

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras): Sir, I beg to move:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms: —

"That the Member of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 21st February 1955."

Sir, it is usual in all parliamentary systems of Government for the President, during the opening of a session, to address both Houses of Parliament. It has been criticised as being merely a narration of facts which have happened during the past year. But that is the usual thing, as hon. Members know, which happens in most of the Parliaments which work under parliamentary systems of Government.

I am sure that the hon. Members are aware that India has always stood for peace, and, ever since her independence, has done what she could to preserve peace in the world. Both in Korea and in Indo-China, our efforts led to a cease-fire, and for the first time, with the settlement of the Indo-China problem, there was no shooting war anywhere in the world. But now again there are war clouds, especially in the Far East. As has been emphasised by the Prime Minister time and again, patience and tolerance are necessary to solve the tangle in Formosa. Our Government have recognised the Chinese People's Republic as the Government of China and have recognised the Chinese claim to the Cairo Declaration. And if the Cairo Declaration is to have any value, then it is fairly certain that Formosa is part of China. But at the same time, one cannot forget the fact that things have got to be tackled patiently, if this problem of Formosa is to be solved in a peace-

ful manner. That will take time, and it is towards that end, I am sure that our Prime Minister is working, so that there will be no clash in the Far East with regard to the question of Formosa. This has been prominently mentioned in the Address of the President. We hope that patience will be exercised by both the sides to solve this question, and there will be no incident which might lead to serious consequences.

Our agreement with China on Tibet, which formed the basis of the joint statement by China's and our Prime Ministers regarding Panch Shila—mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence—must form the main principle through which international tension can be eased and finally peace established. I am glad, Sir, that recently the King of Laos has accepted the idea of the five principles put forward in this declaration.

It is usual, in the present time of atomic age, to talk about the dangers of the use of atom for warlike purposes. The question is whether the new instrument in the hands of men is going to be used for the benefit of humanity or for the destruction of humanity and human civilisation, as we know it today. Both the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics possess atomic weapons, and the United Kingdom Government has now planned to manufacture hydrogen bombs for their security. As the Prime Minister has pointed out time and again, our country is not interested in the production of atomic weapons, but we are immensely interested in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. There is no doubt whatever that in the interests of human civilisation these weapons should not only be banned but destroyed. The question is, who is going to take the risk? There have been appeals, as for instance by Shri Rajagopalachariar, that as the U.S.A. was the first nation

[Dr. P. Subbarayan.] to manufacture these dangerous weapons and use them, therefore they should set an example by destroying the bombs in their possession. Stockpiling of atomic weapons would lead to a dangerous situation and some-oody, therefore, ought to make a start in the matter of the destruction of these weapons. If moral standards are to be the guiding factor, it will be a great help to humanity. If this step can be taken if only there is courage to do so, the U.S.S.R. will have to follow suit, but unfortunately there is the fear complex. Most nations want to protect themselves and want to guard themselves against any surprise attacks by the other side. So the armaments race goes on. They forget that this mentality will eventually lead to war. They think that negotiations can take place only when one can speak from strength, but they forget that two can play at this game. So long as this view is held, the armaments race will go on and tension must certainly increase. The Conference which meets in London in a few days' time on disarmament, I hope, will find a solution. The complete banning of nuclear weapons must be the first step that any conference should strive at and I hope that under proper international supervision this step will be taken. But connected with this is the question of the reduction of conventional armaments. There must be a realistic approach to this problem. The U.S.S.R. today possesses so much strength that it should be the first to agree to reduce its land army in the interests of the good relations that should exist between nations. One hopes that it will understand this position and take steps to get this done.

I am glad that the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations has recognised that India has a part to play in this field and has asked our leading nuclear scientist, Dr. Bhabha, to preside over the Conference proposed to be held at Geneva. The U.S.S.R.

has promised to show how she has been able to set up a nuclear plant producing electric power, but great steps have been taken in this connection also in the U.K., and the recent report on atomic power, placed as a White Paper before the House of Commons, shows that by about 1970 there will be about 12 to 13 stations working in various parts of that country to produce electricity and power for peaceful purposes. This is indeed a great step and I am sure our country will also benefit by the steps that are being taken, because it is well-known that our intention is to use atomic power for peaceful purposes in every way that we can. There should be no secret about the use of atomic power for peaceful purposes, and I hope that all nations will work together in this field, and I think that the plan put forward by the President of the United States for the use of atomic power in a peaceful way is a good one. I am glad that all nations of the United Nations have agreed to tackle this problem in all sincerity.

Considering that our Government have followed a policy in their relations with other States, which is in consonance with the will of the people, I will plead with the Members of the Opposition that they should get accustomed not to criticise but to accept the things that the Government have done in the interests of the country and humanity at large and not merely in the interests of any particular political party. In fact, I would plead for bi-partisanship in foreign policy such as what exists in many countries today though of course, each party can stick to its own view if there is anything that it does not accept.

The problem of the French Possessions in India has been settled by negotiation, and for its happy solution credit must be given to the then Prime Minister of France, Monsieur Mendes France, and I am sure people

a)s< recognise the patience with which this problem was tackled by our Prime Minister himself. I trust that this spirit will also lead to the solution of the problem of Goa. Things do not look very rosy at the present time, but I am sure the Portuguese Government have seen how the relations between France and ourselves have become more friendly since the solution of the problem of the French Possessions. Let us hope that they will also recognise the inevitability of Goa belonging to India.

The food problem which was very acute has been practically solved and we are not burdened with heavy imports of foodgrains today. Great credit must be given for this to the late JShri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai who devoted all his energy to this matter and, as our Prime Minister has said on more than one occasion, credit must go to him for the happy position we are in today. The country has lost in him an administrator with vision and will, to get things solved, even very difficult problems. The Telephone Factory in Bangalore and the Telephone Cable Factory at Rup Narayanpur were also thought of by him when he was Minister for Communications.

I do not think that anyone will deny that the State must play a great part in the starting of heavy industries. Steps have been taken in this direction for the establishment of a steel factory at Rourkela, and the preliminary agreement recently arrived at with the U.S.S.R. will lead to the establishment of another steel factory in the Bhalai region of Madhya Pradesh. Both these factories are envisaged to produce about one million tons of steel each and this will help our problem of steel and steel manufactures. I hope our industrialists will help in this effort. Some work is being done by them in the manufacture of motor cars and motor trucks but there is no doubt that the State must play a major part as they have done in the case of steel production

and also in the manufacture of aircraft and of ships.

The First Five Year Plan is nearing completion and the Planning Commission are now busy in preparing the Second Five Year Plan. The emphasis during the First Five Year Plan was naturally on agriculture and irrigation and power projects. In this connection, Sir, I would like to request our Government to pay more attention to the Southern part of this country. No doubt there are difficulties in the matter of river valley projects in the South and as far as my own part of the country is concerned, all that could be done has been done and I am glad that Government have come to help in the Periyar hydro electric project which is about to be undertaken because electricity will play a more important part in the regeneration of our country. But water is so scarce in the South that some methods must be found whereby even some small rivers can be harnessed for building irrigation projects and I trust the next Five" Year Plan will take this Into consideration. The Second Five Year Plan will naturally lay great emphasis both on industrial production and on the problem of solving unemployment. As has been stated more than once, unemployment can be solved only by spreading industries in various parts of our country and especially by paying attention to the question of cottage and other small-scale industries and I hope the planners will take this into consideration when they begin to envisage the picture of the next Five Year Plan.

The question of the more efficient control by the State of the Imperial Bank of India has already been taken up and one hopes that steps will be taken specially to reduce the difference which exists in the scales of salary of the present Imperial Bank employees. I am sure that will be tackled with earnestness by our Finance Minister in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India.

[Dr. P. Subbarayan.]

The Government have announced more than once that they are working towards a Welfare State, and that is the reason why the President has referred in his Address to the socialistic pattern of society. We hear a criticism that this is only a make-shift, a slogan in order to attract the people during the elections. I can assure hon. Members that this has been done in all earnestness and in the belief that this will be the only way to tackle the problem of poverty and the question of 'haves' and 'have-nots' in this country. It is put forward in all earnestness and I am sure, as the plans of the Government develop, people will see that this is not a slogan but a really earnest effort on the part of the Prime Minister and his Government to deal with this growing problem.

Both in the matter of foreign policy and in the internal sphere, the Government have done what they could in the interest of the people of this country and I am sure, if a comparison is made of what has happened in other countries during the last seven years of existence, they will have to acknowledge that our Government have done far more and have proceeded more quickly than has been the case in other countries. There is nothing that we need be ashamed of and visitors to this country who have seen what is happening are acknowledging the great effort that has been made by the Government for the welfare of the people. There is no question of helping one particular kind of people against another. The whole content of the Government's policy has been one of working for the good of the greatest number of people in this country. After all, that is the function of any Government. I am sure that people will recognise that the country is proceeding with sure steps towards the creation of a new India who will take her rightful place in the comity of nations and will strive her utmost for the establishment of peace and for the benefit of our own people and of humanity at large. The President has

been gracious enough to trace the work of the Government during the past year and I trust this Motion of Thanks will be adopted unanimously.

डा० रघुवीर (मध्य प्रदेश) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति ने संसद् के दोनों सदनों के सामने परसों जो भाषण दिया उस भाषण के लिए मैं उनको धन्यवाद करता हूँ और धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव का अनुमोदन करने के लिए मैं अब खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

भारतवर्ष ने पिछले सात वर्षों में जो उन्नति की है और जो संसार की राजनीति में अपना स्थान बनाया है वह संसार के लिए एक दखने योग्य वस्तु है। इस बात का हमको अपने दश में रहते हुए कुछ पता नहीं लगता। अपने दश में रहते हुए जो वस्तु सामने आती है हम उसको वैसे ही देखते हैं जैसे कि प्रति दिन की दूसरी वस्तुएं सामने देखने में आती हैं। जिस प्रकार प्रति दिन हम समाचार पढ़ते हैं उसी प्रकार सामान्य रूप से हम उसको ग्रहण कर पाते हैं, उसकी विशेषता और महत्ता को हम नहीं देख पाते। किन्तु जब मनुष्य अपने दश से बाहर निकल कर दूसरे दशों में जाता है तब उसको अनुभूति होती है कि हमारा संसार में क्या स्थान है और संसार में मनुष्य के जीवन को अच्छा बनाने के लिए हमने क्या कुछ सम्पादन कर लिया है। हमने बहुत प्राचीन काल से मनुष्य के व्यक्तित्व के विकास के लिए पंचयम, पंच नियम, पंचशील और बहुत सारे नियमों की कल्पना की थी और सहस्रों वर्षों तक हमारे दार्शनिकों, विचारकों ने उन पर विचार किया और उनको अपने जीवन में डाला। महात्मा गान्धी जब भारतवर्ष में आए तो उन्होंने प्राचीन समय से चली आई हुई राजनीति को जिसको दंड नीति, कूट नीति, कॉर्पोरेट नीति अथवा "la patrie" या "Machiavelli" की नीति, Real-politik Macht politik इत्यादि नामों से स्मरण किया जाता था। उस नीति में उन्होंने एक नया सिद्धान्त का प्रवेश किया और वह नया सिद्धान्त यह था कि जो बातें व्यक्ति के जीवन को उंचा उठाने वाली हैं वे ही बातें संसार को भी, राष्ट्रों

को भी और राष्ट्रों के बीच परस्पर सम्बन्धों को भी ऊँचा उठावेंगी। जिस अहिंसा और सत्य को प्राचीन भारतवर्ष के योगियों ने परमात्मा की प्राप्ति के लिए, मोक्ष-सिद्धि के लिए आविष्कार किया था उन्हीं सिद्धान्तों को महात्मा गान्धी ने राजनीति में लागू किया और उसका एक विचित्र परिणाम हुआ। वह परिणाम सार्व संसार के सामने है। मैं जर्मनी में गया और मैंने वहाँ देखा कि पश्चिमी जर्मनी में व पूर्वी जर्मनी में वे लोग जो अपने आप को पीड़ित मानते हैं, वे समझते हैं कि महात्मा गान्धी का ही एक ऐसा सिद्धान्त है जो उनको अपनी स्थिति में बचा सकता है। जिस शक्ति के सामने किसी प्रकार के हथियारों से नहीं लड़ा जा सकता, यदि उससे लड़ने का कोई साधन है तो वह महात्मा गान्धी के सत्य और अहिंसा के हथियार हैं। अफ्रीका में जहाँ आज यूरोपियन गोरी जातियों का अधिकार है, जहाँ उनका लांहा इतना कड़ा है, जहाँ उनका शासन आदिवासी जातियों को ऊँचा उठने नहीं देता, वहाँ भी आज यह धार बह रही है कि यदि हमें कोई शक्ति बचायेगी तो वह नैतिक शक्ति बचाएगी जिसका महात्मा गान्धी ने भारतवर्ष में आरम्भ किया और आरम्भ ही नहीं किया किन्तु सफल बनाया। उनकी नीति का अनुसरण करते हुए हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्रद्धेय पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अन्ताराष्ट्रीय राजनीति में, जहाँ Machiavelli के सिद्धान्त चलते थे—लांगों में डर उत्पन्न करना, अपने राष्ट्र की शक्ति को आगे बढ़ाना, यही अन्ताराष्ट्रीय राजनीति के प्रतीक थे—इस स्थिति को उन्होंने पलटा। शक्ति को बढ़ाना हमारी विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य नहीं, किन्तु शान्ति स्थापित करना, जिस प्रकार व्यक्तियों में समता स्थापित करना, व्यक्तियों में हितैषिता स्थापित करना हमारा कर्तव्य है उसी प्रकार राष्ट्रों में भी मित्रता की भावना हो, समता की भावना हो, उनके प्रति हमारी लूटने की भावना न हो, उनके देश की सीमाओं की हम रक्षा करें। चीन की सीमा की रक्षा करना केवल चीन का काम नहीं दूसरे देशों का भी

काम है। चीन देश में चीन का प्रभुत्व हो, दूसरे राज्य को उनके देश में हस्तक्षेप करने का अधिकार न हो, इसी प्रकार से भारत राष्ट्र के राज्य में किसी दूसरी शक्ति को हस्तक्षेप करने का अधिकार नहीं।

हम उनके हितैषी, वे हमारे हितैषी हैं आदि इस प्रकार के पांच नियमों की पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू और चाउ एन लाई, इन दो सज्जनों ने मिलकर जिस समय घोषणा की, उस समय विदेशों के समाचारपत्रों को पढ़ते हुए मैंने देखा कि कई देशों के समाचारपत्रों में, प्रमुख समाचार पत्रों में, इन सिद्धान्तों पर हंसी उड़ाई गई, किन्तु आज थोड़े ही समय के पश्चात् वे देखने लगे हैं उनका जो सिद्धान्त था “Macht-politik का अथवा प्रसिद्ध फ्रांसीसी “la patrie” का अर्थात् “मेरी मातृभूमि, मेरी मातृभूमि, इसके लिए मैं जीता हूँ, इसके लिए मैं रहता हूँ और इसके लिए मैं लड़ूँ, की नदियाँ बहा दूँगा,” यह विचार आज काम नहीं आयेगा, किन्तु जो जर्मन दार्शनिकों ने और जर्मन कवियों ने एक वाक्य कविता के रूप में, दर्शन के रूप में, आदर्श के रूप में रखा था “Zumewigen Frieden” कि शाश्वत शान्ति की ओर हम पग बढ़ाते हुए चले जायें, उस सिद्धान्त को हमने अन्ताराष्ट्रीय राजनीति का स्तम्भ बनाया और इसके कारण संसार हमारी ओर देखने लगा कि यह देश अपना स्वार्थ नहीं चाहता, अपनी शक्ति को बढ़ाना नहीं चाहता, अपने राज्य की सीमाओं को बढ़ाना नहीं चाहता, किन्तु इसका केवलमात्र एक स्थायी उद्देश्य यही है कि संसार में शान्ति स्थापित हो और वह दूसरों का आदर कर के स्थापित हो। इसका अनुसरण करते हुए इंडोनेशिया ने एक प्रस्ताव रखा कि एशिया और अफ्रीका के स्वतंत्र देशों का सम्मेलन हो। भारतवर्ष ने इसका अनुमोदन किया। यह बड़े महत्व की वस्तु होने वाली है। आज से सार्द्ध चार सौ वर्ष पूर्व, पन्द्रहवीं शताब्दी के अन्त में, यूरोपियन जातियों ने समस्त संसार पर अपना अधिकार जमाना आरम्भ किया, तोपें ले जा कर उन्होंने संसार को विजित किया और जो निरक्षर जातियाँ Unlettered

[डॉ० रघुवीर]

people”

