (cut from elsewhere and buried) as compared with that of the untreated plots.

At Gorakhpur Farm (U. P.), green rotted water hyacinth @ 4,690 lbs. per acre gave a significant increase of 20 per cent. of paddy over no manure.

At Anakapalle Farm (Madras) green leaf of *aman* @ 3,000 lbs. per acre as a basic manure with residual effect of bonemeal @ 112 per acre applied during the previous year, the average percentage increase in yields of paddy was 10 over no manure.

At Mangalalur Farm (Madras) green leaves @ 2,000 lbs. per acre plus super @ 120 lbs. per acre was better than no manure for the paddy crop.

At Alibagh (Bombay), green leaf manure @ 60 lbs. nitrogen per acre gave significant increases in yield of paddy over no manure.

According to Allan, R. G., at Labhandi Farm (C. P.), 1925-26 to 1929-30 sannhemp (cut and applied) gave 52 per cent. more yield of paddy than no manure plot.

(b) *Comparison with the same crop grown in situ*—Joshi, N. V. (Pusa, 1922) found that only the leaves of *aman*, *dhaencha*, guar and cowpea very substantially increased the yield of oats when their whole plants were buried *in situ*.

The field experiments of Hutchinson, C. M. (Pusa, 1916) indicated that plots treated with fermented *sanai* gave the yield of oat grain @ 1,540 lbs. per acre as compared with grown *in situ*.

At Samalkot Farm (Madras) green leaves @ 2,000 lbs. per acre plus bonemeal @ 224 lbs. per acre plus ammonium sulphate @ 78 lbs. per acre gave no significant increase in yields of paddy over green manure alone. At Maruteru Farm, green leaves @ 4,000 lbs. per acre plus top dressing of different artificial were found no better than green manure alone.

Results of paddy reported by Sethi, R. L. (1940), indicated that during 1934-35 at Nagina Farm (U. P.) when the green manure crop was brought from outside and ploughed in, it did not show any response indicating definitely the value of growing the crop *in situ* and ploughing in the roots of plants. In another experiment when the economics of growing the crop *in situ* and in outside plots were worked out, it was found that the growth *in situ* gave a net profit of Rs. 53-12-0, while the profit was reduced to Rs. 37 when the green manure crop was grown in outside plots.

(c) *Comparison with Farmyard manure and other fertilizers*.—Gokhale, V. G. and Habbu, V. E. (Kanara, Bombay 1922), have shown that compared with the land treated with farm ard manure containing a similar amount of dry matter (4,000 lbs.) per acre there was 46 per cent. increase of rice grain by adding green topping manure of *Tephrosia candida*.

According to Basu (Bengal 1925-26 to 1930-31) an experiment to test the effects of water hyacinth green @ 200 mda. per acre applied to *aman* paddy grown in Dacca Farm, gave more than 14 per cent. increase in yield over normal manure during all the three years of experiment for which data were available.

At Gurdaspur (Punjab) *barani* area, bhong imported from other fields and barried showed high increases in yield of wheat between 10 to 11½ per cent. over normal manure for increasing doses of 5.5 tons, 17.6 tons and 26.4 tons respectively per acre in the year of application. These results were confirmed by a similar experiment in another block, though the percentage increases this time varied from 39 to 74 only. But the residual effects observed for 6 years were not consistent in the 2 blocks.

At Samalkot Farm (Madras) for paddy crop green leaf @ 4,000 per acre plus bonemeal @ 224 lbs. per acre was better than cyanamide @ 224 per acre or fish guano @ 336 lbs. per acre. Also, green leaf (basic) @ 4,000 lbs. per acre plus bonemeal on cyanamide @ 224 lbs. per acre, gave no increases over green leaf alone.

At Palur Farm (Madras) for paddy green leaves @ 4,800 lbs. per acre was found better than cake @ 500 lbs. per acre.

At Manganallur Farm (Madras) for paddy green leaf @ 4,000 lbs. per acre plus ammonium sulphate @ 224 lbs. per acre, was better than green leaf or green leaf plus cyanamide @ 224 lbs. per acre.

At Aduthurai Farm (Madras) for paddy green leaf @ 50 lbs. nitrogen per acre was better than normal manure or nitrate.

At Alibagh (Bombay) *Karanj* leaves @ 4,000 lbs. per acre plus bonemeal at 46 lbs. per acre gave greater yield of paddy than *Karanj* leaves by 30 per cent.

As indicated by Allan, R. G. at Labhandi Farm (C. P. 1925-26 to 1929-30) *arnai* (cut and applied) gave 34 and 12 per cent. more yield of paddy than cattle dung and urine-earth respectively.

References.

1. Joshi, N. V. (1922).—Comparative manurial value of the whole plants and the different parts of green manures—Agr. Res. Inst. Pusa, Bul. No. 141.
2. Hutchinson, C. M. (1916).—A modified method of green manuring, Agr. Res. Inst. Pusa, Bul. No. 63.
3. Harrison, W. H. —Indigenous manures of South India and their application—Madras Dept. Agr. Bul. No. 65, Vol. 3.
4. Gokhale, V. G. and Habbu V. S. (1927).—Trees and shrubs for producing green manure in the Konkan and North Kanara. Bombay Dept. Agr. Bul. No. 141 of 1927.
5. Lander, P. K., Wilson, B. H. and Lal, M. M. (1923).—A study of the factors operative in the value of green manure—Agr. Res. Inst. Pusa, Bul. No. 149.
6. I. C. A. R.—Analyses of manurial experiments in India, Vol. II 1933
7. Sethi, R. L. (1940).—Manuring of Paddy, I. C. A. R. Bul. No. 38, p. 13.
8. A consolidated record of the field experimental work carried by the Department of Agriculture, C. P. between 1900 to 1930.

Shri Mohanlal Sakseena's Starred Question No. 232 of 21st November, 1947

VARIOUS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

List of Agreements referred to in Para. A (ii) of the Reply to part (a) of the question	Violations of the Agreements by the Pakistan Government
1. Agreement regarding no change in the basic organisation and nomenclature of Army Formations, Units, etc., until the completion of the reconstitution of the Armed Forces.	1. Ordinance promulgated by the Government of Pakistan constituting a National Guard Organisation in Pakistan.
2. Agreements Pertaining to refugees and their movement, etc.	
(a) Mass exchange of population between East Punjab and West Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province.	(a) NIL

List of Agreements referred to in Para. A
(ii) of the Reply to part (a) of the question

Violations of the Agreements by the
Pakistan Government.

(b) Protection to refugees and evacuees in both East and West Punjab and getting them safely across the border under proper Military escort; top priority to safe and speedy movement of evacuee convoys.

(b) A number of attacks on refugee-trains in West Punjab took place and the Government of Pakistan failed to give adequate protection to non-muslim refugees. Matters improved subsequently when an agreement was reached regarding systematic evacuation by train.

(c) Refusal to recognise illegal possession of property; safeguarding of refugees property and the appointment of Custodian of Refugees property.

(c) Summary sales of shops and other property left by non-muslims in West Punjab by the Custodian of Evacuees' Property in West Punjab, are reported.

(d) Stopping of searches of persons and personal effects subject to each Government retaining right to prohibit bulk transfer of Merchandise.

(d) Searches of non-muslims leaving Pakistan continued unabated throughout the evacuation, except in Sind where searches were considerably reduced as a result of our protest.

(e) Refusal to recognise abduction of women and forced conversions and restoration of abducted women and girls to their families.

(e) In West Punjab forcible conversions took place in large numbers, also, to some extent, in Sind.

(f) Responsibility for feeding for providing medical aid, and security of evacuees in camps awaiting transfer to the other Dominion.

(f) Refugees in certain of the camps in West Punjab were not fed for a number of days by the Pakistan Government, and in North West Frontier Province rations were issued only against payment.

(g) Restoration of peaceful conditions in the Punjab by both Central and Provincial Governments working together in closest co-operation, so that minorities can live in security.

(g) At a number of places in West Punjab non-muslim minorities have been subjected to brutalities.

(h) Protection to property held by religious, charitable and Cultural institutions and restoration of religious places destroyed or desecrated or occupied by members of any other community.

(h) Several instances of violation have come to notice.

(i) Preventions of the publication of false and inflammatory material and avoidance of statements by responsible persons which are either belittling or one-sided.

(i) Do.

(j) Agreement relating to banks and bank records.

(j) Many complaints were received of interference with withdrawals of funds from banks evacuation of bank staff, prohibition of transfer of bank balances, etc., etc.

(3) Agreement on Economic Relations (Trade) and (Control).

(3) This agreement was violated by:—

(i) the imposition of a ban by Sind Government on the movement of merchandise.

(ii) the levy of an export duty on raw jute transported across the land frontiers of Pakistan; and

(iii) continued import of luxury goods by Pakistan after 30-9-47 in violation of the agreement on economic controls;

List of Agreements referred to in Para. A (ii) of the Reply to part (a) of the question	Violations of the Agreements by the Pakistan Government
4. Agreements regarding.—	4. (i) to (iii) Nil.
(i) Clearance work connected with certain imports and exports;	
(ii) the placing of orders and the procurement of stores following the establishment of the two Dominions;	
(iii) Allocation to Pakistan or India of the rights and liabilities of the Governor General in Council in respect of contracts entered into by him before 15th August 1947;	
(iv) Standstill agreement for the maintenance of status quo in all matters affecting trade and movement of Goods as far as possible up to the end of current financial year.	(iv) No supplies of salt have been received from Pakistan since 15th August 1947.
5. Agreements to maintain status quo regarding customs, central excise and avoidance of double taxation on income.	5. The agreement has been violated by the imposition of export duty by Pakistan Government on jute exported from East Bengal to India. Several complaints have also been received regarding the levy, by the Karachi Customs, of duty on passengers baggage and other "in transit" goods to India from places outside India and Pakistan.
(6) (i) Agreements relating to the partition of Railways.	(6) (i) Stores due from the North-Western Railway have not been received.
	(ii) The full complement of locomotives due from Pakistan has not been received.
	(iii) Complaints received from staff who were serving in Railways which now fall in Pakistan and who had retired before the 14th August 1947 show that they have not received their settlement dues.
7. (a) Standstill agreement regarding railway priorities, petrol rationing and motor vehicle spare parts.	7. (a) Nil.
(b) Agreement covering reciprocal arrangements in regard to recognition of certificates and licences issued under the Inland Steam Vessels Act, 1917.	(b) Pakistan Government have not yet implemented this agreement.
8. Agreements relating to	8. (a) and (b) Nil.
(a) Civil Aviation; and (b) Posts and Telegraphs.	
9. Arrangements relating to foodstuffs.	Nil.

Seth Govinddas's Starred Question No. 286 (g) of 25th November, 1947

**PUBLIC AUCTION OF UNSERVICEABLE AIRCRAFTS AT AIRCRAFT SALVAGE DEPOTS
AT CHEKRI AND BAMRAULI IN OCTOBER, 1947**

The total number of serviceable and unserviceable aircraft sold by the Disposals Organisation (Regional as well as Headquarters, up to the 9th January 1948) is as follows :—

Sold to	Serviceable	Unserviceable
Government Departments	57	Nil.
Indian States	27	Nil.
Other Parties	177	527
Total :	261	527

Sri Jashwanth Sahay's Starred Question No. 363 of 20th November, 1947.

GRANTS TO PROVINCES FOR 'GROW MORE FOOD CAMPAIGN'

Statement showing the grants allotted and the amounts actually spent for G. M. F. schemes during 1944-45 by certain provinces and reasons for excess or savings.

Sl. No.	Provinces	Final appropriations of the amounts allotted	Actual Expenditure	Excess (-) or Savings (-)	Reasons for excess or savings
1.	Bihar	9,72,346	9,45,158	(-) 27,090	Savings due to (i) non-availability of suitable Engineering staff (ii) labour shortage and (iii) delay in completing minor Irrigation Schemes.
2.	U. P.	3,74,543	3,35,810	(-) 38,733	Savings due to scarcity of labour and material.
3.	Madras	26,04,771	17,92,545	(-) 7,32,226	Savings due to (i) Adjustment of expenditure upto 31.12.44 only instead upto 31.3.45 (ii) less subsidy to ryots in the newly reclaimed areas (iii) late starting of certain schemes.
4.	Bombay	15,20,483	15,20,483	Nil	..
5.	C. P. & Bihar	6,62,925	1,23,823	(-) 6,39,112	Savings due to (i) paucity of staff (ii) transport difficulties.

Statement showing the grants allotted and the amounts actually spent For G. M. F. schemes during 1945-46 by certain provinces and reasons for excesses or savings

Sl. No.	Provinces	Final appropriation or the amounts allotted	Actual Expenditure	Excess + or Savings (-)	Reasons for excesses or savings
1.	Bihar	16,57,000	12,44,372	(-) 3,12,628	Savings due to (i) less distribution of seed and oil cake than anticipated and (ii) less recovery of improved paddies.
2.	U. P.	16,83,000	16,81,153	(-) 21,847	Savings due to scarcity of labour and material.
3.	Madras	12,45,000	16,02,405	(+) 3,47,405	Excesses due to the certain additional schemes undertaken during the end of the year to cope with famine conditions in the provinces.
4.	Bombay	32,46,000	27,15,210	(-) 5,30,790	Savings mainly due to (i) less purchase of seeds and manures and (ii) payment of less subsidy to cultivators for construction of wells and tanks.
5.	C. P. & Berar	6,79,000	6,01,268	(-) 77,732	Savings due to (i) short supply of seeds & manures inadequacy of staff and transport difficulties.

Statement showing the grants allotted and the amounts actually spent for G. M. F. schemes during 1946-47 by certain provinces and reasons for excesses or savings

Sl. No.	Province	Final appropriations or the amounts allotted	Actual Expenditure	Excess (+) or Savings (-)	Reasons for excesses or savings
1.	Bihar	12,91,000	10,36,636	(-) 2,44,374	Savings due to some of the Post-war Development Schemes being provided for, as G. M. F. Schemes.
2.	U. P.	22,42,000	21,17,699	(-) 1,24,301	Savings mainly due to scarcity of labour and material.
3.	Madras	1,98,39,000	1,76,37,932	(-) 21,91,068	Savings were mainly due to the late starting of certain schemes.
4.	Bombay	46,06,000	32,01,780	(-) 14,04,220	Savings are mainly due to (i) less purchase of seeds and manures and (ii) less subsidy to cultivators for construction of wells and tanks (iii) non-execution of the schemes during the year.
5.	C. P. & Berar	8,64,000	7,17,549	(-) 1,46,451	Savings due to (i) short supply of seeds and manures (ii) paucity of staff & transport difficulties.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra's Starred Question No. 365(f) of 26th
November, 1947**

**MONETARY LOSS DUE TO DELAY IN RETROCESSION OF SECTIONS OF B. A. RAILWAY
APPORTIONED TO INDIA UNDER BOUNDARY COMMISSION AWARD**

A statement showing amount of traffic receipts remitted to the E. B. Railway (Pakistan) in respect of stations later transferred to India as a result of Radcliffe Award.

	Rs.	AN.	PS.
Receipts at stations transferred to O. T. Railway . . .	243222	4	6
.. .. . Assam Railway . . .	751785	0	0
.. .. . E. I. Railway . . .	1136884	6	9
TOTAL	2181891	11	3

**Seth Govind Das's Starred Question No. 423 of 29th November 1947
EXPENDITURE TO GUN CARRIAGE FACTORY, JUBBULPORE**

A. Articles manufactured in the Gun Carriage Factory, Jubbulpore.

(i) *Service Stores :*

A great variety of stores is manufactured including—

- (a) Carriages 3-7" Howr.
- (b) Field light Forges.
- (c) Carriage Ambulance Stretcher Single Wheel Mk. I.
- (d) Chests S. A. No. 1. Mk. 3
- (e) Axes Pick Light I. P. Helves.
- (f) Terne-plate Cylinders for 2" & 3" Mortars.
- (g) Carriers & Steel Boxes for 2" & 3" Mortars.

In addition, the bulk of all boxes and packing cases required for packing and storing military equipment is manufactured at the Gun Carriage Factory.

(ii) *Civil Orders :*

A great variety of stores is manufactured to meet civil orders. These include—

- (a) Road Roller Components : Orders amounting to nearly Rs. one crore.
- (b) Oil Expellers.

B. Approximate cost of maintaining Gun Carriage Factory by way of indirect expenditure incurred.—Rs. 64 lakhs.

C. Approximate total cost of production.—Rs. 122 lakhs.

It is not possible to furnish the market value as the bulk of the stores manufactured comprises service items and are not intended for sale.

**Dr. P. S. Deshmukh's Starred Question No. 467 of 1st December, 1947
REPAIR OF BADNERA STATION APPROACH ROAD**

(a) The approach road at Badnera was last repaired in September 1946.

(b) The necessity for carrying out extensive repairs has been felt for some time but these could not be undertaken earlier on account of more pressing commitments elsewhere.

(c) As indicated in the reply given on 1st December 1947, instructions were issued to carry out necessary repairs which were completed on 26th January 1948.

Shri Khurshed Lal's Starred Question No. 790 of 10th December, 1947
U. P. MEASURES TO KEEP PEACE

The Government of the United Provinces report that a few copies of the leaflet mentioned in the question referred to above came to notice in the past but there is nothing to show that 50,000 copies were in circulation in that Province. The leaflet did not bear the name of any signatories or of the press where it was printed and there is nothing definite to indicate that the circular emanated from Pakistan. A careful look-out is being kept for such literature in circulation and wherever found it will be considered for necessary action.

Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor's Starred Question No. 849 of 12th December, 1947

WEST PAKISTAN REFUGEES IN U. P.

Statement showing information promised in respect of the above question

- (a) the number of refugees from West Pakistan in the United Provinces district-wise on the 10th December, 1947 was :—

Dehra Dun	35,234
Saharanpur	63,573
Muzaffarnagar	3,341
Meerut	22,308
Bulandshahr	1,590
Aligarh	2,900
Mathura	13,610
Agra	4,988
Mainpuri	631
Ktah	478
Bareilly	2,425
Bijnor	4,400
Balrampur	380
Moradabad	6,919
Shahjahanpur	967
Pilibhit	490
Farkhabad	562
Katwah	1,115
Kanpur	12,430
Fatehpur	159
Allahabad	1,265
Banda	70
Hamirpur	125
Jhansi	2,492
Jalgaon	590
Honaree	3,400
Mirzapur	166
Jaunpur	301
Ghazipur	115
Balia	243
Gorakhpur	1,336
Beetl	678
Amangarh	96
Deoria	304
Nainital	2,670
Alwar	43
Gorhwal	136
Lucknow	11,573

Unao	253
Raeberalli	203
Sitapur	502
Hardoi	329
Kheri	493
Fyzabad	1,088
Gonda	1,117
Bahraich	157
Sultanpur	34
Partapgarh	133
Barabanki	90
Total	209,420

1. The U. P. Government consider that in addition there were 60/70 thousand unregistered refugees in U. P.

2. On the 23rd January 1948 the U. P. Government estimated the number of refugees in U. P. at four lakhs of whom about 2,80,000 were said to have been registered.

(b) The number of the refugees in the Government refugee camps in the United Provinces district-wise were as under on the 10 December 1947.

Dehra Dun (Prem Nagar Camp)		5,372	
Saharanpur	Ranipur Camp	3802	14,502
	Ramnagar Camp	1700	
	Exhibition Ground Camp	9000	
Allahabad Phaphaman Camp		472	1,022
	Thusi Camp	550	
Benares Lohta Camp		550	
Gorakhpur Khusuni Camp		106	
Lucknow Talkatora Camp		700	1,100
	Central refugees Camp	400	
Total		22,652	

(c) Total Expenditure sanctioned on maintaining or giving relief to refugees upto November 25, 1947 in rupees fourteen lacs eighty thousand.

Mr. R. K. Sidhwa's Starred Question No. 1 of 28th-January, 1948

ARRANGEMENTS FOR EVACUATION OF NON-MUSLIMS LEFT IN BAHAWALPUR STATE

Statement of Negotiations Regarding Evacuation of Non-Muslims from Bahawalpur

Of the estimated population in 1947 of 2.7 lakhs of non-Muslims, about 45 to 50,000 came out on their own in September and early October 1947 following serious disturbances in the Bahawalpur District of the State. About 25,000 more from that District were evacuated by the State in accordance with arrangements reached between them and the Ministry of States, Government of India, prior to the accession of the State to Pakistan. About 70,000 non-Muslims are now estimated to be living in Rahimyarkhan District of Bahawalpur, most of whom are desirous of coming out. Over a lakh is unaccounted for, and a large portion of this probably represents forcible conversions, which have been particularly heavy in this State.

