

view of the general feeling on the matter and in consultation with the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju, as a special case I allow a discussion to be raised on this matter tomorrow at 6 P.M. The discussion will last an hour.

Now Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari to lay his papers on the Table.

### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORTS OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION AND GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS, NOTIFICATION AND STATEMENTS ON (1) CONTINUANCE OF PROTECTION TO THE SERICULTURE INDUSTRY AND (2) REVISION OF PRICES OF CEMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers under sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951:—

I. (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Sericulture Industry.

(ii) Government Resolution No. 36(4)-T.B./53, dated the 31st December 1953.

(iii) Government Notification No. 36(4)-T.B./53, dated the 31st December, 1953.

(iv) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents referred to at (i), (ii) and (iii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section. [Placed in the Library, see No. S-14/54 for (i) to (iv).]

II. (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the revision of prices of cement.

(ii) Government Resolution No. SC(B)-8(257)/54, dated the 1st February 1954.

(iii) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act 1951, explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section. [Placed in the Library see No. S-15/54 for (i) to (iii).]

### MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

SHRI R. M. DESHMUKH (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"That the Members of the Council of States 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 15th February 1954."

Sir, as hon. Members would have seen, the Address naturally falls in to two sections—one dealing with our external policies and the other dealing with the domestic aspects of our policy. In either sections, I venture to hope that hon. Members will be inclined to feel with me that the Address takes a realistic view of things and is neither unduly complacent nor unduly optimistic about the future of this country.

Dealing with the external policies first, Sir, it may not be irrelevant for me to visualise the background of the policy which has been adopted for this country. When we were put to the choice of making an external policy of our own, we found ourselves lost in a world that had been gripped by the evil spirit and the old time policy of the balance of power. This policy involved the world in talk of block for collective security, for increasing armaments and evolution of arms

ments of increasing potency so far as their destructive power was concerned; talks of being prepared for war in order to prevent war were rampant and that philosophy was then ruling the roost in the foreign Chancelleries of the world. In such an explosive world where the slightest spark could send all of us up in smoke, it was quite conceivable that men of lesser calibre and lesser vision than we were fortunate enough to have at the helm of affairs of our country could easily have been led into identifying themselves and drifting into relationship with either the one block or the other. Fortunately for us we had two men big enough—at least two men big enough—at the time to possess the necessary vision and to see far ahead of the rest of the world and conceive of a policy when that did not promise or was not expected to promise very good dividends. Fortunately, Sir, for our country, we had the Father of the Nation to guide us in this matter, and we had a big enough man with a long enough vision in our Prime Minister who could unhesitatingly reject the policy of war and accept the policy of peace as the guiding principle for the foreign relations of this country and further, who had the courage of his conviction to follow that policy unhesitatingly.

When I was a young man, Sir, I remember long ago to have read an article written by the Father of the Nation himself which had the caption, "From ridicule to respect". I was reminded of that caption, when I visualised the ordeals this policy has suffered, so far as it had been viewed from other peoples' point of view. Today Sir, we can legitimately claim that our policy has come successfully out of the ordeal and has outlived the stage of being ridiculed and I claim that the policy has been effective enough to command the respect of the nations of the world. Our policy was, in its turn, many times criticised as impracticable, as impossible, as

a policy of friendlessness, a policy of perhaps an idealistic character. Yet, it has brought no evil consequences for this country. If anything, we may claim that it has brought us the respect of the nations of the world and, as a consequence of that, we find in the President's Address, which we are about to discuss, various illustrations which only begin to show the fruits of that policy and indicate to us that the policy was right and that it has just begun to pay dividends. The President has been pleased to describe this policy in terms that cannot be improved upon by me. I will, therefore, take the liberty to read what the President himself has been pleased to say. This is what he says: "India has continued to pursue a policy of peace and friendship with all the countries of the world and has not hesitated to undertake responsibilities where, it was hoped, this might enable her to perform some service in the cause of peace". It would be seen by the Members that the necessary implication of this policy of peace is that we reject the policy of war. In consequence, we reject the preparations for a premeditated war and we reject threats of war as an instrument of foreign policy or as an instrument for the settlement of the international differences. We are not interested in wars; we are not interested in the preparations for war and, least of all are we interested in the wars of imperialistic or totalitarian aggression or wars undertaken for the suppression of liberties of other people. Having thus made up our mind, we have settled down to a steady course of extension of friendly relations and adoption of the method of friendly consultations in order to seek settlement of our disputes patiently and quietly. This instrument, it will be found in the long run, if it were to be universally adopted, would be much better for the peace of the world than the present policies in which the world generally seems to believe. We hope that we shall be able to follow the policy successfully and that we shall be able to show to the world by our

[Shri R. M. Deshmukh.]

example that the policy of peace rather than the policy of war is the only policy worth while and is the only policy that will lead to the universal benefit and prosperity of the world.

As an illustration and as an instance of our undertaking or our willingness to undertake the responsibilities which are a necessary consequence of our policy and of our willingness to help the cause of peace even at some sacrifice and even at some cost to ourselves, the President has been pleased to mention the instance of Korea where we had hoped to help the cause of peace and, therefore, agreed to send what has come to be known as the Custodian Force. In this connection, Sir, I might take the liberty of saying that the fact that our country should have been asked to send a force of that type for a task of the kind that existed in Korea is in itself a compliment to the policy that we had been following. And it is not our fault—the circumstances were not of our making—if better results were not achieved or if better purpose was not served. There can be no question about the intention with which we tried to help in the matter. If the circumstances turned out otherwise, as the President has said, and the difficulties arose, the fault certainly does not lie with us. The difficulty has arisen because of the circumstances created by the wrong policy and the malady from which the world as a whole seems to be still suffering.

One thing, however, that has emerged out of the circumstances and the events that have taken place in Korea is that our Custodian Force under very trying and difficult circumstances performed the task with ability and integrity and well merited that honour and credit of which our country may be proud. Sir, the Prime Minister had observed some time ago that there is a peculiar credit and honour that we can claim in this connection, namely, that this is probably the first time in the history of this nation and first time perhaps in the

history of any nation that a force has left the home country on a peaceful mission and not on a mission of aggression or for purposes of war.

Other instances where the policy that we have been following has led to a respect for this country are not wanting. Time and again instances are cropping up where in a difficult position the world nations are gradually beginning to look to India to provide an agency which will be a guarantee of integrity and impartiality. Another instance of this confidence that the world shows in us has been cited in the Address itself and that is the instance of our having provided one of our citizens to act as the Chief Election Commissioner in Sudan. We are proud, Sir, that we were so asked—and we were shown the confidence—to provide such an agency and that we should have been able to provide the necessary personnel to man such an agency and that the agency should have functioned to the satisfaction of all and thus earned not only the gratitude but prestige for our country. It is quite clear that such events and such results do not come as a result of merely fortuitous circumstances. Therefore the credit for all the prestige and for all the respect that our policy has acquired in the eyes of the nations of the world must undoubtedly belong to the policy of our Prime Minister. Having substituted a friendly method of negotiation for the solution of problems for the old-fashioned method of threats of war or distrust, it is not a matter of surprise to find that other people who were less able to see the implications of this policy took some time to adjust their own ideas to the policies that have been followed in this country. They were still doubting and still trying to adjust themselves to the circumstances that were being deliberately brought about by our policy. This was perhaps inevitable but, to my mind, the recent settlement of our outstanding problems with Ceylon, mentioned in the Address, in so far as it goes, is attributable to the breaking down of the barriers of distrust and

misunderstanding I venture to share the hope expressed by the President that this may prove just the first step towards the establishment of a complete understanding not only with Ceylon but with all our neighbours and with all persons with whom we may have occasion to have contacts, negotiations, problems and an opportunity to seek solutions of those problems. And when I say so, I am not excluding Pakistan from the purview of what I have said. Some of our friends here have been constantly trying to impress on our minds that the establishment of friendly relations, negotiations or understandings was not a part of our policy in relation to the nations that appear to be favoured by them. I dare to think that our trade agreement with USSR and our consultations with China on crucial matters about Tibet, that have been mentioned in the Address, would be glad news to them and I venture to hope that it will gladden their hearts. This would incidentally prove to them that the policy of this country which this country has chosen to follow, has after all some meaning in it and some merit in it. To those of our way of thinking, that these events have come about causes no surprise. Our policy is realistic and we will not hesitate to face facts. After all such hon Members as are still doubtful about our policy should not forget that we were amongst the first of all nations to recognise and urge on the rest of the world that a factual account of the realities should be taken into consideration and that the Government of the People's Republic in China should be recognised, not only that it should be recognised but that it should be admitted into the U.N.O. as an equal nation and as a *de facto* Government equal to any other Government of any other nation. Not infrequently Sir, it happens that those who are nearest to us, probably are the hardest to convince. This perhaps explains the fluctuations in our negotiations for seeking a solution of our problem with our most immediate neighbour. Doubts as the President has observed have arisen and suspicions have increased because of certain

events that have taken place and certain circumstances that have intervened. To my mind, what our neighbour chooses to do by way of pacts with other independent and sovereign nations is not a matter that need concern us except in so far as it is likely to have its reactions and repercussions on us as another independent nation. If we wish that the world should live in peace and amity, we cannot act in isolation and we cannot ignore the principle of inter-dependence. And therefore, as good neighbours, there ought to be an account taken of the fact that we may exercise our rights but not in such a manner as would be detrimental to the rights of others. So long as no such repercussions are visible, there is little reason for us to say what our neighbours should do or should not do. It in itself is a sovereign country, and has perhaps an equal right to do what it considers best in its own interests. It is not however in a spirit of complacency that I say so. It certainly is a matter of very vital importance. It is not a matter for complacency at all. At the same time, I would say that it is not a matter which should make us rush into panic. Sir, we have learnt a lesson during the last war that panic demoralises the people. And if our people are not able to keep up their morale, all progress, all peace and all clear thinking becomes a very difficult matter. We have therefore got to see things as they are and not rush into unduly panicky state and draw drastic conclusions from the situation that appears to be developing across the border. From the amount of aid, from the kind of aid, that is being received or will be received we shall be able to see what its impact on us is likely to be. We shall also have to be on the lookout and be vigilant about the sort of control that may or may not be set up for the purpose of keeping this most dangerous instrument in order. Incidentally also, from all these things we shall be able to see the direction in which and the purpose for which this aid is likely to be used. It would therefore be premature for us to take a panicky view of the thing, although we can certainly not

[Shri R. M. Deshmukh.]

be unconcerned about it, and we can least of all be complacent about its possible repercussions on this country. With all these circumstances, that are comparatively of very recent occurrence, I still hope and think that the general policy that we follow, will, in the course of time, be able to break down the barriers of misunderstandings and will make things possible, which under our present circumstances appear to be quite impossible for the time being.

In the field of foreign affairs, Sir, we have been concerned with Africa and we have been concerned with the events taking place all over the world, as a matter of fact. We have sometimes been championing the liberties of the peoples of the world, and unfailingly we have entered a protest with all the earnestness at our command that a certain order of things that makes colonialism possible, that makes imperialism possible, that makes totalitarianism possible, will not bring any good to the world. How far we have succeeded in that is not a matter to be judged from specific events at specific moments, but I hope that in the long run we shall be able to achieve some good and we shall be able to establish a better order of things which will be for the peace of the world, and which will perhaps be a valuable contribution towards the establishment of one world, or at least a step towards the establishment of one world.