थीं उनको उन्होंने समाप्त किया। दक्षिण अमरीका, उत्तरी अमरीका, आस्ट्रेलिया, न्यूजीलैंड आदि देशों के जो निवासी थे, जो वहां की पुरानी रहने वाली जातियां थीं समाप्त हो चुकी हैं। अफ्रीका ही आज एंसा देश शेष है जिसके अधिकांश भाग में वहां की जातियां विद्यमान हैं, और उनका उन्मूलन नहीं हुआ है। इनमें आज जागृति की भावना हो रही है। ये अपने अधिकारों के लिये खड़ी होने लगी हैं। इन गिरी हुई जातियों को यूरोपीय गोरी जातियां जिनका कि वहां पर शासन है, दबाना चाहती हैं। हम शान्ति चाहते हैं, हम शान्ति का आधार न्याय चाहते हैं, यदि शान्ति का आधार अन्याय बनेगा तो वह शान्ति अशान्ति की नींव बन जायेगी। शान्ति अशान्ति के लिए न बने, शान्ति का आधार न्याय पर हो और न्याय की स्थापना मनुष्य की गरिमा, एक एक व्यक्ति और एक एक देश का एक दूसरे के प्रति सम्मान इस सिद्धांत पर आधुत हो। इस आदर्श को सामने रख कर जो सम्मेलन किया जा रहा है उससे अफ्रीका और एशिया की जातियों के अंदर भवष्य में जो वहां अशान्ति होने की सम्भावना है उस अशान्ति की सम्भावना को रोक जाय। इन जातियों को इकट्ठा किया जाय। संसार में चारों ओर से एक नया slogan एक नई घोषणा उठी है कि ये जातियां जो संस्कृति में हमारे से नीची हैं, शक्ति में नीची हैं, आर्थिक विकास, आधुनिक विकास जिनमें हमारे जितना नहीं हुआ, ये सब बातें हमारे समान हैं। इस नये विचार का यह सम्मेलन प्रतीक होगा।

फारमोसा के सम्बन्ध में राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि हम चीन के लोकतंत्रीय राज्य को फारमोसा का अधिपति मानते हैं, फारमोसा में लोकतंत्रीय राज्य का प्रभुत्व होना चाहिए। किन्तु यह तो अधिकार की बात रही। अन्ताराष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से हमको शान्ति भी चाहिए। इसीलिये यद्यपि अधिकार हम लोकतंत्रीय राज्य का मानते हैं किन्तु अन्ताराष्ट्रीय शान्ति

की दृष्टि से हम चाहते हैं कि इसका निपटारा शान्ति द्वारा हो, लड़ाई से नहीं। क्यों? इसलिए कि यदि युद्ध द्वारा फारमोसा को लेने का चीन ने यत्न किया और विश्व युद्ध आरम्भ हुआ तो जिन अधिकारों की रक्षा के लिए चीन युद्ध करेगा, उस युद्ध का परिणाम उन अधिकारों की रक्षा नहीं होगी। चीन का विध्वंस होगा, दूसरे राष्ट्रों का विध्वंस होगा और सम्भव है मनुष्य जाति का ही विनाश हो जाय। इसीलिए उन अधिकारों की हम रक्षा करना चाहते हैं, उन अधिकारों की रक्षा करने के लिए ही आज यह आवश्यक है कि वैश्वीय भावनाओं को स्थान न देकर उसके स्थान पर शान्तिपूर्वक समस्याओं का निपटारा किया जाय।

इंडोचायना में अब शान्ति है। हम आशा करते हैं कि जो थोड़ा बहुत कार्य हमारे प्रतिनिधियों ने इंडोचायना में शान्ति स्थापित करने में किया वह कार्य आगे बढ़ेगा और वास्तविक शान्ति इंडोचायना में प्रतीष्टित होगी।

वियतनाम चम्पा है। वियतनाम में दूसरी शताब्दी से लेकर चौदहवीं शताब्दी तक हमें संस्कृत के शिलालेख मिलते हैं। इसी प्रकार छठी शताब्दी से लेकर चौदहवीं शताब्दी तक कम्बोज की राज्य भाषा संस्कृत रही है। चम्पा और कम्बोज स्याम देश, ये प्राचीन काल से भारत के शिष्य राष्ट्र और प्रिय सखा रहे हैं। भारत शान्ति के देवता भगवान बुद्ध की भूमि है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू देवानाथ प्रिय अशोक के जनानाथ प्रिय उत्तराधिकारी हैं। शान्ति धर्म के चक्र प्रवर्तन के लिए भारत के दूत देश देशान्तरों में अपनी सेवाएं अर्पण कर रहे हैं और अर्पण करते रहेंगे। इससे बड़ी प्रसन्नता हमको नहीं हो सकती।

इसके आगे सांशलिस्ट पैटर्न आफ सोमाइटी इस देश में समाजतंत्र की स्थापना हो, यह हम सब की कामना है, यह हम सब का प्रयत्न है। किन्तु सांशलिज्म किस प्रकार का हो यह बड़ा गंभीर प्रश्न है। यह प्रश्न केवल विरोधी पक्ष के लिए प्रश्न नहीं, यह प्रश्न हम सब के लिए है।

पर विचार करना जिस प्रकार से उनके लिए आवश्यक हैं उससे भी और अधिक इस दश के शासन पद्ध, कांग्रेस पार्टी, के लिए हैं। यह सम्भव था कि कांग्रेस पार्टी अथवा हमारे प्रधान मंत्री अथवा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के कोई अन्य सज्जन सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न, समाजतंत्र का इस दश में जिस प्रकार का ढांचा होगा, उसकी योजना बनाकर बड़े सुन्दर पत्र पर, जो कि तर्कयुक्त हैं अथवा तर्कसंगत प्रतीत हों, दश को देंगे। किन्तु यह हमने नहीं किया, यह हमारे शासन ने नहीं किया। उसका केवलमात्र एक कारण है। वह यह है कि हम यह देखना चाहते हैं कि आज हम जाँ प्रयोग कर रहे हैं, जो हमारी कामनाएँ हैं, जो हमारा आदर्श है वह किस प्रकार से अधिक पूर्ण होगा। आदर्श को पूरा करना हमारा कर्तव्य है, न कि किसी एक वाद को पूरा करना। एक ओर हम केंद्रीकरण 'centralisation' की ओर जा रहे हैं, दूसरी ओर हम विकेंद्रीकरण 'Decentralisation' कर रहे हैं, गांवों में पंचायतों की स्थापना और ग्राम ग्राम में औद्योगिक सहकारी संस्थाएँ बना रहे हैं। एक ओर हम बड़े बड़े कारखानों में बड़े अनुपात पर, बड़े पैमाने पर, उत्पादन करना चाहते हैं और उसकी योजनाएँ तैयार कर रहे हैं, उस पर करोड़ों रुपये व्यय कर रहे हैं, दूसरी ओर हम चाहते हैं कि एक एक गांव में, एक एक परिवार में, एक एक व्यक्ति द्वारा कुछ न कुछ अल्पतम राशि में, छोटें से छोटें स्कूल, पैमाने पर उत्पत्ति होती जाय। एक ओर हम राष्ट्रीयकरण कर रहे हैं, दूसरी ओर हम व्यक्ति की उत्पादन में सहायता कर रहे हैं। एक एक व्यक्ति का जो अनुभव है, जो उसमें सामर्थ्य है, उस को प्रयोग करते हुए दश के उत्पादन में वृद्धि है।

अंत में उद्देश्य तो यही है कि राष्ट्र का उत्पादन बढ़े, दिन प्रतिदिन अधिक उत्पादन हो, जिन वस्तुओं की दश को आवश्यकता है वे सब हमारे दश में बन सकें। यही तो हमारा उद्देश्य है। यदि वह व्यक्ति के द्वारा सफल होता है तो व्यक्ति करे, राष्ट्र के द्वारा सफल होता है तो वह राष्ट्र करे।

चीनी क्रान्ति का एक सिद्धान्त था :

"Min-chu-ti Chi-Chung Chitu democratic decentralisation)"

अर्थात् जनतन्त्रीय संकेंद्रण है। इसका अर्थ यह कि संकेंद्रण ताँ हो किन्तु वह संकेंद्रण ऐसा हो जो एक पार्टी के हाथ में, एक पक्ष के हाथ में हो, दस, बीस, पचास व्यक्तियों के हाथ में हो जो कि जनतंत्र अर्थात् साम्यवाद के सिद्धान्तों का अनुसरण करते हैं। हमने इस प्रकार का नियम नहीं बनाया। हमने जनतंत्र को स्वीकार किया। हमने संकेंद्रण को स्वीकार करते हुये विसंकेंद्रण को भी स्वीकार किया। जहाँ हमने जनतंत्र को स्वीकार किया वहाँ उसके साथ हमने यह भी स्वीकार किया कि नेताओं के पास सारी शक्ति नहीं रहेगी। शक्ति का आधार जनता रहेगी। शक्ति का आधार नेता नहीं होंगे। नेता जाति का नेतृत्व अवश्य करेंगे किन्तु ऐसा समय भी आ सकता है जब कि नेताओं का भी नेतृत्व जनता करेगी। शक्ति का स्रोत नेता नहीं, शक्ति का स्रोत सारी जनता है।

राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में आर्थिक स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में दो चार शब्द कहे हैं। ये शब्द उल्लेखनीय हैं। आपके अनुसार प्रतिवर्ष १० प्रतिशत उद्योग में वृद्धि हुई है। बहुत से दशों के, राष्ट्रों के, इतिहास की ओर यदि हम दृष्टि डालें तो यह वृद्धि कोई छोटी वृद्धि नहीं है। यह बड़ी भारी वृद्धि है। पहले चार वर्षों में यह वृद्धि हुई है। इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि अगले वर्षों में भी १० प्रतिशत ही वृद्धि होगी। संभव है वह अधिक बढ़ जाय या थोड़ी हो, किन्तु एक बार हम गति के मार्ग पर चल पड़े हैं। हमारी गाड़ी का पहिया आगे जा रहा है, एक विशेष गति से आगे जा रहा है। जो गति पहले वर्ष में आरम्भ की, उसी गति से दूसरे, तीसरे और चौथे वर्ष में भी चले। अब यह गति बन चुकी है और रुकने वाली नहीं है। यह दश का अंग बन चुकी है। कितना अंग बनी ? यह वृद्धि इतना बड़ा अंग बनी कि उसके कारण नई समस्याएँ उत्पन्न हो गईं। साथ पदाभ्यास में खाने पीने की वस्तुओं

[डा० रघुवीर]

में, जहां हमें न्यूनता पड़ती थी, हमारा दश का करंडों रूपया बाहर जाता था, हम दूसरे दशों के अधीन थे वहां खाने पीने के सम्बन्ध में तीन वर्षों में हमारी यह स्थिति हुई कि केवल खाद्य पदार्थों की पर्याप्त मात्रा ही उत्पन्न नहीं हुई वरन् खाद्य पदार्थों का आधिक्य हो गया। वे इतने अधिक हुये कि आज खाद्य पदार्थ के मूल्य नीचे गिर रहे हैं। तो जहां यह एक शोचनीय अवस्था है कि खाद्य पदार्थों के मूल्य गिरें, वहां दूसरी ओर से यह एक बड़ी अच्छी स्थिति है कि जिस कारण से खाद्य पदार्थ के मूल्य गिरें वह कारण एक प्रशंसनीय कारण है वह यह कि हमारी उपज बढ़ी। जो मूल्य गिरें उसके लिए शासन प्रबन्ध कर रहा है।

समाजवाद की स्थापना करने के लिये वंयक्तिक अनुभव का पूरा पूरा उपयोग हो इसके लिये हमारे शासन ने "Indian Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation" भारतीय औद्योगिक उधार तथा विनियोग निगम की स्थापना की। यह उस दिशा का प्रतीक है जिस दिशा में हम राष्ट्र को समाजवाद की ओर ले जाना चाहते हैं।

अंत में एक बात कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। हम अपने दश की तुलना दूसरे दशों के साथ करते हुये एक बात का अवश्य ध्यान रखें और वह यह है कि ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से हमारे दश में अब यंत्र युग का प्रारम्भ हो रहा है, विज्ञान युग का अब प्रारम्भ हो रहा है। विज्ञान युग को, यंत्र युग को सफल बनाने के लिये, विज्ञान से, यंत्र से, पूरा लाभ उठाने के लिये दश में एक नई मनावृत्ति की आवश्यकता है। मनुष्यों की यन्त्रों का प्रयोग करने के लिये प्रवृत्ति होनी चाहिये। पाश्चात्य देशों में, अथवा जापान में व्यक्ति नये यन्त्रों के पीछे भागते हैं, गांव का व्यक्ति भी यन्त्रों को मोल लेता है, वह मनावृत्ति हमारे दश में नहीं है। हमारे दश में संतोष की विचित्र भावना उत्पन्न हुई थी कि हमें जो कुछ

मिलता है उससे हम संतुष्ट हैं। आज उस मनावृत्ति को हटा कर, संतोष की मनावृत्ति को हटा कर, विकास की मनावृत्ति, वृद्धि की मनावृत्ति, हमारा स्तर ऊंचा उठाना चाहिये इस भावना को जागृत करने के लिये एक नई मनावृत्ति की आवश्यकता है। इस मनावृत्ति को उत्पादित करने के लिये राष्ट्रीय विस्तार संवाओं की स्थापना की गई है। ये संवायें अभी आरम्भ हुई हैं, इनके कुछ कुछ फल निकले हैं किन्तु मुझे आशा है कि तीन चार वर्षों के पश्चात् जब इसका पूरा फल निकलेगा तो आप देखेंगे कि जिस प्रकार से विदेशों में साँ डंडे साँ वर्षों से यंत्र युग स्थापित है, जो नए आविष्कारों का उपयोग करने की उनकी मनावृत्ति है, जो उनकी यत्न करते रहने की मनावृत्ति है कि हमारी खेती में आगे दो मन आलू निकला है तो अब सत्रा दो मन आलू निकले, यह जो विकास की मनावृत्ति है, वह मनावृत्ति आपके दश में भी आवेगी।

अन्त में मुझे यह कहना है कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने जो संतोष अपने भाषण में प्रकट किया है हम सब उस संतोष से सहमत हैं। मेरे कई भाइयों का जो कि विरोधी पक्ष के हैं, उनका कहना है कि हम अपनी सफलता के गीत गाते हैं, यह अच्छा प्रतीत नहीं होता। यह एक मनावृत्तिगतिक वस्तु है और इस मनावृत्तिगतिक सिद्धांत से लाभ उठाना चाहिये। चीन और रूस ने तो इसका नई विद्या का रूप दिया है कि लोगों में उत्साह कैसे उत्पन्न करें। उत्साह सफलता का आधार पर होता है। चीन, रूस और अमेरिका में एक एक बालक को बताया जाता है कि तुमने इतनी उन्नति की है, तुम्हारे दश की यह विशेषता है। तो यहां भी यह आवश्यक है कि इस दश के प्रत्येक बालक को पता हो कि हमने कितनी उन्नति की है, किस किस क्षेत्र में हमने उन्नति की है जिससे कि वह अगली उन्नति के लिये उत्सुक रहे और सांचे कि हमें अगले वर्ष में इतनी उन्नति करनी है। हम लोगों के यहां दुर्भिक्षों के गीत गाये जाते हैं। हमें इन गीतों को नहीं गाना है। हमें अपनी सफलता के गीतों को गाना है। हमारे

गीत सफलता के तराने हों। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं राष्ट्रपति को धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms: —

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 21st February 1955."

Notice of 23 amendments has already been given. In accordance with our previous practice, I am disallowing six amendments, numbers 2, 5, 10, 11, 17 and 22. The rest of the amendments are in order. Amendment No. 20 has been revised by the authors. The amendments may be moved without any formal speech.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Sir, I beg to move:

1. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret to note that while discussing the economic situation in the country no mention has been made of any substantial and adequate steps which the Government propose to take with a view to achieve the socialistic pattern of society and to disabuse the mind of the people from a general feeling that it is merely slogan-mongering'."

3. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that all that has been stated in the President's Address is only a repetition of what has already been said by the Prime Minister and other Ministers outside Parliament and that Parliament has not been taken into confidence regarding Gov-

ernment's programme for the year'."

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move:

4. "That at the end of the motion t. i.e following be added, namely: —

'but regret that no noteworthy reference has been made to the problem of unemployment and its effective solution'."

6. "That at the end of the motion t. i.e following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the socialist pattern of society mentioned in the Address has been kept absolutely vague'."

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): Sir I beg to move:

7. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address fails to indicate any effective steps to stop the reign of terror prevailing in the Portuguese occupied territories of India and the unsympathetic attitude of the Government towards the liberation movement by not removing the ban on the Indian citizens' participation with their Goan brethren'."

8. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address contains no reference to the growing unemployment problem in the country and the failure of the Government to tackle this satisfactorily'."

9. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address does not contain an adequate appreciation of the hardship of the agriculturists due to fall in agricultural prices and high prices of manufactured goods and the Government's failure to guarantee an

[Shri S. N. Dwivedy.] economic price to the agriculturists'."

12. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret the failure of the Government of India to take adequate steps to help the people of Orissa and Bihar who are undergoing terrible hardship on account of failure of crops due to drought conditions'."

13. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address has not mentioned about the failure of the Government to get people's co-operation in the community project areas due to delay in introducing land reforms and lack of proper personnel to carry out the work of the projects'."

14. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address fails to disclose positive and definite steps for the change of the present administrative and economic set-up of the country with a view to the introduction of a socialist pattern of society'."

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Sir, I beg to move:

15. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret to note that no steps have been suggested in the Address for the attainment of the objective of a Welfare State on socialistic pattern and in particular to relieve the economic distress of agricultural classes due to falling prices, to find avenues of employment to the ever-increasing class of educated unemployed and to device means of evolving a system of national education replacing the present out-dated system'."

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Sir, I beg to move:

16. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address contains no assurance that effective measures will be taken by Government for the betterment of the Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move:

18. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address neither records the failure of the Government to arrest the growth of unemployment in the country nor does it indicate any steps to check it in the future'."

19. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the mass evictions of the peasantry from their land and the falling prices of agricultural commodities, all of which have gone not only to cause widespread suffering and want in the country-side, but also to threaten the economy of our country'."

20. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address only complacently refers to the elections in Andhra but gives no indication of the steps taken to ensure fair and free elections there'."

21. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address is silent on the growing attacks on Trade Union and fundamental rights of the workers and other sections of the toiling people'."

23. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely: —

'but regret that the Address does not take any note of the reckless profiteering by the monopolists, both Indian and foreign, nor does it indicate any steps to check it in order to protect the interests of the people and of our national economy'."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendments and the motion are before the House.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the Address of the President with the careful attention to which it is entitled. Sir, one could certainly compliment the President for his Address, for the sobriety and for the dignity but I must say that what one legitimately expects to emanate from the Address, that human urge or that glimpse into the future programme of Government which would inspire confidence in the minds of the Members of Parliament and in the minds of the people in the country is completely lacking. Mr. Chairman, the President's Address is too much of a resume; it is much less of an assessment of the situation and still much less of an urge and urgency which would realise the future vision which we all cherish in our minds.

Talking about the foreign policy, though the Address covers almost half the space and the mover of this motion has also spoken about it at length, I would mainly deal with the points and the matters which are uppermost in our minds; but, I would be failing in my duty if I did not give a complete picture. I would also be failing in my duty if I did not say that we do feel that the positive role which our country has played in bringing about and in enlarging an area of peace is really commendable. It certainly lies to the credit of this Government and the Prime Minister and we cannot also forget to mention the versatile statesman, Mr. Menon, who is an hon. Member of this House, who has played a great part in bringing about this state of affairs. More than that what

I value much more is the fact that a new spirit has been aroused in Asia and in Africa and in rousing this new spirit and putting these two continents in a proper world perspective, our Prime Minister has certainly played a very great part, a very noble part which we realise, we appreciate and everybody else does appreciate. But, Sir, we must not forget that we are not at all nearer to the aim and object which we want to achieve. Let us not forget the reaction and the counter-steps which are already being taken and in spite of what has been said from here, absolutely unmindful of what our efforts have been in this direction, there has been a drift. There are certain important developments, the reactions and the repercussions of which we have got to take notice of. Our neighbour country is in the throes of a re-birth and at the same time it is busy with military pacts, military pacts here quite close to our doors as well as to the Middle East countries with U.S.A. and other countries. Again, Sir, there has been a great reaction in the great country of the U.S.S.R. in the change of leadership and the change of programme and the conscription in China. These are all reactions of the policy which is being followed by the U.S.A., the policy of positions of strength. It has been our sincere effort to bring home the fact that this policy of positions of strength is not likely to solve any problems. It has been as a matter of fact more substantiated by the reaction which it has created in these big countries. It is very indicative of the fact that the policy of the other countries which are following the policy of positions of strength is going to have a reaction and is going to recoil in the same spirit in which that policy is being followed. Here lies the great importance and the great significance of the policy followed by this country in easing and relaxing world tensions because it now becomes abundantly clear that this is the only policy which can succeed. I therefore again repeat my compliments so far as our noble efforts in pursuing this policy are concerned. But we feel

LSHri H. C. Mathur.] deeply about certain problems to which I wish to refer, but I do realize that in referring to problems like Kashmir we must exercise all restraint. They are not problems which can be solved by making speeches here. I quite appreciate that. There is a great delicacy in that, but, Sir, we of course have to refer to them because it is not only we in India who feel very much anxious about these problems. I would refer to the speech of the Prime Minister of Kashmir, who is a very sober person, a very realistic person who takes a very balanced view of things. He has expressed great concern about the recent developments. We all wish very good and very friendly relation with our neighbour Pakistan and I would say absolutely nothing which would mean any complications to the forthcoming talks between the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India. But certainly, Sir, we must realise and we must disabuse the minds of the people about the apprehensions which have been expressed, apprehensions which have been expressed not by a layman here or a layman there. I refer to the speech of the Prime Minister of Kashmir who delivered it here in Delhi warning this country that the friendly relations with Pakistan should not be at the cost of Kashmir. Nobody in Kashmir has ever asked for a plebiscite. The Rajpramukh or as we call him the Sadr-e-Riyasat of Kashmir who has a great past, who has a great position, not only as Sadr-e-Riyasat but from his personal position also has spoken more than half a dozen times what Kashmir wants. He can truly interpret the minds, not only of his own heritage, of his own mind but of the people of Kashmir. He has spoken more than once what Kashmir wants. The Prime Minister of Kashmir has spoken more than once that they cannot think of any other solution but of integration with India. They are a part and parcel of India. There are only two parties in that country and Roth the parties at least are unanimous in this view that Kashmir certainly is an integral part of this country.

Let us now take a realistic attitude in this matter and I wish that this matter will not be kept any more in suspense and we do hope that when the two Prime Ministers *meet* next, they will certainly take the people out of this suspense and give a clear-cut decision and attitude in this matter. We definitely owe it to the Prim-Minister of Kashmir and to the people of Kashmir that we give them our mind in this matter and we tell them that certainly we do recognise that Kashmir is for all practical purposes—it is already so—and also formally and constitutionally it is an integrated part of India and there can be no question about it.

Sir, now, as I stated at the very beginning, I am more concerned with our domestic affairs, the economic policy of this country. It is here, Sir, that I am very much disappointed by the address of the President. He has at the fag end of his address made mention about the socialistic pattern of society. He has also mentioned about increased production in this country. We all very much value the increased production in this country, but the pertinent question is not only increased production but what is the reaction of this increased production on the socialistic pattern of society, whether the money coming out of this increased production has gone to the poorer people or whether the money which we have got out of this increased production has gone only to the richer people, to the millowners, to the industrialists. What is the reaction of this increased production? We may go on, our production may increase, and if the wealth is going on accumulating in the hands of a few people, what use is that increased production to our country and how does it conform to the declared policy of the Congress?

Well, Sir. I do not wish to start with suspicions. I do not say that the resolutions passed by the Congress Party, the ruling party, are only slogan-mongering. Why should I start with

suspicion? I give them all the credit for it, but I wish to be assured definitely not only by their professions but by definite actions that they are definitely going in that direction. It is not only the plans and the programmes that matter; what is important is the pace of progress and we have seen nothing as a matter of fact. Even the little traces that we notice are not towards that direction. There are two fundamental things, Sir, in this socialistic pattern of society. Now, Sir, comes the State, and it has not so far done anything worth mentioning in this connection. It is all right that we are starting State industries, but do we not see that in spite of this increased production, in spite of the Five Year Plan, what is happening is that unemployment is increasing. The prices of foodgrains have gone down; they are falling at a rapid rate. But still there are millions of people in this country who cannot afford to buy their two good meals. That very clearly shows that our economy has not taken the right direction and the President while only mentioning that there is increased production has not said a word as to how it has reacted and what steps are going to be taken by the Government to give a proper flow and a proper direction to our economy. That is more important.

Mr. Chairman, while talking about economy I must also refer to the land reforms. It is about seven years that we have been hammering at it. I am not talking only of my part of the country. It has been my practice to go about visiting different places during the inter-session period and though I do not deny that some sincere efforts have been made. I must say that it is particularly here in this vital matter of land reforms that our policy is suffering from certain complexes and from great hesitancy. I was really surprised to find that often what we call reforms—those reforms that have already gone through certain Legislatures—do not give land to the tiller. We may talk about the abolition of zamindari but we do not realise what

it actually is in practice and how it has affected the tillers of the soil. I value the psychological aspect of it but I wish to submit that it has not very appreciably affected the economic position of the tiller in a great part of the country, particularly in the South. I have discussed about this problem in Madras, Travancore-Cochin and other places. Leaving aside the big estates, the tea estates, the rubber estates and others, still we find that our Government is very much lagging in this matter of land reforms and they have not been able to do much. Of course, we have plans for irrigation, river valley projects, but here the problem is whether the tiller of the soil has been a gainer in any sense.

The last point I want to touch upon is this. Apart from these two important questions, the most important question which affects the administration and which will make the people happier is, I think, the question of efficiency and honesty in administration. Again, I congratulate the ruling party for having owned, acknowledged and passed a Resolution about this very serious matter at their last political conference. But, Sir, corruption has definitely been on the increase and I say that from absolutely practical experience. I have intimate knowledge of it. Whether the Government recognises it or not, it has definitely been on the increase. And efficiency has gone down to an extent which would shock anybody who has any grasp of the situation. No officer is prepared to take any responsibility today. It is being shirked and these Boards that are being set up will serve absolutely no purpose because inefficiency as well as corruption begins from the top and until and unless we are able to do something at the top we will never be able to achieve any results in this matter. I am not going into details as I wish to close my speech within two minutes. Only the day before the Finance Minister was talking about certain Part B States. He was delivering a speech in Madhya Bharat. Talking about the lack of administrative

I financial machinery, I am very

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] much afraid, Sir, that he does not know where the trouble lies. The administrative machinery is not permitted to function. There is no stability in the Ministries. All the Ministers, all the time unfortunately, are only worried about their chairs. There is no stability. Their whole attention is directed to this one thing. Unfortunately, the State of Rajasthan is no exception. We have suffered, if anything, from this and this has gone down to the Services. A particular officer belongs to this particular Minister; he is a favourite of this Minister or that Minister and he must toe this line or that line. All the Ministers are all the time occupied in how to get a particular Minister out and how to be able to work to that end. Until and unless that Resolution which was passed is really implemented, nothing is going to happen. These Boards which are being set up, they are a mere eyewash. They are meant for an officer here or for an officer there who does not in the least count. Until and unless we do something, we will make no progress and I am surprised to find that the President has made absolutely no reference to this in his Address.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, I rise to question this practice of Presidential Address .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not do that.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY: I propose to make some positive suggestions. "We are meeting here today

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Constitution requires it and he has carried out that obligation. You cannot question that.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY:
for a long session when there are dark clouds of war on the horizon. Our Government is making valiant efforts along with some other Governments to dissipate those clouds. We have great problems facing us; big development plans have to be carried out to

give shape to a socialist pattern of society. We have to gird our loins to put forward our best exertion to build up our country. With these tremendous tasks before us, I should imagine that at the start of such a session, we would want to hear something that would alert us to our problems and stimulate us to do our best. Fortunately, we have today with us as our Prime Minister a man of great stature, a man who could give a lead, an inspiring lead. We would wish to hear him stand up and say something positive and dynamic and give us guidance in respect of the three months' work that is before us. Instead of that we have copied a practice from another country of asking our President—the beloved of the millions—to stand up and deliver a bromide. I am sorry—I have to use that word. But what else can I do when the great task of building up a socialist pattern of society is dismissed in four words. The Prime Minister said the other day that he did not want to follow the Soviet system because it developed as a result of historical facts, as a result of disintegration of the Government through war and then civil war and so on. The same was true of what happened in China. Our historical background was different and so we could not copy those systems. We must devise something for ourselves. But instead of doing that we have copied a system from another country which also has had a different historical background from ours. Why should we follow that practice which has nothing to do with us? We have got different problems, different circumstances and a different historical background. Therefore, I am suggesting that since we are going to have a fourth amendment to the Constitution, we might as well have a fifth one to do away with this practice. I feel that this fifth amendment is very much needed to do away with this practice which makes our beloved President to waste his time in doing something which is not needed. Instead of that we should like the Prime Minister of the day to tell us the problems which face the country, how he proposes to deal with them,

the Bills he proposes to introduce, and thus initiate a purposeful discussion which would make our work later better informed.

Now, with regard to the various issues, I would not go into details, but I would again remind this House that we have big problems before us; great things to do; and we should approach them better informed with a general discussion of principles at this stage. And we should devise our parliamentary practice to suit our requirements. I take the liberty to suggest that the practice of the President's Address be given up and replaced by an address from the Prime Minister of the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not a very good or relevant contribution!

SHRI M. GOVINDA' REDDY (Mysore) : Mr. Chairman, I have very great pleasure in supporting the Motion of Thanks. I was surprised at my hon. friend, Maj.-General Sokhey taking exception to this provision made in the Constitution, or doubting the utility and purpose of the President addressing the Parliament. Sir, it is a well established constitutional procedure. "What began with a convention has developed into a constitutional precedent and a procedure. And, in my opinion, it is for a very definite and useful purpose that this provision has been made. If only my hon. friend pauses for a minute to think what are the advantages that are achieved by this constitutional procedure, he will not any more doubt its utility. Well, Sir, to sum up briefly, the head of the State must, in the beginning of the session of the Legislature, not only review the work of the Government for the past year; but also must outline the important policy, the paramount steps that the Government are going to take to implement that policy; and the outstanding problems that the States and the Legislatures have to face. As the House is well aware, this procedure is borrowed from the United Kingdom Constitution. There are so many other things in common. Either

in matters of culture or in matters of established procedure—legislative procedure or methods of administration—no country has something all its own to claim without borrowing from any other country. Good men always think good of other countries and do not hesitate to take what is good in other countries. Similarly, Sir, India without being vain has always borrowed from every country in the world which has something good to give. We have, indeed, borrowed in framing our Constitution a lot not only from the U.K., not only from the U.S.A., but from other countries as well.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What are those countries?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: And I do not think this is a thing about which my hon. friend should raise a query. Well, Sir, going back to the purpose which this procedure serves, as I was saying, the head of the State in the beginning of the session of the Legislature outlines the policy of the Government and places before the Legislature outstanding problems of importance. We know that in the British Parliament, when the King, and now the Queen, addresses the Parliament, she not only reviews the events that have taken place, but also outlines the steps that the Government are going to take. The Legislature also will be glad that the President who is the symbolic head of the State is acquainted with the work of the Government. Well, this is one way that is provided for the Legislature coming into contact with the head of the State directly and officially. Well, no Member. I am sure, in this House can doubt the utility of this. It also gives a very good opportunity which hon. Members on the opposite side do welcome. I am sure, and that opportunity is to discuss the policy of the Government: to criticise the actions of the Government: and to show to the Government their shortcomings. Well, these are all purposes which every legislature welcomes and I am sure Maj.-General Sokhey will also see that some purpose is served, after listening

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] to my brief explanation. There is some purpose and it is not a waste of time that the President should meet the Members of both Houses of Parliament and then give his message. We are really deeply grateful to the President for having taken this trouble to address both Houses.

Sir, the President has referred, in his gracious Address, to the achievements of Government. Well, it is open for the Members of this House to view these achievements in different lights.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Certainly, I daresay that at least one section of this House views it in a different light, different from the same light with which we view the matter. The President has referred to our achievements. It is quite possible to imagine an ideal society where everyone has enough food, enough clothing, every one has enough opportunities to earn enough and enjoy and where there is no one who is suffering from any of these. Generally, the extreme section of this House which is in the Opposition is likely to presume this state of affairs—this state of 'Utopia'—and then criticise the actions of the Government, the work of the Government in relation to that 'Utopia'. I am sure that the House will realise that this is not a practical point of view. In order to assess the achievements of the Government in a proper light and in order to be fair to the Government, the achievements of the Government, in my opinion, must be viewed in relation to the background. We cannot appreciate a picture if we abstract the figure in the picture from the background against which it is represented. The picture shines in colour, in tone and in beauty only against the background. Similarly, if we have to fairly evaluate the work of the Government, we will have to consider the background; we will have to consider the background under which this Government had to function, the limitations in which this Government has to function, the pro-

blems under which this Government had to labour—and against these odds, how much this Government has been able to achieve. If we, Sir, in this connection judge the achievements of this Government in this way, I am sure every reasonable man will certainly give credit to the Government for the number of achievements that the Government have made. In this connection, I am very glad to congratulate the hon. Mr. Mathur for having expressed his appreciation of the many things that the Government have been able to achieve. If we look at the achievements of the Government, they are too many to enumerate. The Five Year Plan has demonstrably been a great success. In industrial production we have achieved tremendous progress. In agriculture we have overcome the shortage of food. I am only briefly referring to our achievements both in industry and agriculture. In food production, in 1953-54 it was 65J million tons roughly, that is, U4 million tons more than in the year 1949-50 when we were suffering from shortage. The target that the Five Year Plan had visualised is now exceeded by 7.5 million tons and that will be fifty per cent, in excess. In cotton the annual production was 32 per cent, over that' of the base year, that is 1950-51. Nearly 80 per cent, of the five year target had been realised by 1953-54. Similarly, Sir, in oilseeds and other things, we have achieved tremendous progress. In fact, Sir, the members of the Five Year Plan, while reviewing the work and the progress that has been achieved under the Plan, say that the equilibrium, which they aimed at in the Five Year Plan between the shortage and supplies of the essentials and food articles in the country, is in sight. With regard to communications, we have made a very good progress. Sir, I am not going to refer to it. Again, with regard to cloth, which, as the hon. Members will realise, is the basic need of our people, we have achieved tremendous progress, and we are now producing in surplus. With regard to mechanical industries also, we have made tremendous progress.