2. Negotiations for the evacuation of those non-Muslims among the remaining 70,000 as desired to migrate to India were at first being carried by the Ministry of States. At this stage, the Bahawalpur Government appeared inclined to provide some facilities in the shape of escorted special trains, and represented certain difficulties regarding coal, railway stock, etc. Negotiations were also being made to carry out air evacuation from Khanpur air field. Apparently the Bahawalpur Government were finding difficulties in obtaining the necessary railway stock and coal in the ordinary course. In the meantime, India and Pakistan had established a common pool of railway stock, and were smoothly running through refugee specials between the two Dominions. In view of this and the further fact that Bahawalpur had since acceded to Pakistan, the Ministry of States felt that the best course would be to extend to Bahawalpur the arrangements in force in West Punjab. This was suggested to the Bahawalpur Government towards the end of October. The Bahawalpur Government did not agree to accept Indian troops in Bahawalpur territory but at the same time, stated that such non-Muslims as wished to go to India would be provided with facilities to do so under their own military and police escort and undertook

full responsibility for their safe transit to the State border. In actual practice, however, practically no movement facilities were provided by the Bahawalpur State except to a few persons who obtained permits from the Bahawalpur Military authorities.

3. On the 7th November an Officer of the Ministry of States went to Bahawalpur in connection with various matters and discussed the question afresh with the Bahawalpur Government. That Government, refused to recognise the actual factual position, *viz.*, that a large number of non-Muslims wished to leave and were forced to stay on only owing to lack of facilities, and refused to provide any special facilities for evacuation.

4. This new attitude taken up by the Bahawalpur Government was still under consideration by the Government of India when the State sent one of its Hindu Ministers to India in the middle of November with a view to persuading Bahawalpur non-Muslims who had already left to return to the State. Assurances were brought on behalf of the State that action would be taken to create such conditions as would not only enable non-Muslims to remain there in safety, but also persuade those who had left to return. The Government of India welcomed the sentiments and felt that every effort should be made to see if this desirable object could really be achieved. A meeting was thereupon called at which above mentioned Minister of the Bahawalpur State and representatives of the Bahawalpuri non-Muslims already in India were present. These representatives were asked carefully to consider the proposal that they should return under the assurances mentioned above. Some of these representatives were given special facilities to visit other centres where Bahawalpuris had come in appreciable numbers in order to consult them and also persuade them to return. These representatives, after careful consideration of the conditions then prevailing in Bahawalpur and the trend of affairs in the State, came regretfully to the conclusion that the conditions in Bahawalpur were not such as to enable non-Muslims to remain there in safety and with honour and that in those conditions people could not really be persuaded to remain there, much less to return. The Government of India were informed to that effect on the 27th November 1947. In particular it was pointed out that several thousands of villagers had been deprived of their lands and had been forced to come to the towns where they had been staying for several weeks under conditions of utmost hardship and were already in the last stages of destitution.

5. With a view to securing at least some facilities for those who were absolutely destitute or were not State subjects, an Officer of the MEO India went to Bahawalpur but although he contacted both the authorities at Bahawalpur and the Prime Minister, Bahawalpur at Karachi, all facilities for evacuation were completely refused.

6. The matter was next raised with Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan, Refugee Minister, Government of Pakistan by Hon'ble Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Minister without Portfolio during discussions at Lahore on the 9th December. The situation as stated above was represented to Raja Sahib who agreed that as Bahawalpur was not a part of Pakistan, it was up to the Government of Pakistan to ensure the necessary facilities. He also agreed that non-Muslims who did wish to leave should be enabled to do so. He said that he would take up the matter with His Highness the Nawab of Bahawalpur at Karachi and that on his way back from Karachi about a week later, he would fix a meeting at Bahawalpur itself where the matter might be discussed with a view to making necessary arrangements. He asked that some representatives of India should be sent to the meeting and Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar agreed to do so on hearing from Raja Sahib.

7. On the 11th December Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar sent a telegram to Raja Sahib pointing out that complete absence of any transport facilities to India was only increasing panic and asking for the earliest possible arrangements. He also enquired as to the date of the meeting. Further he pressed for the establishment of camps for destitutes at Khanpur and Rahimyarkhan, and distribution of food to them. No reply to this telegram was received, but in another connection Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan informed Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar that a meeting was being held on the 19th at Bahawalpur. No invitation to the Government of India to send any representatives was extended. On the 21st Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar sent a further telegram repeating his earlier telegram and asking for any early decision. Yet another telegram was sent by Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar on the 24th December pointing out the impossible conditions under which the destitutes were living and reiterating the request for opening of camps and distribution of food. Reference was also made to reports of further violence including the shooting down of 20 leading Hindus of Ahmadpur Lamma in broad day light on the 10th December. With a view to obtaining more information regarding conditions in Bahawalpur, a suggestion was made that a Liaison Officer at Bahawalpur may be accepted by the State authorities. In reply a telegram and a letter were received from Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan towards the end of December reiterating the decision of the Bahawalpur State not to permit non-Muslims to leave the State and repeating assurances of continued protection and restoration of normalcy within a short time. No reference was made in these communications to the questions of distribution of food to destitutes the opening of camps, the evacuation of forced converts and the recent instances of renewed violence.

8. In reply to the above Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar addressed Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan on the 1st January 1948 pointing out that while the Government of India did not wish to encourage migration, facilities ought to be provided for those who none-the-less wished to leave. The cases of thousands of destitutes in various towns in the State and of the 60 to 70,000 forcible converts were specially mentioned. Offer was made of provision of railway stock and other facilities out of the pool with the two MEOS and it was suggested that details should be discussed in tripartite talks between the Government of Pakistan, Bahawalpur and India. No reply was received to this telegram, or the earlier representations on these subjects.

9. After waiting for several days, during which panic in Bahawalpur further increased due to events in Sind, and particularly rioting at Karachi, the Hon'ble Minister for Relief and Rehabilitation again addressed Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan, drawing his attention to previous telegrams and to the immense hardship being caused by the protracted delay to which this matter was being subjected. Again a request was made for a conference to discuss the matter as well as concurrence to the appointment of a Liaison Officer at Bahawalpur. In the meantime, it was understood that the State Government were proposing to send out the destitute, mainly Oads, by a foot convoy involving them in a strenuous journey of several days, involving considerable danger and hardship instead of allowing them to be evacuated safely by escorted train. An offer was made that the Government of India would supply special rakes, if necessary, from the Government of India's own stocks. An offer was also made to send the Director-General of Evacuation to Lahore or Bahawalpur to fix up details. Again no reply has been received to this communication. On the 28th January, 1948, the Hon'ble Minister for Relief and Rehabilitation has again addressed a personal communication to Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan on various subjects including the question of evacuation from Bahawalpur.

Shri Basanta Kumar Das's Starred Question No. 71 of 2nd February, 1948.

**DISTRICT-WISE POPULATION OF WEST BENGAL AND ASSAM PROVINCES
AFTER RADCLIFFE AWARD.**

Area and Population of Assam by District and Community.

Name of Districts	Area	Population of Hindus excluding tribal Hills and Plains.	Schedule caste.	Muslims	Others (including tea garden Tribes, tribal Hills and Plains)
	<i>Sq. Miles</i>				
Goalpara	3,979	2,43,649	23,434	4,68,924	2,38,278
Garo Hills	3,152	13,879	789	10,398	1,18,508
Sibsagar	5,138	5,90,262	50,184	51,769	3,76,526
Lakhimpur	4,153	4,66,761	43,527	44,579	3,19,975
Naga Hills	4,298	4,269	45	531	1,84,796
Kamrup	3,844	6,38,491	59,092	3,67,522	1,99,095
Darrang	2,806	3,28,928	19,475	1,20,995	2,67,393
Nowgong	3,896	2,30,791	59,214	2,50,113	1,70,682
Lushai Hills.	8,143	2,452	22	101	1,50,211
Sadiya Frontier tract	3,309	29,549	3,901	864	25,804
Raipara F. Tract	571	2,534	74	61	3,843
K & J Hills	2,45,063	13,649	65	1,555	1,03,998
Assam including Karimganj Sub Division.	4,596	2,30,957	1,02,103	3,90,535	1,89,779

Area and Population of West Bengal by District and Community (Census 1941)

District	Area in sq. miles	Hindus			Total	Others						Total	Grand Total
		Hindus other than Scheduled Caste	Scheduled Caste	Total		Muslims	Christians	Buddh	Jains	Others	Tribes		
Burdwan	2,706	985,529	430,209	1,393,820	234,095	2,289	1,436	615	2,559	181,255	169,267	1,890,732	
Medinipur	1,745	696,192	299,254	664,636	287,210	249	77	12	48	74,054	74,871	1,046,17	
Banburn	2,446	722,269	265,209	1,076,859	54,944	1,216	16	6	24	184,266	184,317	1,299,640	
Midnapore	5,274	2,242,297	249,606	2,491,903	244,569	2,534	1,964	100	2,610	293,686	252,122	3,190,647	
Hooghly	601	1,020,545	164,318	1,184,863	296,225	194	686	120	2,227	2,919	2,110	1,191,240	
Howrah	1,200	1,632,754	245,910	1,999,544	297,977	548	342	20	622	69,890	71,108	1,377,720	
S 6-Puranas	6,916	1,805,977	799,578	2,343,450	1,223,282	29,276	1,656	20	6,812	52,294	59,686	3,669,490	
Cuttack	26	1,476,294	56,289	1,531,812	697,595	16,431	8,456	6,889	46,860	1,088	79,644	2,108,901	
Xabardrip	1,297	307,449	44,641	392,297	430,704	64,22	22	4	301	10,232	17,292	640,202	
Meerchidabad	2,008	517,204	167,164	684,367	277,767	894	2	1,217	29,126	44	27,798	1,640,830	
W. Dinajpur	1,269	133,680	104,266	299,896	264,769	179	29	69	12	99,678	99,896	585,484	
Maldah	1,991	326,065	82,280	579,245	614,081	440	19	-	11	21,463	21,941	644,816	
Jalpaiguri	2,468	194,245	222,217	417,862	143,032	2,222	179	42	278,029	4,276	282,104	645,702	
Darjeeling	1,192	149,576	26,922	176,496	9,125	2,499	54	64	44,760	141,291	186,746	376,299	
West Bengal	28,215	11,017,279	2,312,681	14,330,960	5,201,696	60,296	19,087	9,090	610,895	1,049,799	1,583,687	31,196,463	

Shri V. C. Keasu Rao's Starred Question No. 183 of 9th February, 1948.

INCOME TAX COLLECTION ANDHRA DISTRICTS

(a) (Income-tax collections for the years 1945-46 and 1946-47 from the Andhra District excluding the city of Madras are :—

	(in thousand of rupees)	
	1945-46	1946-47
Excess Profites Tax	7,79	5,19
Income-tax	78,07	73,90
Super tax	7,03	9,30
Surcharge	42,66	14,81
	1,15,55	1,03,20.

These figures include Rs. 7,22 and 7,88 thousand respectively being collections in Chittoor District.

(b) The revenue from Customs and port dues realised at the ports of vizagapatam, Cocanada and Masulipatam during the financial years 1945 and 1946-47 was as follows :—

	Customs		Port dues	
	1945-46 Rs.	1946-47 Rs.	1945-46 Rs.	1946-47 Rs.
Vizagapatam	4,40,175	3,61,190	48,465	1,15,173
Cocanada	301	1,25,326	505	20,423
Masulipatam	55,117	2,347	4,834	3,704

Figures for 1947-48 will not be available until after the close of the year on 31st March 1948.

Shri H. V. Kamath's Supplementary Question to R. B. Lala Raj Kanwar's Starred Question No. 494 of 26th February, 1948.

STATES ACCEDED TO INDIAN DOMINION

(1) Number and names of States that have merged with India.

60 States as follows :

(i) 26 States merged with Orissa.—Athgarh, Athmalik, Bamra, Baramba, Baudh, Bonai, Daspalla, Dhenkanal, Gangpur, Hindol, Kalahandi, Keonjhar, Khandpar, Kharsawan, Narsingpur, Nayagarh, Nilgiri, Pallahara, Patna, Hairakhol, Rampur, Seraikella, Sonepur, Talcher, Tigiria.

(ii) 15 States merged with the C. P. and Berar.—Bastar, Changbhakar, Chhuikhadan, Jaipur, Kanker, Kawardha, Khairagarh, Korea, Nandgaon, Raigarh, Sakti, Sarangarh, Surguja, Udaipur, Malkai.

(iii) 2—Loharu and Patandi merged with East Punjab.

(iv) 2—Banganspalle and Pudukkottai merged with Madras.

(v) 16 States merged with Bombay.—Akalkot, Aundh, Bhor, Jamkhandi, Jath, Kurundwad (Jr.) Kurundwad (senior), Miraj (Junior), Miraj (Senior), Mudhol, Phaltan, Ramdurg, Sangli, Savanur, Sawantwadi, Wadi Jaghir.

(2) Number and names of the States that have combined to form new States.

455 States as follows.—(1) The United State of Kathiawar comprising 46 units. The names of 30 Jurisdictional States of this United State are given below :—

Nawanagar, Bhavnagar, Porbandar, Dharangadhra, Morvi, Gondal, Jafnabad, Wankauer, Palitana, Dhrol, Limbdi, Rajkot, Wadhwan, Lakhtar, Sayla, Chuda, Vala, Jasdun, Anandnagar (Thana-Devli), Vadia, Lathi, Muli, Bajana, Virpur, Maliya, Kotda-Bangani, Jetpur, Bilkha, Patdi and Khirzara.

Note.—Jānagadh may join the new State.

(The names of other 418 semi-jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional States, estates and talukas which have joined this Unit have not been given)

(ii) The United State of Matsya comprising 4 States. Alwar, Bharatpur, Dholpur and Karauli.

PORTRAIT OF LATE PRESIDENT VITHALBHAI J. PATEL

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members though over fourteen years have rolled by, since the sad and untimely demise of Sjt. Vithalbhai Patel, more popularly known as President Patel, his name is remembered with love and respect for his sacrifice and courage as a sturdy fighter, against the British Imperialism, on the constitutional side and for his constructive genius and liberal social outlook in the field of local self-government. There are some Honourable Members in this House, who have had the honour and privilege of working in association with him, in this very Chamber. All of us gratefully remember the noble fight that he put up, in very tough circumstances, for advancing the cause of democracy, and enlarging the powers and prestige of this House. Though hemmed in by various constitutional barriers and obstacles, he always strove his best and strove successfully, to establish and maintain the principle that the Executive must be responsible to the Legislature—the principle which must hold good at all times.

President Patel was the first elected President of the Indian Legislature, under the Montford Reforms. Prior to his election to this Chair, which I have the honour to occupy, he had his parliamentary training, as a member of the Bombay Legislative Council and thereafter as a member of the then Imperial Legislative Council, as the predecessor of this Assembly used to be called, in 1918-19. He was member of this Assembly from December 1923 to 20th April, 1930, when he resigned office at the call of the country, to join the first Civil Disobedience Struggle for the freedom of the country.

By the time of his election to the Central Assembly in 1930 President Patel had acquired a reputation as a keen parliamentarian and had become a terror to the official world on the parliamentary front of India's struggle. President Patel struck a new note in the parliamentary life in India, in devoting himself all through the twelve months of the year to his parliamentary work. He spared no pains to study the subjects on which he wished to have his say in the Legislature. The years of close study of the various problems before the country, that he had spent before he became President, are, I believe, the secret of his self-confidence and mastery over parliamentary subjects and precedents.

In addition to his experience in the Legislature, he had an amount of administrative experience as a member of the Baudra and the Bombay Corporations, and as Mayor of Bombay. The measures that he adopted there for advancement of education and other matters, as also the measures which he advocated in the Legislature on matters of social reform show his wide vision, constructive genius and deep thought in respect of the nation-building programme.

President Patel was not only a Legislator or a Corporator. He was a prominent figure among the political leaders of India and the influence he wielded in the Indian National Congress circles is well-known. He was the trusted representative of India in the Deputations sent by the Congress to England. The part he played in 1922 in what was known as Flag Satyagrah at Nagpur and in the formation of the Swaraj Party for opening the constitutional front in 1923

is well-known. His participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-31 shows that he was not merely an arm-chair politician but he could join the ranks of civil resisters whenever occasion demanded.

President Patel thus came to this Chair, with an exceptional combination of various qualities and aptitudes. He had a keen and penetrating intellect which could plan with a clear insight into the probable tactics and moves of the opponent. He had mastery over parliamentary precedents. He had the sagacity of a politician and the courage and fearlessness of a fighter. But for a combination like this, he would not have left his impress on the future mould of this Legislature, as he has.

President Patel came to the Chair in a very difficult and delicate situation. Being elected to the Chair he had his natural responsibilities towards the elected section of the House and at the same time he had to deal with a Government, which was irremovable by the vote of the House. But he cut his way clear through all the difficulties, by dint of his stern qualities.

On occupying the Chair on his election on the 24th August, 1925, President Patel, in reply to the congratulatory speeches in the House stated the considerations that weighed with him in accepting office. He said:

"Before I made up my mind to stand as a candidate, the decision of this question worried me for days and nights, and ultimately, I came to the conclusion that I would be serving the cause of my country better by the choice I have made and therefore I accepted it."

So it was neither the halo of office, nor the love of power but the spirit of serving his country, that had inspired President Patel. He further said:

"Swarajists are often described as destructive critics. . . . It has, therefore, become their duty to show to the whole world that, if they knew how to destroy, they know also how to construct. They have to show, when the real responsibility comes to them, that they are ready to discharge the duties placed upon their shoulders."

Who will deny the necessity of constantly keeping these words in our minds with greater emphasis in the present set-up?

As regards his attitude towards different sections in the House, he said:

"In the discharge of my duties, I shall observe strict impartiality in dealing with all sections of the House irrespective of party considerations. . . . I belong to no party. I belong to all parties."

On his re-election to the Chair, on the 20th January 1927, when the new Assembly came into existence after elections, he said:

"Any one who aspires to fill this great office, with any hope of success must lay aside all that is personal, all that is of party, all that savours of political predilections and learn to subordinate everything to the great interest of the House as a whole."

The advice is true in respect of all offices. I am tempted here to repeat as my own, a request made from the Chair, to every Honourable Member of this House by President Patel. After appealing to the members for co-operation, he said:

"If on any occasion, anything that I say or do in the discharge of my duties, gives offence to any member, I beg of him not to harbour any ill-feeling against me and allow misunderstanding to grow, but to come to me personally and talk the matter over and have done with it."

His rulings had always maintained the freedom and dignity of the House and, wherever possible, tightened its grip over the Executive. His whole tenure of office is full of such rulings. The most well-known of these are, his ruling on the operation of Fiscal Convention and his ruling in respect of the Public Safety Bill. It required intelligence, analytical genius, legal acumen and not only political courage but a moral conviction of the truth and justice of one's own conclusions, to be able to give such rulings.

[Mr. Speaker]

But, his services which go to the root of the independence of the Legislature and its freedom from the dominance of influence of the Executive Government are not so well-known to the general public—perhaps not even fully known to many of the present-day legislators. It was he, who fought for and brought into being a separate Legislative Assembly Department, independent of Government control or influence, and under the sole control of the Chair. Influence of the executive power is easily discernible when patent but the subtle influence through advisers and officials, who have to look to the Executive Government for their future chances is not easily seen or felt though it is more effective in making the Legislature subservient to the Executive. President Patel was constantly on the watch and the separate and independent Department which he established for maintaining the independence of the Legislature is a solid foundation on which we are standing today and ought to stand for all times. It was for this very reason that he fought against the presence of the police, on the Assembly premises and undertook the responsibility of the protection of the Assembly Chamber and its precincts by an independent organisation, the present Watch and Ward Department.

He also set up the wholesome precedent that the President ought to have a voice in the allocation of work in the Assembly, so as to ensure not merely the best use of time but to protect the rights and privileges of members, in bringing before the House, all matters which they are entitled to bring, irrespective of the favours or frowns of the Executive Government.