The U. N. O., Sir, if we look at it realistically, has not proved a very efficient instrument as yet. And yet we have been supporting the U. N. O. despite the circumstances that at times make us think otherwise for very good reasons. To my mind, Sir, the U. N. O. has tolerated infractions by countries like South Africa which are against the very fundamentals of the United Nations Charter. But it is no use our trying to keep away from a movement which we believe deserves all our support. We have accepted the U. N. O. not with a selfish purpose of achieving this or that end, but it is as a matter

of our general policy of helping in every way towards the promotion of peace. As an instrument of peace, U. N. O. certainly is the best that can be done under the circumstances. If we do not support the U. N. O., there is no substitute for it, and it seems to me, Sir, that it is better to have something which keeps the thought alive than to have nothing at all. So I have no doubt that the House will feel with me that the policy that we have been following has started paying its dividends, and that policy, in the long run, is capable of achieving great things, not only for ourselves but for all the nations of the world.

The most crucial problem however lies in our domestic matters. We have got to build up our country with our own efforts, and if necessary, with outside help. No matter where the help comes from, provided it is in the interest of the nation, our policy would not forbid it, forbid us from taking it. Our policy has no inhibitions of a pre-determined character, and our policy will not prevent us from taking the help either from one bloc or the other, but all this is subject to the over-all condition that our Prime Minister has time and again stressed, viz., that no help will be accepted if there are any strings attached. Whatever may be the position about the help to be received from outside, whether that help comes or whether that help is not forthcoming, we cannot escape our task of building up our country by our own efforts to such extent as we can within our resources, and to my mind the greatest of these tasks lies in the rural areas. From this point of view, the reference in the Address to the Community Projects together with the development of cottage industries, although not as hopeful as it might have been expected or it might have been desired, appears to me to be of the highest significance. The observation in the Address that the contribution of the people is most encouraging is therefore greatly heartening. We are a poor country; we are a backward country, and we have also peculiar problems of our own, and our greatest

hope lies in the utilisation of the only asset that we possess, *viz.*, our great man-power. So long as the response in this direction is adequate and encouraging, there is hope for the country, and we have little to fear and can look forward to the future with confidence.

Sir, the general improvement in the economic condition that has been referred to in the Address should be looked upon by Members with relief and satisfaction. It is natural to feel that more should have been achieved, and it is natural to wish that more should be achieved quicker and faster, and yet inevitably our achievement must be circumscribed by the circumstances in our country and by the financial resources at our disposal. The additional production of five million tons of food that has been referred to in the Address and the approach to self-sufficiency in various essential consumer goods which has enabled the Government recently to decontrol many of these essential items, is a welcome sign of our progress, and the resources which we have so far been utilising for these purposes would now be released for our productive requirements. The improvements registered, and the favourable circumstances referred to in the Address will as their cumulative effect automatically enable us to provide necessary relief for unemployment. There is no magic cure, if I may say so, for unemployment, but the cumulative effect of increasing production and the investment of productive finance must ultimately be trusted to offer a substantial relief to this distressing question of unemployment.

Sir, Members will be glad to note that our Railways are emerging gradually but surely out of the backlog that has been left over as a consequence of the last war, and that so far as the replacement requirements of the railways are concerned, the country is just near self-sufficiency in locomotives and will soon do so in respect of rolling stock.

Next to food and clothing, the Address refers to the problem of housing. It is possible here again to wish

for more, but what I would like to urge that Members should satisfy themselves with is, that the experience that is being gained by persons in the sphere of rehabilitation housing and industrial housing will be valuable and will be at our disposal in achieving greater purposes and greater results.

Sir, these achievements may by themselves appear to be very small, but in the potentialities and in the atmosphere that they are creating, in the hope that they give for the future, their results will eventually, I hope, be very great. We might therefore legitimately claim that the House will agree with the President when he says in his Address, "I think that you may well look back on this year as one of considerable achievement." I feel that the House will also agree with the last paragraph of the Address which I shall take the liberty of reading.

"The new year begins with hope and fear evenly balanced. There is promise of achievement and of progress towards peace. There is also apprehension at the trials we and the rest of the world might have to face. In this crisis of human destiny, we can serve both our own country and the larger causes of the world only by adhering to the principles that have guided us in the past and by remembering the message of peace, tolerance and self-reliance of the Father of the Nation. I trust that that message will guide you in your deliberations."

It is clear, Sir, that if we were to be guided by these high principles, the destiny of this country and the destiny of the world will be ensured. Sir, I appreciate very deeply the privilege that has been granted to me in moving this motion and as such, I move the motion and commend it for the acceptance of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:      Shri Alluri Satyanarayana Raju to second the Motion.

SHRI A. S. RAJU Andhra):

श्री ए० एस० राजू (आन्ध्र) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे माननीय मित्र श्री देशमुख ने आप के सामने पूज्य राष्ट्रपति को धन्यवाद देने का जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया है, उस का मैं समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। बहुत सदियों के बाद हम को यह अवसर मिला है कि हम अपने देश को उन्नति की ओर ले जायँ। स्वतंत्रता मिलने के बाद जो रचनात्मक कार्य इस देश में हुआ, सरकार की ओर से हुआ, लोगों की सहायता लेते हुए हुआ, मैं समझता हूँ कि सारे संसार में, किसी भी देश में, इतने वेग से रचनात्मक कार्य नहीं हुआ, जितना कि हमारे देश में हुआ है। कितनी ही चिल्लाहट हो सकती है, कितना ही प्रचार हो सकता है और चाहे जो कुछ भी चाहो, कहा और किया जा सकता है, लेकिन किसी देश में रचनात्मक कार्य होना कोई मामूली बात नहीं होती।

विनाश का कोई भी कार्य बहुत जल्द हो सकता है, किसी घर का संत्यानाश करना है तो बहुत आसानी से किया जा सकता है एक दो मिनट में कोई भी बच्चा कर सकता है। लेकिन यदि किसी घर को बांधना हो, तैयार करना हो और उस की रखवाली करनी हो तो ऐसा करना कोई मामूली बात नहीं होती। ऐसे कार्य को पूरा करने के लिए सालों लग जाते हैं, बहुत परिश्रम करना पड़ता है, बहुत कोशिशें करनी पड़ती हैं, तब जाकर ऐसे कार्य पूरे होते हैं। इसी दृष्टि से हम को देश के कामों को देखना और करना चाहिये।

अक्सर यह कहा जाता है कि देश को आजाद हुए ७ और ८ वर्ष हो गये मगर इस देश में अभी तक कुछ भी नहीं हुआ है। इस देश के अन्दर जो कुछ भी कार्य हो रहे हैं उन की तुलना हमारे मित्र रूस और चीन से

करते हैं। वे लोग चीन और रूस की लम्बी लम्बी बातें करते हैं, वहाँ के कार्यों के बारे में चिल्ला चिल्ला कर कहते हैं कि उन देशों में इतने थोड़े समय में इतनी प्रगति हुई। वह लोग इन देशों की तारीख को भूल जाते हैं भूला देना चाहते हैं और यह याद नहीं करते कि वहाँ पर जो भी पंचवर्षीय योजना हुई, १० वर्षीय योजना हुई, उस को वहाँ की जनता ने सरकार के साथ मिल जुन कर कार्यान्वित किया, वहाँ की सरकार को बहुत कष्ट उस को पूरा करने में हुए। वहाँ की सरकारें तानाशाही के रूप में जनता से इन कार्यों को करानी रही और फिर भी वह ३० साल के अनेक कष्टों के बाद उस को कार्यान्वित करा सकी। इन ३० सालों के बाद वहाँ जो इन्फ्लेब हुआ उस के बाद भी वहाँ पर रचनात्मक कार्य जारी है और उन के नतागण कहते हैं कि ३० साल के इन्फ्लेब के बाद अब हम को सफनता हासिल हुई है। वहाँ पर अभी भी देश की प्रगति के लिए अनेक प्रकार के रचनात्मक कार्य किये जा रहे हैं, मगर फिर भी यहाँ पर यह कहा जाता है कि इस देश में स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के ७ साल बाद भी कुछ प्रगति नहीं हुई है, इस सरकार को यहाँ से निकाल दो, यह सरकार जनता की सरकार नहीं है, यह जमींदारों की सरकार है, पूँजीपतियों की सरकार है और देशी राजाओं की सरकार है।

AN HON. MEMBER:

एक माननीय सदस्य : ठीक है।

SHRI A. S. RAJU:

श्री ए० एस० राजू : इस तरह का देश में प्रचार किया जाता है। जब आप को सभापति द्वारा बोलने का समय दिया जायेगा उस वक्त आप इस तरह की बात कह सकते हैं। आप को इन बातों को सुन कर इतनी जल्दी अशान्त नहीं होना चाहिये।

AN. HON. MEMBER:

एक माननीय सदस्य : आदत हो गई है।

SHRI A. S. RAJU:

श्री ए० एस० राजू : अगर कोई भी उचित बात कही जाती है तो हमारे भाई एकदम नाराज हो जाते हैं। व समझते हैं कि उन की चिल्लाहट से, उन के दबाव से देश की सारी जनता डर जायेगी, यह सरकार यहां पर नहीं रहेगी और तब उन का अपना राज्य हो जायेगा।

किन परिस्थितियों में इस देश में पंच-वर्षीय योजना चलाई जा रही है और उस में क्या क्या प्रगति हुई है इन बातों को हमारे मित्र भूल जाते हैं। इस थोड़े से समय में देश के विभिन्न भागों में कितने पुत्र बांधे गये हैं, कितनी कच्ची और पक्की सड़क बनाई गई हैं, कितने विद्यालयों में वृद्धि हुई है, कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट (community project) और सामूहिक विकास केन्द्रों में क्या क्या कार्य हुए हैं, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में कितनी उन्नति हुई है, यह इस देश की जनता को भली प्रकार से विदित ही है। मगर हमारे जो भाई टीका-टिप्पणी करते हैं वे इन जगहों पर जाना नहीं चाहते हैं। अगर जाते भी हैं तो वहां हुए कार्य को देखना नहीं चाहते हैं। वे इन चीजों को देखकर अपनी आखें बन्द कर लेते हैं। इन सब कार्यों को जानते हुए भी वे अपने को अनजाना सा समझते हैं। मगर स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद देश में इन ७ सालों में जो प्रगति हुई है उस को देश की जनता भली प्रकार से जानती है और सारे संसार को उस के बारे में ज्ञान है। इन सब प्रगतियों के बारे में जो कि देश में इतन थोड़े समय में हुई है, हमारे भाइयों की ओर से प्रशंसा का एक वाक्य भी नहीं कहा जाना है। जब तक सत्ता पर उन का अधिकार

नहीं हो जाता है तब तक वह अपनी ओर से प्रशंसा का कोई भी शब्दमंह में नहीं निकालेंगे। आप सब लोगों को विदित है कि इन लोगों के आज भी विनाशात्मक कार्यक्रम जारी हैं। आज हम देखते हैं कि देश के अन्दर कहीं अध्यापकों को उकसा कर हड़ताल करवाई जा रही है, कहीं पर मजदूरों को भड़काया जा रहा है और कभी विद्यार्थियों को हड़ताल के लिए उकसाकर देश में अराजकता फैलाने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है। इस तरह के कार्य करना उन का प्रोफेशन (profession) हो गया है यह बात सारी दुनिया भलीभांति जानती है। ये लोग रूस में इन्कलाब होन के बाद लेनिन और स्टालिन की प्रशंसा करते हुए नहीं थकते हैं। इन नेताओं ने अपनी जनता के लिए यह नारा बलन्द किया था कि देश की उन्नति के लिये काम करना सब का धर्म है, देश की उपज को हर तरह से बढ़ाना सबका कर्तव्य है, जो ऐसा नहीं करता वह देशद्रोही है। मगर हमारे भाई इस चीज को हमारे देश में नहीं होना देना चाहते, वे इस तरह की बातों को जनता के सामने नहीं रखते क्योंकि वे इस देश की तरक्की नहीं चाहते हैं, वे चाहते हैं कि इस देश में अराजकता फैल जाय। इस सरकार के कार्यों की जब किसी दूसरे देश द्वारा प्रशंसा की जाती है तो ये लोग नाराज हो जाते हैं। आज देश के अन्दर जो साम्प्रदायिक संस्थाएं हैं उन को ये लोग मौखिक रूप से "कनडेमन (condemn) करते हैं लेकिन जब वक्त आता है तो उन के साथ मिलकर सरकार के विरुद्ध धरना और हड़ताल करने में साथ देते हैं और झगड़ा करने को भी तैयार हो जाते हैं।

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan):  
On a point of order. Is he speaking on the President's Address or is he criticising somebody who has not spoken at all? It is only the mover who has spoken.



