

**Shri Biswanath Das:** Sir, I am very sorry I have to oppose my honourable friend, the mover of the amendment: my grounds are there. We have been—I mean the nationalist sections of the country have been—wedded to the principle of entire prohibition but unfortunately my honourable friend wants and proposes as a Directive part of the Constitution that we should prohibit only the manufacture and consumption of liquor. What becomes of opium ? Opium is the worst evil that is prevailing in the country. Sir, China and the eastern countries are in their present position because of opium-eating. Therefore, I for myself would not be a party to any prohibition if it does not include the prohibition and manufacture of opium for purposes of consumption.

Sir, I am not in favour of having a reform of this magnitude to be put in the directive principles in the Constitution. I consider the Directive Principles of the Fundamental Rights in the Constitution as the Sermon on the Mount. Shri Bhagavat has stated that there is nothing like small and great but fact remains that there are small and great. Therefore nothing will be gained by putting all and sundry in the Fundamental Rights. Under these circumstances I feel that any additions to what we have already is going to serve no useful purpose. We are wedded to democracy. We are going to have a national government. A National Government even today led and guided by not less persons than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel will not have their way if they do not carry the people with them. That being the position, I do not see why the question of prohibition should come in at all here as a Sermon on the Mount. Sir, despite the difficulties, despite the financial stringencies, despite various limitations, the provincial Governments in Madras and other Provinces have already adumbrated the reform. I plead patience with friends. For myself I want an all-India policy in which the provinces and the States should go on together fighting against this mighty demon of drink and opium consumption.

Under these circumstances I do not see how any useful purpose could be served by only putting this in the framework of the Constitution as a Directive Principle. Directive Principles are of course useful and they will serve as a beacon light to the incoming ministries. They will serve as a sort of test for the work of the Ministry after the term of office of five or three years. As test, they remain for ever, but that does not bring us anywhere near our goal if we include this in the Constitution and keep it as a Directive Principle. Under the circumstances I am strongly opposed to this addition which will mean nothing more than another Sermon on the Mount. Sir, I want a practical step to be taken and the practical step is being taken, despite difficulties, and I have no hesitation in believing that the installation of a national Government of India, guided and led by a Ministry which is responsible to the Honourable Members of the Constituent Assembly or the National Parliament, will have no other option than to take up this great reform on hand without any delay. Sir, despite difficulties, even the Central Government, ridiculous though it looks, is thinking of having prohibition in the province of Delhi. I state all this merely to show the anxiety of the Government, I again appeal to the Honourable the Mover that nothing can be gained by appealing to sentiments in the name of Mahatma Gandhi. We must look to the practical aspect of the question, and nothing will be served by putting this in the Directive Principles. Under these circumstances, I stand opposed to the amendment.

**Shri Biswanath Das** (Orrisa: General): Sir, I stand to support the motion of the Honourable Dr. Ambedkar which has given a clear lead to the country. The Amendment which is to come as article 40 reiterates our policy and position regarding India's international relations. While the contribution of the West to international relations and promotion of international security was first the Hague Conference and secondly the League of Nations and now, thirdly, the United Nations Organisation, India even when she was in fetters and bondage, had her mighty contribution, not in the shape of influence of prowess or wealth, but by bringing her thought into the field of international concept, - the mighty, intellectual and moral influence of a Tagore and a Gandhi who taught nothing short of intentional amity, honourable and open relations between nations and countries. This is a mighty contribution to the betterment of international relations in a world that is out for cut-throat competition in armament; and soon after, is bound to come into the field keen economic rivalry. This being the position today, it is difficult for India to decide what her international relations are going to be and what part she is going to play in the world. The motion of my Honourable friend Dr. Ambedkar not only lays down what we ought to do and what we have to do, but also states the limitations within which India is to play her role in international transactions with other nations. The role is honest; the role is upright; the role is open. India, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, our great leader, has learned to take to such open course of action. There is nothing hidden in our ways. There is nothing secret in our ways. That explains the difference between the course of action adopted by other State from those adopted by India.

Coming to our relations either present or future with the United Nations Organisation, we see that that Organisation is divided into blocs. We have stated in the clearest terms that we belong to no bloc, despite the fact that we are a young nation, a new born free state, with feeble power though our resources are mighty and have yet to be developed. In this strife between two big blocs, ours is a difficult and unenviable position. We have not to be in blocs and we have to fend for ourselves for our own defence and for our own security. Though our respected leader, the Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has told us that he found no theocracy or no communal tendency in the near and Middle East States, we have the latest announcements in the Press that the very slogan of "Islam in danger" is bringing most of the Muslim Arab countries together against us. That is one difficulty. Our neighbour, the Pakistan State, always considers us unfortunately as enemy No. 1 despite the fact that we agreed to bring Pakistan into existence so as to bring about peace and amity between us, the two states. She regards us however like an enemy and raises the cry 'Islam in danger' which brings Muslim countries together.

Secondly, Sir, despite the unanimity of purpose disclosed by the united action of representatives from Pakistan and India, the fact remains that the Muslim countries gave the go-by to India when the South-West African question was discussed by the U. N. O. This leads us to the belief that they are made to play the game of the Britisher, the unseen hand of Britain and the unseen hands of South Africa and Britain together. These explain our difficulty and helplessness in the international sphere. I have already stated that our leaders have emphatically announced that we do not belong to any bloc. We are not helped by any bloc and attempts are even being made by the different blocs not to do anything which helps India on her way to progress. That being the position I find little reason for my friend Seth Damodar Swarup coming forward with an amendment calling upon the Constituent Assembly to accept a position which is least air to the best interests of the country. Sir, we are called upon to free the politically and economically exploited people of the world. Where is the necessary force to back this great programme of freeing the politically and economically exploited races of the world today in India? It might be that after some time India will be their beacon light and focus attention on the exploited countries of the world. That is our hope. But Heaven knows how long it will take for us to be able to do it. It is in the hands of God. I would therefore beg of Mr. Damodar Swarup and appeal to him to withdraw his amendment which expresses the point of view of the Socialists. I support the amendment moved by Dr. Ambedkar which clearly and fully brings out the aspirations of India. I fully support it.