I had the honour of knowing President Patel personally from 1915 and had also the further privilege of being associated with him as a worker in the rank and file. But, it is not my personal regard and affection for President Patel that prompted me to accept the beautiful picture donated by an admirer from the Frontier that the House now sees before it. It will keep his memory green, from day to day, in the midst of our labours in this House. I feel that in grateful memory of the fact that the heights on which we are standing today as a Sovereign Legislature has its democratic foundation laid well and deeply by him that we must always have him with us in this Chamber in the form of this beautiful picture. Stationed just opposite the Chair, he will be an inspiration and guide to the Presiding Authority.

My judgment about the place which President Patel occupies in the history of our national struggle for freedom and the part he played in this Legislature may perhaps be considered as exaggerated or over-coloured, because of my personal association, regard and admiration for President Patel. I cannot, therefore do better than cite the testimony of an eminent opponent like Sir John Simon, who, in his report of the Statutory Commission, says as under:

"It is nothing in the contrast between Westminster and Delhi more striking, than in the position assumed, and the influence exercised, by the occupant of the Chair of the Assembly. He claims and employs, powers of interference, which would be quite contrary to the stricter limits of the Speakership,—reprimanding a government member of the Council of State for not attending and speaking at a debate in the Lower House, advising the Government not to proceed with important business when the Swarajists walked out, explaining his view of the proper operation of the so-called Fiscal Convention and so forth"

In honouring him we honour ourselves.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (Prime Minister and Leader of the House): Sir, on behalf of Government and this House, I should like to associate myself with the remarks that have fallen from you on this occasion. Some of us here present were associated with Vithalbhai Patel in this House and some outside. He belonged to an older generation and those of us who were associated with him even intimately were associated as a junior is associated with a senior. As I listened to you, Sir, those old days came before my mind when sometimes I used to come here and sit in the Visitors' Gallery and see President Patel

presiding over this Chamber and often enough, with a mischievous twinkle in his eye, say something which brought discomfiture to many. Those days, though not very far off, still seem very long ago and almost as if age has passed between those days and today. Vast changes have taken place and one feels—perhaps, one always feels that way—that those were the days of giants in our political field, men of great stature, among whom one of the tallest was Vithalbhai Patel. It is right that we should honour his memory not only in the country but more specially in this Assembly, and should keep a reminder of him always before us in the shape of this picture.

You pointed out, Sir, how he always stood for the freedom of this House and fought against executive authority, which was in those days an alien authority. He stood for the liberty of the individual as well as for the liberties of this House. Now, Sir, specially on behalf of the Government, may I say that we would like the distinguished occupant of this Chair now and always to guard the freedom and liberties of the House from every possible danger, even from the danger of executive incursion. There is always that danger—even from a National Government—that it may choose to ride roughshod over others, that there is always a danger from a majority that it may choose to ride roughshod over the opinions of a minority, and it is there that the Speaker comes in to protect each single member, or each single group from any such unjust activity by a dominant group or a dominant Government. Vithalbhai Patel performed that function at a different time and performed it with remarkable ability. He laid the foundations of those traditions which have already grown up round the Chair which you, Sir, occupy with such distinction. I hope that those traditions will continue, because the position of the Speaker is not an individual's position or an honour done to an individual. The Speaker represents the House. He represents the dignity of the House, the freedom of the House and because the House represents the nation, in a peculiar way, the Speaker becomes the symbol of the nation's freedom and liberty. Therefore, it is right that that should be an honoured position, a free position and should be occupied always by men of outstanding ability and impartiality.

We welcome this picture here as reminder of one of the great Indians of old, one of the giants who have passed. We think rather wistfully of those old days.

May I, however, say Sir, if I may be permitted to say so, that while we welcome this picture here into this House, this Assembly Chamber should not become a picture gallery with large numbers of pictures to the right and to the left. I think it is right that we should have a picture gallery of eminent men, but some other room might be converted into that Gallery. I should not like more than one picture, or possibly two, in this particular room. (*An Honourable Member: "Mahatmaji's!"*)

I welcome on behalf of the House, Sir, this addition to the membership of the House, if I may say so, that is, a past President continually looking down upon us and helping us in our work.

GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform Honourable Members that the discussion and voting on Demands for Grants in respect of Home, States and Information and Broadcasting will be taken up on Monday the 15th March instead of Wednesday the 10th March 1948. The revised programme of dates is as follows:

Wednesday, the 10th March 1948.

Commerce—2½ hours.

Health—1½ hours.

Thursday, the 11th March, 1948

Works, Mines and Power—2½ hours.

Education—1½ hours.

[Mr. Speaker]

Friday, the 12th March, 1948.

Relief and Rehabilitation—1½ hours.

Communications—2½ hours.

Saturday, the 13th March 1948.

Defence—2½ hours.

Transport—1½ hours.

Monday the 15th March 1948.

Home—1½ hours.

States—1½ hours.

Information and Broadcasting—1½ hours.

Tuesday the 16th March, 1948.

Food and Agriculture—1½ hours.

Finance—2½ hours.

Copies of this revised programme will be sent to the Honourable Members for their use.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri (Assam; General): What about filing of notice of cut motions for Commerce and Health?

Mr. Speaker: They can come even today—these notices can be given by this evening. We are discussing today Demands Nos. 19 and 10. I will first place before the House Demands 10 and 19 and then the Cut Motions will be moved.

DEMAND No. 10—CABINET.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,04,000 be granted to the Governor General to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1949, in respect of 'Cabinet'."

DEMAND No. 19—MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,04,000 be granted to the Governor General to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1949, in respect of 'External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations'."

Mr. Waziruddin Ahmad (West Bengal, Muslim): Before the cut motions are moved, I have to submit one thing. I find that some so-called "agreed" cut motions have been selected for moving today. They are however cut motions belonging to the Congress Party. They are not agreed to by other members. The result is that the discussion would rather be something like a domestic arrangement between the Government and their supporters in which third parties like us will have practically no interest. I would suggest that at least one cut motion suggested by private members—not belonging to the Congress Party—should be included every day. That would satisfy the requirements of reasonable debate.

Mr. Speaker: I entirely agree. Last time, I thought that this was all an agreed arrangement and the motions were to be moved by Honourable Members, to whatever party they may belong. My impression was that it was agreed to by Members that the particular subjects should be discussed. In addition to that arrangement, as I thought it, I asked if any other member wanted to move any other motion; of course not in express words. I said at the end that I presumed "These are agreed cut motions to be moved." Thereby I invited any other Honourable Member, if he so wanted, to move any other cut, but none

came forward. However, I am prepared to let any cut motions to be moved here. If there no agreed arrangement, as I understand from the Honourable Member Mr. Naisiruddin Ahmad, then, of course, any other member, who wishes to move a cut motion will have a right to do so. But, it will be better that, if any such cut motions are going to be moved, previous information should be given, so that the Honourable Minister in charge may also know what particular motions are going to be moved and may be ready with the information that he will have to give to the House in respect of that motion.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Madras: General): Would it not be better in view of the 10 or 15 Honourable Members who are not prepared to accept this kind of arrangement—each one of them having any number of cut motions—if they would be good enough to have previous contacts with the Secretary of our Party, so that they can come to some sort of reasonable agreement. I am not referring particularly to my Honourable friend, but in view of the absence of the Chief Whip, we have had a certain amount of difficulty and I hope he would understand.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad: I am not raising it as a remark.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena (U. P.: General): With your permission, Sir, may I say a few words. About the day's arrangement. There are no organised parties other than the Congress Party and therefore, in the absence of that, I could not talk to individual members, but I did have a talk with Haji Ishaq Seth, Mr. Anthony and Dr. Kunzru and I asked them if they wanted any particular cut motions to be included even after that, you will remember, Sir, that after the agreed cut motions by the Congress party members had been moved, I specially requested you to ask other members if they wanted to move any other cut motion, but nobody did so. It is necessary that at least 1 or 2 days before the demands relating to a Ministry come under discussion, information should be sent to the Government Whip so that the Minister may be prepared on that point.

Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: Day before yesterday when the Budget was discussed opportunity was given only to the members whose cut motions were on the paper and no other member had any chance to speak on the motion. I think the grievances of most of the members on that will be removed if they are given a reasonable opportunity of speaking on these very motions.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It depends upon time.

Mr. Speaker: We are having a new experiment as it were, in attempting to bring under debate, the whole of the budget and each and every Department. My own reaction in the beginning, when the arrangement was suggested to me, was that the time was perhaps short and it was bound to be short if each and every department is to be covered. We have two alternatives: Select a few Departments and take a longer time or if all the departments are to be touched, then the speeches have necessarily to be very short and brief. One of the alternatives which suggested itself to me was that the number of cut motions should not exceed three at the most, so that there may be a reasonable opportunity of debate. Of course, the time-limit is there. I am giving 15 minutes to each Honourable Member who wishes to move a cut. Honourable Members are not able to have their full say within that short time. I, therefore, also suggested that rather than have many speeches, it is better to have fewer speeches with more substance extending over longer time. I am entirely in the hands of Honourable Members in that respect. If they want to have a larger number of speeches, then the time limit must be curtailed; if they want to have longer time, the speeches must be curtailed. That is the position.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad: We may be given more number of days.

Mr. Speaker: This time 8 days have been allotted instead of 5 as usual. Honourable Members have got 2 days for general discussion; they are again

[Mr. Speaker]

getting now 8 days instead of 5, which means 10 days and further, when the Finance Bill comes in, we will have some opportunity. That opportunity will be within the scope of the Bill, but some opportunity will be there also and 4 days are, I believe, allotted to that. So in all, it makes 14 days.

Shri R. R. Diwakar (Bombay: General): For Finance Bill, I suppose there are only 2 days.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member has lost sight of the fact that, there is a motion for reference of that Bill to a Select Committee and two days are being reserved for that and when the Bill comes back, there will be another two days. So it will be 4 days. The subject is common. So I am entirely in the hands of the Honourable Members and it is better, if they could give previous intimation, by agreement, to the Honourable Minister concerned or his department about the cut motions which they want to move. So if any Honourable Member wishes to move any further cut motions other than those that have been included, I shall give him an opportunity to do so.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru (U. P.: General): Sir, before the debate begins I should like to make a suggestion for the consideration of yourself, the House and Government. We are now following the example of the British House of Commons as far as we can. I believe the practice there is that when the vote relating to an important Ministry, *i.e.*, a Ministry whose activities have aroused considerable public interest comes up for consideration the Minister in charge in placing the estimated expenditure before the House makes a statement, so that the House may know what the policy of Government is. Other members who follow him do so with a knowledge of the principles which have guided the Ministry and of the results achieved by it. Now in India the Ministries whose activities are a matter of great public interest are, Defence, External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations and one or two other Ministries. I therefore suggest that it would be in the interest of the House and of a better focussing of our attention on important points if the Prime Minister on this occasion initiated the discussion himself by making a pronouncement with regard to the policy and activities of his Department. I am sorry I have sprung a surprise on him; I wish I could have had an opportunity of speaking to him beforehand. If he finds it convenient to address the House at this stage we shall all be grateful to him. But should he prefer to wait and reply at the end of the discussion, I hope he will keep my suggestion in mind for the future.

The Honourable Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru (Prime Minister and Leader of the House): Sir, I think the suggestion just made is eminently good and reasonable, but I am not clear in my mind as to whether it will be feasible on this occasion. If the House so desires I prepared to make some kind of a statement on the working of the External Affairs Ministry right at the very beginning. But the time is so limited that if I speak now and have to speak again at the end—as I should after hearing Honourable Members—I shall take too much time of the House and others will not have it. I think it would probably be better if I spoke after hearing the criticism of Honourable Members and gave some kind of general account of the activities of the Ministry.

DEMAND NO. 19.—MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

Foreign Policy of India

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Mr. Speaker: Cut motion moved:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Condition of Indians in Commonwealth Relations Countries.

Seth Govinddas (C. P. and Berar: General): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Speaker: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I wish to state at the very beginning that there is a very great amount of uncertainty over our relations with the British Commonwealth. In the country there is a good lot of nervousness among certain sections of our people as to the attitude of our Government in regard to this British Commonwealth,—whether we are going to remain in it or whether we are going to come out of it. I wish to state quite categorically that we are extremely anxious that Government should state their position as clearly as possible at an early date—even if it not possible for them to state it today—that we are determined to go out of the British Commonwealth and remain an independent country and become an entirely independent republic, of course willing to be on the best possible relations with the British Commonwealth as we would be continuing to remain on the best of terms with all other countries of the world. I learn that some treaty talks have been going on either formally or informally between our Government and the British Government. So far the public has not been taken into confidence and we do not know at what stage these talks are, what sort of talks these are and why these talks are being carried on. We know that some time ago under other auspices the British Government used to tell us that there should be a sort of prior treaty between India and England before India became absolutely free and independent, whether inside or outside the British Commonwealth.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, may I intervene to say that there is no question of any formal or informal or any other kind of treaty talks of any kind going on? I do not know where the Honourable Member gets his information from.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I stand corrected and also reassured.

The next point is this. I find—and I think the House also is of the same opinion—that there are darkening clouds in the international world today. From every part of the world warnings seem to be pouring in that the world is getting ready or getting willy-nilly into the next world war. The only assurance that we have so far received from the statesman of these big countries is from Soviet Russia, and I think it was Mons. Molotov who told the world the other day that there is no fear or danger of there being another world war within the next five years. It is not very reassuring; it only means, "Well, you can all go to sleep or rest assured that there is not going to be another world war in the next five years, but thereafter what is going to happen we ourselves do not know." So far as we are concerned, we are not prepared to give any assurance or guarantee to the rest of the world that there is not going to be another world war very soon, and we all know that so far as relations between Soviet Russia and America are concerned, they are very strained indeed and they are getting ready to face all emergencies. In America there is a frenzy and fever pervading the whole of the nation for fear that Soviet Russia might be herself ready in a short time to declare war against America and her allies. In these circumstances I think it is necessary that the House should be taken into confidence by Government as to the various steps that they are taking in order to prepare India against such a contingency and in order to prepare India also to prevent the emergence or early advent of such an emergency or in regard to defence forces and also in regard to the various diplomatic

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]
 relations or good feelings that we are building up with various other countries. In our own country, or rather within the India that we have known, there have come to be two Dominions. There is Pakistan on one side and ourselves on the other. How the diplomatic relations between these two States are going to be developed in order that they might not lead us into another war is a very important matter, and on this point also we want some enlightenment.

We also know that there are groups among various countries in the world. There is an Anglo-American group in the formation. There is another group forming round Soviet Russia and all the time there is a great competition between these two groups to win more and more satellites to themselves. We have seen in the recent past what happened in South Eastern Europe and also in China and her neighbour, Korea. Things are not very reassuring. Only the other day Czecho-Slovakia is supposed to have gone through a storm in a tea cup and a party revolution. Communists are said to be gaining not only permanent but the sole interests in the whole of that country, nudging away all other parties with the result that President Benes is supposed to be ill. What sort of illness, we do not know. Hungary is going through a similar revolution and a revolution forced by the Communist party and through the machinations of either Soviet Russia or America or both. Under these circumstances, some of our public men in this country have begun to wonder whether the policy pursued by our External Affairs Department and Pandit Nehru—the policy of not joining these two big groups—is really correct and right. I have held the view, and I expressed it the last time when I moved this cut motion, that the House would be morally advised to agree with the Prime Minister of not aligning our country with either of these two groups.

There is another kind of grouping. That is the Christian nations on one side and the Muslim nations on the other. It is our duty under the present circumstances not to align ourselves on either side at all. But then we are being asked whether this particular attitude of ours has done us any good. If it has not done any good, there must be many reasons. One of them is that our External Affairs Department has not been quick and strong enough to build up ambassadorial relations and diplomatic relations with all the countries of the world and with those which we find to be anxious for world peace. Have any efforts been made in this direction? The House would like to have some information on this point.

That is why I think the time has come when somebody or other should take active steps to build up what is known as a peace front. Although the United Nations Organisation has been brought into existence to ensure world peace, we know even on the testimony of the Secretary General of the House Mr. Trygve Lie, that very many nations have not been able to play their part by the organisation. Under these circumstances it is up to India, with her moral stature, the stature built up in this country by Banaji, and that is being built up by our own Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, to take a lead in this matter, and build up not a group, not a power bloc, but to get together round a table all those nations, small or big, which are determined upon not becoming satellites of these blocs of nations, but which are bent on doing everything possible both on the United Nations front and outside in order to ensure the continuity of world peace and to postpone the advent of these wretched clouds of another world war.

Shri B. Das (Orissa: General): Will you please explain what you propose?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That is why I wish to make one or two suggestions. We should hasten to build up our embassies in Latin America. We should send our goodwill missions to as many of these nations as we can in South East Asia and the Middle-Eastern peoples, and I think it would be well indeed

is some of our public men are encouraged, if not by the Government, at least by this House and political parties in this country, to go and contact all these people who are suffering under various imperialist systems—the negroes of Africa and the Asiatic peoples in Asia and various other places—and give them encouragement and extend to them our hand of friendship and also our strength.

The other day the Honourable the Prime Minister has told us quite frankly, what I considered to be a very great truth, namely, our reference to the U.N.O. of this Kashmir issue was an act of faith. That was a great declaration. It is a declaration on which any Foreign Minister in any country could be proud. Only when the countries of the world are prepared to make this U.N.O. an instance of their acts of faith, can there be any future for this world and for this organisation. But the same thing cannot be said of the various other countries. We have gone there with the feeling that they would behave in the way that they should, as honourable countries, as respective countries and responsible countries, with consistency and morality. But instead of that I have facts here to prove that the manner in which they have dealt with Kashmir is absolutely inconsistent with their own past professions and activities. If I may draw the attention of the House to a few facts, I find that, in regard to the suggestion made by a number of these important countries and their representatives on the U.N.O. that we should withdraw our Indian Armed forces, the United States and the Russian people themselves were contending over this particular point in regard to Greece. And what did the United States say? In the case of Greece: Greece complained against Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria that they were allowing their troops and partisans and other people to come into Greece and create trouble. What did the U.N.O. do? She directed these countries to keep their troops under control and their own people under control and the police there warned. But are they pursuing the same policy in regard to India? Is this the way that nations have to behave on this great international theatre? In fact they recommended that instances in future of armed bands on one territory crossing into the territory of another country should be considered a threat to peace and dealt with by the last measure provided in the Charter.

In regard to Korea the United States has refused to withdraw her troops unless and until she was assured of peaceful conditions there and also of a well-established Government in that country.

There was a Chinese resolution on the 10th September 1947 at the U.N.O. where she wanted that British troops should be removed from Egypt and Great Britain opposed this viewpoint stating that British troops had exercised no pressure in recent years that the British troops were kept there.

Again during the debate on Palestine, Britain refused as long as she continued to hold the Mandate on Palestine to share her obligations and rights with anyone else. Yet we are asked to share our responsibilities with Kashmir or Pakistan or some other authority and Great Britain is advancing this particular view. Again, as recently as February, 1948, Roy Henderson, Director of the U.S. State Department said in connection with sending American troops to Greece to drive out the Greek Communist Gorrillas that the Greek forces alone may not be able to tackle them without American help. If U.S.A. can send her troops to Greece to help the Greek Government at its own request to maintain peace in her own territory, I cannot understand how American delegates to the U.N.O. can possibly raise any sort of objection to India sending her troops into a part of the Indian Union, viz., Kashmir, at the request of the Kashmir Government itself.

As regards the demand for a change in Sheikh Abdullah's administration. Even this morning there was some sort of feelers in the press. The U.S.A.'s attitude is objection to this suggestion in regard to Hungary. I have therefore given enough instances or precedents in order to show that these people have

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

not been keeping faith with themselves and with their own previous statements and it is well for them to take this warning that so far as India is concerned although she was prepared to make this reference of the Kashmir issue to the Security Council as a matter of faith, an ever increasing strata of our own society to feel that their faith is being very badly shaken and we have begun to wonder whether after all we had been wise enough from a political point of view in making this reference of the Kashmir issue to the Security Council. Let them realise one thing. It was not because India was not able to defend herself against these barbarous raiders that she made this reference. Although during these three months they have not been able to come to any sort of decision India has been able to hold her own on the Kashmir front and has been able to repulse many of the attacks by the raiders driving them away with heavy losses. It is because of India's anxiety to have an opportunity to show her impartiality and also to establish it as one of the greatest precedents in her own progressive activities that India placed this particular matter before the U.N.O. I trust that the Security Council of the U.N.O. which is meeting again today will be able to take into account the general temper in this country and also remind her own delegates of her own past professions and activities and see that justice is done to India. It is not only a matter concerning India; it is a matter of worldwide importance and concerns U.N.O. herself for it will show whether really the U.N.O. has become the progressive custodian of world progress and peace.