AN HON. MEMBER: It is in order.

SHRI B GUPTA (West Bengal): He has been wrongly tutored.

SHRI A. S. RAJU:

श्री ए० एस० राजू : इस समय देश के अन्दर विभिन्न स्थानों में जितने भी रचनात्मक कार्यक्रम हो रहे हैं, उन की सहायता करना और उन को आगे बढ़ाना इस देश की जनता का परम कर्तव्य हो जाता है। जब तक हम इन रचनात्मक कार्यों में सरकार को पूर्ण रूप से सहयोग नहीं देगे तब तक हमारा देश उन्नत नहीं हो सकता है।

अभी हमारे मित्र श्री देशमुख जी ने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के विषय में जो बातें बतलाई और हमारे देश की जो नीति है उस के विषय में जो कुछ कहा, उस का सब को समर्थन करना चाहिये।

आधवासी होन के नाते मैं इस सरकार की बधाई देना चाहता हूं। आन्ध्रवासियों की ४० सालो से जो इच्छा थी उस को पूर्ण करने में केन्द्रीय सरकार ने आन्ध्रवासियों की जो सहायता की है उस के लिए मैं सरकार को आन्ध्रवासियों की ओर से, आन्ध्र की धारासभा की ओर से बधाई देना चाहता हूं। राष्ट्रपति जी ने स्वयं अपने अभिभाषण में आन्ध्र राज्य की स्थापना का जो उल्लेख किया है उस के लिय भी मैं बधाई देना चाहता हूं। केन्द्रीय सरकार की सहायता से आज आन्ध्र सरकार अपना काम चला रही है। एक महान त्यागी आन्ध्रवासी के नेतृत्व में आज आन्ध्र की सरकार का कार्य चल रहा है।

आप सब लोगो को विदित है कि आन्ध्र एक पिछड़ा सा राज्य है। अभी वह बाल राज्य है उस को पूज्य राष्ट्रपति जी ने आशीर्वाद दिया है। जिस राज्य को आशीर्वाद देने में राष्ट्रपति नहीं हिचकचाये, उस को हर प्रकार की आर्थिक सहायता देने में सरकार को

कोई हिचकचाहट नहीं होनी चाहिये, यह मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं। यह राज्य नवनिर्मित राज्य है और दिल्ली से दूर स्थित है। बंगाल, पंजाब, बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश जैसे प्रान्तों की कम्यूनिटी प्रोजेक्टों द्वारा पंचवर्षीय योजना में जितना लाभ पहुंच रहा है, उतना लाभ इस राज्य को अभी प्राप्त नहीं है। इस का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि मैं पक्षपात का दोषारोप इस सरकार पर लगान जा रहा हूं। कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि दूर की चीज दूर की ही होती है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा आन्ध्र प्रान्त की जनता को पंचवर्षीय योजना से लाभ पहुंचाया जाना चाहिये। पहिली पंचवर्षीय योजना से तो वह अधिक लाभ नहीं उठा सका है मगर मझे पूर्ण आशा है कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में नवनिर्मित आन्ध्र राज्य का पूरा ध्यान रखा जायगा उस को अधिक आर्थिक सहायता दी जायगी जिस से कि उस की जनता को हर प्रकार से लाभ पहुंच सके और वह दूसरे प्रान्त को यह दिखा सके कि भाषावार प्रान्त होन के नाते वह स्वयं अपना कार्य कर सकता है, अपना पालन कर सकता है और अपनी जनता की रक्षा कर सकता है, उन की प्रगति और उन्नति के लिए काम कर सकता है।

यह हर्ष का विषय है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने राज्यों के पुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में एक आयोग की नियुक्ति कर दी है। आशा है कि यह आयोग बहुत जल्द सारे देश का भ्रमण करेगा और इस विषय में जनता के विचार मालूम करेगा। मझे आशा है कि नवनिर्मित आन्ध्र राज्य के अगल बगल रहने वाले जो दो करोड़ आन्ध्र बन्धु हैं, जिन की इच्छा भी अपने पड़ोस के नये राज्य के साथ रहने की है, उन की भी इच्छा पूर्ण हो जायेगी, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है।

उसके लिये मैं आशा करता हूं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार किसी तरह से हिचकेगी नहीं।

मैं नहीं चाहता कि सिर्फ आंध्र के लोग ही उसका लाभ उठाये बल्कि मेरी इच्छा यह है कि देश भर में जितने लोग हैं सब उसका लाभ उठाये। मैं कुछ लोगों के इस कहने से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि अगर अलग अलग प्रान्त बनें तो केन्द्र कमजोर हो जाता है। मैं इस बात को कभी नहीं मानता। मेरा कहना है कि केन्द्र इस तरह कमजोर नहीं होता है। बल्कि मजबूत होता है। केन्द्र एक बहुत बड़ा बगीचा है जिसमें रंग रंग के पौधे हैं, कुछ नये पौधे हैं और कुछ पुराने पौधे हैं, तो अगर उस बगीचे में नये पौधे रखे जाते हैं तो इसका मतलब यह कभी नहीं हो सकता कि उससे बगीचा कमजोर हो जाय। वह कमजोर नहीं होता बल्कि ताकतवर हो जाता है। इस से सारे भारत की एकता खत्म नहीं होती बल्कि वह और भी ताकतवर हो जाती है।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह बात अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति को नज़र में रखकर कहना चाहता हूँ। आज युद्ध का भय प्रकट किया जा रहा है और कुछ लोग यह भी कहने लगे हैं कि हम अमेरिका के स्टूजेज (stooges) हो जाते हैं, यह हो जाते हैं, वह हो जाते हैं। वे लोग जितना भी इल्ज़ाम इस सरकार पर लगा सकते थे उतना लगाया, जो कुछ भी इल्ज़ाम इस नेतृत्व पर लगा सकते थे वह सब कुछ लगाया लेकिन मैं आपको याद दिला देना चाहता हूँ कि यह वह नेतृत्व है जिसने सारी दुनिया को चकित कर दिया है। यह वह नेतृत्व है जिसने कि खून की बिना एक बूंद बहाये ही ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यशाही को यहां से हटा दिया और उस में पूर्ण रूप से सफल हुई। इसके नेतृत्व में ही सैकड़ों देशी राज्यों का खात्मा बिना खून बहाये हुआ और वहां गणराज्य की और जनराज्य की स्थापना की गई। यही नहीं, यह वह नेतृत्व है जिसके कारण शान्ति से जमींदारी प्रथा का अन्त हुआ और उसके स्थान पर किसानों और

मजदूरों की भलाई के लिये जो कुछ किया जाना था वह हुआ। उस काम को यह नेतृत्व बहुत कुछ कर चुका है और आगे भी कर रहा है। इतनी छोटो सी अवधि में इस नेतृत्व ने इतने बड़े बड़े काम कर के दिखाये। जो टीका टिप्पणी करने वाले हैं उनसे मैं पूछता हूँ कि उन्होंने क्या बरके दिखाया, उन्होंने कोई एक भी काम करके दिखाया है, सिवाय इसके कि उन्होंने नारे लगाये और तरह तरह के झंग दिखाये, इसके अलावा कोई काम करके नहीं दिखा पाये। यदि मुकम्मिल सियासी आज़ादी दिलाने के बाद आर्थिक स्वतंत्रता इस नेतृत्व में नहीं हो सकती तो मैं नहीं समझता कि किसी दूसरे नेतृत्व में हो सकती है जो कि दूसरे राष्ट्रों पर निर्भर रहते हैं। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि सब कुछ इसी नेतृत्व में हो सकता है और इसी नेतृत्व में डेमोक्रेसी (democracy) चल सकती है। आज जो ताकतें अपने को इंकलाबी ताकतें कहती हैं वे मेरी राय में इंकलाबी ताकतें नहीं हैं बल्कि वे इंकलाब के विश्व हैं और वे तानाशाही ताकतें हैं, वे यहां डेमोक्रेसी को बिन्दुल खत्म करने वाली ताकतें हैं। मेरा तो विश्वास है कि उनके होते हुये भी, उनकी काली करतूतें चलते हुए भी, इस देश की प्रगति होगी और इस देश में जनतंत्र राज्य कायम रहेगा। इस देश के इस नेतृत्व में केवल एशिया का नेतृत्व करने की ही नहीं बरन सारी दुनिया का नेतृत्व करने की क्षमता है। यह नेतृत्व इसके योग्य है और हमें पूर्ण विश्वास है कि हमारे पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व में ही यह गणतंत्र रहेगा और सारी दुनिया में उनका नाम रहेगा, चाहे कोई कितना भी विरोध करे।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 20.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved and seconded:—

"That the Members of the Council of States 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 15th February 1954."

Notice of 31 amendments have been received to this Motion. I would like all of them to be moved formally at this stage excepting 3, 4, 10, 13 (a), 13 (c), 15, 16, 20, 22, 23; 25 and 31 (iv) which are disallowed.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret the failure to mention the inadequate measures taken by the Government, resulting in the Kumbh Mela tragedy at Allahabad'."

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

'but regret the failure to mention the callousness and indifference shown by the authorities in going through a reception and musical entertainment, hardly a few hours after the Kumbh Mela tragedy, at Allahabad'."

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the statement regarding foreign affairs contains no positive measures to be adopted by the Government for the defence of the country'."

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

'but regret that the measures adumbrated by the Government are inadequate and totally insufficient

for the economic development of the country'."

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that in connection with the reference to the progress of the river valley projects no mention is made of the failure to remove the just grievances of workers engaged in these projects; which in fact is hampering their successful execution'."