Among all these things, I want only, Sir, to refer to two or three most important achievements which, in my opinion, should get precedence. One is, Sir, the cottage industries. Every one in this House realises how our cottage industries have suffered for the past many years. Cottage industries which were once the glory of the country had to drag on their existence—their hand to mouth existence—and the Government have given their topmost consideration to the cottage industries and have taken some steps to put cottage industries on a very sound footing. In this connection, Sir, this House is aware of the fact that a team of experts from the Ford Foundation was asked to survey the field of cottage industries, and to suggest to the Government the action that they should take for the development of cottage industries and putting them on a sound basis. Well, Sir, this team of experts did excellent work and gave many suggestions. The Government have acted upon all these suggestions. One is to organise these cottage industries on an institutional basis, and this House is aware that several Boards have been formed. There is the Khadi Board; there is the Handicrafts Board; and then, there have been several societies, and the Government have come forward liberally to give them assistance in this matter. In the four years from 1949-50 to 1952-53, the amount that was spent on cottage industries was only Rs. 15 lakhs—for all the four years. In 1953-54, the amount rose up to Rs. 5.64 crores. The assistance that the Government was able to give was Rs. 5.64 crores. In 1954-55, Rs. 10 crores have been provided for, out of which Rs. 8 crores have been sanctioned. Again in the matter of improvement of techniques and management, and in the matter of increased credit and marketing facilities, the Government have taken very definite steps. On khadi alone, Sir, in 1953, Rs. 5 crores were spent, and on other smaller industries Rs. 90 lakhs were spent. Loans to the extent of Rs. 21 crores have been given since 1953, and now, after 1953,

it is over Rs. 5.82 crores. An expert marketing organisation has been set up, and in order to ensure a sure market for the cottage industries' products, emporia in different stations and in foreign countries have been opened. Emporia have been opened in Colombo, in Rangoon, Aden, and in other places, Sir, and industrial co-operatives have also been encouraged. The Government have recognised the necessity definitely of co-ordinating the cottage industries with the manufacturers. The Government have realised that unless a definite sphere is demarcated for cottage industries, and unless that sphere is left exclusively to cottage industries, cottage industries have no means of survival. By this way, Sir, cottage industries have been given a sure opportunity for their development and for their progress.

The other point to which I wanted to refer was about the irrigation projects. Every one realises that our country was suffering from acute food shortage, and in order to relieve that food shortage, and in order to develop not only agriculture, but also industry, the Government have visualised several river projects. But that is an old tale. What I wish to point out in this connection, Sir, is the progress that we have made in the matter of river valley projects. The hon. mover of this motion, Sir, was outlining to this House the appreciation which foreign experts have made of the progress that we have achieved in these river valley projects, and of the overall progress of the Five Year Plan. The advantage that would result from the development of the river valley projects not only brings extensive land under cultivation and ensures raw materials and food crops to the nation, but also supplies the electricity which is so necessary in order to develop our industries. An overall industrial structure for the country has been visualised, and the Government have done very well in placing the country on a footing of self-sufficiency. I am sure, Sir, by the time the Second Five Year Plan comes

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] into operation, we will have gone a long way on the road to reach self-sufficiency, at least in most of the important needs of the country.

The other development, Sir, in the country, which we look to with satisfaction is the creation of the necessary outlook in this country. The hon. Member, Dr. Raghu Vira, was referring to this question. From my imperfect knowledge of his speech, I can say that he has made a reference to the need for the development of this outlook. Well, Sir, our community projects and the national extension centres have ensured that this need is answered. The voluntary co-operation that the Government have received in several project areas ensures that there is sufficient interest taken by the people, and there is adequate appreciation by the people of the work that has been done. Only the other day in another place the element of public co-operation that was forthcoming in connection with the Kosi project was being outlined. The measure of co-operation extended by the public in connection with the Kosi project shows that the people have appreciated the need for progress and that they have been enthused by the objectives of these Community Project centres.

There is one fact, however, to which I am sure our friends on the opposite will refer, and that is the question of the fall in the prices of agricultural products. It is really a matter with which this House is deeply concerned. We must realise that between 60 and 70 per cent, of the people in India are following this avocation. Their entire livelihood is dependent on agriculture, and the economy of the country as a whole is to that extent also dependent upon that factor, and if the economy of 60 to 70 per cent, of the people is not prosperous and on a sound footing, then we can at once say that the economy of the whole country is not on a sound basis. Therefore I would plead that Government should give

due attention to this subject. I have heard different voices in this connection coming out of the mouth of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. At one place they say that it is not possible to check, to arrest the fall in prices.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: By the same mouth?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: At another place they say that it is necessary to check this fall in prices, but I do not see any inconsistency in this, as Mr. Gupta seems to imagine. What the hon. Minister means by saying that he will not be able to check the fall in prices is that he will not be able to check it all at once. Anybody can see that it cannot be arrested suddenly, because the price structure of agricultural commodities depends on other factors also. What I wish to urge in this connection is that there must be an overall approach to this problem in order to solve it. The approach must come not only from the Ministry of Food and Agriculture but there must be co-ordination between the Commerce and Industry Ministry and the Food Ministry.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Finance Ministry also.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, the Finance Ministry also. Another factor that is very necessary in order to stabilise the prices of agricultural products is to bring about co-ordination between imports and exports. We are planning for a Socialist Welfare State and therefore we have to arrive at a definite pattern in regard to the daily necessities and then keep the other things in another sphere. What I mean to say is that in order to protect and safeguard the interests of the consumer, we have to classify and categorise the commodities which are deemed to be daily necessities. As far as these daily necessities are concerned, since these affect the general public, whatever may happen, the

Government will have to keep in view the consumers' point of view only. With regard to this sphere which belongs to commodities which fall within daily necessities, the Government should have a definite plan.

KAZI KARIMUDDIN (Madhya Pradesh) : All agricultural products are daily necessities.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: All the agricultural products do not come within daily necessities. There are, for instance, the commercial crops which do not come under daily necessities. They belong to my classification of *tV>e* other sphere. Any conflict between **he* price structures in these two spheres will bring hardship to the community. In a socialist pattern of society, there must be a harmonious co-ordination between these two spheres to the extent that the general consumer does not suffer and at the same time that the agriculturists also do not suffer. By this I mean to say that the price levels of the commodities which are not included in daily necessities also must be stabilised and by stabilising the price structure of these things which are outside the pale of daily necessities, agricultural economy will to a large extent be strengthened. There have been various suggestions given for stabilising the prices of agricultural products. I hope that the Government will take them into consideration.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): You do not want any stabilisation of food prices? I would like to understand you correctly. Your argument leads to it

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am happy to find that my attention has been drawn to this. I did not mean to say that, and I do not see how my hon. friend got that impression that there should be no stabilisation of food prices. In fact my whole argument is that. Maybe I have not expressed it in the clearest terms, but my whole argument has been to show that the fall in the price?

of agricultural products must be arrested.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Including food grains?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Of course. I was pointing out that in order to do this, it is necessary for the Government to make a distinction between articles which are daily necessities and other commodities.

PROF. G. RANGA: The consumers' interests must predominate and therefore they should have things as cheap as possible.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am afraid Mr. Ranga has not understood me at all.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is my trouble.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I said that the consumers' interests, in reference to the daily necessities, must be the dominant consideration. I do not see any conflict between the safeguarding of the consumers' interests and at the same time stabilising the price structure. In fact, in my opinion, any Government should attempt that work in order to see that the general consumer, including the agriculturist consumer, does not suffer any hardship. I might perhaps clarify this further. I do not want the speculative element to enter into the field of agriculture. The speculative element may be a good thing in industry but it is not desirable in the agricultural field. My point is that it should be eliminated in the agricultural field, for instance, in commodities like groundnuts, cotton, sugar, gur, etc. This element of speculation can be removed only if the Government realises that these things have a bearing upon the economy of the agriculturists. Therefore they should stabilise these prices. I hope, Sir, I have made my point clear. I do not want the agricultural com-

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

I
munity to suffer on the plea of sale-guarding the interests of the consumer. That is not my point; my point is that the Government should do all in then-power to stabilise the prices of agricultural products. In other countries it has been done, and I do not see why it cannot be done here.

The only other suggestion which x would like to make in this connection is that this state of affairs call for a

definite plan. The Five Year 1 P.M. Plan visualizes production in the industrial field, production in the agricultural field and then that amount of social outlook and awakening which is necessary in order to ensure development in these two fields. What I am suggesting here is that a plan must now be evolved or in the second Five Year Plan due attention should be given to review the different relations between different aspects of life in order to achieve, in order to reach what we have now declared as the socialistic pattern of society. It requires, in my opinion, a different arrangement and if the framers of the second Five Year Plan have this in view, they can re-arrange the second Five Year Plan.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Reddy.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am concluding. Sir. Reviewing the work that has taken place in the past year, there is nothing to regret. On the other hand we find numerous developments for which we have to congratulate the Government. I am not referring to foreign affairs but I wish only* to say that those who doubted the policy of the Government in international affairs have now come to realize and have been praising the Government for the remarkably high stature which this policy has attained in international politics. Well, Sir, the record of the Government for the oast few years is a record which is a matter of pride for anyone and I hope

the Opposition will take this into consideration while dealing with this Motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30.

The House adjourned for launch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, as we discuss the Presidential Address here in this House today, some other gentlemen are sitting somewhere else in this continent of Asia, discussing some other matters. I have in mind the representatives of the powers who have formed the SEATO Agreement and who are meeting today in Bangkok. What they are discussing has been clearly indicated by their speeches and actions and it is time that we took serious note of the developments that are taking place in that quarter. Sir, as you know, even before the conference was summoned, President Eisenhower made a statement in which he made it clear that economic and military aid to certain countries, especially the countries of Asia, would be increased in the next fiscal year. He also divulged that "forces support" would be increased to certain Asian countries; and Mr. Dulles has made no secret of his aggressive plans as he spoke on the subject. And then we find that the whole American budget has been, more or less, adjusted in order to strengthen the military bases and alliances on Asian soil and this conference of the SEATO Powers is only a step in that direction, a most dangerous step. It has also been published in the press that it is proposed by the SEATO Powers to establish their headquarters in Singapore and that Australia, Britain and certain other countries would be sending theii aeroplanes and other war equipments there and would keep the field ready for use by the U.S.A. Therefore, one can conclude that they are thinking of

full-fledged preparations for building up a most powerful military base, almost at the gateway of Indian seas. Whoever has Singapore, it should be realised, would be in a position to control the Indian seas and thereby bring pressure upon countries like India who are not prepared to tow the American line.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Or any other line.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, in the international situation, you find again the question of Taiwan or Formosa as it is called looming large and the situation has become so menacing due to the actions of the United States of America that it is not quite enough only to express our sentiments or express our disapproval of the conduct of the U.S.A. It becomes necessary for us now to mobilise the entire country and to initiate a powerful movement, a movement political and moral, so that the Americans are expelled from the Taiwan and from the Taiwan Straits.

Sir, by violating all the pledges they have given, the U.S.A. has taken possession of Taiwan today and has not only built up a military base there but is making preparations for war against the People's Republic of China. The Cairo Declaration of 1943 and the Potsdam Agreement of 1945, make no sense to them now, although they had been signatories to both those declarations. Today it is claimed by them that Taiwan does not belong to China and that it belongs to that gentleman who has been propped up there—Mr. Chiang Kai-Shek. Now, as you know, a whole army is being maintained at American cost there and millions of dollars are pouring in in order to keep that base against China, threatening the peace of China, and indeed the whole of Asia.

It is not merely the U.S.A. who is to be considered guilty in this matter. The United States of America can be treated as the principal accused. But there is again the United Kingdom which is supporting it, again in viola-

tion of their past pledges. It supports the actions and the stand taken by the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom is still the head of the Commonwealth to which India is unfortunately tied up even at this hour.

It is very clear that these are two very important developments—one in Taiwan and the other in SEATO and it is also clear that they menace the freedom and the security of the Chinese people and Asians. Undoubtedly the people of China are* the main target of attack, but at the same time they endanger the freedom and security of our own country and other countries of the Asian continent. Therefore, it has become absolutely necessary for us to make a realistic assessment of the situation and to find out who is the guilty party, who is the war-monger, ready to plunge this continent into another war. This has to be clearly stated and I find that there is some amount of hesitation in fixing the guilt on the United States of America and pointing out the U.S.A. as the chief aggressor who is threatening the peace and security of human civilisation.

Sir, the same power, the U.S.A. is carrying on aggressive actions on the continent of Europe and in the European hemisphere. There also you find that they have violated the agreements that were arrived at one time at the conclusion of the War. Today they are going ahead with their North Atlantic Treaty. In its last meeting held at Paris in December the question of using atomic weapons was freely discussed by the NATO Council. And a certain statement was made by the Belgian Foreign Minister, Mr. Spaak, who said that permission was sought in the Council meeting for the preparation and for the use of atomic weapons and that permission had been granted. This statement emanated from one of those men who participated in that Council meeting, where this question of using atomic weapons was discussed. And the same theme was again touched upon by Field Marshal Montgomery

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] when he spoke on the subject and he made no secret about the fact that they were intent on going ahead with their preparation for using atomic weapons. This has also found a place in the statement issued by the Commonwealth Prime Ministers after the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and this is what is said in the Statement: "They agreed that the overwhelming superiority of the Western Powers in nuclear weapons offers at the present time the most effective and practical assurance that world peace will not be disturbed". Now, you find Sir Anthony Eden speaking on the same thing; every British statesman of the ruling class who has spoken on the subject has made it clear that they stand for the development, and not destruction or prohibition, of the atomic weapons so that they can carry on their predatory wars against the countries of Asia and of Europe who do not yield to their dictation or fall prostrate at their feet. That has been made clear by them. You will find, of late they are busy trying to carry through what is called the Paris Agreement. The plan for the European Defence Community went phut because the French Parliament rejected it. After that, they contrived a new plan by which they are trying to revive German militarism, to include the German Army within what they call the West European army.

SHRI K. 9. HEGDE: On a point of order, Sir. I doubt whether my hon. friend is thinking that he is in some other forum than the Parliament of India. I think he thinks he is in the United Nations.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Go on, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, I do not see the point of order. Anyway, you will have occasion for points of order v?— I touch that delicate subject.

There again, these very Western imperialistic Powers led by the United States of America are busy reviving German militarism which brought about two wars in one generation and is out to bring about another war if it is left free. We find, therefore, that it is necessary for us to clearly estimate the situation and tell the world that we, in our wisdom, consider the actions of the United States of America to be harmful and dangerous not only to the peace of those countries which are directly threatened but to the peace of the world. Peace is one and indivisible you cannot defend peace on this frontier if it is allowed to be broken somewhere else and that is something which we have learnt to our bitter cost. Therefore, Sir, time has come when we must find out who the enemy of peace today is. It is no use trying to talk about two war camps—two war blocs—and all that sort of rubbish nonsense. We know from the live experiences of the people, of the live experiences of the past years that it is the United States of America and its accomplice the United Kingdom which are preparing for another war in order to defend their Empire, maintain their Empire and to grab other countries and territories in the world. It is they who, in the name of anti-Communism, are preparing for establishing their world domination. This is a fact which has got to be recognised today. If we do not recognise this fact today, we may be too late and it may cost us a lot in the future. Therefore, Sir, when I hear gentlemen on that side sometimes speaking about power blocs and all that, I feel that they would still take a little more time to recognise as to who stands for peace and who stands for war today.

There are clearly two lines in international policy today; one line is the line—as he has pointed out—of "position of strength" pursued by the United States of America and this line is clearly a line of war which is seen not only in its pronouncements

but also in its various plans and warlike actions all over the world. The United States of America, even today maintains no less than 400 bases all over the world and there are about two million men under arms; two-thirds of the Budget is spent for maintaining the Armed Forces and for developing their aggressive defence forces and this is a fact which goes on official records of the United States of America. It is the United States of America again which is engaged in bolstering up here and there military pacts and alliances. As you know, Sir, they have entered into a number of military pacts and alliances in the world today. There is not only the NATO but there is the Turko-Pakistan Pact; then there are so many other agreements like the agreement with Mr. Chiang Kai-Shek, with Dr. Syngman Rhee and with all the other powers which are prepared to act as the Drill Sergeants of the United States of America. All these agreements go to threaten the peace and security of the world. At the same time, they are also spending no less than one hundred million dollars every year for certain subversive activities in the countries which have passed out of the orbit of capitalism and where the banners of socialism triumphantly fly. All these things are no longer a secret. It is these people who are trying today to build war bases on the soil of the Indian sub-continent, an example of which is there in the shape of the U.S.-Pakistan agreement. It has been reported in some papers that they are thinking of sending even more of armaments and materials to Pakistan so that Pakistan can be developed into a war base. This is what they are doing.

As far as the atomic weapons are concerned, the United States of America, in the course of the past three years or so, and especially at the time of the Korean War, made threats for using atomic weapons and they are saying now that it is very important for them. It is

they who, in the last year, exploded these atomic weapons and hydrogen bombs in the Bikini Islands defying the protests of the people of Asia. Today, it is they who are developing this type of armaments and are going ahead with their experiments when nearly twenty million Japanese people have signed a declaration that they want these experiments to be stopped in the Pacific. It is they who claim that atomic weapons are necessary for the defence of what they call peace and security of the world. The whole diplomacy of these Powers is based on the threat of atomic weapons. Sir Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, supported these atomic and hydrogen explosions in the Bikini Islands. As you know, Sir, in April last, after the Prime Minister had spoken here and on the floor of the other House condemning these explosions, there got up in the House of Commons the Prime Minister of England who said that these explosions were a deterrent to war and were helpful to the cause of peace. Such are the atom maniacs today who have got to be called to account; such are the atom maniacs who have got to be restrained by the will and power of the peace-loving people of the world today. A question, therefore, arises as to what we are doing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, we are concerned with the President's Address.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir, it is there in the President's Address, Paragraph 7 or what, I do not know.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken twenty minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here is what the President says: "I earnestly hope, however, that these difficult problems will be solved peacefully and by negotiation". The President is "hoping", and I wish to tell him as to how these hopes should be translated into action. If the President hopes for such a thing it is necessary to balance this hope by bold action on the part

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] of the Government. The Government should come forward and lead the people, if it is genuinely interested in peace and if it wants to carry forward its struggle for peace against these atom maniacs and the plans that are being adopted by the war-mongers all over the world. Therefore, Sir, it is very pertinent for us to raise this question but here again we find certain halting steps taken and certain hesitant views expressed and there is also a certain misconception on the part of the hon. Members on the other side of the House. I would only like to tell you that while the building up of the bases of SEATO go on, we have the most shocking experience in our country in the form of sending materials from Ishapore Gun Factory to Malaya. In the last week of January about 400 *kukris* were despatched to Singapore from the Calcutta Docks by s. s. Cynthia. As you know, Sir, this is a weapon which is used by the Gurkhas. Many other materials had been sent over the preceding month to the same destination from the Calcutta Port.