I have only one word more to say. We are anxious that if the U.N.O. is likely to fail to discharge her duties as the world expects her to do, it will not be possible for her or anybody else to expect India to oppose the idea of veto. The veto has been a big bugbear to the Anglo-Americans and they want this to be removed. We are now better able to understand why Russia was not prepared to have this veto removed. Therefore it will be impossible for India or those other nations who are able to see eye to eye with India hereafter to agree with those nations who are anxious to remove this veto in order that they may be able to do whatever they like.

Sir, I have stated by case as impartially as possible so far as the U.N.O. is concerned and I trust that the U.N.O. will be able to discharge her own duties towards the cause of world peace as well as towards the peoples of the world, including India.

Seth Govinddas: Sir, since I entered the Indian legislature in 1923 I have been discussing the question both in the Assembly as well as in the Council of State, when I was a member of that House. And since this Department has come into the hands of our respected and beloved premier Hon'ble Pandit Jawaharlalji I had the privilege of raising this question twice in this House, once on the 14th March, 1947 and again on the 4th December, 1947. On both occasions I said that a better man than Panditji could not be available in this country to manage this department. I repeat what I had said on those two occasions. But at the same time I must say that in spite of this Department being in the hands of Panditji, nothing much could be done as far as the countries of the Commonwealth are concerned. Panditji himself said on the 4th December, while speaking on my cut motion:

"Coming to another part of this cut motion in regard to Indians in the British Commonwealth, that is an old subject and a painful subject. I entirely agree with any criticism that might be made, that we have not been able to do anything substantial in this direction."

When I moved my first cut motion on the 14th March our country was not free. On the 4th December we were free and our brethren abroad expected that after our freedom we shall be able to do something for them. We also wanted to do something and still want to do something substantial for them but I admit that the problem is so complicated and ticklish that it is very difficult to say precisely what should be done in this respect. When I raise

this question again on the floor of this House today I cannot suggest anything in particular which can be done but I do so only with a view to review the whole subject, so that we may jointly think and the Government may think with us as to what can be done as far as our brethren living in the countries of the Commonwealth are concerned. Their number is as big as 45 lakhs and as the population of the world is increasing their number is also increasing.

Now I shall briefly deal with the problems of the different countries. In South Africa we find that in spite of the decision of the U.N.O. in 1946 and in spite of our knowledge that our legal position is as strong as it was in 1946, though we could not get a two-third majority in the following year, the Ghetto Act is still on the statute book of South Africa. Satyagraha is going on there. Recently the two famous Indian leaders of South Africa, Messrs. Dadu and Naicker, were arrested and sentenced to six months hard labour. I should like to know what are the plans of the Government as far as South Africa is concerned.

Coming to East Africa we find that the Inter-Territorial Organisation of the three Colonies, Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda, has come into existence or shortly going to come into existence. We know that the Indians of East Africa were opposed to this Inter-Territorial Organisation and so was the Government of India. The revised proposals of this Inter-Territorial Organisation, I am afraid, are worse than the original proposals. The population of these three colonies according to races is as follows: Kenya has a population of about 16,000 Whites, 56,000 Asiatics and 20 lakhs of negroes. In Tanganyika the Whites are about 8,000, the Asiatics 32,000 and Negroes 50 lakhs. In Uganda the Whites are only 2,000, the Asiatics 14,000 and Negroes 35 lakhs. In spite of this microscopic minority of Whites we find that their representation in the Central East African Legislature would be much more than that of Asiatics as well as of the indigenous population there.

Another very dangerous thing is happening in East Africa. The Central Indians Overseas Association of which I am the President has received a cablegram like this:

"Reliably informed Indian Muslims here pressing for separate electorates in Kenya. Would be disastrous to Indian community. Repetition of Indian calamity should be prevented here. Spread of religious politics will do untold harm to African progress. Government decision being taken mid-January. Suggest you publicly condemn and appeal Colonial Office against separate electorates and circularise Indian press to secure comment."

On the 25th February another message from London has appeared which says:

"The Kenya Government is seeking to solve the problem of Muslim representation in the Legislative Council by reserving for the Muslim community two of the five seats which the Indian community have in the Legislature. These two seats will be in the Nairobi and Mombasa electoral areas which return two candidates each on the common Indian roll. Instead of being able to vote for both candidates they will only be entitled to vote for one and thus the Government expects that Muslims will support the Muslim candidate and Hindus their own."

I had been to East Africa in 1938 and I dare say that there was not any sort of communal feeling in that country. The poison from India has gone there and if the reservation according to communities is made I feel that that is only the thin end of the wedge.

Immigration laws in all the three colonies have been passed. These immigration laws are most harmful to the growth of those countries. The Raja Maharaj Singh delegation which went to these colonies made their Report in 1946 and it is said in their Report:

"The present immigration Bills, although non-discriminatory and non-racial in form will in practice adversely affect Indian immigration much more than the immigration of Europeans. In fact they will have the effect of almost closing the door to the further entrance of Indians. We have been assured that the purpose of the Bills is not to discriminate against Indians. But having regard to the past history of immigration restrictions and

[Seth Govinddas]

to present utterances by persons in authority and by non-official Europeans we think that the apprehensions entertained by Indians have sufficient foundation. Racial discrimination in practice is as objectionable as discrimination against law and in some respects it is more dangerous as it is more insidious in its operation."

The relations of India with East Africa have been very old. When Vasco de Gama came to East Africa he found Indians trading there. Various investigations have proved that Indian immigration to East Africa has not been harmful to the indigenous population there, but has been to their good. I have seen vast barren lands in East Africa and the quality of those lands is so good that if they are brought under cultivation, at a time when the food problem is facing the whole world, it would be advantageous not only to East Africa but to the whole world. At such a time these immigration laws come into existence.

Coming to Fiji, Mr. Vishnu Dev, M.L.C. has sent me a copy of the new Immigration Ordinance there according to which every Indian who is residing in Fiji will have to produce a birth certificate. We know how difficult it is to produce a birth certificate and I feel that this is only a preparation to deprive them at a future date of their citizenship rights.

Now, Sir, in Mauritius we find that though the disabilities of Indians in that country are not so great as in other Commonwealth countries, yet the economic conditions are very bad. Mr. Ridley was sent from this country to investigate into the economic conditions of the Indians in Mauritius in 1940 and Major Ord Brown, the Labour Adviser to the Colonial Office, was also sent there in 1948. He says in his Report:

"The most superficial observations reveal the poor physique of the average Indian worker in Mauritius. The picture therefore in Mauritius is that of a poorly paid, under-nourished, sickly population capable only of such a limited output of work that an increase of wages offers little promise of improved performance."

Coming to the West Indies countries—Trinidad, Jamaica, Grenada, Barbados, St. Lucia, etc.—we find that a move has been made there to have a Federation of all the West Indies countries. There was a conference there last year to which I am sorry to say no representative could be sent from India. Of course we cannot oppose this Federation on principle. But I feel that this Federation will also be something like that of the Inter-territorial organization of East Africa and therefore a proper watch has to be kept as far as this Federation of West Indies is concerned.

Regarding Burma, Ceylon and Malaya, the three neighbour countries with which we have the oldest relations, last time when I moved my cut motion, I made a bold suggestion—that was to have a common citizenship of India and these countries. A suggestion like this was made to France by Mr. Churchill in the last war. Let these small countries not think that we want to exploit them. If there is a common citizenship of these three countries and India, we shall be able to give them a good protection at the time of war and they will have to spend much less on their defence. However, if that is not possible, at least we can adopt common defence measures. We can also enter into economic agreements with these countries. The Indian population there, Sir, is in very big number. Burma was once a part of this country and it is in the interests of these countries and also of India that we have further and more intimate relations with these countries. And now, Sir, in conclusion I want to point out two things...

Mr. Speaker: I may just inform the Honourable Member that I am extending his time. I am doing so instead of curtailing it because there are four minutes now for the recess time and I do not think they could be offered usefully to any other member. He may go on till 1 O'clock.

Seth Govinddas: Thank you very much.

I want to urge, Sir, that we should never demand any preferential rights or any exclusive treatment for Indians in any country of the world. We should merge our interests with the interests of the indigenous population of those countries. We should never agitate for anything only for Indians. We should prove to them that if we are there, we are there for mutual good; and besides that, we should try to keep the closest relations with Indians all over the world. It can be done, Sir, by giving scholarships to the various students by bringing them here into our universities. That is being done also to some extent. This can be done Sir, by sending our representatives to various countries, and the Honourable the Prime Minister knows that there are still many countries where we have not been able to send our representatives. This can be done, Sir, by sending goodwill missions by sending cultural missions. Just the other day replying to a question of mine, the Honourable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad said, that he was thinking of sending cultural missions to various countries. I wish, Sir, that these missions are sent first to those countries where our representatives have not been sent. After India has become free, we have to keep our relations with our brethren all over the country all the more.

In the end, Sir, I wish to say that the question of citizenship is there. After we go out of the British Commonwealth and declare ourselves a free Republic—which we are bound to do in the near future as we have adopted a resolution in this respect in the Constituent Assembly moved by the Honourable the Prime Minister. The question of citizenship will become a most important question. I wish, Sir, that Indians do become the citizens of the various countries where they have gone, and we only help them on humanitarian and moral grounds. That is the only thing which we can do from here; and while taking my seat I again repeat that a better man than Panditji we could not have in this department. We expect much from him and so do our brethren expect in various countries.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half-Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Speaker (The Honourable Mr. C. V. Maralankar) in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Honourable the Prime Minister like to speak now?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow I have to speak at the end and I would prefer to speak then.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the suggestion of the Honourable Pandit Kunaru, which seemed to be acceptable to the Honourable the Leader of the House, I was just wanting to know whether he would intervene at this stage. He would, of course, have the right of speaking at the end. I do not call upon him now.

Several Honourable Members: At the end.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. In fact the position which I myself have always preferred is that after some of the Honourable Members who wish to speak have had their say, it is better that Government should have their say on the subject, so that when other Honourable Members follow with their criticism, they stand in a much better position. But I leave it entirely to the wishes of the House.

Shri K. Santhanam (Madras: General): If the arrangements were such it would have been possible, that is if we had five or six hours. But as it is, Honourable Members will then have no opportunity to speak because there is only one hour left.

Mr. Speaker: I could see that the time at our disposal is short but I would not be measuring speeches by the quantum of time but by the quality. Then let us proceed.

Mr. Husain Imam (Bihar: Muslim): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the stand which India has taken in connection with her position in the councils of the nations is that of independence. I am glad that India is neither following the 'right of the dollar' economy, nor the leftist one of Russia. But there is a need for another thing; I would not call it innovation, but a persistence in our work so that we may be able to lead a group of those who have been so far exploited. It is not enough that we do not belong to any of these two groups; but what we want is that India should take up the leadership of all the Nations of the world who had been exploited in the past, and it is necessary that the number of those who are under the influence of these two groups of Powers should be gradually reduced.

The almighty dollar has been trying all these years to bring one country after the other under its sway. We saw an example of it at the time when the partition of Palestine was being discussed in the U.N.O. Countries which had spoken openly against the partition were forced either to abstain from voting or to vote against what they had spoken. All this was done because America decided to do something and she brought pressure; the pressure which America could bring to bear is tremendous; even those countries which had suffered in the past from exploitation had to succumb to this pressure because of the fact that the dollar is able to buy many things.

What I wish to stress is that the membership of the U.N.O. should not be confined to the old countries, but the new countries which are throwing off the yoke of imperialism should be encouraged to come in, and every effort should be made to make them members of the U.N.O. We find, Sir, that Indonesia is not yet a member of the U.N.O. because of the position which it occupies in the Dutch scheme of things. We find that there are still certain small countries which have not yet joined the U.N.O.; it is to our interest that their entry into the U.N.O. should be facilitated and we should be able to lead a group of those countries which have been liberated from the imperialistic yoke. For instance, I would like to see Ceylon becoming a member of the U.N.O.—that will be a vote in favour of India.

Sir, I regret that the House did not find any time to bring in any cut on the other part of the External Affairs Department. I refer to Demand No. 41 under which Rs. 208 lakhs are being sanctioned for Embassies and other branches in the international world. If there had been any cut motion on that, I would have been able to discuss the particular Embassies, and their expenses and the work which they are putting in. But as there is no cut, I am simply referring to it in passing.

The third thing which I wish to stress is that it is not sufficient that we should be in the right, but that what is necessary is that people should be convinced, external opinion should be convinced, that we are in the right. That requires an amount of propaganda which I regret is not being made. I draw the attention of the House to some articles which were published in a Bombay Paper—Babu Rao Patel's paper—in which he had given pictures of American propaganda which is going on, and films which were being shown in America under the heading of "Bloody India." It is something which means that there has been some mistake by our own censors out here, as well as something defective in our Embassy over there, that the thing should have been allowed to go ahead in the manner in which they have done. I for one, Sir, do not wish to wash dirty linen outside; I may have my grouses, I may have my fights with my friends and my countrymen, but I think the forum is not that; it brings shame not to one community but to the entire population of India that we have

degraded so much. I therefore feel, Sir, that the propaganda side of our outside should be strengthened, and inside censorship should be more rigorous. In this connection we would like to hear from the Honourable Minister in charge, what exactly has been done to find out the culprits who sent out this film of "Bloody India," and what steps have been taken to stop repetition of that kind in the future.

Sir, I feel that the Department is in the best hands possible, but our officers—if you will excuse me—are not wide awake enough to look at all fronts. I know this is a rather tall order. We have got to fight on so many fronts. We have fought on so many fronts in the past and we have to fight on so many fronts in the future. Therefore, to ask any one to look at all fronts is not easy thing. But Sir it should be done, and if necessary, we should expand the Department and do everything in our power to keep the fair name of India high and above board.

Shri H. V. Kamath (C. P. and Berar: General): Sir, I rise to support Prof. Ranga's out motion. Since we last debated Foreign Affairs in this House, there have been two or three events of portentous significance to the world. The first was the martyrdom of Mahatma Gandhi who died for peace and in the cause of peace. With his death—the death of one who had been a fighter for peace all his life,—the greatest single force for peace has been removed from the world.

Then, Sir, we are seeing the clouds of war gathering in Europe and simultaneously, the movement for freedom of the exploited and suppressed peoples in the Far Eastern corner of the world. Indonesia, Indo-China and Korea are still struggling for freedom.

In the West, it is a different picture altogether which is emerging. What Herr Hitler did in 1939 Tovarich Stalin has done in 1948. Herr Hitler's forces goose stepped into Prague in March 1938 and in February 1948 we see the forces of the Red Army marching into the same city. One was a menace from the left geographically but a coup from the right politically. Today it is a menace from the right geographically but a coup from the left politically. But the sum and substance is the same.

The storm is gathering. Prof. Ranga said it was a storm in a tea cup. I won't put it as complacently as that. It is much more than a storm in a tea cup. If we pursue the same path of complacency which Chamberlain pursued in 1938-39, I am sure that within a year's time, war will be upon us right in the heart and the soil of India. We cannot afford to be complacent. We must take it very seriously and in right earnest. The latest report from America reads thus—it is hot from the agency:

"Evacuation plans for 75 million city dwellers in the event of major bombing attacks were revealed by Thomas Mac Donald, Public Road Commissioner, yesterday.

He said in an interview that Federal and State engineers were surveying highways in the States of Washington and Oregon to provide civilian escape routes from major west coast cities.

He said the west coast evacuation systems will be used as a pattern for other cities throughout the country. Mass hysteria undoubtedly would sweep major American industrial cities if attacks occurred. But proper planning for civilian evacuation could greatly minimize the effect."

So, Sir, America is preparing for the evacuation of 75 million city dwellers in the event of war. That shows that war is not distant, although God forbid that war should come to us or to the world; but we certainly must prepare ourselves for it. While we pray that it may not come, we must keep our powder dry, as the old adage goes. Czechoslovakia has been sacrificed, and Turkey, Greece and Italy seem to be next on the cards. Britain, France and America together

[Shri H. V. Kamath]

with the Benelux countries, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg have formed or are forming a Western European Union. Thus the stage is set for the Division of Europe into two separate blocs. Whether it is racial or otherwise, it is not necessary for me to go into at present.

Along, Sir, with this war which is based, may I say, on political ideology—we may call it pluto-democracy or capitalist democracy *versus* Communism or Socialism—there is also another war brewing. That is the race and colour war, the seeds of which are being sown in South Africa. Our own countrymen there as the House is very well aware, are being ill-treated, insulted, humiliated and oppressed. If this tendency is not curbed, if it is not eliminated, then along with the ideological war, there will be another war—a racial war—running parallel to this, if not subsequent to this. Therefore, Sir, what we are concerned with today is the danger of war and how to meet that danger.

So far, Sir, the Honourable the Minister for Foreign Affairs has formulated his foreign policy in such a way that India has been pursuing a more or less neutral policy in foreign affairs. She has not aligned herself with any bloc, either American or Russian.

But, Sir, how far will this carry us? That is a moot point. How far will it save us from the danger of war, if war actually overtakes us? The Western Powers as well as the Eastern, namely, America as well as Russia, think today in these terms, that whosoever is not with us is against us, and we have no use for neutrals. They say: "If you are with us, come with us and fall in line with us and throw your lot with us." That is what America and Russia say today.

But we have been pursuing so far—happily, I must say,—a neutral policy, calculated perhaps to obtain the maximum national advantage economically, commercially and otherwise. What I would stress at this stage is that if we are pursuing a neutral policy, it follows from that, as a natural consequence, that we should not take part in any power politics or disputes that might arise between rival elements. Unfortunately, Sir, this did not turn out to be so, because towards the end of last year, when there was a contest for a seat on the Security Council, we were found fighting Ukraine which naturally alienated Russia unnecessarily. Then again, if my memory does not betray me, when Argentina applied for admission to the United Nations, India did not give support to her case, based partly on anti-Fascist prejudice. Thus we have rubbed some nations on the wrong side. I submit, Sir, that when we formulate our foreign policy, we should not be guided, or misguided, by the internal politics of any country or State. I would in this connection, Sir, point out to the House what Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose said in the course of his Haripura address. It is very relevant and I believe it throws a salutary light on our foreign policy. He said:

"I attach great importance to the question of a foreign policy for India and of developing international contacts. I believe that in the years to come international developments will favour our struggle in India."

That was of course in those days. He further said:

"In connection with our foreign policy, the first suggestion that I have to make is that we should not be influenced by the internal politics of any country or the form of its State. In this matter, we should take a leap out of Soviet diplomacy. Though Soviet Russia is a communist State, her diplomats have not hesitated to make alliances with non-Socialist States and have not declined sympathy or support coming from any quarter. We should make India and her culture known to the world."

Therefore, Sir, I would submit that we should base our foreign policy on this. Whether our lot would not be improved by aligning ourselves with a definite bloc is a point deserving our most careful examination. I am not of

course competent to say which particular bloc we should align ourselves with, but certainly it would be useful for us to align ourselves with some one bloc. To form a neutral bloc with our existing strength and resources is to my mind out of the question. Of course, when we become a strong nation, we can aspire to lead other nations and form a balance between these two blocs, but as we are situated today, it is an impracticable proposition.

Then, Sir, I submit that our ambassadors and embassies in foreign countries should be centres of Indian culture. They should radiate our civilisation and our heritage and form sort of oases in the deserts of foreign countries.

Our philosophy has got a meaning for the world and I think, Sir, that the world is moving more and more in the direction of spiritual socialism which has been our heritage, which is our message for the world and our mission in the present century. We have proclaimed liberty, equality and fraternity as the key notes of our constitution, but fraternity is impossible without the spiritual content of democracy and liberty. Therefore Sir, I would stress that is the role that our embassies should play in foreign countries and finally, Sir, I would request the Honourable the Foreign Minister to see that our ambassadors do not go about roving all over the world: I would here mention that our Russian Ambassador she has been discharging her duties wonderfully, but after having been in Moscow for 2 months she was absent for 3 or 4 months and this would certainly mar our relations with the foreign country to which she has been accredited. I feel our ambassadors must stick to where they are and cultivate friendly relations. It is not an easy matter for a country with a nascent freedom to be friendly with all nations of the world. Therefore, I would urge that our ambassadors should be more or less whole time in whatever countries they are accredited to, and should cultivate not merely social relations, but also relations on the highest spiritual and political level.