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

'but regret that while cursorily referring to the unemployment problem, the address contains no adequate appreciation of the growing unemployment problem nor, any indication of satisfactory measures to solve it'."

[Shri B. Rath in whose name stood amendment No. 9 was absent.]

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret to note the failure of Government to tackle the problem of unemployment in an effective manner'."

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

'but regret to note Government's failure to initiate and pursue a vigorous national programme suited to the present occasion to meet any threat to our national security and development'."

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that—

\* \* \*

(b) no explicit opinion is expressed in the Address about the

reported intention of Pakistan to enter into alliances, military and otherwise, with U. S. A., Turkey and other Middle East countries;

\* \* \* \*

(d) no condemnation is expressed of the official bungling, mismanagement and callousness that were responsible for the appalling Kumbh Mela tragedy on the *Amavasya* day (February 3, 1954)."

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret to note that the Central Government is shelving its responsibility in ensuring freedom of expression and association to the linguistic minorities, particularly in Bihar, which is essential for the proper functioning of the States Re-organisation Commission'."

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

'but regret to note the callousness and indifference of the Central Government towards the Kumbh Mela tragedy'."

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that there is no proper appreciation by the Central Government of the necessity—

(a) of clarifying and enlarging the terms of reference of the States Reorganisation Commission;

(b) or referring specific issues to the Commission;

(c) of bringing about and ensuring proper and peaceful conditions, in conformity with accepted concepts of democracy, namely, freedom of as-

sociation and expression and mobilisation of views; and

(d) of neutralising the present administration in the disputed areas, particularly in Bihar, namely in Manbhum, Singhbhum and Seraikella and Kharsawan'."

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

'but regret to note the tendency on the part of the Government to rely increasingly on promulgation of Ordinances in inter-session periods of Parliament particularly in regard to short term taxation measures without the authority of Parliament'."

SHRI PRASADARAO (Andhra): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that no mention has been made of the worsening agrarian crisis and the falling purchasing power of the masses'."

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

'but regret that serious note has not been taken of the growing unemployment both in urban and rural areas and the failure so far of the Government to provide employment or necessary relief to the unemployed'."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: (Andhra): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that Prisoners of War in Korea have been handed over to U. N. Command against the terms of armistice agreement, and that the Government of India continues to conclude aid agreements with the Government of U. S. A. which threatens our very borders by concluding military pact with

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

Pakistan and establish military bases there'."

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

'but regret that Government of India has concluded an agreement with the Government of Ceylon without adequately protecting the rights of persons of Indian origin there'."

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

"but regret that the Address speaks of "significant progress" and of "considerable achievement" when hundreds of millions go without enough food, clothing, education or medical facilities, when hundreds of millions are unemployed and other hundreds of millions go under-paid and under-employed and when the agrarian and industrial life of our country faces a serious crisis because of the policies, that are being pursued by the Government of India'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not express regret at the failure of authorities in making proper arrangements for the pilgrims at Kumbh Mela and at the singular inappropriateness of holding an At Home and Music Concert on the day of Kumbh Mela tragedy'."

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

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

'but regret to note that the Address has failed to suggest measures for safeguarding the security of this country in view of changing world situation particularly the proposed military alliance between Turkey and Pakistan and the military aid of U. S. A. to Pakistan'."

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir I move:

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

'but regret that—

(i) the Government's foreign policy suffers very serious limitations and inconsistencies which come in the way of India playing her full part in the struggle for world peace;

(ii) effective steps are not yet taken by the Government in order to fight the U. S. threat to the independence and sovereignty of our country resulting from the U. S.-Pakistan military pact;

(iii) there is neither objective appraisal of the deteriorating economic situation in the country nor are there any effective proposals to improve it in the Address;

\* \* \* \*

(v) the Address does not make any reference to the responsibility of the Government for the grim tragedy at the Kumbh Mela, nor does it contain any proposals for relief measures for the relatives of the victims of that tragedy'."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendments and the motion are now open for discussion.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar):  
Sir, I rise on a point of order before the discussion starts. My point of order is this. It is a well-known and well-established principle of law that the merit or demerit of a matter which is *sub-judice* or is under investigation or is being enquired into should not be discussed in a House of legislature. The reason for this principle of law is this.

(Interruptions.)

I am in possession of the House. The reason I was mentioning was this, that the persons who are enquiring into the matter may be influenced by the

decision of the Legislature. I am sure, Sir, that in this particular case the members who are enquiring into the Kumbh Mela tragedy will not be influenced but the principle of law is there and, therefore, I want your ruling. If you accept my point of order, I would request you, Sir, to order all those Members who are going to speak on this motion.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: How can a point of order arise when nobody has spoken?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: On a point of order, Sir. The amendments have already been moved and the point of order is out of order at the moment. If there was to be a point of order, it should have been mentioned at the time of the moving of the amendments.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: There is another point which I would like to mention. One point of importance, first of all, is that it is not a court of law. The point of law which he has referred to is bad in law because the matter has been referred to in the President's speech and we are debating the President's Address and the court of enquiry is not a court of law. Therefore, there is no point at all which the hon. Member should have raised.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI C. C. BISWAS): Sir, I was going to point out that the point of order which he has raised would have been very appropriate if we were in a court of law, or if we were discussing a matter which was before a court of law. That is not the case here; mention has been made of this matter in the President's Address and there is no reason why Members of this House should not be given an opportunity to discuss it. If they make statements which are the subject matter of an enquiry, it will be for the Members to regulate their speeches and consider whether or not they should say anything on the matter which is now before the court of enquiry. The Prime Minister told us yesterday that the Members will have an opportunity of

discussing this matter critically with reference to the points which are the subject matter of enquiry when the report of the Enquiry Committee is placed before the House and, subject to that, I think, Sir, it should be open to Members of this House to express their sentiments regarding this terrible tragedy.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN: I know the decision you will give, Sir, after this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me say what I have to say since you have raised a point of order. There is a provision in the rules which says that anything is admissible provided it shall not relate to any matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India. Since it has been said that it is not a court of law, the point of order is not tenable.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN: Sir, I raise another point of order: Although the Kumbh Mela is of all-India interest, yet it is purely a provincial or a State subject.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: What is the point of order. The point of order cannot be raised before.....

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN: The Constitution of India is very clear on this point. We find the following in List II—State List—of the Seventh Schedule: Entry 1 mentions Public Order, entry 2 mentions Police, entry 6 mentions Public Health and Sanitation, entry 7 mentions Pilgrimages and entry 28 mentions Markets and Fairs.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It has no reference to "At homes".

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN: Since Kumbh Mela is a State subject, we have no power to discuss it. It is for the State Legislature to discuss it. This is my point of order. I know the ruling which is going to be against me, but I want your ruling on this also.

**SHRI C. G. K. REDDY:** There is no point of order, Sir.

**SHRI C. C. BISWAS:** Supposing a railway disaster takes place in any part of India. It is suggested that this matter cannot be discussed on the floor of Parliament, but, must be a subject matter of discussion within the State where the disaster occurred? That is a proposition which we can never accept; because the tragedy took place at Allahabad, to say that the whole of the responsibility must lie with the authorities in that State and that, therefore, no one outside that State is competent to say anything about it, is a proposition which we cannot accept. Sir, I do not take such a restricted and narrow view of the rights of Members of this House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** For the reasons urged by the Leader of the House and the consideration that the President referred to the Kumbh tragedy in his Address and the *Mela* was not a Provincial but a national festival and the victims of the tragedy belonged to all parts of the country and the Centre agreed to the raising of the terminal tax, we cannot say that discussion on it here should be banned.

**SHRI H. C. MATHUR:** Mr. Chairman, I was amazed at what the hon. Member who moved the motion said about the military pact between Pakistan, the United States and Turkey.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

He wants to wait and watch and judge the affair from the quantum of aid that is given to Pakistan. Sir, it is just contrary to what the hon. Prime Minister said on the floor of this House and what he has been saying all over the country. The hon. Prime Minister has never missed an opportunity and  
4 P.M.      an occasion to denounce this pact. As a matter of fact he has denounced this pact basically and on principle. The quantum of aid received is absolutely immaterial because this pact just undermines the entire foreign policy of India for peace and we feel

very much concerned about it. Because though Pakistan is directly concerned, they cannot dump gunpowder at our doors and if their house is blown up, our house will be rocked too. Sir, to my mind the master plan of the master diplomats is unfolding itself and the very purpose for which Pakistan was carved out and created is being fulfilled by these pacts and agreements. Speaking on this very subject at the close of the last session when foreign affairs were discussed I submitted and I find it expedient today to repeat and emphasize that our policy in respect of Kashmir has been weak, hesitant and absolutely unrealistic.

Sir, we have left our fellowmen in Kashmir in a state of suspense and stalemate though the people of Kashmir have in a very unmistakable manner given expression to their feelings of deep confidence in India and to their desire for a full and final accession. It was most unfortunate that we committed the suicidal mistake of not driving out the aggressors from the occupied territory, clean out of it, before we stopped and before we ordered cease-fire. Sir, it would be really tragic if we do not realise even now that our case before U. N. O. should be confined only to driving out the aggressors and to claiming compensation for all the ravages that they have inflicted on that beautiful valley. Sir, this decision as a matter of fact should have been taken two years earlier. India would have been happier for that; Kashmir would have been happier for that and Pakistan would have reconciled to that realistic state of affairs and would have understood the position. This question should have been dead, buried and forgotten long back. It has unnecessarily been kept alive. The *Sadr-e-Riyasat* of Kashmir as well as the Prime Minister of Kashmir have spoken in clear and unmistakable manner. They cannot think in any other terms but full and final accession to India. There are only two political parties in the State and both those political parties as well as anybody that counts speak and support loudly the same decision and

particularly now the elected Constituent Assembly of that State has adopted a resolution ratifying such a decision and there is absolutely no reason why India should not accept that decision from Kashmir. Have we not been recognising—it is a square question which I want to ask—have we not been recognising this Constituent Assembly? Have we not recognised the recommendations of this Constituent Assembly? Has the President not been issuing orders on the recommendations of this Constituent Assembly? What, after all, are the reasons for not accepting that hand of friendship which has been extended by that State? The Prime Minister of that State mentioned only the other day, "We the people of Kashmir hereby extend our hand of friendship; we want full and final accession. It is now for the people of India and for the Government of India to accept that hand". I ask the Government: What are the reasons now for not accepting that hand of friendship and what are the reasons that we should not tell Pakistan that Kashmir is a part and parcel of India and that the accession is full and final? What the hon. Foreign Minister and Prime Minister of Pakistan have stated in regard to this matter is absolutely out of context and if anybody is responsible for bringing about such a state of affairs it is Pakistan itself. Sir, I would submit, and I would submit with all the emphasis at my command, that we must take a realistic attitude in this matter. How can we forget that Pakistan never hesitated to launch a treacherous attack on India in Kashmir? Let us not forget that Pakistan would not hesitate to launch an attack on India if it were strong enough to do that. What are our reasons to believe that Pakistan has changed its attitude? As a matter of fact, the past indicates that and the present confirms it and every event is in that direction. The Prime Minister of India was magnanimous enough to offer a plebiscite and we were anxious enough to create an atmosphere of friendship and friendliness. We were anxious enough to have nego-

tiations, to accord the warmest of receptions to the Prime Minister of Pakistan here. We wanted to settle this affair by negotiations and in between again such a thing happens which clouds the whole issue and which makes it obvious to us that the purpose for which Pakistan was carved out and created is being fulfilled in this manner.