According to estimates obtained by us, it appears that tons of other materials worth no less than 5 to 7 crores of rupees have been sent from Calcutta Port to Singapore. Previously the materials used to be sent in the name of the Government. Now they are being sent in many cases, in the name of Grindlays Bank in order to give out as if it is a sort of private deal between two parties. I think the time has come when we must put a stop to such things. At the same time we have exposed on the floor of the House and outside how the Dum Dum Airport is being utilised by the British for sending their troops and other materials to the war zones in Malaya and to the Eastern region. Now the Prime Minister said they go as civilians. What a consolation that the soldier wears a civilian uniform and goes there to kill the Malayan people! We are supposed to be an intelligent and civilised people. Why should we

be beguiled by such fantastic arguments that they go there in civilian dress and therefore they do not come under the purview of the declared policy of peace of the Government of India? Stop the assassins from going to those countries, no matter in what dress they are going, no matter whether they carry arms with them or not; the fact remains that the arms are there and these enemies of the freedom of Asia, of the Asian people are being sent there in order to butcher the people of Malaya and to build their bases in Singapore and other places so that the security and peace of the Asian people are threatened. Therefore we say that such actions are called for to-day. At the same time when we stand for the Five Principles, Five Noble Principles, on the other side you will find some people—I do not necessarily mean in this House—if you will go to the Andhra elections or to the Calcutta by-election you will find hon. gentlemen getting up and carrying on scurrilous and most slanderous propaganda against the Soviet Union and the Chinese Peoples' Republic, a propaganda which would make even Mr. Dulles and Mr. MacArthur blush. This is what I want to tell them point-blank. How is it that if we are going to develop friendly relations with these countries, friendly relations which must inevitably be built in the interests of world peace, that our Ministers and important Congress leaders go about the country making speeches which are not only hostile and untrue but which are provocative and go against the building of such relations? Time has come for the Prime Minister of India to restrain his colleagues, restrain the Cinderella leaders who have not understood the meaning of the Five Principles and the sacred cause it seeks to uphold and who think that a by-election or other elections are so important that anything and everything can be said against the countries which are friendly to us, countries which are pursuing a policy of peace.

Now, the hon. Member there gave advice to various countries. The Soviet Union, for instance, do not need such advice. They are for peace and they need friendly co-operation to-day. Sir, I would only refer to the speech made by Mr. Molotov to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the 8th February this year. There he said: "As against their armaments drive the Soviet Union poses its peaceful policy and its proposals for a substantial reduction of all armaments and unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons with establishment of effective international control over the reduction of armaments as well as the prohibition of atomic or other weapons of mass destruction. * * *

The Soviet Government has already proposed to the Government of the United States to conclude an agreement without delay to give up the use of atomic weapons and to employ atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. The Soviet Union is fully willing to support also the recent recommendations of the World Peace Council to have all countries destroy the stock of atomic weapons so that the peoples all over the world might be sure that atomic warfare will never be permitted. That is why the Soviet Union shows such willingness and activity in calling an International Conference for the peaceful utilisation of atomic energy. We propose to the United States to compete not in the production of atomic weapons but in using atomic energy for peaceful purposes."

Therefore, Sir, I say the Soviet Union does not need advice in this case. They are unconditionally for the prohibition and destruction of all atomic weapons and for the diversion of atomic energy for the development of human civilization, for the development of the material and cultural well-being of the people. Time has come for us to recognise these facts and join with that country in fighting atom maniacs in a much more effective manner than we are fightin

to-day. Then at the same time it is necessary for us also to recognise that in the interests of peace, friendship with these countries must be developed, not merely for just proclaiming certain nooiu principles which are called the Five Principles but in the form of taking moral and political and economic actions whenever that is called for. To-day the United States of America has got to be restrained. Its accomplices and its supporters have got to be checkmated. Therefore, Sir, I think that the situation is long past when we can satisfy ourselves only by expressing our sentiments; the time has come for bold action and if we in India can go forward in the struggle for peace, join with the people of other countries in the struggle for peace I am absolutely certain that these maniacs will be put in their strait-jacket and world peace will be preserved despite all their plans and preparations. Therefore, Sir, when we judge and discuss the international situation, let us not view it from the angle as if we are onlookers, as if we have only to give moral lessons and also express our sentiments, but let us judge it as if we are the actors in the great drama which is going on for the preservation of world peace, for saving human civilization from the destruction of atomic weapons which the Americans and the British are out to use against other peoples. That is the most important to-day. At the same time.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, there are a very large number of speakers. You will please be brief. You have taken half an hour already.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I thought I had spoken for only fifteen minutes. Anyhow I shall hurry up. Now with regard to the internal situation a wrong picture has been presented here. The internal situation is really something which should require a very objective appraisal on the part of the Government. Unfortunately the Government has more or less given the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] same rosy picture as it has been giving for the last two or three years. Now, Sir, I would only like to tell the House that in these few years it is the rich people who have become richer and it is the poor people who have become poorer and that is something which is stated in the articles published in the 'Capital' and 'Commerce'—not by Communists but by people who belong to their faith, the faith of the ruling party. Now, Sir, if you look at the annual number of the "Eastern Economist" of 1954 you will find them writing like this. I am quoting. "The performance of the stock markets during the year as a whole was actually without a parallel in recent years." The same number of the "Eastern Economist" notes with great satisfaction "higher earnings and dividends" of the leading cotton mill companies.

Then, Sir, as you know, there was the Congress session at Avadi. There was a lot of talk about socialism, the socialistic pattern of society and there was a spate of wordy competition between speakers on that great platform in espousing socialism and socialistic pattern of society, and the Prime Minister was naturally the prima donna in the whole show. And after he had made his speech, the Times of India News Service reported—I am reading it from the report, "Under the stimulus of the Prime Minister's statement on the economic policy the Bombay Stock Exchange developed a cheerful tendency after a fairly long period of dullness. On Thursday the operators took a constructive view of the Prime Minister's exposition of the socialistic pattern of society. Prices picked up again and under the lead of steels many features of strength were established."

What a wonderful socialism this is that it boosts up the stock market and it is welcomed by the operators in the speculative stock market! The Prime Minister should ask himself as to what kind of socialism he is striving for to- [

day that creates so much buoyancy and enthusiasm in quarters which believe in speculation and profiteering on a scale rarely known in civilized countries.

3 P.M.

Therefore I say the talk of socialism would not conceal the reality and the truth. Now, if you look at the balance sheets of the companies for these years you will find that they are making enormous profits. If you take the profit index as a whole, it rose from 211 in 1940 to 260 in 1948 and to 310.5 in 1951. Since that time the trend has been maintained and even accelerated. Now, it has been estimated that whereas the profit on the paid-up capital was to the tune of 7 per cent, in 1951, it came up to 18.6 per cent, in 1953.

Now, I would only like to mention some of the important concerns which would prove what profits they are making. The Imperial Bank of India, for instance, has increased its profit from Rs. 133.55 lakhs in 1952 to Rs. 136.91 lakhs in 1954. The Punjab National Bank of the Jains and Dal-mias has increased the profit from Rs. 34 lakhs in 1952 to Rs. 53 lakhs in 1954. The United Commercial Bank of the great Birlas have raised their profits from Rs. 28.54 lakhs in 1952 to Rs. 29.06 lakhs in 1954. The Bank of India shows an increase in profit, as also the Bank of Maharashtra and the Bank of Baroda. In the cement business which is again very much blessed by the Government, the Associated Cements have raised their profits from Rs. 1,81,22,758 in 1953 to Rs. 2,08,00,000 in 1954—that is in one year. Then in the field of tea you get the same story. In almost all the British and Indian Tea Companies, especially the big ones, you will find they are making enormous profits. Some of them have made more profits in the course of the last few years than the value of their total paid-up capital. Then you find that the Imperial Tobacco Company which,

if the Congress Ministry were to come in Andhra, would be supported, raised their profits (Interruption)..... but you will be glad to hear that it is not edning into existence despite Mr. Ranga and his very noble efforts. I wish he was on our side. The profits of that concern rose from Rs. 1 crore 17 lakhs in 1953 to Rs. 2 crores 72 lakhs in 1954. The Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation raised its profits from Rs. 48 lakhs in 1952 to Rs. 1 crore 68 lakhs in 1953. Tatas of course are very happy. In 1948 their profits were Rs. 1 crore 26 lakhs and in 1953 they rose to Rs. 2 crores 10 lakhs. The Indian Iron and Steel Company are making profits at similar rates. The cotton textile mills—the very favourites of the Congress rulers—are having a gay time. The Buckingham and Carnatic Mills have made a profit of Rs. 50 lakhs in 1953 as against Rs. 6 lakhs in 1947.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: (Nominated): What is the rate of profit please?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That you can find out. I am not a capitalist accountant. I am interested only in telling you how much money they are getting. The Delhi Cloth Mills have raised their profits to Rs. 74 lakhs in 1953 from Rs. 27 lakhs in 1947. The Elgin Mills have raised their profits to Rs. 78 lakhs during last year and the Khatau Mills have similarly raised their profits to about Rs. 23 lakhs.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is enough, Mr. Grpta.

SHRI BHHPESH GUPTA: I am coming now to the jute industry. Again you will find that in the last 3 years they have a gross profit—according to the balance sheet published in the Year Book—of Rs. 33 crores and the net profit would come to Rs. 13 crores. Most of these mills, as you know, are under the British Managing Agents. Therefore you will find that in almost

all these important sectors it is the millionaires who are making profits, wnereas the small men are going down. Well, this is the journey towards socialism of the Avadi pattern. This pattern fits in very well wtilth the profiteers and monopolists of this country and therefore we find that they are greeting the Prime Minister's statement.

We find that unemployment in the country is growing apace. You will find that unemployment has grown from 4,93,000 in July 1953 to 5,89,000 in July 1954. I am giving you only the figures in the Employment Exchanges. There are many people who have not been registered in the Exchanges. So, that shows an increase of about 20 per cent. If you look at the white collared jobs, there again you will find that it has increased from 1,55,000 to 1,98,000—an increase of 28 per cent. Now in his Budget speech the Chief Minister of West Bengal said that it has created such an alarming situation in the State that he cannot tackle it without the aid of the Government. For every 100 employed men in Calcutta and in the industrial centres of Calcutta you have got 27 unemployed. That is the position today. We find that it is growing all over the land; yet it was said in the Five Year Plan that in the course of five years they would find new employment for 54 lakhs of people who are unemployed and that they would get jobs for about 32 lakhs of people who are partially employed. But we find that, in practice, the reverse process is taking place. Instead of being eliminated, unemployment is growing. This does not indicate the prosperity of the country, but it only shows that the country is going to rack and ruin if you will only look at the people and not at the multi-millionaires and patrons of the Congress Party.

At the same time you find that the prices of agricultural commodities are falling. If you look at the Reserve Bank Bulletin published in November,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] you will find that it has fallen by 16.8 per cent, in the case of rice. 17.6 per cent, in the case of wheat, 35.8 per cent, in the case of gram and 31.1 per cent, in the case of gur. That is what is given in the official publication. And Mr, P. J. Thomas, ex-Economic Adviser to the Government of India has calculated that the fall in prices of such commercial crops has meant a loss of no less than Rs. 60 crores to the people of Travancore-Cochin alone. This is how the situation stands today.

KAZI KARIMUDDIN: Does he want the prices to go up?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, Sir, the Government does not stop such a thing. The steepfall in prices of agricultural commodities continues. If the 70 per cent, of the people are not protected, if they are not saved from this plunder and falling agricultural prices, then the economy of our country can never be on a sound footing. You know, Sir, that a large percentage of our agrarian population is composed of non-earning dependents as they are called in the Census Report. About 60 per cent, of the agrarian population do not earn anything but they are dependent on the meagre earnings of their family members and it is in that context that we have to look at these things. The Government should realise that until and unless the fall in prices is checked, it will continue to lead to the impoverishment of the entire country and bring disaster to the economy of our country. The Government's policy, as I have said, is helping the wholesalers and other profiteers to make money at the cost of the peasantry, at the cost of the agricultural producers, and this is something which does not speak well of any Government.

Sir, then about the other classes—the middle class, the small traders and industrialists the same is the picture. How many industries have gone into liquidation during this period?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must finish now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is something which the Government should find out. According to us, a large number of industries and businesses are closing down because of the economic crisis; because of the fact that they do not find markets for their goods; because of the fact that the people do not have enough purchasing power to buy things that are produced, and also, to some extent, because of the fact that they are not provided with industrial raw materials and credit and other facilities by the Government. Therefore, all classes are being hit under this regime, all classes are being affected under this regime by its economic policy. So, the President's Address gives us, if I may say so with all humility, a thoroughly misleading picture. The Government is living in a world of its own. It may be a very fine and pleasant world as far as the multi-millionaires and landlords are concerned, but it is a very grim and dismal world as far as the common men are concerned—that is what I am going to tell. Sir, therefore, we think that the time has come when it is no use trying to draw some credit upon the foreign policy of the Government, but the time has also come for giving serious attention to the economic policies inside the country; because ultimately the strength of a country, the power of a country depends on the contentment of its people—the material and the cultural well-being of the people, the advancement of the people and the economic prosperity of the people. It is here that the Government has deliberately let down the people at every step and the seven years of Congress rule have meant tears, have meant sorrow, have meant unemployment for the workers, have meant evictions for the tenants on all sides. Therefore, I say that when the hon. Member moves

a vote of thanks for the Congress Government, he should not forget the electorate, the voters, the common men, the workers, the peasants and the middle class who are suffering under this regime. If he has a mandate from them, he should get up and strongly criticise the Government for failures on their part; for bringing misery and starvation to its people. Production levels

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:.....are meant only for profiteering on the part of these people. You can make money by increasing production, but that does not mean that the people are getting the benefit of increased production wherever such increase has taken place. We have seen in the old days certain industries made enormous profits

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are repeating.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: At the time when we were having high production in jute and other industries in Bengal in 1943, we had the tragic famine of 1943 which took a toll of about 35 lakhs of people. Today I say when you flaunt these increased trade figures it means nothing to the people. It is the people who have been let down; it is the people who have been impoverished by the policies of this Government, against those monopolist profiteers

(Time bell rings.)

.....and it is the people whose interests have got to be defended before anything else.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should like to bring back the House from the denunciation of the Americans and capitalists to the President's speech. Sir, I have taken this opportu-

nity to speak to thank the President for his speech to Parliament. The President has touched upon many points of interest not only to this House but to the people at large and we are really grateful for the masterly survey that he has made. I am not one of those like Major-General Sokhey who believe that the President's Address is quite useless. On the contrary, it gives us a kind of a survey of the achievements of the Government and the progress of the country.

There is no doubt that this past year has been one of considerable achievement for our country, both in the domestic and international spheres. This year I could call it a "Nehru year" if I am permitted to say so. Our prestige in the national and international world has risen tremendously because of two reasons. Firstly, because of the increase in production all round and self-sufficiency in food; and, secondly, because of the foreign policy of neutrality followed by us—say dynamic neutrality. India certainly has become very important in the eyes of the world because of various reasons. The visits of so many foreign dignitaries which were enumerated in the President's speech, as well as the invitations to our statesmen to visit the different countries are not without significance. India's role in Korea, Indo-China, our peaceful solution of the problem of the French possessions as well as the Conferences of Colombo, Indonesia, Geneva and London are pointers to the important role played by India and by our Prime Minister. And naturally the whole country is very proud of the achievement of our Prime Minister. It will not be out of place to mention that the world's events are coming in quick succession. The wars in Korea and Indo-China, then the disappearance of Stalin, Beria and Malenkov, the success of hydrogen bombs and their far-reaching effects

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Malenkov has not disappeared.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: But he may disappear tomorrow—one never knows

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I may also disappear tomorrow.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Everybody may disappear, but here there is a greater chance. The emergence of Germany, the problem of the Middle East, the unstable French politics and the struggle for Formosa, and the internal politics of a number of countries—are all engaging the world's attention one after the other. These and a number of other factors may make the world situation very unstable. And the trouble is that as soon as one quarrel is patched up somehow or other, the others crop up immediately, and the opposing parties to these quarrels are one and the same. To steer clear of all these unstable factors, as well as to steer clear of all our internal quarrels—quarrels between parties, between States—is a Herculean task, and it is a matter of gratification that even under such conditions the status of our country has risen steadily in the eyes of the world. India, which was a dependency only a few years ago, has become the arbiter of the world. Our foreign policy is appreciated everywhere by friends and foes alike, not for anything else, but because it is very genuine. The world is war-weary, and all know the consequences of a full-fledged war where atomic weapons are used. It will mean annihilation of the world, and there will be nobody to enjoy that freedom for which all the parties seem to be fighting. The plea of fighting for freedom becomes meaningless under the circumstances. Freedom for whom, and for what? But there is one thing about which we have to be very clear in our mind. Rightly or wrongly, and whether we wish it or not, we are in an age of ideological wars, *i.e.*, the wars are fought in the name of a particular ideology. The one type of ideo-

logy promises food, clothing, work, and even education and medical aid to all. The only thing that they are not prepared to give is freedom of thought to the human beings. It seems that the whole structure of the society is maintained on fear, and strict obedience to the ruling party is the order of the day, and if one disagrees, then either he has to die, or go into exile, or work like a slave, and what not, we do riot know. The value of the human beings, not only ordinary human beings, but the human beings who were persons in high positions till today, changes overnight, and the names of those persons occupying high places are obliterated the next day, and you do not know whether a particular park was bearing a particular name. On the other hand, the other ideology, while aspiring to give food, clothing, work, as well as medical aid and education to all, may not like to reach its goal at the cost of human freedom. It values freedom of mind as well. In all democratic States, one has the freedom to criticise even the highest without being afraid of anything—one's life, one's property or one's relations. The hon. Member who just now made his speech could not have made that type of speech in a country where such freedom did not exist

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where Nizams and Birlas did not exist.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Where Bhupesh Guptas also cannot exist, denouncing their own Government.....

(Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Now, Sir, between the two, what shall we choose? What can anybody choose? It is a hard choice, because the majority of men want food and shelter at any cost, and freedom of mind has no meaning unless their

primary needs are met. And yet, curiously enough, man cannot live by bread alone. There is no difference between human beings and Beasts, if man is not free to shape his own life and destiny. The achievements of some of the Communist countries are no doubt striking and perhaps a person like myself, and for that matter, many persons in this House and out side are attracted by them, and like them. And perhaps many things we would like to imitate from the Communist countries, if we are sure that we are safe from the disruptive tactics of some of their party men here. The violent exhibition that the hon. Member just now made in his speech, if that is the foretaste of the things to come

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Lady Member need have no fear about it. If we come to power we would allow her to open more "Anna-pumas".

(Interruption.)

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Sir, the President's Address mentioned the agreement between China and India over Tibet. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us, but there is a little misgiving created in our mind regarding the wrong boundary map which is prepared by China. It is supposed to be an error of the past, but somehow it is mentioned in the recent maps which are published. If it is an error, is it so very difficult to correct it? Personally, I do not think so, especially when both the Governments are so very friendly and our Government is going out of its way to help China in the international sphere. I therefore think, Sir, that such misunderstanding should not be allowed to be perpetuated. I hope the Chinese Government will take steps to remove this cause, of misunderstanding.

..Then, Sir, the President has, in his Address, touched upon the subject of co-existence and the principles of Ppunch Shila. They are very excellent

principles. They are: mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non interference in each other's internal affairs—I hope the Communist Party will keep it in mind that it is non-aggression

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think you better tell the Americans about it.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: You are here, and therefore I am telling it to you. When the Americans come here, I will tell them also—equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co existence. Well, Sir, they are very excellent principles to be practised, and I hope everybody will emulate them. It is a matter of gratification that the Pakistan Government has recently been trying to be friendly and is seeking settlement of the Kashmir affair. The hon. Member, Shri Mathur. said something about Kashmir. But as he knows the background of the whole thing, I hope he will be a little more patient, and let us hope that some kind of a permanent solution will be found, not only to this question, but to all the pending questions between the two Governments. Sir, he also mentioned something about the Portuguese possessions. I have no doubt in my mind that sooner or later they are bound to come to us. There is nothing static in this world, Sir, and the situations in many countries are changing. Only the other dory, Russia and France changed their Prime Ministers. America changed its *Party* majority. China is worried over the question of Formosa. Nearer home, Andhra is going to polls

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And we are going to win.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Let the result be out. So, Sir, during such unstable times the steady policy of our Government keeps India together. Otherwise these forces are pulling in opposite directions. There is the langi. age question; there is the boundary question; there is the question of economic policy and increasing taxation. There are some big questions and

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi]. some small questions which agitate the mind of the public. And there are a number of other questions which have a very unsettling effect on the public mind, for instance, local jealousies also keep the people agitated, and all these things must be heeded by our Government. But, in spite of these facts, it is heartening to see that people are getting out of the mood of frustration, and that phase is passing away, and more and more enthusiasm is being felt. The younger generation especially is getting interested in building up the country, and our community projects and other things are having a very good effect on the morale of the people or by some party, but Government interest in the social welfare measures adopted by the Government. For instance, the Harijan Bill, the Marriage Bill, the Succession Bill which is coming before the House and a number of other measures are appreciated by large numbers of people, and the people have begun to feel that our Government is earnest. What is done may not be considered enough by some people or by some party, but Rome was not built in a day, and we cannot remove age-old evils in a day. But we are going to achieve results sooner than many other countries achieved, in removing such evils. We have had only seven years since Independence, out of which the first five years have been spent in fighting scarcity, tackling the refugee problem, getting integration and achieving internal stability. Now, we have turned the corner due mainly to the increased production of food, and our Government have started some very good projects. This has given confidence to the people. I have felt this myself because, when I was recently at Avadi. I saw how much enthusiasm is felt by the people.

It is a matter for gratification that the index of production is going up. Our friend was saying that it was going up but that the benefit is reaped by the capitalists. I should say that the benefit is reaped by the whole country. Unless we increase our production, « can never

be independent from the influence of other countries. If the money goes into one pocket, it is bound¹ to travel to other pockets also, and this way the whole country is bound to feel the prosperity. Even now if you go and mix with the masses, you will find that they feel prosperous. Our friends here may say for propaganda reasons that people are down-trodden, etc., but it is not so. If you speak to the masses, you will find that they themselves feel that something is being done for them, and that they are really better off. As the President has mentioned in his Address, many of the targets laid down in the Five Year Plan have been achieved in three years, and that is really very gratifying. It is no longer necessary for us to go in search of food in the world market. Our index of industrial production has gone up to 144, representing an average annual increase of 10 per cent. The steps taken by the Government in these years, in spite of many mistakes committed here and there, are bearing fruit. I must admit that in achieving results we have paid disproportionately more in many cases due to inexperience perhaps but not due to deliberate miscalculation. Probably this was inevitable, because most of the people to whom jobs were entrusted went on changing from one job to another, and the experience gained by them has not been properly utilised. No good results can be achieved without some reasonable continuity in the personnel concerned. Every new man coming to a job works on a theory of his own and many times he discontinues whatever has been done by the previous man. This is, I think, the experience of almost all the Departments. It may be a good policy to change men from one job to another but still we cannot get away from the fact that it leads to wastage of money and materials—After all, nobody can say that the Government is perfect. Even the Government is not saying that it *is* perfect. They have committed many mistakes. In some cases, as I said before, they were extravagant. I do admit that our country can ill afford!

that kind of extravagance. It may be because the right type of personnel were not found or the right type of agencies were not found. Almost all the persons who were assigned the tasks were new and had to learn the work. Now, let us hope that economies will be introduced in all our undertakings.

At present the Planning Commission is drafting the Second Five Year Plan. The term 'physical planning' is very much in the air. I heard of the phrase only recently. I did not know what exactly it meant. I asked somebody, and his explanation was that physical planning meant that targets must be achieved irrespective of costs. If that is so, it is not good. Another explanation was that it means that we must fix our targets first and then think of the cost and adjust it to whatever we can afford. There is something in this. Professor Mahalanobis and people of his school are advocating such a plan. I wonder how far such planning will be the right type of planning for our country. We cannot afford to waste any money and we must calculate the cost before undertaking any scheme.

There were some other points mentioned by some speakers, but there was not much sting in them. I thought of replying to them, but I think I should wind up now by saying that I associate myself with the motion before the House. Thank you.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must frankly confess that this is a most disappointing document that we are discussing today. I listened to the President carefully and even read between the lines the speech he delivered and compared it with the Address that he gave last year. I found that even the same words have been used in both the Addresses. Last year, he spoke of 'considerable achievement'. This year also, almost the second line contains the same words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It saves time and labour.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: It does not save time and money, because we have allotted two days for discussing the Address.

Almost half of the Address relates to a review of the international situation, but I do not want to waste my time on that aspect of the Address, because I feel that our Prime Minister, the head of our Government, is so much obsessed with international problems that perhaps he forgets all that is happening in our own country to the common man of this land. He knows more about Formosa and the off-shore islands of China than about the remotest corners of our own country. Therefore, everything has gone off the track, and the condition of our country is deteriorating. But I must say this much that there is nothing to gloat over our achievements in the international field, although our efforts towards peace have been appreciated in many countries of the world. If we are to succeed, it is for us to mobilize the democratic forces who stand for peace not only in our own country but in bordering countries as well. In that respect we have moved very lately and I want that our efforts should run on a positive line. Having said this much, I wish also to refer to a problem which affects us directly. I refuse to consider it as an international problem—that is the problem of Goa. The President has only hoped that the problem of these Portuguese possessions would be settled before long in a peaceful way. But I feel that had the Government of India not stood in the way of the people, had not banned the Indian citizens from participating in this liberation movement, in the great struggles that the Goans themselves are carrying on, perhaps this problem would have been solved by this time. There is no indication in this speech nor do I find anywhere any mention that there is going to be a change in this policy and to remove the ban and allow the Indian citizens to join their brethren in Goa in fighting the mis-rule in Goa and

[Shri S N. Dwivedy.] getting it integrated into India. Unless you have democracy and peace in your own country and in your border areas, you can certainly not contribute towards*»peace and democracy in the world outside. It is essential therefore that this ban should immediately be removed and the people who want to participate in the struggle in Goa should be made free.

There are many things to which I will come later but I will just refer to the last sentence where the President has mentioned about "a society conforming to the socialist pattern." This is a sentence which is worth considering. I was expecting further elucidation on this point from the mouth of the President but I find that it is as vague as anything. Perhaps the President himself is completely in the dark as many others in this country are—those who have very recently adopted this as a model of their economic planning. The President therefore has been cautious enough only to refer to "a society conforming to the socialist pattern." I would like the Government to make it perfectly clear, when they are mouthing these slogans, whether they believe in socialism or not. I will be told and it has been stated clearly, not in this House, not in the announcements of the Prime Minister when this very fact was being discussed in the last Session of the Avadi Congress, that they don't believe in the word 'socialism', the meaning that it generally carries. If you don't believe in socialism, then how can you develop a pattern based on socialism? This is something quite ununderstandable, as if one can become a Muhammadan without accepting Muhammadanism. I would say that this is lack of honesty and sincerity on the part of the ruling party today to confuse the masses and mislead them because their own performances during the last 8 or 9 years have completely proved that this Party, if it remains in power for more years, will surely strengthen the foundations of the capitalistic structure. Perhaps they want to build and

maintain the *status quo* and give it a name as a socialist pattern. Therefore they have kept it beautifully vague so that everybody may carry its meaning in any way he likes. Sir, if the Government is really anxious to build up this country on the socialistic pattern, then the primary requisite that one would have expected is a change in the administrative sphere, a change in the economic system and at least a move in that direction. I will just take one example. Take the question disparity in income. This is a problem which is uppermost in everybody's mind and about which, to say the least, even a mention was made as early as 1931 in the Karachi Congress. But after 8 years of Congress rule, what have you done? What is the disparity today in the income? It is from 1 to 1,000. If you compare it you will find the position. Everybody here is speaking of our achievements during such a short period—within 7 or 8 years—and says that so many problems were there and we have solved them. What about Yugoslavia? The other day we had, as our guest the Head of the Yugoslavian Republic. There the ratio of disparity is between 1 and 6. In Sweden it is 1 to 3. In Norway it is 1 to 2 but here the margin between the highest and the lowest income is, as I have already mentioned, from Rs. 5 to Rs. 10,000. If this is the type of socialistic society that you want to build, there is no wonder that Birlas and Tatas and Singhanias would be the first to welcome it and they have done it already after the Resolution of Avadi Congress. Sir, if you really want that the disparity in income, this economic inequality should go, I don't say that it should only be implemented in the administrative sphere. You cannot expect the Government servants to be true to their profession and to work honestly if there is an ocean of difference around them in trade, commerce and business. What I want is in this country there must be a ceiling on income of all types, whether trade, commerce or business or service and that should not exceed Rs. 2000 a month in terms of the cur-

rent prices. Are you prepared to take this step? Are you prepared to really plan your activities in this way? I am sure you would say as the Finance Minister has been saying in this House, that this would not improve matters. Therefore I would like to know very seriously I put this to the Government to clarify in this House as to what is the basic principle of socialistic society that would guide them in moulding their plans and activity in all spheres of life. You should make that very clear. I would only end by repeating what was said by Acharya Narendra Deva recently. He referred to this word and he compared Congressmen to Buddhist nihilists and said "they had no thesis to establish, nor any doctrine to uphold, but were always prepared to demolish the thesis of other schools." So that is where the "socialism" stands. You want to confuse the Indian masses. You want to mislead them, saying one thing and doing something else. I would only give you a warning here. I know the Prime Minister of India was a great lover of socialism. He is also a student of history. Let us not forget that Mussolini and Hitler also began with this slogan of socialism and they ended with dictatorship, bringing disaster not only to their own country, but to the whole world. Theoretically speaking, therefore, you may temporarily mislead the people. You may be able to carry on for some more years in this manner, you may be able to really hoodwink the people, when there is a very great pressure to usher in great changes both in the economic and social spheres. You may postpone them for some years and you may be able to continue like this. But ultimately this vague generalisation will lead the country to ruin and thereby you will ruin yourself also. So, when you use the word, when you say something, let us be clear in our minds, clear in our conception and let us know beforehand where we are going to. We the socialists of this country have been carrying on the agitation not only today.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you leave us?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: We did not leave socialism. You went into the hands of the capitalists and became the handmaids of the capitalists, and became the enemies of the people who fought the Britishers and drove them out. Sir, we have been carrying on the agitation for introducing a socialistic society in this country, not today after the attainment of independence, but when we were in the freedom movement itself. From that time onward we have been carrying on the agitation. We have been warning the people that after independence, these forces in the country, these classes who are exploiting the people, the capitalists and others they will really enjoy the fruits of the common people's labours, unless the common people are prepared and organised even from those days, otherwise all their labours would go in vain. And that is exactly what has happened. That is why we see today this spectacle. We really see today the sight of a Prime Minister who knows socialism and who discussed socialism in this country, act like this. I remember Sir,—I was then a mere boy—in 1933, reading that publication "Whither India" of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Gandhiji was fasting. He was going to devote one full year for Harijan work, suspending the political struggle. Jawaharlal Nehru came out of jail and he wrote a document. He remained out only for a few days. In that document he gave a lead to organise on a class basis and to destroy the obstacles in the way of their progress. And it is the same Jawaharlal who is today not only finishing these classes and masses, but presiding over the destiny of the country in order to do something which is contrary to what he propounded in those days. He is the greatest stumbling bloc on the road to socialism. But with us this is a matter of faith, a matter of creed. There is of course, something in the press, there is an uproar all over going on, asking us to come back to the Congress.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: We did not leave the Congress for the loaves and fishes. We actually left the Congress when such loaves and fishes were being offered to us. We left them because we wanted something more fundamental, something more vital to the interests of the nation as a whole. The mere shouting of slogans will not do. Please clarify what you mean by socialistic society! Otherwise you cannot expect any reasonable and self-respecting man to come and listen to your arguments.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: But that is what you are doing all along.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: I would like to refer to the President's Address and say a few words bearing on economic affairs, but that I will do later. First of all, I would like to say something about the administration. What do we find today? In the Administration as it now is, do you find the Constitution being worked in the manner that it should be to establish a Welfare State in this country, and to establish a democratic State? Are they really serious about that? Have they really acted in the manner that is expected of them? I would reply, "No," for if you look around, what do you find? You find corruption and inefficiency in the Administration and it has become almost chronic. Not only that, to shield that, in order to cover up that inefficiency, you are resorting to repressive measures, you take recourse to the Preventive Detention Act. I am indeed sorry the President has not referred to these things in his Address.

You are indulging in the most undemocratic action and denying the people of this country even the ordinary rights. Take the case of Manipur. It is a tiny State, a very small place *on the* border of India, but a strategic place too. There the people of Manipur have made the universal demand not today, but for the last four or five years, they have been

coming up with the demand, making representations meeting the Home Minister and the Prime Minister, asking them to grant them their request. And what do they want? They want the establishment of a representative and elected Government. That much is their demand, nothing less and nothing more. But what has been your reply? You have no reply. You are not listening to their demands. You are not considering their immediate and primary demand. But ruthless suppression of their movement is going on there. You will perhaps be surprised to hear, Sir, that the Preventive Detention Act has been resorted to and Mr. Reisiang Keishing, a Member of the other House, who is the leader of this movement who came to Delhi, as soon he went back, he was arrested for some offence or other. He was released on bail but only to be arrested again. He was to come here to Delhi where his family was living and his wife was expecting a baby. He was to come here and he had already bought his ticket; but the authorities there probably thought that his release on bail was something which should not have been done and so they arrested him and kept him in detention. That is what is going on in that part of the country. And remember, the women-folk have taken the lead in this movement. What is this movement for? It is for a right which they were enjoying during the Raja's rule and which has been denied to them as a result of a retrograde step on the part of the so-called democratic Government here. And the women are being assaulted and repression has been let loose there. I would ask the Home Minister what exactly prevents him from conceding this very primary and elementary demand of those people? You may say that the States Reorganisation Commission is there. Perfectly right. The States Reorganisation Commission will come out with its report. But that Commission will come out with the report saying that you may have State A, State B, State C and so on. It will not make any recommendation about this demand of

these people, whether they should have a representative government or not. And let us not forget that some Nagas of Assam are still boycotting ■are still not joining the Indian Union. There are still some seats in Assam Assembly which are not being filled. They are not coming forward to participate in the elections. But these patriotic Nagas are as much Indian as we ourselves are and they want to be with us always. Such people, if you really excite them, if you do not deal with them sympathetically, you will be doing a great harm to the country.