Sir, in this connection, I would just mention one thing and that is if Russia, China and India become one solid bloc, comprising nearly 1 thousand million—one half of the population of the world—we will form a group which will be invincible in the face of any assault from any quarter of the world. When I was in Russia, Sir, about 12 years ago, I had a talk with a Red Army Officer...

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time-limit by three minutes.

Shri H. V. Kamath: I will finish in half a minute. We should try if possible to form a bloc consisting of Russia, China and India and here our approach against Russia on the ground of her communism or atheism should not stand in the way because even Russia today with her translations of Mahabharata and Ramayana is moving towards the spiritual content of democracy and socialism. Therefore, Sir, I think it is high time for an alliance of Russia, China and India, the three great countries of Asia, which will lead us towards the goal of liberty, equality and fraternity for the whole world.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Mr. Speaker, several Honourable Members who have taken part in the debate have expressed their preference for a policy of what they call neutrality or independence. They have approved the foreign policy so far followed by India because they think that it merits that description. The Prime Minister who outlined his policy in this House in November last also expressed his conviction that such a policy was in consonance with the political status and the moral dignity of India. Sir, it seems to me that we cannot consider the question of our foreign relations merely in accordance with such a formula. We cannot merely consider whether our policy should be one of neutrality or one of alliance with a state or a number of states. I think this kind of approach is fundamentally wrong. We must consider what the vital

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru]

interests of our nation are. By vital interests, I mean those interests on which the integrity and the prosperity of the country depend. These interests are undoubtedly bound up with questions relating to defence. These interests must be such that would give up all that we hold dear in order to protect them. These fundamental interests should be such that we would be prepared to go to war in order to protect them and if this view is accepted, we must consider what steps we should take in order to secure our defence and to provide ourselves with the means of economically developing our country. If we find that we can expect the assistance that we need more from certain countries than from others, then taking human nature as it is, we are bound to be more friendly to these countries than to other countries with which we are not so directly concerned. Any such policy would not to be a policy of alliance; it would be a realistic policy taking account of the supreme objectives that we have to keep in view and using every possible method in order to achieve their realization. Suppose we feel that the kind of help that we want we can get most from the U.S.A. Then, I submit it is not in consonance with our national interests that we should regard America in the same light in which we would regard any other country. We cannot follow towards it a policy of absolute neutrality. Even a policy of friendly neutrality would not be adequate in these circumstances. Our policy must be more positive. It should be inspired by real and positive good-will towards it. Now if we follow such a policy, we shall not thereby commit ourselves beforehand to an approval of all that America does or of all the policies that she may follow in the domain of foreign relations. Even good friends can disagree amongst themselves on certain questions; they can differ even on important questions. If we recognise that our interests are more likely to be achieved by our being more friendly to certain countries than to others; by being more friendly to them without being antagonistic to others, we shall not thereby surrender our right to differ from them even on important questions of policy. I think, therefore that a policy which takes account of those interests of ours which we are in duty bound ever to keep in view will not derogate from our high ideals or be a lapse from those standards of conduct which we would always wish to follow.

All that it would mean is that we would have to see what is the nature of the world we are living in and adjust ourselves. We cannot always act as we like or even express our own individual opinion on every question discussed in the international conferences. We may on a certain point hold a different opinion from that of some of our friends but we may not feel, in view of the national interests that we have always to guard, that it is not desirable for us to oppose them. This is the only limitation that we would place on ourselves in following the policy which I venture to think is more in the interests of India than a policy of pure neutrality.

An Honourable Member: What about Kashmir?

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: I shall refer very briefly in a minute to the question of Kashmir.

I therefore think that the Prime Minister when he takes part in the debate will be good enough to tell us how he proposes to secure those interests of ours which are essential to the maintenance of our freedom and our economic progress. It is only then that we shall be able to understand what the character of his policy is. Sir, we have undoubtedly so far followed a policy of absolute independence. Our representatives have not hesitated to express their opinions on any occasion at any international gathering. But I am afraid that this attitude is not always helpful I fear that some of the antagonism towards India that was displayed in connection with the discussion of the Kashmir question in the

Security Council was due to our failure to realise that it is sometimes as much our duty to remain silent as to speak out in consideration of our supreme interests. Had we recognised the reality of the situation and realised that we could be no more free to follow always policies approved by us than any other country, even the most powerful country in the world, I think we would have had a few more friends. I hope that the attitude of the members of the Security Council when they discuss the question of Kashmir again will be more fair and more in consonance with the facts. It is surprising, as pointed out by Mr. Gopiaswamy Ayyangar, that important members of the Security Council wanted us not merely to come to terms with the Muslims of Kashmir or the Government of Pakistan but also with the tribesmen. Such a policy and such an attitude on their part can, it seems to me, be explained only by a feeling that India was essentially unfriendly to them. I hope that my fear is not justified, but I am sure that such a view has been expressed to the Prime Minister by others more competent than I am to form an opinion on this subject. The Kashmir question, which an Honourable Member asked me to consider in the light of the policy which I advocated, in my opinion supports the view that I have taken. Frankly speaking, I have met hardly any one who has been to any international gathering and has not expressed the opinion that the foreign policy that we are following at present is not in consonance with our most important interests, and is doing us no little harm abroad.

Sir, let me say before I sit down that though I have not agreed with the policy laid down by the Prime Minister in November last I have not considered it in any spirit of hostility. His view, has received my earnest and serious consideration. There is no one either in this House or outside who would doubt the loftiness and purity of his motives and his desire to protect the best interests of India and to give her a high place among the nations of the world. Yet I feel, Sir, that his policy, though in consonance with high aspirations, is not a realistic policy. It is not enough for us that we should give expression to our high aspirations; it is not enough that we should lay down lofty moral principles. What is required is that we should bring about a correlation between our interests and our power to protect them. It is this correlation that would enable us to have a really sound foreign policy. So long as we are oblivious of this fundamental fact, however pure our motives, however keen our desire to advance the reign of justice and fairness in the world, we shall fail either to guard our own fundamental interests or to protect the interests of the weaker nations, whose champions we regard ourselves to be.

Shri K. Santhanam: Foreign policy is a difficult and delicate subject and I have no desire to say anything which will cause the slightest embarrassment to our Prime Minister. At the same time, it is essential that the directions of our foreign policy should be carefully reasoned and should be free from all ambiguity. So I shall content myself in the few minutes before me with indicating a few directions in which that policy should be pursued.

Foreign policy is a function of three things: of our ideals, of our national interests and of our economic and military power. I shall say a few words on each of these points.

So far as our ideals are concerned, I think there are three great fundamental issues. Should there be a sovereign world authority with legal and material power to prevent war? I think, Sir, that this is an issue on which we should take a definite stand. We should strive, at whatever cost, to see that the United Nations does get this power. I was distressed to find that our representative objected to the removal or restriction of the veto power. So long as the veto power is there, the United Nations will be another League of Nations and go the same way. We must support every effort to see that

[Shri K. Santhanam]

the veto power is removed and the United Nations and its Security Council get all the legal power necessary to prevent war as well as the material resources necessary to do so. I say this in spite of our rather indifferent and bitter experience of the Security Council in relation to the Kashmir issue. Still, the prevention of war is more important and we should see that in the next one or two years the United Nations becomes a sovereign world government as otherwise there is no real hope for the world.

Secondly, can political dictatorship be tolerated in any part of the world? Today, it is becoming a serious cause of dispute in Europe and Asia and we should make a bold and sturdy determination and resolve that we are going to oppose political dictatorship in any part of the world and in any country. The theory that democratic countries can co-operate with dictatorship countries led us to two world wars and if such a notion prevails again I am sure it is going to lead to a third world war. Here and now, our country must stand for democracy. Wherever there is dictatorship, our representatives should say we are against dictatorship and against dictatorship nations and that we are for democracy.

Thirdly, can economic anarchy be permitted? This anarchy may be called capitalism, or by any other name. But so long as the masses of the world are disinherited, so long as they are not assured of elementary social security, no political arrangement, no international arrangement can secure peace. We should strive for liquidation of poverty, not only in our own country but throughout the world. These are the essential elements of our foreign policy, so far as ideals are concerned.

Let me now come to our national interests. What are they? We should be prepared against any possible combination against our safety. I do not want to say anything which is calculated to disturb our relations with our neighbouring State. We want to be friends with Pakistan, and if they are going to be friends, we shall go all out to support them. But that friendship will come only when Pakistan and her neighbours and all those medieval nations behind her frontiers know that friendship of India is profitable while hostility will be dreadful. It is only on that condition that we can hope for friendship between India and Pakistan, and our foreign policy should be so directed that the restless elements in those nations—in Pakistan and the medieval countries—will be certain that it is a wholly unprofitable policy to think of hostility towards this country. We should seek for this purpose friends all over the world.

We must also have friends who will be capable of helping us in our industrial and economic reconstruction, for our foreign policy will be effective only to the extent that we are economically and militarily strong. We have to build up our economic and military strength and we cannot do that with our meagre intrinsic resources. We want outside help, the assistance of those who can and are willing to help us. We must make friends with them. No one in this world will give something for nothing. If we seek assistance from those who can help us to build our economic and political strength, they are bound to ask for some terms. If they are very unreasonable or immoral, we are bound to decline. We can take no chances with our independent existence and must then get along even with the scanty resources we have. If we can get their friendship on any reasonable terms we should be prepared to correlate our ideals to them and seek that friendship. It is on that the future of our foreign policy will depend. While we are developing our economic and military strength, we should be content to play a minor part in the disputes of big powers and we should cultivate the relations of our smaller neighbours. We should seek friendship with Burma, with Ceylon and with other neighbouring countries. For instance, our economic difficulties in

Indo-China are very great. Many of our nationals are finding it difficult to get even a small part of the property which they left behind during the war. Our foreign policy should be directed towards an intensive and comprehensive friendship with all these neighbouring countries, while our Embassies abroad, in Washington and Moscow and other places should, as Mr. Kamath suggested, be more cultural. There, our culture and ideals must have as much effect as they can while our political and economic relations should be concentrated within, what may be called, India's field of force. I hope our field of force will ultimately embrace the whole world. But it is a small field today, confined to 200 to 800 miles from our frontiers. We should cultivate our foreign policy intensively in this field and extensively in other fields. It is by this combination of realism and idealism that we can have a coherent, a persistent and a really effective foreign policy.

I am sorry I have had no time to develop my ideas and I have already taken more time than I should and so I suggest these points for the consideration of the Prime Minister, and I am sure under his able leadership India's foreign policy will become purposive and decisive and will play an effective, though small part in leading the world to a better state of affair than that in which it finds itself today.

Mr. Nasiruddin Ahmad: Sir, I have a very short time at my disposal to deal with a very important subject, namely our relations with the other parts of the world. It has been suggested here that our best course would be to remain aloof from international politics. But I think it is simply impossible to adopt that course. Whether we like it or not, we will have one day to side ourselves with one or the other of the power groups that are ranging themselves in the world. If we cultivate a sense of isolationism the only result would be that we will not attack anybody and start a war; but that will not prevent others from attacking us if they like. We cannot therefore remain isolated.

Sir, though it is somewhat unpopular or unfashionable to admit it, we cannot escape joining one or the other of the groups that are aligning themselves on one side or the other. It has been authoritatively stated that there were 81 occasions when aggressive wars were fought. On each one of those occasions, the aggressor was always a power without any responsibility, a dictator or an autocrat. It has never happened that a democracy has ever fought an aggressive war. Wherever a democracy has fought, it has always fought a defensive war. It is the opinion of persons competent to judge that it is an actual combination of democratic powers that will be proof against another war. There are two great power groups, now—the Anglo-American Group and the Communist group, and we have to choose between the one or the other. Whether we like it or not we will have to make up our mind and the sooner we make up our mind the better.

One Honourable Member has suggested the formation of a geographical group—that the Asiatic powers should hold together. But I should submit that we should group together on an ideological basis and not on a geographical basis. We should join the Democratic group and not the Totalitarian group. If the totalitarian group gets the upper hand, another war is inevitable; if on the other hand the democratic group gets the better of the world, then there will be peace for a time. The military strength of the Democratic group which chiefly consists of the United States and the United Kingdom, is obviously far stronger than that of the Communistic group. Whatever differences we may have with the United Kingdom and the United States or the other allied powers in small matters, like problems of Indonesia, Palestine and Kashmir—I call them small in view of the magnitude of the danger which faces the world today—whatever differences we may have with them, we must join

[Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad]

the Anglo-American group which stands for democratic principles. If we do that we can play an important part in preventing another world war.

Sir, the idea of the U.N.O. is that there should be a common purpose in which all the countries should join; there should be a Federation of the democratic countries; there should be a Federal Legislature, a Federal Judiciary and an International Federal Army. This is the crux of the whole situation. If we have a strong Federal Army under the U.N.O. there will be no world war. If we join and remain in that group there will be ample scope for us to develop our own culture, but we must in our own interest first join them and make that combination a success; and then the peace of the world for some time can be assured. In these circumstances, I should humbly submit that aloofness will not do. We must join the Democratic group and be instrumental in preventing another war and our small differences and our small problems can be solved by our joining that group unequivocally and at an early date. Sir, the stage is set for the Democratic group to begin its operation. There is already a World International Bank, and International Army will come into being as soon as we join together. In these circumstances, I should clearly and emphatically suggest that our policy should be to join the Democratic group. Sir, the matter is of great importance. I should submit that the Honourable the Prime Minister should consider this matter. It is not necessary for him to commit himself to a definite policy just now. But I should submit that he should take these matters into careful consideration and lead our country into proper channels and make our foreign policy a success.

Shri B. Shiva Rao (Madras: General): Sir, in the important statement that the Prime Minister made on Friday in relation to Kashmir, he spoke of certain wider issues, implying thereby the general position of the States since we achieved our freedom. Sir, having taken part in the last general assembly session of the United Nations, I would like to refer to certain "wider issues"—if I may borrow his words—which affect the position of India in the United Nations, whether it is the problem of Kashmir or the rights of Indians in South Africa. It is admitted that so far the proceedings in the Security Council on the question of Kashmir have failed to give us satisfaction. On the question of Indians in South Africa, the first session of the United Nations passed a very satisfactory resolution by more than a two-thirds majority, and yet last year although the Delegation was led by the same experienced and skilful leader, and the terms of the resolution proposed by the Indian Delegation were comparatively milder, we did not get a two-thirds majority. There is not the slightest doubt that so far as the United Nations are concerned, the tide at the present moment is running somewhat against us. India's position is one, more or less, of isolation. During the few minutes that you have been pleased to allot to me I would like to invite the attention of the House to certain basic factors which we would do well to bear in mind.

The first factor, Sir, is the fact that the United Nations works on the basis of a certain number of blocs. The biggest bloc is the Latin American bloc consisting of about twenty members, led more or less by the United States and having a few members from other parts of the world like the Philippines and very frequently China. That is the biggest bloc. The next, from the standpoint of size, is the one ranged round the United Kingdom which consists of not only the United Kingdom and most of the Dominions, but countries like Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Turkey and sometimes the Scandinavian countries. The third is the Muslim bloc with the Arab States, as the core and Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan attached to it. And the last, numerically the smallest, but strategically by far the most important is the Soviet bloc, consisting of the U.S.S.R.,

Ukraine, Buclorussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In this setting the position of India is very much like that of an unattached member in this House.

So far as the question of Kashmir is concerned, I think we would do well to remember this too: that the United States having taken a very definite line in regard to the partition of Palestine and thus alienated to a considerable extent the sympathies of the Muslim bloc of countries, is not likely to range herself easily on the side of a nation which does not belong to the Muslim bloc. Incidentally, Sir, although this is not a point which I would like to develop at this stage, I may inform the House that, so far as publicity in the United States is concerned, Pakistan has come to a working arrangement with the British Information Services who do an extremely good job for Pakistan. In comparison, India's publicity arrangements are utterly inadequate.

Another important point which we would do well to remember is that Pakistan is, inside the United Nations, "the good little boy." She takes very good care in regard to interests which do not directly concern her, not to tread on the corns of the Imperialist Powers of Western Europe. So far as we are concerned, we have taken up the cause of the natives of South West Africa, we have taken up the cause of Indonesia and thereby earned the gratitude of subject races, colonial peoples, and the inhabitants of mandated territories all over the world. And although our position inside the United Nations is one of comparative isolation, I think outside vast numbers of people look to us for friendship inside that organisation. Sir, if I may be permitted to say so, in progressive circles throughout the world our Prime Minister is recognised as one of the most powerful exponents of social democracy and freedom. Nevertheless, following the policy as we have pursued in the past, we have to pay a price for it. The imperial powers of Western Europe are not likely to take to us in a kindly fashion, particularly in comparison with Pakistan, as in all matters which come up before the Trusteeship Council, we take up the side of the underdog.

Lastly, the only point that I would like to refer to in this debate is in regard to the future of the United Nations. Indeed, over the peace of the world, there hangs a big question mark, that question mark being provided by the uncertain and uneasy relation between the United States and the U. S. S. R. On the eve of the last session of the United Nations there appeared a most remarkable article in an American quarterly "Foreign Affairs" signed by 'X'. But it was widely recognised in the United States that the writer was no less a person than the chief policy maker in the State Department at Washington. I think it would interest the House if I read out two very brief passages from that article, because at the present moment the foreign policy of the State Department is shaped by the writer of this article. "So far as the Soviet is concerned" he said, "she reflects no abstract love of peace and stability, no real faith in the possibility of a permanent happy co-existence of the socialist and capitalist worlds, but rather a continuous and persistent pressure towards the disruption and weakening of all rival influence and rival power." And his final conclusion is of the utmost interest and significance. His conclusion is that the "Soviet power today bears within itself the seeds of its own decay and that the sprouting of these seeds is well advanced;" that if "anything were ever to occur to disrupt the unity and the efficacy of the Party as a political instrument, Soviet Russia might be changed overnight from one of the strongest to one of the weakest and most pitiable of national societies." That is the view which is firmly held in influential official circles in the United States at the present moment.

I have not the time to develop other points on which I wanted to speak today, but I would like to say this in conclusion. Whether it is Korea or Palestine or Kashmir or Greece or Spain, or any other question which comes up before the United Nations, the primary consideration from which all these issues are faced

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

is not so much the merits of the question but whether a particular solution will stimulate the sprouting of those seeds of decay in Soviet Russia to which reference has been made, or whether that solution will strengthen the basis of the Soviet. These are some of the wider issues whose significance we would do well to remember.

There are one or two suggestions which I would like to make to the Prime Minister before resuming my seat. One is that inside the External Affairs Department the time has come for the creation of a policy-planning department, very similar to that which exists in the State Department but not so conservative in its outlook. And the second is that he should consider the formation of an inter-departmental committee at secretariat level consisting of representatives not only of his own department but of the Education, Commerce, the Public Health and Industries Departments, so that whenever any delegation is sent abroad under any of the branches of the United Nations or to the General Assembly, there may be a co-ordinated policy inspiring all of us.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, I have taken interest in the various suggestions and criticisms made. I think possibly if I had been speaking not from my place here but from somewhere else I might have produced a longer list of criticisms. So I am grateful for the gentle way in which Honourable Members have treated the External Affairs Department.

In criticising the foreign policy of the Government of India during the last year or six months I should like this House for an instant to turn its mind to any country today and think of its foreign policy—whether it is the U. S. A., the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., China or France. These are supposed to be the great powers. Just think of their foreign policy and see if you would say that the foreign policy of any one of those countries has succeeded, obviously succeeded from any point of view, from the point of view of moving towards world peace or preventing world war, succeeded from even the mere opportunist and individual point of view of that country. I think if you will look at this question from this point of view you will find that there has been a miserable failure of foreign policy of every great power and country. It is in that context that we shall have to see these things. It is not really the failure of the foreign policy of any particular power, though perhaps two or three major powers do influence foreign policy greatly. It is a gradual or rapid deterioration of the international situation. Now surely the responsibility for that deterioration might lie on some powers. In India our responsibility is very little. We may have functioned well or badly on the international stage but we are not, frankly speaking, influential enough to affect international events very much. Therefore if that great deterioration has taken place in the international sphere it is not due to our policy. We suffer from it just as every other nation suffers from it and I think it is this vague feeling that somehow we have suffered or something that has happened that induces members to search for reasons why we have suffered. I think that is a very right approach, because we must find out the reasons, where we might have erred, how we might have bettered our lot and so on and so forth. Nevertheless I think the real reason is that the causes lie entirely outside any policy that we have pursued. There are bigger and deeper causes affecting the world and we, like the strongest of nations, are pulled hither and thither by these forces. That is one fact that I should like the House to bear in mind.