Sir, the last time when Pakistan attacked Kashmir, we were almost caught napping. It was almost by a hair's breadth that a great tragedy was averted. I hope we will not be caught babbling this time. A vigilant and vigorous India alone can stop aggression. Our Government and our people must therefore be vigilant and vigorous. A national policy must be launched. As a matter of fact, I have tabled a resolution for this very session of Parliament that a convention of all the political leaders in the country and Independents should be invited by the Government of India and a programme of national security should be chalked out and it should be pursued. Aggression or no aggression, we are living in such times that we must be vigilant against Pakistan's designs; we must be vigilant against foreign intrigues and we must be vigilant against the fifth columnists in this country. More than that, we must develop our national vigour and launch a national programme, a movement to organise our defence and to steel our will and determination. It is only such vigilance and vigour which will avert the catastrophe. Sir, my complaint against the Government is that even this issue of international crisis is being made a party issue. The Government is thinking only on party lines and treating this matter on a party level rather than on a national level. It is really unfortunate that they want to take advantage of this international situation for the party benefit. They should have called a convention, as I suggested. The President of the Congress who is also the Prime Minister of India lost no time in asking the Congress Party to organise meetings and processions and organise public opinion in this



[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

matter. I think, Sir, that in such national affairs, in such affairs of national importance, the proper thing would have been not a party organisation, but an all-India organisation. So it was definitely with that background that I tabled my resolution. And it is for that purpose that I most earnestly appeal to the Government that on such occasions we must rise above party levels. I attach a very great importance to the proposed military pact, Sir, and I do not think it was a correct advice which was given by our friend that we should wait and watch. There is nothing for us to wait and watch. We must be up and doing. It is one thing to be panicky and it is another thing to be vigilant and to be doing. We are not at all afraid of it. We do not bother our heads about that. We know that we have got inherent strength and that inherent strength has got to be mobilised. That is all that I have asked for. And I wish that we should remind our American friends that atom bomb is strong and hydrogen bomb is stronger, but man is the strongest of all. They may have the T. N. T. power to wipe off the masses but they have no power to wipe off man and man's desire for peace. It has been the sustained policy of India to restrict the sphere of war. It has been our constant endeavour to seal off an area to be the sanctuary of peace. Why are our American friends anxious and why do they not realise that by trying to increase their sphere of influence they are trying to come face to face with the other power-bloc? Any small incident can just set the fuse on. We may have to pass through fire. And I wish our American friends and our Pakistan friends to understand that of course we will get burns and we will have to pass through fire, but we will come out of that fire and we will emerge out of that fire steelled to better strength but that fire will consume the might of America and that will destroy Pakistan for ever. Let us not mince matters and let us be very clear about it. Can America say that India is not democratic? Do Americans not believe that it is only through India and India

alone that democracy can survive in Asia? If democracy and free world are the motives of America, then America has got to be most friendly with India and most helpful to India. But we find that America has taken up a most unfriendly attitude and a most unfriendly action by going into such a pact. Sir, as I submitted at the very beginning, my feeling is that our Anglo-American friends are not so much interested in a free world and a democratic world. It is all tall and hollow talk. They are interested only in increasing their sphere of influence and they are interested only in their trade and commerce. And it should be quite obvious to us that this military pact is directed only towards the increase of that sphere of influence and to exert a sort of influence and pressure on India so that India may be sucked into that sphere.

Then, Sir, there is another thing. Although it may look a bit paradoxical, yet all the same I feel strongly—and I do not hesitate in stating—that an industrially developed India will be a great headache to America, and England particularly. As a matter of fact, our textile industry is already a source of great anxiety to the British. We are not only self-sufficient, but we are exporting and seizing the markets. Japan is coming into the picture and England is facing starvation. They must take the earliest opportunity to destroy the textile industry of India. As I submitted, it might look very horrifying but it is a fact. History repeats itself. History has taught us a lesson. Is it not true history that hundreds of superb weavers of Dacca fame were liquidated in the interest of British Textile Industry? Therefore I would like to warn the Government of India to take all precautions and all care. Again I repeat that there is no occasion for us to be panicky. There is no occasion for us to be worried about it. We have also noted and noticed that there have been political murders in Asia, and the shady hands of the power blocs have been suspected. I hope our security organisation is alert

and vigilant, and I do think that they will discharge their duties very well. But still I find it necessary to alert them and to give them a warning, because I will never forget that it was through the culpable negligence of our security organisation that we lost the greatest man that India had produced.

Sir, I will confine my remarks about the foreign policy only to this aspect of the question and would like to touch another very important point. The more I have travelled the more people I have met, the more convinced have I felt that it is neither Communism nor communalism which threatens the integrity and progress of our country. It is the growing spirit of provincialism. The poor masses are not concerned. It is only the politicians and the officers of the Government at the top who are responsible for corrupting the national life in this sphere. Just think of the unseemly attitude which the State of Bihar took in respect of the Commission for the Reorganisation of States. What an unseemly attitude have they taken? Think of the arrogant attitude taken by the Chief Minister of Bombay in respect of Abu and the adjoining areas. I am simply surprised to see that these people are behaving like Sultans as if they have conquered certain areas and annexed those territories to their kingdoms. Then we see the outburst of the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh over the location of the steel plant as if heavens would fall if it is located in Orissa or Bihar or Bengal. What does it matter where it is located, so long as it is in the best interests of the nation? I do not mind Abu and the adjoining areas remaining in Bombay if the people of that area so desire. Let them so remain. I do not mind it, but it is really absurd that the Chief Minister of Bombay should refuse the Home Minister of India and say that he would not put the Resolution which was unanimously passed by the Rajasthan Legislature before the Legislature of the Bombay State to take their opinion. He has simply ignored the Home Minister of the Government of India. The Constitution

requires that the other States concerned should be consulted. The Resolution has been in the hands of the Home Minister for some time now, but he feels absolutely helpless, because the Chief Minister of Bombay would not take it to the Bombay Legislature. As I said, I do not mind if Abu and the adjoining areas remain in Bombay. Let them remain so, if the people of those areas want to stay there. What does it matter? But this sort of attitude by the people at the top is simply indefensible and we have to hang our heads in shame. It definitely irritates us to the utmost.

Then, Sir, we are all aware of the small kingdoms which are being carved out in the offices. Here is a departmental head who happens to be a Punjabi, and all the Sardars must be provided for. Here is a gentleman from Madras and all the South Indians must be flooded in. What is all this nonsense? I repeat, Sir, that neither Communism nor communalism but it is the growing spirit of provincialism which is the greatest danger to the integrity, development and progress of India. The Government of India stands to blame in this matter. They must take strong action and put this down with a heavy hand. We have got this States Reorganisation Commission. Only peaceful representations and proper evidence before the Commission should be there. Let the Commission come to its decision and I think, if necessary, even the Constitution should be changed to avoid the contingencies of the type which I have pointed out. Let people who have no concern in these disputes, people of independent views, consider this matter. Their decisions should be respected, and any activity and any action against that decision should be treated as anti-national, and the people who indulge in such provincialism should be punished. They should be treated more strongly than even the corrupt officers.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): What about the Ministers?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: That is exactly what I am saying. When I thought of this, I thought, 'Who is going to punish these officers?' That was my headache, because the Ministers are more guilty than the officers themselves. That is absolutely true. Sir, this is something which has got to be attended to. Wherever I went, when I went to such national institutions like Chittaranjan and Sindri and when I talked to the people there, this sort of complaint was voiced by them. If the departmental head happens to be of a particular province, all sorts of things happen there. I will deal with this further when I discuss the Railway Budget and say what is happening in the Railway Department, and will cite some instances before the hon the Railway Minister.

My next amendment was about unemployment. The President himself has referred to it in his Address and he has felt concern about it. It is certainly a matter for deep concern and anxiety that there should be such acute unemployment even at a time when we are in the midst of the first Five Year Plan. I submit that I was very much dismayed when I found that even in those areas where the execution of the Five Year Plan was in full swing and where other industrial development was taking place, the situation regarding unemployment was as acute as anywhere else. I am talking of the Damodar Valley Area. There are so many dams being constructed there; there are so many canals being dug there and it is in that area that we have Chittaranjan and Sindri, and yet I was told that educated young men—Bengalees—who were even prepared to take to manual labour, were being driven back disappointed. My friend who seconded the motion talked about the Five Year Plan. I think, Sir, that there can be no truer comment on the Five Year Plan than this increasing unemployment among the people. There is nothing which can give a better indication about the success of the Plan and if this is the state of affairs regarding

unemployment, it is absolutely unrealistic to talk about the success of the Five Year Plan.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only two minutes more.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Though the greatest concern and anxiety has been expressed regarding unemployment and though some haphazard actions have been taken, we have not even started with the first thing. There is no survey made in any sphere in any State about the real situation regarding unemployment. How are we going to meet the situation? How are we to tackle this problem? I asked this question more than eight months ago here on the floor of this House of the Minister for Labour, "Have you any agency, have you got any organisation, have you got any intention to go into this matter?" On occasions like this, a little concern is expressed, but how does it help?

Sir, I will close in a minute, but I cannot close my speech without referring to the most ghastly tragedy at Kumbh. I will not deal with it exhaustively, because it is the right of those friends who have tabled amendments on that subject, and because I have had an opportunity to speak first, I will not take away their rights. But I cannot help referring to it. What has happened there could not happen anywhere else. I am even prepared to believe that the Government made the very best arrangements conceivable. I do not know but I am told as a matter of fact that the Mela Officer took all pains and that he was a sincere and good worker. I have no reason to dispute that, but certainly the Government stands self-condemned, and I do not find words strong enough in any dictionary to condemn the Government when they say that they did not know about the affair till eight hours had passed after the occurrence. The Prime Minister of India and the Chief Minister of U. P. had confessed it. Does it lie in their mouth to say that they did not know about it for eight hours or nine hours? The House may condemn me for saying this, but I

will not hesitate to say that I was not shocked so much about the tragedy as by the fact that a garden and music party was held that very evening. Have we fallen so low, have we degraded ourselves to that extent? Such a thing is simply inconceivable in any civilised country, and we must express our greatest resentment against such a conduct on the part of authority, whether they be the highest dignitaries of the State or not. They do not remain so, when they are charged with such callousness. Thank you, Sir.