4 P.M.

Sir, you are using this Constitution and the Acts in such a manner as would give a feeling that there is no honesty in this Administration, as would give a feeling that one really cannot fight for justice in this country. Take the case of Travancore-Cochin. I want just to refer to it because the Ministry has gone—a minority Ministry has gone and there is nothing to complain—but the fact remains that there is no stable Ministry even today; there cannot be a stable Ministry in that part of the country as long as the parties composing the present Assembly continue to be what they are today. If in Andhra the possibility for the formation of an alternative Ministry was not explored and fresh elections were ordered, what prevented the Government of India to advise the Rajpramukh of Travancore-Cochin to order fresh elections as was demanded by the outgoing Ministry? "You did not do that because you wanted, somehow or other, by hook or crook, to come to power in that part of the land.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): You had done the same thing.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: We have not done that. We made it perfectly clear.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Dwivedy.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: You must have seen the Congress Party itself saying that for nine or ten months the Ministry continued even without consulting the Congress Party. You now say that we did the same thing; we did not do the same thing. We rather saved the situation and formed a Ministry when the Constitution was being shattered in that part of the country. We came to the rescue to give a democratic Government and a good Government too. If you give me a little more time. Sir, I will mention a few more subjects.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have exceeded the time, Mr. Dwivedy.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: I do not know. Sir. Have you fixed any time limit?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Normally fifteen minutes.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Government has been repressing the minorities.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up, Mr. Dwivedy.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: About unemployment problem, for instance, many previous speakers have spoken? but I only want to say that there has been no attempt whatsoever which can be said to be adequate to solve this problem and unless you solve this problem, there is no hope.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: What is your solution?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: He wants my solution and if you give me time I shall deliberate on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Some time later, not now.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: I would only refer to one aspect and that is this: In this document, there is a reference to scarcity conditions. I come from a part of the country—Orissa—

[Shri S. N. Dwivedi.] which is the worst affected on account of draught conditions. According to Government estimates—that was before the harvest—the loss was about Rs. 30 crores. It is much more now and this affects about seven districts out of the thirteen districts. Parts of Bihar are also affected likewise but the Government of India has so far given only two crores of rupees for these unfortunate people. The Government of Orissa is trying in a limited manner; the Government of Bihar also is doing but I would expect the Government of India—and I would urge upon the Government of India—to give at least Rs. 15 crores for helping the people there.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President of India correctly epitomised the feelings of this House and outside when he said this: "This past year has been, I am glad to say, one of considerable achievement for our country, both in the domestic and the international spheres. Parliament and our people have justification to view their labours with some satisfaction. There is no reason, however, for complacency. We have to face difficult problems in our own country and the threat of war again darkens the future of humanity". Naturally, Sir, under the present circumstances there is a good deal of agitation about what is happening outside the borders of this country. War clouds are gathering and we are distressed about it. I am glad that my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta also is distressed about it but there is a difference in approach between my, hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and I. He is advocating the cause of a particular country whereas I represent a viewpoint which means that peace should be brought to the world irrespective of siding with one bloc or the other bloc. When I was hearing Mr. Gupta, I was rubbing my eyes and I was thinking whether a Russian delegate was speaking in the United Nations. It took some time for me to realise that an Indian was speaking in the Indian Parliament.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE in the Chair.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a pity.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: It is undoubtedly a pity. There is no doubt about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does; not reflect to your credit.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: So far as this country is concerned, we have reason to be satisfied that we have done a good deal in bringing about peaceful conditions in the world. In the recent past there were many occasions when war was thought to be imminent. You are aware, Sir,—and it was not long ago—that in Indo-China, the trouble took almost a terrible shape and it was thought that war was imminent. Unfortunately, this dispute could not be settled within the four walls of the United Nations and it had to be settled in another forum and in another place. Even when the talks were going on in Geneva, it was to the credit of ourselves that our representative who though he was not officially there was mainly responsible for bringing about reconciliation between the several countries. After the Geneva Agreement, what responsibilities India assumed and how she has discharged them are all matters of common knowledge and I shall not repeat them. But I can assure my hon. friends here that one thing more than anything that is clear for anyone who has gone out of this country is the enormous stature of India in the eyes of the foreign countries. May I illustrate my viewpoint by saying that when we landed in Idlewild Airport—Mr. Barooah, Mr. Naskar, Mrs. Menon and myself and Mrs. Menon was first—we went for a customs check up. The officer who was checking up just looked round and asked, 'Are you the delegates from India?' Mrs. Menon said, "Yes". Then the officer said, "I have nothing to check. The world peace depends on you". That

correctly epitomises the feeling in the foreign countries. You may hear different stories from official sources or from the inspired press but to the extent that I could see things, the common man in every country looks for peace and in looking for peace he is looking to this country for that purpose. If we belie the hopes of the world today, we shall not be true to the world. We have a great responsibility and under the circumstances, we must make constructive suggestions rather than vituperative speeches as my hon. friend Mr. Gupta was pleased to make today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Vituperative on the economic portion.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I was hearing him and I was wanting to know what exactly he wanted our Government to do in the matter of foreign policy? Was he giving any concrete suggestions for us to act upon? Nothing was coming excepting a few suggestions here and there, as for instance, why not enter into pacts with Communist countries and things like that. Of course, he was not bold enough to say that as a concrete suggestion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never said such things.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: He was suggesting. I am quite sure that he is not bold enough to make a suggestion like that but at the same time he was insinuating.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can I insinuate a suggestion?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am quite sure and the records may be checked up to see whether Mr. Gupta made any suggestion whatsoever at all for change or improvement in our foreign policy. He does not claim to have made any constructive suggestion but he did make certain covert suggestions to say, "Why not go the whole hog with Russia?" That is the suggestion that was made.

I can plainly tell him this country may not be interested in one set-up or other, in one bloc or other. Our main purpose and main objective is to see that peaceful conditions exist' in the world, and for that object we shall certainly strive.

Now coming to other matters, well, it is not the forum here to have a detailed discussion about many of the international problems. Undoubtedly disarmament is an extremely important problem. There are two views about it. There is a strong view that nuclear weapons should not be used under any circumstances. There is the other view that nuclear weapons alone cannot be banned; there must be simultaneous restriction of other conventional weapons. These are subjects which certainly require a good deal of thought and a good deal of consideration and certainly our country is giving the best possible attention and the course adopted by this country is generally accepted by all countries as being the most reasonable, and may I also use the word 'sensible'.

Now coming to the question of the domestic policies I propose to deal with them in greater detail and also deal with several of the criticisms which have been levelled against the Government. Just now my friend Mr. Dwivedy representing the Socialist Party had very strong expressions to use against the Government. He , said: Civil liberties are destroyed; democracy is no longer in existence. He cited the instance of Manipur and said that the people are agitating in that place for a representative form of Government. "You" are resisting it. "You" are not conceding their right demands. Did he forget what happened in Travancore-Cochin just a few months back? In Travancore-Cochin he may remember a portion of the country is inhabited by the Tamil-speaking people. In the last general elections out of the 15 seats 14 went to that party which wanted a separation. All the 14 were elected by an overwhelming majority.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twelve.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am sorry. Twelve by an overwhelming majority. But when they demanded that they should be dealt with separately, the Socialist Ministry in Travancore-Cochin was not willing to do it and possibly rightly also. I am not blaming them for that because there is the Commission which is entrusted with the responsibility of drawing up the future set-up of the States. Now when their report is still pending, naturally the Travancore-Cochin Government felt unable to concede their demand. But what I am objecting to is this. If they could adopt that policy in Travancore-Cochin, their complaint against the policy adopted by the Government of India with reference to Manipur becomes meaningless. The two things are almost identical and if you examine the matter there is absolutely no difference between the conditions prevailing in that portion of Travancore-Cochin where the Tamilians reside and the conditions prevailing in Manipur. It is very easy to preach but very difficult to practise. The difficulty with the Government of India is the same as that Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai was faced with in Travancore-Cochin.

Another aspect that he touched upon is the Rajpramukh of Travancore-Cochin not accepting the advice of the outgoing Ministry in Travancore-Cochin to dissolve the Assembly. Of course the Socialist Party in this country is trying to gamble everywhere, but every gamble has gone against them as in the recent elections in the South where they have hopelessly failed whereas in the last general elections they did succeed to some extent. May I say, Sir, in the very district of Malabar which was supposed to be the stronghold of the P. S. P. and from which three Members to Parliament were elected in the last elections, hardly one member could be elected to the District Board during the last District Board elections. The party is more or less being wiped out in that part of the country.

Still the political boast is always there and as a matter of gamble, the Ministry which was in power more by courtesy than by any legitimate claim, advised the Rajpramukh to dissolve the Assembly. Now you will appreciate the fact that the Ministry had the support of only 18 members in a House of about 118 members, and this Ministry was there merely because nobody else was willing or in a position to take up the responsibility at the time. Rightly and according to the Constitution the Rajpramukh refused to accept their advice. He thought there was the possibility of an alternative Government and he would try it and it is to be seen whether the alternative Government has got the support of the House or not. It is not a mere joke to have an election almost every year. It might be a joke for people who take a very speculative view of the matter, but if you want to work democracy in the spirit in which it has got to be worked.....

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Only when it suits you.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: These criticisms are of a cheap character and rather not based on any fundamentals.

Now a contrast was drawn in the matter of Andhra. It was well-known that in Andhra there was no possibility of an alternative Government. There was no gainsaying the fact that the Opposition parties were not willing to combine. That is not the case in Travancore-Cochin.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Even they were not invited.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: It is not an invitation for a dinner, Mr. Dwivedy. It is an invitation to form a Government and unless there was the possibility of forming a Government there was no purpose in inviting those people to form a Government.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: But it is an obligation imposed by the Constitution on the Governor to do so.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My friend probably does not know that it is not so laid down in the Constitution of India. I have gone through every clause and every article in the Constitution of India and there is no such obligation.

The next point raised was the complaint about the use of the expression "the socialistic pattern." Mr. Dwivedy was probably thinking that this is his monopoly and he had the patent right for it and nobody else had a right to use "the socialistic pattern." Now Mr. Dwivedy thinks that everybody who does not think like him is either dishonest or insincere. The fundamental mistake that he committed was in thinking that the Congress Party was laying down a new policy which is incorrect. The Congress Party was only giving a new emphasis to a policy that was in existence right from 1948. The policy of the Government is primarily to see to increased production and at the same time to see that there is equitable distribution. Because of this objective and now that we have achieved a degree of success in the field of production we want to emphasise the question of distribution and that is why the phraseology that was used was of a "socialistic pattern." The Prime Minister of India has repeatedly emphasised that when he said "socialistic pattern." The Socialist Party of India need not fear that their garb is being stolen by any other party. There is nothing to steal because it is an empty one and my friend is merely deceiving himself when he thinks that the Congress by using the expression "socialistic pattern" wanted to have some support which otherwise would have gone to the Socialists as such. If experience means anything at all, we know what exactly the amount of public support that our friends of Mr. Dwivedy's party are getting from the country. The by-elections have shown it. The results in the other elections have shown it. It will not be long before we see it again, in the Andhra elections, the results are to come out within a few days.

Now coming to the other question raised by my friend about Goa, the matter is undoubtedly a very delicate one. Nobody is more anxious than the Congress Party and its Leader to see that Goa is integrated within the frame work of the Indian Constitution. But unfortunately for us we are in power whereas Mr. Dwivedy is in the opposition and it is quite easy for him to make cheap criticisms. But when the question of implementation comes in there is a good deal of practical difficulty, not merely internal but international as well. This country is playing an important role in the international sphere where we are emphasising every day that every dispute should be settled amicably and that there should be no war under any circumstances and we have largely succeeded in our mission at least in postponing war if we have not succeeded in seeing that there is no war at all. Now in this context one must assess our difficulty in the matter of Goa. It is not a question of any practical difficulty in conquering Goa, probably it is a matter of days or matter of hours. Even the Prime Minister of Portugal said that if India desired to conquer Goa it can do it in the course of a few hours. Then what does hinder us from not taking the necessary steps to liquidate foreign rule in Goa? It is our international commitment; it is our philosophy of life; it is that approach that is standing in our way in taking military action against Goa. For the sake of Goa if you take to arms, what will be our position in the international sphere? Will not our friends of the Socialist Party examine the implications of it? I can quite understand the Communist Party saying it because they have absolutely no faith, at least the Communist Party of India have absolutely no faith either in democracy or in the methods that are being used in a democratic form of Government. But what surprises me is when parties who openly pledge themselves to democracy, parties who openly say that they want no war in the world, say: Well, Goa is a tiny little country; why don't you take possession of it? He

[Shri K. S. Hegde.] turned round and said: Well, I do not want that but I want some licence to see that everyone of the Indian citizens can go into Goa and join in the struggle in a non-violent manner.

Here again the question comes in. For the present legally, though not morally, Goa is a part of Portugal. If you arouse the people of this country, maybe in a peaceful manner, to invade the country, then what is the implication? It is only trying to get cheap popularity, trying to hoodwink the people, when our Socialist friends say that all that we want is that the Indian people may get into Goa and liberate Goa. Let me assure my friend, Mr. Dwivedy that we are next to none in our anxiety and in our enthusiasm to see that Goa becomes a part of India but all that we are anxious is to solve this difficult problem in a peaceful manner as we have done in the case of Pondicherry. My friends raised the same slogan about Pondicherry a year back; you will remember it, Sir. But in the course of one year, what has happened? Probably, partly due to the statesmanlike behaviour of the then Prime Minister of France and certainly also due to the very effective manner in which we were able to persuade the French Government to concede the demands of the people of Pondicherry, those pockets have become part of India. Similar steps are being taken in Goa and I have **v** doubt that this question will be solved within a very very short time.

Now, coming to the question of domestic policy, I shall not take much time of the House. It is common knowledge that we have exceeded the targets we fixed in the Five Year Plan in many matters—in food, in clothing, in industrial production. Rather than saying it ourselves, let us examine what impartial observers have to say about us. I have been working in the Second Committee of the United Nations and I have had to go through a number of Reports submitted to the United Nations on eco-

omic and social matters. One thing more than any other that was underlined in those Reports was: the phenomenal progress that has been made in this country. They were impartial observers; they had no reason to over-rate our achievement and they always had a comparative picture in their mind. They have examined the conditions in the Middle East, in the Far East, in Europe and in many other countries. From the data available and from the conclusions before the United Nations, one thing was clear and that was that India was making a tremendous progress in the economic sphere. The same opinion was reiterated in the Report of the Colombo Plan. Probably none of these Reports will impress my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. For his satisfaction may I invite his attention to what Pravda, his Bible, wrote a few month's back?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am glad that at least on one occasion Pravda has been acceptable to the hon. Member on that side.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I have to quote it to carry conviction to my friend who will not be satisfied with any other thing excepting that. Even such papers who have disinterested opinion about the progress that is achieved in this country have come to a unanimous conclusion that this country has made remarkable progress. Undoubtedly, the Opposition has got a duty to place before the House the omissions more than the achievements but even in doing so they must have some regard for facts, some regard for the existing circumstances. Nothing will satisfy Mr. Bhupesh Gupta excepting chaos in this country. I have no explanation for it. Probably he is regretting the progress that has been achieved.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Chaos is being created by the Congress.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The public shall answer that; they are answering it in several parts of the country

I was expecting you to repeat the boastful suggestion that you made during the last session that you will see the Congress dogs running with their tails between their legs in the Andhra elections. They will give their verdict soon. Leaving that aside and ignoring him for the present, one has to make a reasonable assessment of the progress that has been made and taking an over-all picture we have every reason to feel happy about it, but not feel complacent about it. Of course, what we have achieved compared with what our requirements are, certainly is not still very impressive. We have got a good deal more to do and this Government is determined to do it irrespective and in spite of the obstructions that may be placed by friends who do not want this country to be free and independent. This country shall certainly progress and that will be done within a very reasonably short time.

But at this stage I have got a few suggestions also to make. It has been brought to the notice of the House by my friend Mr. Govinda Reddy that there has been a fall in the prices of agricultural commodities. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta also repeated it but it is rather interesting that when the price of wheat and rice were controlled at an uneconomic level and when some of us were shouting for decontrol or for a fair price, Mr. Gupta and his party men strongly raised protest on the floor of the House and they said that control should be continued. You will remember it. Sir, and the records of this House will bear me -out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never said that.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Even today the most interesting position is that when they go to an industrial town they say that the price of rice is very high and when they go to an agricultural area they say the price of rice is very low.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because the fact is so.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: It is rather remarkable that they are capable of speaking in two voices—one to the industrial labour and the other to the agricultural labour.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Between them there are the wholesalers and the profiteers

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: There are profiteers of the labourers. I have my own experience. The biggest profiteer in this country is the political party to whom my friend owes his allegiance. If he will come to an industrial town along with me—I will take him on any pay day—I can show how goondas are kept at the door to collect subscription from the poor labourers so that they may live in a rich condition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is a most shocking slander on the trade union movement in this country. The hon. Member should refrain from making such a slanderous attack even in a speech like this.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My friend need not take cover under the trade union movement. He can put on his badge and that will expose him very correctly. I know what is happening in many labour centres and you ought to be ashamed of it. It is a slander; it is a statement of fact and if it turns out to be a slander you have got to thank yourself for it.