Another factor and that is more applicable to us is this: that owing to the unfortunate events that have happened in India since the 15th August 1947 anything we did outside the world has suddenly lost weight or lost weight for a time. We counted for something not, very greatly of course, more in our poten-

uality than in actuality, because potentially we counted for a great deal, though actually we need not have counted for much. But the events that occurred after 15th August in India, Pakistan, etc., all over here—Pakistan I might say naturally did not count for much because it had no background; it was a newcomer; it was we who counted—those events suddenly brought down our credit in the international domain tremendously. It affected the United Nations when they were meeting last October, considering the South Africa issue. Undoubtedly the fact of the events in India affected the decision of the United Nations General Assembly in regard to the South Africa issue; so also in regard to other matters. All these facts have nothing to do with foreign policy. The point I wish to place before the House is this, that it may be desirable for us to adopt a certain foreign policy or a certain other one, one of what is called neutrality or, as Pandit Kunzru said, a more positive one. But all this has no relationship, it has nothing to do, with what has happened. Other factors govern it. If you like it was a fault, but we have been rather passive about all these matters, and where we have been somewhat active are the very things in which some of the Honourable Members desire us to be more active than we have been. We are asked to collect the smaller nations round about us—in India or elsewhere. I think Mr. Kamath wanted us to go into darkest Africa and have alliances with the tribes there.

Shri H. V. Kamath: I did not say that.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: May be somebody else. Well, I am all for our going to Africa or to any other place. But the point is the very activity—call it idealistic: I do not think it is purely idealistic; I think it is, if you like, opportunist in the long run—this policy that we have so far pursued before we became a Government, and to some extent after we became a Government, that is, standing up somewhat, in so far as we can, for the weak and the oppressed in various continents, is not a policy which is to the liking of the Great Powers who directly or indirectly share in that exploitation. It is that that puts us in the wrong with them.

There has been a lot said about other matters. It is a clear issue before this House. Here is Indonesia. We have done precious little in the way of actual active help; we are not in a position to do that. But we have got sympathy towards them and we have expressed it as publicly as possible. Because we give our sympathy and some faint degree of help to Indonesia and because this offends and irritates some of the major powers of the world, are we to withdraw that? Are we to remain quite tame and say "No, this might irritate this power or that" because it does irritate this or that power and there is no doubt about it. Naturally we cannot as a Government go as far as we might have done as a non-official organisation where we can express our opinions as frankly and as aggressively as possible. Speaking as a Government we have to moderate our language. We have sometimes to stop doing things which we might otherwise do. Nevertheless, the fundamental thing is, do we sympathise and openly sympathise with a country like Indonesia in her struggle for freedom, or do we not? That applies not to Indonesia only but to several other countries. In each case we have to face the passive hostility of various interests, not only the direct interests involved but the indirect interests involved because the direct interests and the indirect interests hang together in such matters. It has been an astonishing thing how in the last so many months this Good Offices Committee functioned in Indonesia—all good people, and as it happens the Secretary of the Committee was an Indian. The way it has functioned and the results it produced are not at all satisfactory. If this House is dissatisfied with what the Security Council has this year done or considered in regard to Kashmir they would be still more dissatisfied, I think, if they consider the Indonesian Good Offices Committee's work, because unfortunately the approach to these problems is a certain approach with which this

[Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru]

House cannot fit in on account of our past traditions, on account of our ideals etc. Now I am not talking in terms of this bloc or that bloc; I am talking independently of these blocs as have appeared in the world stage. We have either to pursue that policy generally within limitations—because, we cannot pursue it wholeheartedly, nevertheless pursue it openly—or give it up. I do not think that anything could be more injurious to us from any point of view—certainly from an idealistic and high moral point of view but equally so from the point of view of opportunism and national interest in the narrowest sense of the word—than for us to give up these policies that we have pursued, namely of standing up for certain ideals in regard to oppressed nations, and trying to align ourselves with this great power or that and becoming its camp follower in the hope that some crumbs might fall from their table. I think that would be undoubtedly from the narrowest point of view of national interest a bad and harmful policy. I can understand some of the smaller countries of Europe or some of the smaller countries of Asia being forced by circumstance to bow down before some of the greater powers and become practically satellites of those powers, because they just cannot help it. The power opposed to them is so great and they have nowhere to go to. But I do not think that consideration applies to India. We are not citizens of any weak or mean country and I think it is foolish for us to get frightened, even from a military point of view or any point of view, of the greatest of the powers today. Not that I delude myself about what can happen to us if a great power in a military sense goes against us; I have no doubt it can injure us. But after all we have in the past opposed ourselves as a national movement to one of the greatest of world powers. We opposed ourselves in a particular way and in a large measure we succeeded by that way, and I have no doubt that if the worst comes to the worst and in a military sense we cannot meet these great powers it is far better for us to fight in those ways than submit ourselves and lose all the ideals which we have. Therefore let us not be frightened too much of the military might of this or that group. I am not frightened and I want to tell it to the world on behalf of this country that we are not frightened of the military might of this power or that. Our policy is not a passive policy or a negative policy. In fact these words are used rather vaguely. Two or three instances that were given perhaps gave an indication of the thing that was working in the minds of some of the Honourable Members which they have not had the time or the desire to say clearly. I shall give one instance. It was stated, I think by Pandit Kunsru that we supported veto in the United Nations presumably because we did not wish to offend the Soviet group.

Pandit Hriday Nath Kunsru: I made no reference to it.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Someone did.

An Honourable Member: Mr. Santhanam referred to it.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: It is immaterial. Now I want to place the facts before the House as far as I remember them. The veto was put there, as the House will remember, by the common consent of all the Great Powers—all the Great Powers in every Group. It was put there because they felt—and may I say that the Soviet felt that way: the United States also felt that way, because three huge and great Powers did not like the idea of half a dozen little countries just telling them to do this or that. Both felt that way and neither of those were prepared to submit just to a kind of majority voting and of little nations put together, so that it was put there in the Charter right at the beginning. Whether the veto was used or misused, I am not going into the question, but now this question arose that the veto should be removed. This was not liked by several Great Powers. It was not a question of supporting this bloc or that bloc. Both the blocs did not like the removal of that veto.

Now the problem before us was that if that veto was somehow removed by a veto or decision of the United Nations, there was little doubt that the United Nations as they are ceased to be at that instant. That was the choice. It was not a question of liking the veto. On behalf of India, as on behalf of many countries, it was stated openly that we disliked this veto and that it should go. It was pointed out however that this could only come about by some kind of general agreement. Now we agree with what Mr. Santhanam said that the United Nations, in spite of its failings and weaknesses, something that is good. It should be encouraged and supported in every way, and should be allowed to develop into some kind of world government or world order. Therefore we instructed our delegates not to press this question of the veto to the breaking point and to say that although we did not like it, it should remain there so long as it could not be removed by some kind of agreement of the major groups involved. In that way various questions come up and each question has to be considered on the merits. I do not know if any Honourable Member has analysed our voting at these international conferences. It would help them perhaps to appreciate the scene better if they took up any of the major issues during the last year in the United Nations or its various Committees and Councils and find out what India has done. It is certainly true that our instructions to our delegates have always been obviously and firstly to consider each question in terms of India's interest, secondly on the merits—I mean to say if it did not affect India, naturally on the merits and not merely to do something or give a vote just to please this Power or that Power, though of course it is perfectly natural that in our desire to have friendship with other Powers, we avoid doing anything which might irritate. As a matter of fact we go as far as possible to try and win over. It is not our purpose to enter into other people's quarrels. Our general policy has been to avoid entering into anybody's quarrels. If I may say so, I have more and more come to the conclusion that the less we interfere in international conflicts, the better unless our own interest is involved, for this reason that it is not in consonance with our dignity just to interfere without any effect being produced. Either we should be strong enough to produce some effect or we should not interfere at all. I am not anxious to put my finger in every international pie. Unfortunately sometimes one cannot help it. One is dragged into it. For instance there is the Korea Committee. Well, not only are we in that Committee, but ultimately our Representative becomes the Chairman of that Committee. Now that leads to another matter, to which reference has been made by some Honourable Member. That is this. It is an odd contrast today that while in the official councils of the United Nations we may not perhaps pull the weight we ought to, nevertheless in the unofficial councils outside our weight has considerably increased. Why is that so? Because progressively people see that within the United Nations things are done far from idealistically or morally or in terms of the underdog or in terms of the smaller nations or in terms of the Asian nations, and so more and more of these people try to search for someone else and in their search for someone else who might perhaps give a lead in these matters, almost automatically their eyes turn towards India. Now I do not wish to enter into any comparisons with other countries, and certainly we have done nothing in India to merit any question of leadership of anybody. It is for us to lead ourselves and then only can we lead others properly and I do not wish to place the case of India at any higher level. We have to look after ourselves. That is why I am, if I may say so, in spite of being Minister in charge of External Affairs, not interested in external affairs so much as internal affairs at the present moment because external affairs will follow internal affairs, but there is no basis for external affairs if internal affairs go wrong. Therefore also I am not anxious to widen our scope of representation all over the world. It is fairly wide now. That too we have been almost compelled by circumstances to do because we

[Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru]

simply cannot be an independent nation without having that representation, but I am not anxious to extend it any further unless some very special reason arises. That being so, nevertheless the fact remains that we stand for certain things. Now when we come into contact with the external world, do we stand for them or do we not? We have to choose. I have no doubt at all, as I said right at the beginning of my remarks, that in the long run it is to the great advantage of India for it to attract to itself the sympathy and the hope of millions of people in the world without offending others. It is not our purpose to offend others or to come into conflict with others. Nevertheless the world is in a pretty bad way and it is easy enough for people to tell me 'Oh, you talk idealistically, you should be practical.' May I remind the House that we have seen for these many years the results of persons and things being very practical? I have had about enough of this practicalness, which leads to incessant conflict and which leads to all the misery and suffering that we have seen. If that is the meaning of being practical, the sooner we are not practical the better. But that is not being practical. That is being grossly impractical in their march without looking to the left or to the right and each group just contracting in close circle, full of danger for the other group, trying to win over other small or big nations by some immediate advantage or something given. I do not say that is good enough for this country and we really are not even compelled by circumstances to do it. We might have been compelled by circumstances but we are not compelled by circumstances to give up because it does amount to giving up our independence in order to gain the goodwill of this country or that country. I think not only in the long run but in the short run, that independence of opinion and independence of action will count. That again does not mean that we should not associate ourselves closely in certain activities with particular countries. We do. Pandit Kunzru referred to the necessity for our developing economically, militarily and otherwise. Surely this House realises that nothing is more important in the opinion of this Government than to make India economically strong and militarily—not strong in the Big Power sense, because that is beyond our capacity, but as strong as we can to defend ourselves if anybody attacks.

We want to do that. We want the help of other countries; we are going to have it and we are going to get it too in a measure—I am not aware of this having been denied to us to any large extent. Even in taking that help, economic or other, or even in getting political help, it is not a wise policy to put all your eggs in one basket, if I may say so, that one should get help and more especially at the cost of one's self-respect. Because then you are not respected by any party; you may get some petty benefits but ultimately even those may be denied, and then you may have no basket to sit in or go to.

Therefore, purely from the point of view of opportunism if you like, a straightforward honest policy, an independent policy is the best. What that policy should be at a particular moment, it is very difficult for me or for this House to say because things change rapidly from day to day. It may be that we have to choose what might be a lesser evil in a certain set of circumstances—we have always to choose the lesser evil. We stand in this country for democracy, we stand for an independent Sovereign India. Now, obviously anything that is opposed to the democratic concept—the real, essentially democratic concept, which includes not only political but economic democracy—we ought to be opposed to. We will resist the imposition of any other concept here or any other practice. That I can understand. But there was a curious confusion in the speeches of some Honourable Members when on the one hand they talked about our standing for the weak and the oppressed, against imperialism and all that, and

on the other hand they asked us more or less to side with possibly a Power here or there which may stand for imperialism. It may be that sometimes we have to side with this Power or that Power. I can quite conceive of our siding even with an Imperialist Power—I do not mind saying that; in a certain set of circumstances that may be the lesser of the two evils. But nevertheless, as a general policy it is not a worthy policy or a worthwhile policy.

May I state another fundamental difficulty before us? Because of our past record in India, that is the anti-imperialist record, we have not been *persona grata* with many groups and peoples outside. We have not got rid of that yet. With the best will in the world, those people do not like us. Those people govern opinion elsewhere, they govern the Press. It is amazing how a certain section of the Press, say in the United Kingdom, deliberately and offensively misrepresents us. Now as I was sitting here a telegram came to me, a telegram from a foreign correspondent in this country sending a long message to his Paper in London, which is the most offensively false thing that I have seen. It amazes me that any person who has been here for some months should have the temerity to send such false messages, and it is about time that the Government of India dealt with this matter more firmly. We have been extraordinarily lenient towards the Press, Indian or foreign. We have gone out of our way to tell them that we will not do anything even if they send messages which are extremely disagreeable to us. But there is a limit to falsehood and that limit has been passed I think in regard to some messages.

Well, it is in this context that I should like Honourable Members to see the picture. Mr. Kamath said in a kind of peroration that we must join this bloc or that. He said, "I do not know which, but join this bloc or that." I remember later he inclined towards one bloc, but that was his first statement—evidently in the course of his speech he changed his mind.

Shri H. V. Kamath: I was developing my point.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: What does joining a bloc mean? After all it can only mean one thing: give up your view about a certain question, adopt the other party's view on that particular question in order to please it and gain its favour. It means that—it means nothing else so far as I can see because if our view is the view of that party then there is no giving up and we do go with that bloc or country or whatever it is. The question only arises when we are opposed to it on that point; therefore we give up our view-point and adopt the other one in order to gain a favour.

Now, I am prepared to agree that on many occasions not only in international conferences but in this House one gives up one's point to gain a compromise, and I am not prepared to rule out the possibility of our subordinating our viewpoint in international conferences in order to gain something worthwhile. That is perfectly feasible, that is often done. But this general approach is the worst possible approach to get anything from that country. I should like this House to realise that even if we wanted to adopt that policy, this approach is the worst approach to get that thing done. Because you have got to leave your view-point about it, you simply give it up to get a few crumbs, and the next day you do not know where to go. You do not know what it comes to.

The fact of the matter is that in spite of, in a military sense, our weakness—because obviously we are not a great military Power, we are not an industrially advanced Power—nevertheless, India even today counts in world affairs, and the trouble that you see in the United Nations or the Security Council is because she counts, not because she does not count. That

[Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru]

is a fact you should remember. If we had been some odd little nation somewhere in Asia or Europe, it would not have mattered anything. But because we count, and because we are going to count more and more in the future, everything we do becomes a matter for comment, and because many people do not like our counting so much. It is not a question of our viewpoint or of attaching ourselves to this or that bloc; it is merely the fact that we are potentially a great nation and a big Power, and it is not liked possibly by some people for anything to happen which strengthens us.

So there are these various things to be considered. It is not such a simple matter for us, as just by a resolution, to affiliate ourselves to this organisation or that organisation and get all the privileges of membership of that organisation. That kind of thing is not going to happen. And therefore, Sir, I do submit to this House that while undoubtedly much has happened in the past so many months or year which is very undesirable, so far as the External Affairs Department is concerned it has not functioned at all well, if I may admit frankly to this House. Also as far as our Information Services are concerned they have not functioned at all well. That is all perfectly true. But so far as our fundamental approach to this problem is concerned, I just do not see how we can fundamentally vary it. An occasion arising we adapt it to circumstances—that I can understand—but the fundamental approach I do think has to remain the same, because the more you think about it, the more you analyse it, there is no other way. It is not a question of your adopting a certain policy because idealistically you think it a good one but I do submit that if you give it up there is no other policy for this country to adopt with the slightest advantage.

Now, I just mentioned about our Information Services and the rest.

Mr. Shiva Rao made one or two suggestions, which I welcome. One was in regard to the various Delegations, Deputations etc. etc. that go abroad. Each Ministry chooses its Delegation, gives it a brief and that Delegation goes to a particular Conference. Often enough, the briefs of two Delegations do not fit in with each other and there is a slight conflict, so much so the two Delegations speak with two different voices. Frequently also, the choice made of people who are sent abroad is not too good. So there is this conflict and lack of co-ordination. That is why we are trying to set up, in accordance with Mr. Shiva Rao's suggestion, some kind of an agency in External Affairs. In fact, it is there in embryo stage. It is called the Conference Section. Every Delegation will be fundamentally chosen by the Ministry concerned—the External Affairs Ministry will not choose every Delegation—but the proposal will in essence be vetted by the Conference Section of the External Affairs Ministry in order to prevent overlapping and possible conflict.

Then in regard to publicity, there is at the present moment, may I whisper to the House, a small discussion going on between the External Affairs Ministry and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. So far external publicity has been handled by the Information and Broadcasting Ministry. Now external publicity as such should obviously be organised and looked after by the External Affairs Ministry. That is, in fact, so in every country. In England, external publicity is under the Foreign Office, not under the Home Publicity Service. The two are different, because external publicity has continually to keep in touch with external affairs. Of course, we will come to an agreement and make proper arrangements about that. But there has been unfortunately a great lack in our approach to foreign publicity in the last few months. At the same time, I do not want this House to imagine that by improving our publicity, some wonderful change will come about, because the reasons for people thinking as they do in other countries and in Government Departments, are far deeper than just lack

of publicity. Mr. Shiva Rao pointed out that our publicity in America, however efficient, consists after all in a small organisation. That is all that we can afford. At the present moment, Pakistan's publicity has been undertaken at their request by the British Information Service in New York which is a tremendous organization. Now, it is not for me to judge or appreciate the propriety of this. It is for the United Kingdom to do so. Today publicity in America is organised on such a big scale that it is just absurd for us to think of competing with them. I understand the British Information Service have got probably 600 men working in New York. We are certainly not going to send 600 men. We shall try and probably we can send 6 men, i.e. hundred times less. And all this publicity organisation has unfortunately during the past few years been built up on an anti-Indian basis. The British publicity organisation in America, the House will remember, was functioning some years back with one of its main objectives as anti-Indian propaganda. The same people function there today, so that whatever propaganda they do, they have an anti-Indian bias, whether they want it or not. We cannot get out of that rut. In fact, I regret to say that some Indians who used to do anti-Indian propaganda are still employed by the British Information Service in America.

Now, may I apologise to the House for not dealing with so many matters that have been mentioned, especially by my Honourable friend Seth Govind Das about Indians overseas, I should like the House to consider this question again in this background. It is not a question of the External Affairs Department or this House turning a switch this way or that way and everything will be all right. It is far more complicated than that, and when the time comes, if necessary, we are prepared to switch over to this or that policy, provided we are dead convinced that it is for the good of the country.

As for the Indians overseas, I will just say one or two words. Many of these difficulties continue and they are likely to continue. I am sorry to say that we do not get much help from the British Colonial Office. Not only we do not get much help, but it astonishes me, used as I am to the delays of the Government of India—and they are pretty remarkable—but the delays of the British Colonial Office are indeed a revelation. I remember that we sent some urgent letters and also reminders by cable. It took us exactly ten months to get a reply. The matter was about sending a Deputation to some of the British colonies just to have a look at the Indians there. It was a very simple matter, no great principle involved, still it took them ten months to reply, and during that period other events happened and it could not be done. So that what I mean is, we come up against this bureaucratic red tape in all these offices, here as well as there.

But the real difficulty is this question of citizenship. Now, these Indians abroad, what are they? Are they Indian citizens? Are they going to be citizens of India or not? If they are not, then our interest in them becomes cultural and humanitarian, not political. That interest of course remains. For instance, take the Indians in Fiji or Mauritius. Are they going to retain their nationality or will they become Fiji nationals or Mauritian? The same question arises in regards to Burma and Ceylon. It is a difficult question. This House gets mixed up. It wants to treat them as Indians and with the same breath it wants complete franchise for them in the countries where they are living. Of course, the two things do not go together. Either they get franchise as nationals of the other country, or treat them as Indians minus the franchise and ask for them the most favoured treatment given to an alien. These difficulties come up in regard to citizenship and the rest.