DR. RAGHU VIRA (Madhya Pradesh):

डा० रघुवीर (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बड़ा हर्ष है कि मैं माननीय अध्यक्ष राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी के अभिभाषण का अनुमोदन और उस पर अपना आभार प्रकट करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में सबसे बड़ा गुण, जो उनके नाम के अनुकूल ही है, "प्रसाद" है। जो बातें उन्होंने उसमें रखीं वह बड़े स्पष्ट रूप में रखीं। हमने पिछले वर्ष में क्या कुछ किया और अगले वर्ष में हमें क्या कुछ करना है इस पर हमें विचार करना है। आज हमारे समक्ष सब से बड़ी समस्या अपने देश की रक्षा की है। इस रक्षा की समस्या के सम्बन्ध में जो हमारी नीति १९४७ से अब तक रही है उस पर एक दृष्टिपात करना आवश्यक है क्योंकि हमारी शान्तिप्रिय नीति का ही आज यह परिणाम दिखलाई पड़ता है। हम इसके अतिरिक्त दूसरी नीति का अनुसरण नहीं कर सकते थे और जहां तक हो सकेगा हम संसार में शान्ति स्थापित करने का यत्न करते रहेंगे।

जिस समय भारत स्वतंत्र हुआ उस समय ही भारत के हृदय में एक अग्नि थी। वह अग्नि थी एशिया के देशों के ऊपर पाश्चात्य देशों ने जो अन्याय किये, पिछले ३००-४०० वर्षों में, उस अन्याय को दूर करना, हमने इंडोनेशिया की स्वतंत्र होने में सहायता की।

उस का परिणाम यह हुआ कि डच लोग और उनके सहायक अमेरिकन हमसे कुछ बहुत प्रसन्न नहीं हुए। इसके पश्चात्, जुलाई १९५० से लेकर आज तक, हमने संयुक्त राष्ट्र में चीन को सम्मिलित किये जाने का आग्रह किया। अमेरिका को यह बात नहीं रुची। कुछ अन्य देशों को भी यह बात नहीं रुची। उसके पश्चात् जनवरी १९५१ में जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र में चीन को एग्रेसर (aggressor) (आक्रामक) घोषित किया गया उस समय भारत वर्ष अकेला ऐसा देश था जिस ने कहा नहीं, संसार में शान्ति स्थापित करो, यदि चीन को आक्रामक घोषित करोगे तो विश्व शान्ति भंग हो जायेगी। चीन के साथ समझौता कराने के लिये भारतवर्ष ने अनेक देशों का नेतृत्व किया जिनमें एशियाई देश और अरब देश सम्मिलित थे। इस प्रकार के प्रयत्न बहुत दिनों तक चलते रहे। परन्तु हमें इन में सफलता नहीं हुई। उसके पश्चात् जब अमेरिका जापान के साथ संधि करने लगा तब हमने बड़े विनम्र भाव से फिर संसार में शान्ति को स्थापित करने के लिये न्याय को ही सबसे बड़ा आधार मान कर यह कहा कि यदि सैन फ्रांसिस्को में जापान के साथ संधि करनी है तो उसके लिये चीन के साम्यवादी शासन के प्रतिनिधि भी बुलाने चाहियें, नहीं तो शान्ति पुनः भंग हो जायेगी। संयुक्त राष्ट्र ने इस बात को स्वीकार नहीं किया। हमने इस सैन फ्रांसिस्को की जापान के साथ संधि में भाग नहीं लिया। उस के अतिरिक्त हमने अलग से एक संधि, कुछ मासों के पश्चात्, जापान के साथ की। हमारे पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान ने पश्चिम के राष्ट्रों को प्रसन्न करने के लिये सैन फ्रांसिस्को की संधि में भाग लिया, और जापान के साथ जो संधि हुई उस पर हस्ताक्षर किये। परन्तु हमने कहा कि जापान की संधि में जापान के साथ अन्याय हुआ है। रयूकू और बोनिन द्वीप, जो जापान के हैं वे उससे छीन लिये गये हैं, और उसे अपनी रक्षा करने का अधिकार नहीं दिया गया जो कि

[Dr. Raghu Vira.]

उसे मिलना चाहिये। मोरोक्को, ट्यनी-सिया तथा इंडो-चायना में फ्रांस के जो अत्याचार चल रहे हैं उसके विरुद्ध भी हमने अपनी ध्वनि उठाई। गोआ में पुर्तगाल विद्यमान है, पांडीचेरी में फ्रांस विद्यमान है। हमसे एक ओर फ्रांस रुष्ट हुआ तो दूसरी ओर इंडोनेशिया का पक्ष लेने पर हॉलैंड रुष्ट हुआ। इन देशों को हम से कोई प्रेम नहीं।

हमारे अमेरिका के साथ आज तक सदा अच्छे सम्बन्ध चले आये थे। अमेरिका के साथ भारतवर्ष का राजकीय सम्पर्क पिछले युद्ध काल में हुआ। उस से पहले हमारा कोई राजकीय सम्बन्ध, कोई सम्पर्क अमेरिका के साथ नहीं था। हां, सन् १८१० में अमेरिका से यहां ईसाई धर्म के प्रचारक आए, सन् १८३० में अमेरिका में एक बड़ा भारी कन्वन्शन (convention) हुआ और उसके अनुसार सन् १९३० से लेकर आज तक लाखों और करोड़ों डालर भारतीयों को भारतीयता से अलग करने के लिये व्यय किये गये। केवल धर्म का ही प्रश्न नहीं था, ये अमेरिकन प्रचारक भारत वर्ष से जाकर अमेरिका में यहां के सम्बन्ध में जो प्रचार करते थे, जो हमारे देश के रहन सहन और पहनाव के दृश्य अमेरिका की जनता के सामने चित्रित करते थे—वे हमारे लिये कोई बहुत अच्छे चित्र नहीं थे—जिनके द्वारा वह यह बतलाते थे कि किस प्रकार हमारा देश जंगली देश है, असभ्य देश है, किस प्रकार हमारा धर्म, हमारा कर्म, हमारे आचार-व्यवहार धूषित है, यहां तक कि नांगे लोगों के नंगे चित्र प्रस्तुत करते थे। अमेरिका में इन अमेरिकन प्रचारकों ने वहां की जनता में भारतवर्ष के प्रति द्वेष-भावना, तथा असभ्यता की भावना उत्पन्न की उसका एक प्रमुख उदाहरण जो हमारे सम्मुख है वह मिस मेयो की “मदर इंडिया” (“Mother India”) है। जितनी यह पुस्तक अमेरिका में भारत के विषय में पढ़ी गई, आज तक उतनी संख्या

में कोई दूसरा ग्रन्थ नहीं पढ़ा गया। हां, यह सच है कि एमरसन, थोरो, हिटमन आदि विद्वानों ने भारतवर्ष के उच्च आदर्श और दार्शनिकता से प्रभावित साहित्य को उपस्थित किया। यह भी सच है कि स्वामी विवेकानंद और उनके अनुयायियों ने भी अमेरिका में भारत के सम्बन्ध में सच्ची विचार धारा फैलाने का यत्न किया। यह भी सच है कि रज्वेल्ट ने चर्चिल से कहा कि तुम भारतवर्ष के साथ समझौता क्यों नहीं कर लेते। यह सब कुछ होते हुए भी सन् १९४७ के पश्चात् अमेरिका के साथ जो सीधा सम्बन्ध हुआ उसमें यद्यपि समय समय पर अमेरिका के बड़े उच्च विचारकों ने यह कहा कि “वी आर ग्रेटफुल टेट देयर इज एन इंडिया” (we are grateful that there is an India) (हम इस बात के आभारी हैं कि विश्व में एक स्थान भारत नाम का भी विद्यमान है) जो केवल शान्ति और न्याय की ओर ध्यान देता है। किंतु फिर भी भारतवर्ष की तटस्थता और उदासीनता की नीति अमेरिकन योजनाओं के अनुकूल नहीं बैठती।

अमेरिका की संसार को अपने ओर लाने की योजनाएं दो प्रकार की थीं : एक, आर्थिक सहायता और दूसरी, सैनिक सहायता। आर्थिक सहायता के क्षेत्र में हम लोग बहुत शीघ्र नहीं आए तब तक नहीं जब तक हमें यह विश्वास नहीं हो गया कि अमेरिका की आर्थिक सहायता हमको बंधन में नहीं बांधेगी। जब अमेरिका ने हमको विश्वास दिलाया कि हम आर्थिक सहायता के बदले में तुमसे कुछ नहीं चाहते तब हमने अमेरिका से आर्थिक सहायता ली। किन्तु आर्थिक सहायता देने से अमेरिका को सतोष, शान्ति नहीं मिली। वह आज अपना चक्र रूसी और रूस के साथ वाले राज्यों के चारों ओर बना रहा है। अभी उस चक्र का घेरा पूरा नहीं हुआ, इसलिये

उसको यह षडिकर नहीं कि भारत केवल शान्ति चाहता है। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि अमेरिका शान्ति नहीं चाहता। अमेरिका शान्ति चाहता है किन्तु उसका शान्ति का मार्ग दूसरा ही है। शान्ति का मार्ग वह हमारे समान नहीं मानता किन्तु वह युद्ध द्वारा शान्ति का मार्ग देखता है। उस युद्ध के लिए वह चारों ओर अपनी श्रृंखलाएं फैला रहा है। यद्यपि अमेरिका ने हमको आर्थिक सहायता देते समय कहा कि हमको इसके बदले में कुछ नहीं चाहिये, किन्तु फिर भी उनके हृदय में आशा थी कि भारतवर्ष सहायता करेगा। परन्तु जब उसकी आशाएं पूरी नहीं हुईं तो उसे दुख हुआ। अमेरिका के बड़े बड़े प्रसिद्ध समाचार-पत्रों ने हमारे पूज्य भद्रय नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को "Political Peter Pan, the Lost Leader, the Man in the middle" इत्यादि उपाधियों से विभूषित किया है।

अब हमारा आगे क्या कर्तव्य है इस नये वर्ष में जिसका हम आरम्भ करते हैं। राष्ट्र-पति ने बड़ी बुद्धिमत्ता से इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहा। जहां तक विचार का सम्बन्ध है हमारी नीति एक है, किन्तु जहां तक कार्य प्रणाली का सम्बन्ध है, अभी उसमें हमें वास्तव में विचार करना चाहिये। हमने आज तक किसी के साथ सैनिक संधि नहीं की। अभी भी दृष्टिगोचर नहीं कि हम किसी देश के साथ सैनिक संधि करेंगे। किन्तु हां, जब युद्ध सामने हो तो यह निश्चय करना होगा कि क्या किया जाय। आज तक हम शान्ति के बारे में सोचते आए। परन्तु जो शान्ति का सरोवर हमने बनाया था उसमें आज अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान ने एक बड़ी भारी चट्टान लाकर डाल दी जिसके फलस्वरूप इस सरोवर में ऐसा आंदोलन उठ खड़ा हुआ है कि उसके छोटे सारे संसार में फैल रहे हैं। रूस ने इस संधि का विरोध किया है, और