Coming back to the subject, we cannot allow our agriculturists to go to rack and ruin. During the time when they would have got good prices the Government rightly in the interests of the consumer stepped in and controlled the prices. They were compelled to sell their produce for a more or less uneconomic price for the national good. So today when the prices are falling, it is no answer to tell them that the Government finds it difficult to keep up the price level.

[Shri K. S. Hegde.] Many countries have kept up the price level. In America they have got what is called the Farm Product Act. They purchase in the open market at fixed prices. We cannot allow our agriculturists to go to ruination because in their prosperity lies the prosperity of India. And I was not able to quite understand my friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, when he was trying to make a distinction between commercial crops and foodgrain crops. It will be appreciated that the producers of the foodgrain crop have not merely done their job but have done a patriotic job during very difficult times. They have not profited as much as others who have profited from natural emergencies. They have no desire to profit but at the same time they have got some legitimate claims on society and on the Government. It is they who are the backbone of this Government. At a time when others were being deceived by false slogans, they stood by this Government. If you analyse the voting strength of this Government it will be found that it is the rural people who back this Government and I hope this Government will realise the responsibilities that it owes to them.

If you discard or ignore their due rights, I think you will do it at your peril and it is time that we bring it to the notice of the Government that soon steps will have to be taken to stabilise the prices of agricultural products.

One word more about the land reforms. One often glibly talks about land reforms, but no precise connotation has been given to this expression. It is time that the Planning Commission and the Government of India just tell the public what they mean, rather than give vague expression in this matter. What is happening because of this vague expression? Many people who are tilling the land are feeling that they are going to get the land free of any price. At the same time, many people who are holding the land think well, there

may be something, but they do not know what it is.

PEP*. G. RANGA: You mean cultivated or uncultivated?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Uncultivated. There is embarrassment and uncertainty about the future. In such a state you do not expect any improvement of a permanent character. They may exploit the land for the time being, but if I were a landholder I would certainly not sink any money for permanent improvements, either for embankments or for constructing houses. That is the difficulty. Some people are going about the country saying: "The land is going to come to you free." And others are saying: "Nothing is going to happen to you." Do not leave them in this confused state. Tell them precisely what you mean. May I tell you one thing? Certainly do not mix up the tenancy legislation with the land reforms idea; and do not mix up the land reform idea, in an isolated manner, with a socialist economy. If you are going to socialise it, socialise all sectors. Treat everybody equally, do not pick out land sector alone as being an easy prey, and say "we are going to take away your land and distribute it to some others." That will not be morally just or economically just and that will be a political blunder. If today many people have faith in our sense of justice and equity they will lose it at one stroke. By all means, equalise income; by all means, reduce the higher level of income; but do it in a common plan and in a manner which will be equitable to all sectors.

Taking the overall picture, I for one am extremely happy that we have achieved remarkable progress. And I was more happy when I went to foreign countries; they were giving us sincere compliments. They thought that this country is doing remarkable well. Many undeveloped countries are looking to this country for lead in many matters. Today our position and prestige in the international

world is something which probably we here do not fully realise. In the United Nations, often times, the voice of India is heard with attention. Had you come to that House, you would see two or three individuals invariably got the attention of the House and the earphones invariably went to those particular speakers were in the forum. One of the speakers was from India, but I would not mention his name because he is in the House. Now, it is for this reason that I am saying: "Do not lower our prestige in the eyes of the international world. Let us behave in a manner consistent with our position in the world." There may be a few exceptions like my friends in the Communist Party, but the majority of India will have to assure the world, we are united; and we are unitedly behind the Prime Minister and behind this Government. And that way we ensure our position. Jai Hind.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, before coming to deal with the President's Address, I will make a passing reference to my esteemed friend and colleague, Mr. Hegde. He referred to an editorial in "Pravda". "Pravda" and the Government of India at least stand on all fours in one respect. That is, "Pravda" means "truth" and the emblem of the Government of India is also "Satyameva Jayate".

Let me come to the President's Address.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: (Uttar Pradesh): And the speaker is also "Satyapriya" !

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: I do not make any parade of my name. Thank you for the compliment that you have given. I will begin the President's Address from the end. He writes in the last paragraph :

"The progress we have made during the past year has produced in our people self-reliance and hope for the future"

I add here: "hope deferred has~ made the heart of the Indians sick."

".....That is the surest foundation on which we can build. It is for you, Members of Parliament, to give shape and form to this hope and to advance the country to its cherished goal of a Welfare State and a society conforming to the socialist pattern."

What is 'socialist pattern'? Is it; socialism or something else? I do not know who has written the speech for the President. If it has been done by the Prime Minister, I will only remind, the Members of the House and him—I mean the Prime Minister—to reread his Presidential address in Lahore in which this sentence occurs: "I am a Socialist." That was in the year 1929. Twentyfive long year* have passed and from being a "Socialist" he has become an advocate of a "socialist pattern". You may also refer to what he said just after his return from China in the speech which he delivered before the National Development Council on the 9th of November, 1954, a report off which appeared in the "Hindustan Times" of November, 10. He says: "The first thing I should imagine about planning is to have a definite picture of where you are going to." And later on, he says: "That, too, involves ultimately some specific and definite views about the structure of society that you are aiming at." Believe in something definite, accept something definite. If you believe in the teachings of Gandhiji, accept Gandhism as your principle and construct a society on that pattern. I can understand that; but not this delightfully and frightfully vague-term which is neither fish nor flesh nor even red herring—it is delightful so far as the capitalists are concerned and frightful so far as the common man is concerned. I am reminded here of the name which Hitler gave to his party "National Socialist German Workers' Party."* He did not dissatisfy anybody. 'Na-

[Shri Satyapriya Banerjee.] tional' is there; 'socialism' is there; 'Germany' is there; 'workers' are there; 'party' is there. If you believe in something else, say so. if you believe in selectivism. make that clear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And Hitler was, of course, there.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE : With your socialist pattern you p,o to a capitalist and say: "See here, don't be afraid. This is only a pattern. You will get your profits all the same." just as my esteemed friend and colleague, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, quoted the enormous profits that the millowners have derived from their mills. That state of things will continue. Go to the voter: "You are coming to power. We want a socialist pattern of society. Don't be afraid." This sort of shilly-shallying, this sort of playing, this sort of tinkering with the problems that go to make the future of a country, this sort of hoodwinking the people as to the real state of things will not help you. On the contrary, the people if not today, if not tomorrow, the day after tomorrow certainly will find out what stuff you are made of. They will curse you then. "You have been preaching things and dinning into our ears things which you never meant and we have come to realise that Quit." That will be the nemesis of the present Government. While I was a school boy, I had a teacher of grammar who was teaching us conjunction. He told us

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Not interjection ! ?

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Interjection will come from you, just after I have spoken. And he said, there are two very important conjunctions: One is 'and' and the other is 'but'. He said "and and....." and "so and so....." that is also a very powerful conjunction. But he added: "if you add one word but' after that, the whole thing is spoiled. Such is the case with the President's

Address and such is the case of the picture he has delineated, the rosy picture that he has prepared to show before us. The Five Year Plan has brought to us this thing and 'hat thing. I will only add one 'but' to it. But it has not been able to solve the unemployment problem by e /en a bit. What are these 'ands'. if you cannot solve one 'but'? Have you been able to solve the unemployment problem to any degree? Every day, hundreds and thousands are thrown out in the streets They are going out for employment and finding none. That is the state of things you have brought the whole country to. I am not going to give you the entire picture of unemployment over the whole of India. because data for that purpose does not

I come from West Bengal. The West Bengal Government Instituted an enquiry into the state of employment in that State. Do you know what that report has presented to us? Let me tell you something about it. There are four and a half lakhs of unemployed, employment seekers, in the cities of Bengal. And in the rural areas there are 5-6 lakhs. That means 10-1 lakhs unemployed. Add to that. That report says that one lakh every year will be the increase in the number of unemployed, not to speak of any decrease. As my friend, Bhupesh Gupta, pointed out just the other moment, out of every 10(1 employed people in the city of Calcutta 27 are unemployed. And, if I take the whole of Bengal, for every 100 persons employed in the whole of Bengal. 47 are unemployed. This is the picture that you have got to consider. If that is true of West Bengal, it must be more or less, equally true of the other States of India. Who has brought forward this state of affairs in the country? Is it you, Sir. or is it me, or is, if the Communist Party, with which I work in close co-operation and march shoulder to shoulder together? It is the Congress Government and the Congress organisations Power is in

their hands; they have abused their power; they have misused their power. And, therefore, all the blame must lie with them. I charge them with that. I charge them with inefficiency, with corruption, with nepotism, and with everything that goes with it. If they have any sense of decency, any sense of honour, they will either find out ways and means how to find out employment for every one unemployed or will find the way out for themselves.

In paragraph 22, Sir, the President says as follows:

"You will have to < insider the Constitution Fourth Amendment Bill. These amendments have become necessary in order to further; economic and social progress and to give effect to the directive principles of State policy as embodied in the Constitution."

I say here and now, with all humility and with all the emphasis that I can command, that the Chapter on 'Directive Principles of State Policy' and the rest of the Constitution go ill together. The chapter was inserted again to hoodwink and de-ceive the people. I make this bold assertion that this chapter on Directive Principles of ' State policy was taken from the Constitution of Ireland, and it was done only to deceive and hoodwink and mislead the people, to create in them the confidence in the Government of the Congress and in the organisation of the Congress. I myself, some time back, brought an amendment to this very article of the Constitution. The Leader of the House is there, and he will bear me out when I say that the Congress Government did not have the courage—I will not say generosity—to accept my amendment, and the Bill which they have now brought before the House—it has already been introduced—goes not very far. The principle of compensation is accepted there. If the principle is there, you have got to pay compen-

sation, large or small. Therefore, if the principle of compensation is even now accepted by the Government, does that go to help the policy enunciated *in* the Directive Principles? I say emphatically 'No.' Sir, I suffer from want of time. Sir, I am beholden to you and Prof. Ranga for giving me out of turn today the opportunity to speak, and I have given Prof. Ranga my word that I will not take much time—I have been given his time. Therefore, with all thankfulness to you. Sir, and him, I resume my seat

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr Vice-Chairman, I have great pleasure in associating myself with this motion of thanks to the President on his Address to both the Houses of Parliament.

Incidentally, Sir, I may point out that such a renowned paper of high standard like the Times of India, in its leader, mentioned that the Address was to the Lok Sabha. This is by the way. Had it been really so, this occasion for offering thanks would not have been there.

Sir, leaving aside all the comments of the Opposition Members as made for the sake of saying something in disapproval particularly for putting it before their constituencies I should like to point out that the reception the President's Address has met with in the press is favourable. And even the press which is usually not very friendly to the Congress Party has said that it is a brief and a comprehensive review of the events that have taken place. After all, Sir, a President's Address is ;'i>t expected to go into the criticism *at* what has been done, or to lay out a policy of what is going to be doae But, I think, within the limited time available the Address leaves very little to be wished for, because in one brief sentence in paragraph 24, Sir, by referring to the Bills that are before Parliament, the President has referred to almos; everything ol

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] importance with which Parliament is dealing. Sir, I would like to deal with an aspect which should be part of our foreign policy in line with what has been done by our country so far for bringing about peace or in line with her attempts to keep away war, if I may say so. Under the astute guidance of our Prime Minister, India has now won a position of pride and honour of which we are all proud. It is not necessary to say so in so many words. When at the time of the San Francisco Conference India was invited to attend that Conference and be a signatory to the treaty establishing the war guilt of Japan, India showed her courage by remaining out of it and not being a party to the treaty. I would just give two or three instances in which India has proved that what India thinks today the world comes to accept tomorrow. To that extent, India has shown to the world that her decisions can be considered more or less prophetic. Her policy of neutrality, which was highly criticised and not looked upon with favour by some countries which then thought that India in her in-mature political experience was perhaps not able to take correct decisions, was later on appreciated by them, and they began to see the wisdom of that policy, which alone has been the saving grace in the world situation today. Later on we declared our faith in co-existence and that policy also is being taken, as a means for steering clear of what might sooner or later become a preparation for war. India, with her population, with her size and not joining this bloc or that bloc, has been a real bulwark of strength for peace in the world today, and so, Sir, in view of this, I would like to make a suggestion that India with the original path she has struck in the counsels of the world, should go a step further and ask the different nations, at an appropriate forum either through our Prime Minister when he attends these Commonwealth Conferences or at the forum of the United Nations through our

representatives, to read the lessons of history and find out whether or not the real cause of world tension today is not the way in which the world's territories are divided among nations. If socialisation is considered to be the proper solution for the equitable distribution of lands and wealth in a country in order to satisfy people's land hunger and give them satisfaction and not lead to any heart burning among them, socialisation in the international field should and ought to mean the division of the world's lands on a fairer basis. It is not necessary for any country to ask for land just for living on that land. Living room is enough for everybody in his country, but what is required and meant by equal division of world's lands is the opportunity for using the world's commodities, opportunity for sharing the raw materials of the world without any restriction. This is what is being done as a matter of fact when countries like the U.S.A. and the U.K. are coming forward to the help of under-developed countries in order to keep them away from the Communist bloc, and so there is no reason why this idea of socialisation of the world's lands should not be acceptable to them. After all in their own country, in England, socialisation has been accepted as a principle and that is what has led in a way to contentment among the people there without their accepting Communism. If anyone reads history with a frank mind and if any politician wants to own facts to himself, it should be clear to him that this unequal distribution of land was the cause of the last two World Wars. I will not go farther into that history here. The cause of the two Wars was the desire of each country to extend the sphere of its own trade. This was at the bottom of the Japanese also joining in the last war. From that point of view, if in a peaceful way—this is what the United Nations is meant for—adjustments are made so that these economic difficulties which ultimately lead to trade pacts, trade

barriers and ultimately war, are re- I moved, I am sure that this terrible cloud of war hanging over our heads to which reference has been made in the President's Address would be cleared. I feel that there is no country better fitted to do this frank speaking than our country and no person with courage better suited than our Prime Minister. So, I would like to emphasise this point once again for the due consideration of those who have to deal with these matters at this critical juncture. I do not say that this is an idea which has not struck anybody earlier. I am sure that this point has been thought of. When I asked a high dignitary of one of the Commonwealth countries as to how they expected people to trust the good intentions of Western countries in helping the underdeveloped countries and the overcrowded countries of Asia, when such a vast continent like Australia had only six million people—perhaps it has gone up to 8 millions now—or when such a vast territory like Canada had only about 11 million people and when vast tracts of South America and Africa were still unexplored, there was no answer but he did say that this question was mooted once somewhere, but of course he could not say why it should not be taken up at a high level. So all I am saying is that this matter should be considered by people like Sir Winston Churchill and others with all the emphasis it deserves.

Now, I would like to touch on one more point in the President's Address, and that is about cottage industries. I feel that a solution to the problem of cottage industries would give a solution to the problem of unemployment in our country at least for the time being until the country becomes a fully industrialised country. I do not want to go into details about this, I would only ask the Government to kindly have a uniform policy over certain items. I may mention their approach to the question of khadi and khaddar versus mill-made cloth, bullock carts versus trucks,

bullock ploughs versus tractors, biris versus cigarettes which are manufactured with the help of machines as also bins manufactured with the help of machines made in our country; tailor-made clothes versus machine cut cloth and machine-stitched clothes from big mills like the Delhi Cloth Mills which are bound to put out of employment many tailors. Indian cloth versus imported doth from Japan and America. Streets and streets of big cities like Bombay are full of cheap socks, handkerchiefs and ties, for which there is no need to import and which are sure to kill the indigenous industries in these items; soaps made by Cottage industries versus those made through foreign factories like Lever Brothers; and oil pressed by indigenous ghanis versus manufactured through mills. There will have to be some uniform policy on these matters and I would also like to mention the proposed rationalisation of mills industry which also would add to the existing problem of unemployment.

Sir, I cannot close my speech without referring to one important item. I am sorry the hon. Law Minister is not here. He was here some time ago, and I wanted to mention before him one thing incidentally. With regard to the reference in paragraph 24 of the President's speech in which he has referred to the Bills before the Houses, I would like to refer to the Hindu Succession Bill which has been introduced in this House. With regard to that I would like to first pass on the thanks of the Members of the All India Women's Conference of which the worthy President—Shrimati Lakshmi Menon—is sitting here, to the Members of the Rajya Sabha in particular and the Government also for having brought the passage of that portion of the Hindu Code Bill to the present stage but at the same time expressing its disappointment that more progress which could have been made has not been made and expressing apprehensions that in view of the short time

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] *leit* of the life of the present Parliament of one year and ten months or so, that there was a danger of the most important portions of the Bill not passing. As a result they have made a suggestion that in preference to the other portions of the Bill, it would be better to take up what I have always called, the horse position of the Bill *i.e.*, the carriage or cart part which makes the things go, the succession or the money part of the Hindu Code. First pass it and then proceed with the other parts of the Bill. Sir, I am sure the Bill is coming before us for reference to a Select Committee but unless that reference motion to Select Committee is made in the other House, it would be difficult to finish the Select Committee's report to enable us (both the Houses) to consider the Bill and pass it before the life of the present Parliament is due to finish.

Lastly, I would like to refer to the remarks made by the Members of the Opposition *viz.*, their doubts about the Congress adopting a socialistic pattern of society (*Interruptions*). I would only like to say that these people seem to be perturbed over the idea of Congress accepting socialism because they seem to think that it takes the wind out of their sails. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE) : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 24th February 1955.