Finally, Prof. Ranga right in the beginning asked a question about India being in the British Commonwealth. Apparently, he has been misled by some newspaper reports that have been appearing recently about a Delegation that

[Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru]

has gone from here to London to discuss this matter. It surprises me how people can give rein to their imagination. I suppose this Delegation referred to a Defence Ministry Delegation led by Mr. H. M. Patel. It had nothing to do with this matter; it had to do entirely with defence matters and certain materials that we wanted to purchase in England and elsewhere. No such question has been discussed. As to our general position, however, that was defined in this Constituent Assembly in the early stages and it will finally be decided by the Constituent Assembly itself. There is no question of any Committee or any individual discussing it or coming to even preliminary conclusions about it. Whatever the final decision may be, it is quite certain, I believe, that India will be a completely independent and sovereign Republic or Commonwealth or State or whatever you may like to call it.

Now, that does not do away with the consideration of the other problem of what our relations should be with, whether it is England or the British Commonwealth or any Group.

That is not merely a theoretical question, but a very practical question again in regard to citizenship. Leave out other matters; it affects the citizenship of all Indians abroad. In the various British colonies exactly what type of relationship we should have which might affect that citizenship; they may not become aliens—All these must be considered, but apart from that politically and otherwise, India must be a completely independent country.

Mr. Speaker: I have to put to the House the cut motions.

Prof. H. C. Ranga: Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my cut motion.

Seth Govinddas: Sir, I also beg leave of the House to withdraw my cut motion.

Mr. Speaker: Have the Honourable Members leave of the House to withdraw their cut motions?

The cut motions were, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,04,000 be granted to the Governor General to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1949, in respect of 'External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 10.—CABINET

Inadequate number of Ministers and consequent lack of effective Control over Departments

Dr. B. V. Kestkar (U. P.: General): Sir, I beg to move:

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

Mr. Speaker: Cut motion moved:

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

[At this stage, Mr. Speaker vacated the Chair, which was then occupied by Mr. Hossain Imam (one of the Panel of Chairmen)]

Planning Policy of Government

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari (Madras: General): Sir, I beg to move:

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

Mr. Chairman: Cut motion moved:

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

Dr. B. V. Kestkar: Sir, in moving this cut motion, I would like to draw the attention of this House and the Government to the present inadequacy of the number of Ministers and the serious bottle-neck that it is leading to.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to one Honourable Member that the time is very short and I would like him to apply a certain self-restraint, so that we may be able to finish the work.

Dr. B. V. Kestkar: Ordinarily, Sir, a motion of this kind would be considered of not much importance, but I do consider and I submit to the House that in the present circumstances, this is a matter of considerable importance, not only to the better organization of the Government, but to the progress of the country. We are at present passing through critical times. We have just gained our freedom, but while gaining our freedom, we have been at the very beginning upset and our whole social, political and economic life has been upset by the happenings that have taken place after the 15th of August. Side by side we have also the old bureaucratic machine left in tact as it is by the Government and which we have to modify. Therefore, Sir, the problems that are facing us are enormous. We have at the same time to revitalize and modify the existing machinery and adjust it to suit the altered circumstances. We have to plan and prepare schemes for the future development and progress of the country. We have also at the same time to face many dangers, internal and external, which are trying to disintegrate and bring us down. Therefore, Sir, the problems before us are enormous. We have at the same time to devise ways and means to solve all these problems simultaneously. Now in these circumstances can we consider our present Cabinet set-up to be adequate and able to face the situation? I am afraid, Sir, that the answer is in the negative. No doubt we have in the present Cabinet some of the most distinguished men of the country. We have in our Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister acknowledged leaders of the country and those men who have led us in the struggle for freedom and led us successfully. We have the Honourable the Prime Minister who is not only present leader of the country, but is a Minister of External Affairs Department. He has at the same time to rush up here and there, trying to cope with an unexpected situation here and an unexpected situation there and at the same time he has to go through a huge amount of written work of his Department, i.e., the External Affairs and the Commonwealth Relations Departments. I may say that the same is the situation with regard to the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister who is at the head of three Departments and at the same time one of the great leaders of our country, who has to do what I may call extra-departmental work in rushing here and there and trying to persuade people or make them do this or that. Now I will ask you, Sir, whether it is possible not only now, but for some more time to come—I can venture to say that time may not come even for 4 or 5 years more whether all these leaders will be able in the extraordinary circumstances in which they are placed to attend to the departmental work and at the same time look to leading the country and the masses of India. As things are at present, it is not possible for the greatest genius physically to cope with such an enormous amount of work. The same is the case with regard to others to a lesser degree. The Honourable Minister for Industries and Supplies, has to look to the development of Industries in India and at the same time to the supply position. With regard to our agricultural and food problem there is the Honourable Minister for Food and Agriculture who has to do all these things simultaneously. I would submit, Sir, that it is not possible for many of these Ministers to go through conscientiously with all the work that they would like to and they ought to. I am quite aware that many of them confess themselves that they are not able to cope with the enormous amount of work that they have to do. The abnormal times in which we are living are really responsible for this state of things. Now in these conditions, the net result is that we find that the departmental heads the

[Dr. B. V. Karkar]

Bureaucracy has everything left to do without much control and ultimately they carry on the work and they guide the work of the Departments, because the Ministers have not much time to look to them. It has happened, Sir, in many cases important schemes have become null and void because the Ministers have not had time to look to them and approve them. Now, I submit, Sir, this state of things cannot be allowed to continue any longer. Not only in the interests of the country, but in the interest of the Ministry itself and in the interest of efficient work, we cannot allow many important questions that are facing us to be left unsolved or to be left half-solved or solved in an imperfect way. I submit, Sir, that without a thorough control and check on the bureaucratic machine without a thorough guidance into the new channels into which we would like to guide them, it will not be possible for us either to re-vitalize the Government of India or to set up our new construction schemes as we want them. Otherwise with things as they are going on at present we will go on drifting and doing things as we were doing before; we will not be able to give any new direction to affairs as we would like to and as Government have promised us that they would like to. I do not know what the obstacles are in the way of expansion or enlargement of the Cabinet; it is possible that the Honourable Prime Minister may be able to tell us. There have been rumours—I do not know how far they are true—that it is considered that there are not sufficient men of ability to do all this work and therefore Government are obliged to carry on with the able men that are available at present. I do not know if that is true; but at present we have as our National Cabinet a Cabinet of all talents. We have men taken from all parties, men who are there for their abilities and who can be professional Ministers. They are there because they can do their work well. We have many parties in the Ministry; probably we have most of the parties, except the R.S.S. and the Muslim League. It is possible that Government consider that sufficient talent for the Ministry does not exist in a particular party or a particular group. But they are at liberty, as they have done up till now, to take people from anywhere. The criterion we would place before them is that the work must be done quickly and efficiently and all the problems that are facing us must be dealt with quickly. And in the plans of national progress our reconstruction should be put through as quickly as possible. I submit to the Prime Minister that this should not be considered something entailing enormous expenditure. I find in calculation that a Minister is cheaper than a departmental Secretary, all expenses calculated. I am sure the Prime Minister will not consider that this is a kind of demand on Government to increase the strength of Ministers by any number, but we feel that the number must be increased to some extent and as soon as possible in order to cope with the immense amount of work before us. I would go even to the extent of saying that certain departments in which it is considered that development is necessary should be split up into two or three departments, and put under different Ministers. For instance, it may be that in Defence we may have one department for the army and another for the air and navy. That is of course a hypothetical case; I am not saying that it should be done. But with regard to all departments we can have as many Ministers as are effectively able to deal with the work that is before us. The heavy burden on our present Ministers must be lightened and they must not be allowed to present the excuse that they have no time to look into this or that matter for pressure of work. I submit that this is not a matter which is to be taken lightly; this is a matter which we have to deal with urgently, and I am sure that the Prime Minister as leader of the Cabinet will inform us of the proposals that Government have to make about this matter.

Sri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, in attempting to elicit an answer from the Prime Minister in regard to the policy of Government on the subject of

planning the House and myself are well aware that no one here is more planning-minded than the Prime Minister himself. But there inevitably comes a time in human affairs that however keen one is action is delayed unless the attention of those concerned is focussed and some decision arrived at as a result of it. And my object in speaking on this motion now is that I feel that the mind of the Prime Minister might have been made up in one particular way, probably because of the accommodations contained in the report of the Advisory Board on Planning which was submitted about a year ago, the report of a Committee over which my honourable friend Mr. Neogy presided.

Sir, in the little time that is at my disposal I shall attempt to survey the recommendations of that report in the light of the background that existed prior to the Committee coming into being, and also to make a few suggestions with regard to the future. Sir, the report itself is one which I think has to be looked at from a different point of view now for the reason that the time the report was drafted certain conditions existed which made the Committee suggest certain line of action on certain presumptions. The basic presumptions on which the Committee reported are now no longer valid. To take only a few instances, in para. 14 of the report the Committee presumes that for the next five years the provision of funds is not likely to create any difficulties. Again in para. 18 it says that all funds required can be raised by internal borrowing. Thereafter in para. 20 it says that India as a potential purchaser is relatively well placed for it seems likely that we shall have no difficulty in providing the foreign exchange needed. I am sure members of the House realise that the matter of raising funds is not quite so easy in the internal market, and so far as foreign exchange is concerned, we have more or less come to a dead end, unless arrangements can be made with Britain for the purpose of releasing a large part of our sterling resources and we can explore other avenues of borrowing money from the International Monetary Fund or other similar organisations. That in my view is one of the very many instances where we find that the Committee had taken more or less a short-range view of the whole question. In criticising the report of the Committee I would like to mention that apart from the close personal friendship that I have with the Chairman—he is a person for whose ability and integrity I have the highest regard—I do feel that we have to depart from the recommendations of that Committee to a very large extent at the moment. The Committee has not given a more or less unanimous report; there have been minutes of dissent. The Chairman himself has suggested that while he agrees that nationalisation may be good in certain cases—and he has himself been one of those who wanted nationalisation in certain aspects of our economic affairs—he feels that it should not be made a condition precedent for proceeding with the planning. Another important member of the Committee Mr. G. L. Mehta refers to para. 56 where it suggests nationalisation of certain industries and certain activities, and he says he does not agree. Sir Feroze Kharegat, an experienced official of Government, wants a master plan; he feels that the Committee has not suggested one. Of course it may be that because of his unfortunate personal experience of the meticulousness of the Finance Department which had in the past treated his proposals with scant courtesy, he says that there should be no meticulous financial examination of any proposals made by the Planning Commission. There is another very valuable minute of dissent from the pen of my Honourable friend, Mr. K. T. Shah. It is almost a book and in the causticity of its remarks it reaches Shavian levels. That is the background of the report.

And let me now examine some of the other aspects of the report. The report leaves the question of foreign capital in the air. As I said before so far as internal capital is concerned, it is satisfied that we will be able to

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

raise for our needs enough. So far as foreign capital is concerned, it persists in the view that all the capital needed will be available in the country and no foreign capital need be brought into the country. There is confusion in regard to whether certain industries might be built up with foreign capital. It says: "Consumption industries should not be built up with foreign capital". And I find that whatever has been suggested in the report has had its effects even in the memorandum prepared by the Industry and Supply Department for the Industries Conference that took place recently, at which conference the resolution adopted regarding foreign capital is extremely vague.

On the main issue the report has suggested a machinery, the effect of which is a planning commission of five or three: the chairman, to be a person of considerable experience in public affairs and two other persons—one from Industry and Agriculture and Labour, and another from the Government Department if it is three.

The report also takes into account certain ancillary bodies which could be used for this purpose which existed, or are supposed to be continuing to exist in the Government. The report says that the Co-ordination Committee of the Cabinet would do certain functions. Actually today the Co-ordination Committee of the Cabinet does not exist. Perhaps another committee called the Economic Sub-Committee of the Cabinet which has recently come into being might be doing some co-ordination. But it lacks the machinery that the Co-ordination Committee had. The report also mentions about the Planning Section of the I. & S. Department. I find that the Planning Section of I. & S. that now exists relates to resettlement proposals for all India besides miscellaneous planning as far as centrally administered areas are concerned. And the reports pre-supposes that the Commerce Department will do a certain amount of work and so will the Tariff Board in regard to foreign trade and commerce. Again there is a reference to the Development Board of the Secretariat which I now understand is practically non-existent.

Actually, one fundamental feature of that report is that it has failed to realise that the existence of the Planning Commission must presume some kind of liaison establishment in the Secretariat. It says the Planning Commission will make recommendations about all manner of things. Then it would act as a priority board. It mentions about initiating action in certain respects, but which is the agency to carry it out? There is no question of an ancillary Department in the Government of India being contemplated for the purpose. The Committee has recommended a Central Statistical Office, a suggestion which was mooted in the Government of India before and rejected by a Departmental Committee. But I find that there are various statistical organisations now existing such as the Industrial Survey Organisation in the I. & S. Department and the one attached to the Commerce Department. But there is nothing that now exists which could be called a Central Statistical Office.

The position really is this. If we admit that the recommendations of this Committee are valid, and start with the appointment of a Planning Commission now, there is absolutely nothing in the Government of India which would be able either to furnish it with aid or to carry out its recommendations. There is nothing that would ensure that any recommendations by that Commission, even if it is in a position to do so, will be carried out. For instance, today in the Government of India, so far as the Economic Advisor's Section is concerned, I do not think there is anyone at all senior enough for the purpose. We have no Chief Economic Adviser. We have a Deputy Economic Adviser and it looks as if we are left in the position of having to depend on the Adarkar family. As a matter of fact there appears to be an all round deterioration in

every department of this nature both qualitatively and quantitatively. The committee's recommendation to depart from the previous scheme and to establish a Planning Commission has to be viewed at from this angle. In regard to the experiment for Planning and Development Department the experience of the Ministry has been in some respects unfortunate. But that does not mean it ought to be condemned outright. I know all that happened at the time when there was a Ministry of Planning and Development, and the various extraneous factors that killed it. The fact was that the Ministry came into being just because the Governor-General wanted it. There was no organisation to support it. The Cabinet was functioning in such a manner that each Member was a law unto himself and the P. & D. Ministry provoked the hostility of every other Ministry. The Supply Department on which the Planning Department had to depend for informations and assistance in those days offered complete non-co-operation. The Planning Department was supposed to have inherited the powers of the War Resources Board, but what it did inherit really was General Hutton as its Secretary. The fact that Sir A. Dalal wanted to interfere with the Commercial safeguards scheme of 1935 Act eventually killed it. But what is interesting to note is that it was later replaced by a Co-ordination Committee of the Cabinet, presumably for the purpose of providing—Sir Eric Coates with a post of importance. But in itself the experiment is interesting. But whether due to the personality of that particular officer who was its Secretary or due to the exigencies of the period, the Secretary of the co-ordination Committee was able to move about all round the Secretariat and was in a position to get things done.

My plea today is that if you establish a Planning Commission at the moment, as it is it would be able to do nothing. What I would humbly suggest to the Prime Minister is not to revive the entire Planning Department of the past but to reconstitute it in a manner that is entirely different. I am not copying the Pakistan example when I say that it is better for the Government of India to bring into being a Ministry of Economic Affairs. The Ministry of Economic Affairs for the time being could be attached to the Prime Minister but work under the Direction of the Economic sub-Committee of the Cabinet. This would practically help to revive all the organisation that have been more or less allowed to fall into disuse or disappear—an organisation for providing economic advice; a Central organisation research for the various purposes of planning.

We have perhaps a nucleus of some of these in some respects. They have to be put together and quite a lot of spade work will have to be done and every department dealing with the economic activities of Government will have to have such a section dealing with planning and that the Cabinet sub-Committee can co-ordinate the work of all those sections. Have a Central Statistical Office and also a Consultative Committee similar to what has been recommended by the Planning Advisory Board. Then we shall in a couple of years time be ready or perhaps even before for an independent Planning Commission such as envisaged in this report.

I would like to say that the only other analogy in regard to a Planning Commission of the type contemplated in the report is from Russia and the position in that country is entirely different. The Planning Commission of Russia has 42 Departments Working under it and at the time it was brought into being and on later occasions also, it has been specifically stated that the Planning Commission could give directions to all departments of Government and the Departments will have to carry them out. No such position can be envisaged in our own country. Therefore, for the time being, the Honourable the Prime Minister had better ignore the main recommendations of the Planning Advisory Committee and create a machinery that would more or less do the spade work that the Dalal Ministry was intended to do at the time it

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]
came into being. That I think would meet the needs of the situation and it is mainly this, Sir, that I wanted to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister.

Meantime a consultative committee on the lines of the recommendation of the Committee can be created. Similar organizations can be created in all the provinces. As a matter of fact, some such organization exists at present in some of the provinces. What I would like to suggest is that the members of the Economic Sub-Committee of the Cabinet should individually go to the Provinces accompanied by a responsible official of the Ministry of Economic Affairs if one such is created and see what is being done and any further consultation could be done by the Provinces and the Centre meeting in the Consultative Committee or whatever organisation might be created for the purpose. The need of the moment is to create an organisation which has an executive character, which will be able to get all the departments of Government to act together and which will be in a position to bring into being the various ancillary bodies needed rather than create a new and independent organisation, which often serves a decorative and not a useful purpose. I would say before concluding that it would be perfectly suitable and proper for the Minister for Industries to bring into being an Industrial Board, if necessary, to manage the Sindhri factory and the steel plants which are going to be established but the creation of a Planning Commission, I think, at the moment is premature. This is what I would like to urge upon the Prime Minister for his immediate consideration.

TAKATION ON INCOME (INVESTIGATION COMMISSION) (AMENDMENT) BILL

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Honourable Shri R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Minister for Finance):
Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Taxation on Income (Investigation Commission) Act, 1947.

GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

DEMAND No. 10—CABINET

- (i) *Inadequate number of Ministers and consequent lack of effective control over Departments* (ii) *Planning Policy of Government*

Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya (Madras; General): Sir, I rise to support the cut motion moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Keskar. I shall have very little to say, except that I endorse every word of what he has said and I shall give a few details regarding some of the statements that he has made.

The cut motion relates to the smallness of the number of ministers and the consequent lack of efficiency in administration. It is a composite motion not only relating to the number of ministers but also to the inefficiency of the mechanism of administration. Thus you have two parties brought into the picture, first the ministers and secondly the secretariat. I shall deal with the second first, as my Honourable friend has dealt with the first portion fairly adequately.

The secretariat portion is really the basal structure, the foundation and the plinth of the structure of the Indian National Government. The secretariat continues to be what it was. The traditions which have been developed are not the traditions which we would like to perpetuate. The traditions that surround the secretariat were built up under circumstances totally different to the circumstances in which we

are ruling. The very rules and regulations are different. They were made when the bureaucracy occupied the lower as well as the top rungs of the ladder. The secretaries were endowed with enormous powers, almost the powers of passing final orders. In fact there was no distinction between the Secretary of a Department and the Member of the Department in those days except that the secretary was a daughter-in-law who rose to the position of the mother-in-law of a Member in a short time. Naturally the superior officer sympathised with the position of the subordinate officer as he rose from the secretary's position to the Member's position. Indeed when he was secretary he was doing all the work of the Member, so also when he became a Member he began to rest on his oars and left every thing to the Secretary. The Secretary therefore became possessed of all finalising powers,—a policy which has continued more or less up to the present day. Now this system has to be completely overhauled. In order to overhaul the system, it requires enormous effort, capacity, genius for details, painstaking and patience. That alone constitutes fairly difficult work for the ministry. I do not blame the ministers for not having been able to tackle this formidable task, because the ministers unfortunately have been engaged in unexpected preoccupations. That is one main point.

You go to the Secretariat building itself. It is a maze of labyrinths, meandering and sinuous corridors, one does not know where one is. I went once by the last gate. I was told the reception office was closed. I was directed to be middle gate. There the people said that I must go by the last gate. I told them the reception office was closed, though it was before 5 P.M. and what was I to do. I asked a gentleman to come with me and he said that it was not his business and so we had a struggle and at last I discovered some person who identified me. He led me to the middle gate and then back to the last gate. There I was obstructed. They said oh "You have come this way" "Yes, I have" I said "but where is your reception office?" This gentleman who escorted me found that the reception office was closed and what was I to do. He left me and I went upstairs quietly.