देशों ने इस संधि का विरोध किया है, किन्तु अमेरिका ने अब इसको दूसरा विशाल स्वरूप दिया है। वह यह कि पाकिस्तान से लेकर तुर्की तक वह सैनिक सहायता देगा। यह सहायता किस प्रकार की होगी, कितनी होगी यद्यपि समाचार-पत्रों में इसका विवरण आ रहा है किन्तु निश्चित रूप से अथवा अंतिम रूप से इस सहायता का क्या स्वरूप और परिणाम होगा यह भी हमें अभी देखना शेष है। हमारे सामने हमारे पिछले मित्र ने अभी कहा कि हमें इन परिस्थितियों में क्या करना होगा। प्रश्न हमारे सामने इस नये वर्ष में होगा कि क्या हम बाहर से सहायता लेंगे अथवा नहीं? यह ऐसा प्रश्न है, जिसका हां या ना में उत्तर देना व्यर्थ है। यह निश्चित है कि हम स्वयं अस्त्रशस्त्र नहीं बना सकते, और जितने अस्त्र शस्त्रों की हमें आवश्यकता पड़ेगी उसको हम मोल भी नहीं ले सकते। अभी तक दरिद्रता और भूख को दूर करने के लिये हमने पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाई है। अब यदि आवश्यकता हुई तो दसगुना, बीसगुना सौगुना अपनी शक्ति लगा कर हम स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिये योजना बनाएंगे, और दानवों और आततायियों का सामना करेंगे। किन्तु इसके लिये यदि हमको बाहर से सहायता लेने की आवश्यकता पड़ी तो हम उसे अवश्य लेंगे, ऐसा मेरा अपना वैयक्तिक विश्वास है। अभी तक हमने विदेशों से केवल आर्थिक सहायता ली थी, किन्तु आर्थिक सहायता लेने से पहले हमने यह निश्चय कर लिया था कि हम किसी प्रकार के बन्धन में नहीं पड़ेंगे। मुझे विश्वास है कि जिस समय युद्ध का वातावरण चारों ओर होगा और हमको यह दिखलाई पड़ेगा कि शान्ति के लिये नहीं अपने अस्तित्व मात्र के लिये हमको सहायता लेने की आवश्यकता है, तो हम ऐसा अवश्य करेंगे, एक से, दो से अथवा अनेक से, यह कहना इस समय आवश्यक नहीं।

[Dr. Raghu Vira]

पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में एक दो बातें करनी आवश्यक हैं। जिस समय पाकिस्तान की रचना हुई उस समय हमने कोई विशेष दुख प्रकट नहीं किया। हमको दुख हुआ किन्तु हमने उसको स्वीकार किया, इस आशा से कि इस देश में शान्ति रहेगी। किन्तु पाकिस्तान की जनता ने, वहाँ के समाचार-पत्रों ने हमें पहले दिन से ही शत्रु कहना आरम्भ किया। उन्होंने "जोशे जिहाद" जैसी फिल्म अपने देश में दिखलाई। प्रमुख संस्थाओं को इसलाम के नाम पर भड़काया जा रहा है, उनके एजेंट लाखों की संख्या में यहाँ काम कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने पुस्तकें प्रकाशित की हैं २०० की संख्या में, जिनमें लिखा है : "डिमोक्रेटिक (democratic), सेक्यूलर (Secular), नेशनल (national) राज्य का विध्वंस करना हमारा कर्तव्य है।" ऐसी दशा में भारतीय जनता का कर्तव्य है कि वह अपने अन्दर इसके विरुद्ध एक नई जागृति उत्पन्न करे। मेरे पूर्ववक्ता मित्र ने कहा : क्या यह कोई पार्टी इशू (Party issue) है, क्या यह कांग्रेस पार्टी का काम है? मैं मानता हूँ कि केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी का काम नहीं, समस्त भारत की जनता का है। मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता है कि प्रत्येक पार्टी संकट के समय में अपनी सहायता देगी, और समस्त देश उठेगा। और यदि यहाँ (dause macabre) यम ताण्डव, (dause de feu) अग्नि ताण्डव हुआ, यदि यहाँ पर किसी प्रकार की भी ज्वालाएं चारों ओर जलने लगीं और दानव और आततायी यहाँ आए तो यह सारे का सारा देश एक साथ खड़ा होगा और चीनी कहावत : Pu Tung Hsin के अनुसार बृह संकल्प, निर्भय, स्थित प्रज्ञ होकर इंडो-नेशिया के राष्ट्रपति "कपाल नगारा यन्मूल्य" की घोषणा "सातू नगारा, सातू वंशा" (एक राष्ट्र, एक जाति) को अपनाते हुए "आ नो भद्राः कतवो यन्तु विश्वतः" अच्छे विचारों

अच्छे कामों और शक्ति को चारों ओर से सम्पादित करेगा, और शत्रु को नीचा देखना होगा।

[For English translation see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 21.]

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Presidential Address is a dull and colourless speech, reflecting the complacent and bankrupt policy of the Government during the last one year. If the Government cannot advise our President for anything better than this—and the Address should be a review of the developments and failures if any, and not this kind of a dull and colourless thing which does not show us anything—if the Government is incapable of advising the President for anything other than such speeches, then it is better that we stop this farce of a Presidential Address and bring suitable amendments to our Constitution; that would be better for all of us and for our country.

Sir, it is our duty to review on this occasion both the foreign and the internal policies of the Government during the last one year. Taking up the foreign policy first, we have to say sorrowfully that in spite of the Prime Minister's claims of an independent and neutral policy, we still continue to have a subservient policy, a policy subservient to foreign imperialists. Take the question of the Korean situation itself. Yes, we have intervened in it and it is good that we sent our Custodian Force so that the Korean prisoners of war could get an opportunity for explanations. But what actually happened? Every one of us certainly commends the way in which the Custodian Force behaved there. On that there can be no difference of opinion whatsoever. But what we are criticising is the governmental policy which, after all, our Custodian Force has to carry out and it is this policy that is subservient and the Government's foreign policy is neither independent nor neutral. When the Korean prisoners of war were taken, it is well-known that America's agents as well as the agents

of Chiang Kai Shek and Syngman Rhee were there, and in spite of that, while receiving them, instead of breaking up these gangsters who had been implanted among the Korean prisoners of war, we took them and posted them in the same old battalions. There even murders took place and in spite of repeated requests that the terrorist gangs in the Korean prisoners war camps should be disbanded, we did not take any steps whatsoever, on the ground that the taking of any such steps would mean bloodshed. The result has been that there could be no explanations, the period of 90 days was over and the U.N. Command stuck to its pound of flesh and said "No more explanations; but return the prisoners back." Again the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission presided over by us condemns the U.N. Command's attitude on the whole question. But what is the use of this condemnation? Ultimately it could not stand and the explanations could not be continued for the full 90 days as provided for in the Armistice Agreement. On the other hand, knowing fully well that handing over of the prisoners of war back to the U.N. Command means their being released—released nominally—but then to be forcibly recruited into their army, the army of Chiang Kai Shek and Syngman Rhee—they were returned. And we know they are immediately taken to the island of Formosa where they are put in concentration camps for three months for the so-called brain-washing and later on to be forcibly recruited into the army. We know what this brain-washing means—nothing but torture.

Why is it that they have done it? It is nothing but being intimidated by the American threats. The worst of it is that we had 17 murderers who were responsible for the killings in the camps of the Korean prisoners of war. Witnesses had to be called and a trial launched. The trial was launched but on the ground that the United Nations Command would not release the witnesses to come, we simply handed those mur-

derers back under protest. What is the use of the protest?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): What do you want them to do?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: You knew that all these things would come when you took up the responsibility of presiding over the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and you ought to have carried out your responsibilities without being intimidated.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): We should have invaded South Korea?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Declare War?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, the intimidation by America continues. It was a great speech that the Prime Minister made in this very House during the debate on foreign affairs at the last session and he vehemently attacked and condemned the pact which the United States of America proposes to make with Pakistan. He said that it was a danger not only to India, not only to Pakistan but for the whole of Asia. What has happened afterwards? The Ruling Party—and our Prime Minister also—was a party to the passing of a resolution as they passed at the Kalyani Session, praising the American Imperialists as champions of freedom and democracy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Why "question"? You please refer to your own resolution. Why is it that the President has come out with so colourless a statement and has not even referred to this pact? He only says that some events have intervened meanwhile which made our relations with Pakistan not as happy as they ought to be. Why can't he even mention the real facts?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: We are between the devil and the deep sea.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: That is exactly my point. It is not a question of being between the devil and the deep sea but that you do not want to make the U.S.A. angry by follow-



[Shri P. Sundarayya.]  
ing a really independent neutral policy. The most surprising thing is that we rightly condemn the American Imperialists' efforts to establish military bases or to conclude some kind of military pact with Pakistan in spite of our protests. We are protesting not because we are afraid of this thing, not because we are afraid of some military aid coming there—if it comes we can take care of ourselves—but because we feel that it is a danger to the freedom of the people of Asia. It is from that angle that we protest. While we protest, our country led by the Prime Minister goes on accepting aid in so many forms from America and goes on signing aid agreements by which even the so-called American technicians and specialists are given diplomatic immunity in our own country. What kind of a protest is this?

Now, Sir, coming to the British Imperialists, we find that they are allowed, even after seven years of Independence, to recruit Gurkhas in Nepal. I have been reading in the press during the last few days that the British Imperialists are going to start not one but half a dozen and more bases in Nepal for recruitment of Gurkhas. For what purpose? To take them across our own country to our neighbour Malaya and suppress the Malayan people, and they recruit them so that if not these Gurkhas, at least their own British rifles can go to Africa and murder the Kenya people and even have a score board there saying, "5 sh. for every person shot". Is this following an independent policy—bases for the British in Nepal, bases in Pakistan for the Americans, both West and East? We also know that with the American aid and with the aid of the NATO Powers, the Portuguese in Goa have been reinforcing their military bases there; the French Imperialists have been reinforcing military bases in Pondicherry and there are also bases at Trincomalee. What kind of an independent foreign policy is this which goes on allowing all this kind of Imperialist bases all round our country? It does not mean that the

only way to put a stop to all these things is to make our army march; there are other ways of clearing out these people. Why is it that our Government is not supporting the people in Pondicherry to fight back the goondas who have been armed by the French Imperialists? We can certainly do it.

AN. HON. MEMBER: How?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: If you do not know, you can later on personally discuss it.

Why don't you arm the people to protect themselves against the French armed goondas? Pondicherry is not one consolidated pocket. There are villages scattered in between our territory. Similarly Daman is not one consolidated pocket. They have to go through our territory to go to their territories; why do you allow these foreign Imperialists to transgress our territory? You can stop them. If the Government really wants, without even declaring a war, you can squeeze these Imperialists out of our country.

SHRI A. S. RAJU: What is your own Subbiah, leader of the Communist Party doing in Pondicherry?

PROF. G. RANGA: That is a good point; why not appreciate it?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Unless you are on the other side.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Now, let us take the Indo-Ceylon Agreement. We are very sorry that our Prime Minister has given his consent to this agreement. From every aspect this is an agreement that is not in the interests of our people or of the people of Indian origin in Ceylon. It is the Government of Ceylon that is to prepare the register and if the name of any adult Indian is not found on the register then he will be considered as an illegal immigrant or an illicit immigrant and the onus of proving that he is not an illegal immigrant is on this unfortunate immigrant and not on the

Government which fails to register him properly. The dispute with the Ceylon Government is on the question of citizenship rights, on this very question of giving the right of registration itself to the Ceylon Government and thus throwing ourselves open for forcible ejection. What kind of an agreement is this? What kind of a justice is this to our own people who have migrated there? Even those people who have been registered and who have been given Ceylonese citizenship are to be kept, it seems, on a separate register and in a separate electorate. What does this mean? Does this not mean that we are accepting a kind of untouchability? Yes, it may be only for ten years. How can there be two kinds of citizens, one set of citizens belonging to Ceylon and another of Indian origin who are to be treated separately? Why should we accept this? The main purpose of putting these people in a separate electorate is to see that our people—most of whom are working in the plantations—do not join hands with the Ceylonese workers and defeat the vested interests, more importantly, the British planters who rob the Ceylonese people as well as our own workers. On top of this, the Prime Minister of Ceylon after he concluded the agreement here, goes back and makes a statement that any Indian labourer if he loses his job will be forcibly deported. What is then the use of this agreement? By such kinds of threats he tries to cow down our Indian labourers there so as to do whatever the British planters want them to do because once the labourers lose the job they not only lose the job but they are liable to be forcibly deported from Ceylon. There are so many other things also. That is not the way to defend the interests of our people who have migrated from our country to Ceylon.