Then I found myself at one end of this block. I thought that the Home and the States Department, were together, because they were under one Minister but the fact was that Home Department was at one end the States Department was at the other end. I walked up the whole distance. I was duly escorted from block to block until at last I went from right to left, left to right, then took a rightabout turn till ultimately I found myself in a place where they said "No doubt it is there but that portion and this portion are not connected by a bridge. Please go down and go a few steps and then go up." Then I did this journey and there I was confronted with the receptionist. He kindly telephoned to the gentleman I wanted and I found myself safe at the destination after a miles walk. This is the mechanical portion

A certain gentleman who has made original research in inorganic chemistry and atomic fission brought his thesis to me and he wanted to be introduced to some officer who could transmit it to the savants of foreign countries. I went in search of secretary after secretary and at last I found a certain gentleman helpful. What a task it was! If you go to the railway station you know just where the first class lavatory is, or the second class lavatory or the women's lavatory is,—all immediately, by the boards. Also you know where is the first class refreshment room, the second class restaurant, the booking office, the telegraph office, the station master's office, the goods office, the parcel office and so on. But here there is nothing to guide you. There are 16 Ministries and perhaps there are 40 departments. Each minister has got four or five departments under him. There is no guidance, there is no outer signboard anywhere. It is a vast maze. The old secretariat building has a rotten arrangement. It must be corrected and I hope one of the ministers will take it as a pastime and look into this matter. I asked for a chart or

[Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya]

a map if any in order to show me which is located where and which gentleman is sitting in which room. The Deputy Secretary kindly promised to look into it and send it to the engineering department. I dare say it will come in a couple of years. That is the mechanical side of it.

Now a word about the administrative aspect. A gentleman came and quartered himself upon me and lived with me for one month, because he wanted to know whether a certain export control was continuing or not. He went to the office day in and day out. I did not interest myself enough but at last I wanted the room and therefore I offered to look after his affair and sent him away after 25 days. For four months we never got a reply. At the end I phoned up by chance a certain gentleman on the advice of a friend and he said that this control was removed on the 26th of July whereas the man waited for 25 days without getting this information in August. I do not want to bring up these questions by means of an interpellation in the legislature. I therefore have adopted the practice of writing to the secretaries or departments by means of personal letters private and public. A certain officer was wrongly dismissed in my opinion. I have looked into the whole case, and got legal opinion on it. I have been trying to correspond with the Defence Department as well as the Home Department with which the case was concerned. They always presented technical difficulties in the way of redressing the wrong. Nothing is possible absolutely, it is the same old story under a new name. This secretariat must be reformed.

What is the position today of the Secretariat *vis-à-vis* of the Honourable the Ministers? Each minister is surrounded by four or five I.C.S. secretaries. In the year 1928 there was a movement called the 'No Tax Campaign' of an agrarian nature in Bardoli and some wag writing a book described in the tune of the Charge of the Light Brigade, when the police people attacked the people's buffaloes, "Police to the right, of them, police to the left, of them, police to the front of them to the back marched the buffalo brigade." And here what do you find? I.C.S. to the right, I.C.S. to the left, I.C.S. to the front of them march the Ministerial brigade. This is a most extraordinary state of things. We must look into this matter. I know that our Ministers who have been transplanted from another region—from the jails—into the secretariat chamber may not flourish there because the soil may not be good, the atmosphere may not be good and the seed itself may be wrong. All these things are possible and the help of the I.C.S. may be necessary for a time and is necessary. But let it not be understood that we are under I.C.S. rule. I greatly appreciate the answers given in this House by the Ministers! they are expansive, they are detailed, they are helpful, they are co-operative. If the same spirit pervades the whole atmosphere of administration in the secretariat, a new chapter will open out.

Then I will come to the Ministers. I am fond of saying that the government of a country is one and indivisible. So also finance is one and indivisible. If a country is divided into Provinces and Centre it is just for convenience of administration. If a Government in the Centre is divided into Ministries it is for convenience of administration. But no single administrator or Minister is a self-complete organism in himself. The whole gamut has to be traversed in order to get at a point. For instance, in a province if you want an electricity licence you have to go to the Local Self-Government Department so far as the particular town is concerned; it has to go to the P.W.D.; and finally comes the super-master, the arch builder and destroyer, the Finance Minister. He can do and undo things. The Finance Minister is the coping-stone of the arch. He is there to do or undo things. He is to be a supremely independent minister. I do not want to go into details. Every aspect of the matter is inter-connected, enmeshed and inter-twined with a number of Departments. How are we to extricate and unravel all this? There must be

a Liaison Minister between every three Ministers. This gentleman must take note of all the complications that have set in in the course of the day and gather the three Ministers and try to unravel the whole thing by the evening. Attach this man to every group and whether the complications be financial, technical, or departmental, they must be cleared up, and you will get a solution very quickly. I have managed some institutions. The first thing I did was to read all the post. You will then know all the errors of your Department. Of course our Ministers have no time to read the post. They must set somebody to do the business. When they do this they can understand what are the difficulties. I consider that the Premier is overburdened with duties. He has to work for 17 hours a day and I don't want to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. After all we want him for a long time and so I would ask him to relieve himself of some of his duties. The Premiership and Foreign Affairs can never go together. Mr. Asquith who was once a Premier of Britain was also Minister for Foreign Affairs and he gave the latter over to Lord Curzon. Mr. Eden took over the duties from his predecessor. The Premier's duties are so onerous and responsible and foreign affairs are still more so onerous and responsible that the one, overlapped upon the other makes the burden intolerably heavy. In addition our Premier has Planning as I now discover. Planning constitutes exclusive work for one Minister. In addition there is the Federal Court though I suppose the judges are not going to give much trouble. Similarly, the Home Department portfolio had three or four additional Departments of which the Refugee Department has recently been given to a separate Minister. In addition to Home, there is under the same Minister Information, then States, and then Broadcasting also. I am very sorry that the Sardar is not here. He has fallen ill. Apparently he has fallen very ill. Who is to take over his duties? Is your mechanism of Ministry such as automatically to arrange to put a certain man to discharge the duties if any one minister by accident or by misfortune were to fall ill or has to go on leave? Again our Premier has not yet begun to make foreign travels. He will have to travel for very many reasons. Tomorrow if he goes abroad then who is to take his place? What is the second line force that you are preparing? Why not take some young men and train them as Junior Ministers. It has been made sufficiently plain that there should be some Parliamentary Secretaries. I do not like that name and I would call them Junior Ministers. Such Junior Ministers must be brought into existence immediately in order to get through the routine and take over the administration and final order-making duties from the secretariat. Every order in a National Ministry must go over the signature of a Minister or Junior Minister. When this is done the Junior Ministers will be able to get all the information in an authoritative manner—not merely as Clerks or Secretaries but as Ministers—and will post you with all the details and relieve you of the routine work with which you are burdened or ought to be burdened at the present moment. In this manner you will find that Commerce and Industries are inter-related to each other, that Education and Health are inter-related to each other, that Railways and Communications are inter-related to each other and that Works, Mines and Power and Labour are inter-related to each other. The other day we were confronted with a Bill for the acquisition of lands and the renovation of lands in Delhi and Ajmer Provinces. What was the position? We immediately discovered that we had to approach the Finance Minister if we changed the contents of the Bill. Then nothing can be done unless the Finance Minister is consulted. These things are inter-related in administration, and the more you give attention to these matters the better. Junior Ministers are therefore necessary as connecting link. I am not asking for this for any particular reason. I am not a candidate for either of the posts. But I would say that in the interests of good administration and the success of nationalism these matters must be seriously taken up. I do not blame anybody. You have had sufficient difficulties already and we are not going

[Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitarāmāyā]

to add to them. We know that unexpected conditions have supervened and complicated the even march of our progress and the tranquil manner in which we ought to have gone on. That is a legacy that has fallen to our lot. I would only beg that you should give attention to these matters seriously because it is now almost 1½ years since our Government took up office, first with twelve Ministers which became subsequently thirteen, fourteen, fifteen and now sixteen Ministers out of whom two are more or less *ad hoc*. When the refugee work is over that Minister will have to be given another portfolio and when the Linison work is over the other Minister will have similarly to be given some portfolio if he cares to stay. I know also that the Ministers are here not because they have sought the jobs but in answer to an urgent public call. Therefore all the greater praise do I bestow upon them. Under these circumstances I would like you all to steal some time from the routine of duties and make this mechanism more efficient and more perfect.

Shri K. Hanumanthaiya (Mysore State): I wanted to speak on behalf of the States.

Mr. Chairman: But the time is so short.

Shri K. Hanumanthaiya: I would like to tell the Honourable the Prime Minister that the people of the States who form more than one-third of the population of India and in area nearly half, have not had any representation on the Cabinet so far. The Prime Minister was formerly President of the States People's Conference. . .

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid I cannot allow this speech to go on.

Shri K. Hanumanthaiya: Everytime this is what is happening to the States people.

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Member, if he so desires, can bring an adjournment motion to discuss the matter.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta (Delhi): May I say a word about the Centrally governed areas?

Shri K. Hanumanthaiya: With the permission of the Chair I would like to suggest that we may go on for another half an hour and discuss the matter.

Mr. Chairman: I have got four names and if I were to allow everybody to speak it will be past six o'clock and the Honourable the Prime Minister will require half an hour to reply to the debate. Next time we might make better arrangements. This time we must be content with the arrangements as they are.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, it is not quite clear to me what the matters mentioned by the two Honourable Members who spoke last—something about the States and something about the Centrally administered areas—have got to do with the motions under discussion. Are they supposed to be some separate motions or are they parts of these?

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta: If you will permit me to say a few words, Sir, the idea of including the Centrally governed area was to suggest that there should be a separate Ministry for this. It will be conducive to more efficient working if a separate Minister is appointed.

An Honourable Member: What about the Central Provinces and Berar?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: If we are to provide a Minister for each of such areas, we should have a thousand.

I am in an unfortunate position, unfortunate in the way that I find it very difficult to resist the arguments advanced today on both these motions. Dr.

Keskar's motion is to the effect that there should be more Ministers and that the Departments should be better controlled. I do not quite know what he means by Departments being better controlled, nor do I quite understand what Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, in his very interesting remarks, said. If Dr. Keskar thinks that by appointing a number of Ministers the Departments would be better controlled, I think he is wrong—in fact entirely wrong. It is much more likely that the Ministers who are appointed so will be for a long time controlled by others. Instead of their controlling they will be controlled or they will fail to understand the machine and the permanent machine will control them. This is not a matter so much of policy or of circumstances in India. It is the development of an intricate and complicated system of administration in every country. If Dr. Pattabhi had had to walk a mile here in some secretariat building, he probably would have to walk about seventy miles in a War Office building in Washington—just one War Office building—I am not talking of the whole secretariat. The secretariat establishments now of great countries are so enormous, so complicated, that nobody understands them; no government understands them; they run themselves as a spontaneous growth.

An Honourable Member: A Frankenstein.

Shri T. A. Ramalingam Chettiar (Madras: General): The officers themselves do not know what they have got to do.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: So that this is a problem which is not solved by appointing more Ministers, but it is a separate problem and a very difficult problem. In fact one of the major problems of the age is how to control this intricate system of administration democratically because democracy cannot deal with such problems. Only high-class experts in an organization can really understand it. The democratic system arose in a fairly simple way where high principles were laid down and they were carried out by certain civil servants; but when the civil servants' job became not only frightfully intricate but also rather technical—because it is becoming more and more technical—then a democratically elected House finds it difficult to consider it in all its details. So the civil servants or the technical establishment became progressively more and more independent because nobody could understand or control them. They just laid down principles or high policies. It is a very difficult matter to consider and in fact the whole democratic structure of government is rather imperilled by this development. I do not think therefore that the appointment of additional Ministers will by itself bring about any radical change in the control of departments. I do agree that whether you may call them Ministers or Deputy Ministers—it is desirable to have a large number of heads looking after these various activities. On the other hand, if you increase the number of Ministers, the Cabinet becomes uncontrollable.

An Honourable Member: In England there are 21 Members of the Cabinet.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: That is why it is not a very good one.

It is a grave difficulty. There is a tendency then for the Cabinet Ministers to function separately. It ceases to be a practical thing. The whole idea of Cabinet Government is that it should be practical, a jointly responsible thing.

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras: General): We could have additions with Cabinet rank or without Cabinet rank.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: I am going to deal with that point. So I think it is definitely undesirable for the Cabinet to be too big. It cannot function together. In fact, if I may confess it, even our present Cabinet is slightly difficult to function together. In fact, to give you a very

[Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru]

simple test, it becomes sometimes difficult to sit even round a table together, and if people have to sit in two or three rows, it ceases to be an informal meeting to consider a matter. It becomes more like a public meeting: so that the only way out is not to increase the Cabinet Ministers but to have somebody in the nature of Deputy Minister or whatever he might be called. You may perhaps have some kind of Deputy Minister in charge of each major department and a person who can be called a Cabinet Minister in charge of three or four of them, in supervisory charge. That is a possibility. It is true that the work of many of the Ministers—in fact of all of them—is very heavy. Anyhow it would have been heavy because we had to catch up, not to carry on, a machine but create precedents and do many such things. Quite apart from this, the events of the last six months have put such a tremendous pressure upon Government and prevented it doing many things which it otherwise might have done, that it has become really difficult to know how to deal with all the problems that we have. It is not of course a question of lack of policy or of people not being eager enough to do this or that job. It is far more an intricate question of doing something which is an organic growth and which is not upsetting. Now for instance we had the case of appointing additional Ministers in this Government, first Mr. Neogy who came as Minister for Rehabilitation and Relief; then Mr. Gopelaswami Ayyangar. After their appointment, for some weeks almost, they were homeless. They did not have a place to sit in or an office. They did not have a Secretary, clerk or stenographer or anybody because naturally the establishment here thinks in terms of a Minister having a certain circle of Secretaries, assistants, helpers, menials, etc., and if all of that is not there, he simply cannot function.

An Honourable Member: That is the trouble, Sir.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: It is certainly the trouble and perhaps might be important. Nevertheless it is true that you do want some place and some organization to function. If you are to function efficiently, you must have a certain equipment and certain place to sit in and certain methods of work, so that it is an odd thing, you will notice, that this House protests—and rightly protests—against the increase of bureaucracy and at the same time it suggests things which inevitably involve increase of bureaucracy. The Minister is just there—somewhere—one person but with him he brings in thirty or forty or fifty officers sitting to the right and to the left of him.

Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya: That is because you want to bring more members on the top on the same foundations.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyway it is a difficult problem. The House will not expect me to give a precise answer to these questions, but I do realise that it is necessary to make some further arrangements for, if I may say so, the individual supervision of various departments more than it can be done now. I do not think Ministers can be added to—certainly you could have one or two more, but I rather doubt whether the increase will be conducive to better work. May I say that long before I requested Mr. Neogy to come in as Minister for Relief and Rehabilitation, even then we were thinking in terms of a Minister for Social Welfare and Economic Welfare, some such Minister, because we attach considerable importance to that. But then other events came in, the Punjab events and others, which put that rather away from our minds.

I should like in this connection, if I may, to say something about certain remarks that have been made, and that have been repeated I believe outside, in criticism of certain of my Colleagues. In fact, they are named—four of my Colleagues—and the criticism made is that for various reasons they should not be in the Cabinet, that they should resign. Now, obviously I am the

person primarily responsible for their appointment to the Cabinet and if any criticism is to be made it should be made about my appointment or about me—not about them. As a matter of fact, I have no doubt that each one of them would willingly and gladly divest himself of this tremendous responsibility at the slightest suggestion; nobody is sticking on or holding on to office. Office is not a pleasure nowadays, as the House might well realise; it is not easy now to induce people even to accept office because it is so difficult and the burden is so heavy. In fact, I might mention that two of my Colleagues—I shall not name them now—have actually repeatedly asked me to relieve them, but it is at my request only that they have continued, and one of them has only continued at my request for a limited period of time and not for long. So I would say this, that it is rather unfair on my Colleagues and on me for these criticisms to be made. I can understand that it is the right of any member of the public to demand on public grounds or other grounds that the Cabinet may be changed or the Government may be changed. Or if he likes occasionally he may criticise any individual Member of Government. But this persistent criticism of some Members of Government and a demand for their withdrawal from the scene of their activities is improper unless it is coupled, as it should be coupled, by a change of Government completely and primarily by the removal of the Prime Minister who is responsible for them.

I may say that naturally the Cabinet as it exists today is what you might call a "mixed" Cabinet, you may call it a Cabinet of various talents or varying talents, whichever you like. It was deliberately made that way, whether that was rightly done or wrongly done is another matter, but it was deliberately made from the point of view of having various elements in the Cabinet who could devote themselves with ability to the particular tasks in hand. It was not meant at that time to be just a purely Party Cabinet, although undoubtedly the viewpoint of the Party was the dominating viewpoint and had to be because that viewpoint was represented by the great majority in this House, and we were responsible to this House, and the majority in the Cabinet also represented that viewpoint. Nevertheless, it was not conceived to be a purely Party Cabinet. It was felt by me and by those Colleagues of mine whom I consulted at the time that in the peculiar context of events after this change-over we should proceed on a wider basis. No doubt gradually, as soon as the immediate problems are over, we thought things would take some other shape—may be there may be purely Party Ministries or All-Party Ministries whatever that might be—but immediately in the early days of August when I had to think about it I thought this was the right thing to do and those Colleagues whom I consulted also thought that that was right. We cannot, in the changing context of today, make plans for any lengthy period of time; I can only look a few months ahead. I do not know what may happen after that. So it was in that context that we made this Cabinet, deliberately including people who were not definitely of the Congress persuasion but whom we expected naturally to fall in line with the general viewpoint of this House.

I wish to say this, that in spite of differences of opinion on many topics we have pulled on with extreme friendliness and co-operation; we have differed, we have argued, but we have in a very large measure shown very great loyalty to each other. So it distresses me to see any Colleagues of mine criticised in the way some of them have been criticised in the Press.

Shri B. B. Diwaker: But that is for supporting the Nehru Government!

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say a few words about planning? I do not entirely understand or agree with Mr. Krishnamachari's suggestion that planning as such should be postponed for two years and preparations for planning should be made till then by the appointment of various other liaison agencies on the Secretarial level. I agree that those liaison agencies should be appointed on the Secretarial level. I thought it might be

[Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru]

a good thing to revive the Cabinet Co-ordination Committee which existed last year; it did do some good work, I think it might be revived. I do not know what the Development Board as such, as it existed, would do much good now. We have now, you will remember, something of this kind; we have now the Rehabilitation and Development Board and although it is thinking in terms of refugees only, nevertheless it is thinking in terms of development also. I hope that either as an extension of this or independently of this something more in the nature of planning will be arranged.

Prof. H. G. Bangs: A Central Planning Commission.

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, the various liaison bodies can come into existence almost at the same time or may be that the Planning Authority itself may create them—quite possibly. This business of doing a lot of spadework in preparation for the Planning Authority hardly seems to me to be necessary partly because we have got tired of spadework—we have been doing it year after year without any structure emerging out of it.

Another thing that I am anxious that we should do is to improve the complete set up of our statistical organisation. At the present moment many of our Ministries have some Statistical departments. That is not good enough; we are very bad in regard to statistics, although as a matter of fact Indian statistics have a very high reputation in the world today; that is not Governmental statistics but some Indian experts have a very high reputation. I hope that before very long we shall organise a set-up connecting governmental activities with the non-official statistical organisations so that this work may go ahead. That will also be the foundation for the planning activities in the future.

There are many things that might be said about planning; it is a vast subject. But all I can say to Mr. Krishnamachari is that I am intensely interested in it and I am very sorry that events have somehow compelled us not to pay much more attention to it. I do hope that before this Session is over we might be able to produce some more concrete proposals.

Shri B. Das: May I put a question to the Honourable the Prime Minister? Is he aware that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Supply told us on Friday afternoon that the Honourable the Prime Minister would allot a day to the House to have a discussion regarding industrial planning and the formation of a Planning Commission, and if so, whether he is allotting a day for it?

The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, certainly. Sometime in the session.

Mr. Chairman: Do the Honourable Members concerned wish to press their cut motions?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No, Sir. I would like to withdraw my cut motion.

Dr. B. V. Kestor: I would also like to withdraw my cut motion.

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Members, Shri Krishnamachari and Dr. Kestor wish to withdraw their cut motions. Do they have leave of the House to withdraw?

The cut motions were, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,08,000 be granted to the Governor General to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1949, in respect of 'Cabinet'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till a Quarter to Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday the 10th March 1948.