Now, Sir, I take one more instance—even though I cannot go into much detail, the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference. The full details we do not know.

5 P.M.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: But there is no mention of it in the President's Address.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It does not matter. Sir, we do not know the full details and the press reports on it are so contradictory and so conflicting that we do not know what to make of those press reports except that recession in trade and in industrial production in America is coming on which will have its own effect especially on the so-called British Commonwealth and as such all the Commonwealth countries must pool in such a way that we should export more so that the ratio does not fall. Does it mean that we export more to defend the interests of the British imperialists? Or do we export more keeping in view the needs of our people and the needs of our industrial development? These details we do not know. And the way in which.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will know it tomorrow. You had better wait and reserve your remarks.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: From our earlier experiences of the Finance Minister's statements on such conferences, we did not derive much benefit, but I hope this time he will be giving more facts so that we can really form some opinion as to what is happening under the big cloak of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference.

Coming to internal policies, I have to characterise the Government as the Government of procrastination. In fact it is worse than that. Of course, there is one exception where there is no procrastination. When it is a question of shooting down people, they are very prompt. There is no necessity then for a commission or committee to investigate and report or no sub-committee or sub-sub-committees to formulate their opinion. They are very prompt in that matter; overnight within hours and even minutes they.....

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: How many committees did you have?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Murderers they are all.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: And why all this procrastination, because they want to hoodwink the people into believing that they are enquiring into their conditions whereas in reality the Government relies more and more—because it cannot rely on the support of the people—on the support of the most reactionary forces to maintain its rule against the people. Sir, this is patent to anybody who is following what is happening. Take the Travancore-Cochin elections. It is the Catholic Church with American money that is behind the whole Congress campaign there. Sir, though in our Constitution we say that religious pressure should not be applied in the elections, in spite of that open circulars are issued by the Church, in the name of the Church, that anybody who votes for any left group and that anybody who does not vote for the Congress shall be excommunicated.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Is there such a communication?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Today I have not got it here but if you want I can give you the photostat copies of that circular and ...

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Probably you wrote it and prepared a copy.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Such kind of things you are capable of; not we.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: This is the first time we are hearing about this circular of excommunication. It is not mentioned in the press even.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Then take the question of PEPHU. These Rajahs and Biswedars ....

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on. You will have your chance.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is usual to expect interruptions from hon. Members there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is mutual.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Otherwise there won't be life at all. It is only in the course of conflict that these things should be thrashed out.

Now, take the question of reorganisation of the States. What was the necessity of this States Reorganisation Commission? Why does the Government want to postpone issues after issues till it is swept off and forced to take decisions? The Congress has been saying for so many years that it stands for linguistic provinces. Whatever the States Reorganisation Commission may report, that will not be final. The Government will have to take its decision on the question. Then why cannot the Government take a decision now on broad principles that the States in the South at least, to start with, might be organised on the basis of language, i.e., Kerala, Karnatak, Maharashtra and Gujerat, and ask this Commission to demarcate the boundaries on that basis? Why should a Commission be appointed to go into the whole question over again? This Commission is useless. It is a delaying Commission. It is only a Commission to fool the people. Nothing more than that. I would appeal even now before the Commission begins to function that it will be better for the Commission, if its labours are going to be of any use, to come out as early as possible, not as early as possible but within a period of three months, with interim reports recommending that these linguistic provinces should be formed in the first instance, and then the question of boundary adjustments and the question of adjustments of bigger and smaller provinces in the North, etc., could be taken up later. If they do not do it, they will be creating unnecessary controversies and demonstrations and ultimately when the people go into action these Commissions will be silenced and the Government will be forced to act. Of

course, first they use their military, their police and they shoot down a few people and ultimately when they see that they cannot suppress the people by these shootings, they will concede their demands.

Now, what is the condition of the people in the country? It is very surprising that we see in the President's Address considerable achievement in many aspects. But what actually is happening? Unemployment is rampant and on the increase. Even those people who are employed are being paid very low wages. We will refer to all these things in much more detail on other occasions.

Let us take the question of Bengal teachers. Of course, we shall discuss about it much more tomorrow. But they are being refused even the wages which the Central Pay Commission has recommended, which the Secondary Education Board constituted by the Government of Bengal has recommended. They come forward with a request for this, they sit in satyagraha peacefully for seven days and then the West Bengal Government starts bargaining. It says, "We will give you Rs. 5."

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: No, Rs. 7/8.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Wait please. Then, after two days, they say, "We will appoint another Commission", as if these Commissions are not enough. If you go to the Education Minister you will see a whole room full of reports of these Commissions and Committees. Then later on they say Rs. 7/8 would be given. Then another Rs. 7/8 would be given from January 1955. What kind of a Government is this? Is it a fish market to bargain like this? Or do they take such decisions based on principles of justice?

Then the sugarcane growers problem is there. Though the sugar prices have gone on rocketing, the Government goes and reduces the price of cane and when the growers demand that the prices should be restored, all kinds of horrors take place.

129 C.S.D.

Then, the Government brings forward the so-called land reforms or tenancy reforms, and the result is that they leave so many loopholes in those things that instead of conferring land on the tenants, there are more evictions than previously. It is the case in every province. In Punjab alone one lakh notices have been served to evict the tenants. Of course, I can go on amassing facts, but my other colleagues will take up those things when their time comes. Then there is the Adivasi satyagraha for land. The workers demand more wages; wages which will enable them to have two full meals; they are asking for a very small portion of the huge profits to be returned to them as bonus, but what do they get? They get bullets and not food and that also on every occasion; even on the eve of the Republic Day the workers get bullets and not their wages.

Sir, this bankruptcy of the Government in all these things has culminated in the Kumbh Mela tragedy. Yes, I purposely say 'has culminated in the Kumbh Mela tragedy'. Not that the Government had not tried to make any arrangements there. It might have made very good arrangements. It could have been improved, but that does not matter. We are not concerned with what arrangements they had made. What we are concerned with is at the end why is it that these arrangements have broken down. Is it because you have not been able to foresee all these things? No. It is due to one reason and that is that you had withdrawn even the meagre police force that you had put there to look after the so-called V. I. Ps., very important personages. Why should these very important personages go and disrupt the whole arrangements there and cause this tragedy? Are these very important personages even now remorseful to see how far they have been responsible for these things?

Then, Sir, I cannot understand our Prime Minister Nehru defending the action of those people who were res-

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

possible for this kind of tragedy. He does not believe in having dips in the holy waters of Ganges. (*Interruption.*) In any case, he has not taken a dip on that day. These important persons go there and express their own religious sentiments. Of course, I have nothing against their religious sentiments. But why is that all at the cost of all the police arrangements and at the cost of the Government machinery? I say that these people are partly responsible, if not fully, for these kinds of tragedies. That is why I say that it is the culmination of the bankruptcy of this Government. It is adding insult to injury when it is said that they did not know that such a tragedy had taken place. The Prime Minister himself has said that he came to know about it at five minutes to four. Here, Sir, is the statement of Shri Gopal Narain Saxena, the President of the Praja-Socialist Party, Uttar Pradesh, in which he has stated that Mr. C. B. Gupta, the Health Minister of U.P. has said that he reached the scene of occurrence within an hour of the occurrence, and they, along with the Chief Minister of U.P. counted the dead bodies and contacted the authorities and made the necessary arrangements. If that is so, then how is it that the Government had no information about the tragedy? Are we to believe all these statements? To come out with such excuses is really adding insult to injury. It is better for them for Heaven's sake to acknowledge those mistakes so that at least they may not repeat them. I, therefore, say that the Government should not take the people to be fools to be misguided by such kinds of bogus and false statements. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, that is why the people are wanting to know as to how long they are going to suffer at the hands of this Congress rule, the rule of landlords and profiteers (*Interruptions.*) That is the question they are putting now. And I say that it will not be long enough..... (*Interruption.*) I can understand the thick-skinness of the Congress rulers when they go and take At Homes and

enjoy music concerts at the time of such great tragedies.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: We are not going to be moved by your shouting.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I know that you are not going to be moved by my shouting. You need not tell me that. If you have got any decency..... (*Interruption.*) Sir, the people are asking, "How long?" But I am sure that it will not be very long before the Congress rule is ended.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion of thanks moved by Mr. R. M. Deshmukh. But while Mr. Sundarayya was addressing the House, some of the Members might have been surprised at the sudden change in his policy in this House. But, Sir, so far as I am concerned, I am not surprised at all. I remember aright, Sir, that on the 24th December, when the foreign policy of the Government of India was under discussion, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party Mr. Bhupesh Gupta very enthusiastically supported the Prime Minister in each and every syllable that he uttered in this House. Now after two months there has been a sudden change—at least there appears to be a sudden change—in the mind of my hon. friend, Mr. Sundarayya, who says that the policy of the Government of India is subservient to American imperialists. So far as the Korean question was concerned, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta supported the Prime Minister, but I do not know what has happened since then that Mr. Sundarayya has changed his policy.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I have always been saying that.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Now, Sir, a responsible person does not change his policy every now and then. Those persons who have to adjust their policy to suit the requirements or to suit the conveniences of some other persons have to act according to the orders that they receive. I therefore do not blame Mr. Sundarayya or Mr. Bhupesh

Gupta when I find that they are changing their policy every now and then, because they are not the masters of their own policy.

**SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA:** We are the masters of our own policy. You are not.

**SHRI P. T. LEUVA:** I think we are the masters of our policy so far as our party is concerned. But you do not form any policy of your own. Mr. Sundarayya's speech, according to me, was full of empty words. He did not try to prove anything which he stated in this House. He said that this Address of the President was colourless and dull. But he did not try to prove how it could be made colourful or how it could be made interesting. So far as we are concerned, Sir, this Address only states what has transpired in the past, what we have done during the last year and what we propose to do during the course of the next year.

Now, Sir, the President has not made any extravagant claims so far as this Government is concerned. As a matter of fact, the statements which are made in this Address are understatements of facts. There is no doubt about that and my hon. friend, Mr. Sundarayya, could not controvert those facts. There has been definite progress so far as the agricultural production in this country is concerned. There has been a definite rise in the industrial production. My hon. friend, Mr. Sundarayya, is always very fond of citing statistics which suit his purpose. But unfortunately, this time I do not know why he has forgotten.....

**SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA:** No time. Next time.

**SHRI P. T. LEUVA:** But you had sufficient time to refer to Kumbh Mela and you had no time to refer to the agricultural production. As everybody knows, Sir, during the year 1952-53 the agricultural production has gone up by five million tons. The industrial production in each sector of industry has shown an increase. These are facts

which cannot be controverted by any type of language or by any exhibition of temper or by any exhibition of abusive language.

Sir, there is a reference, at least there is one amendment tabled by my hon. friend sitting along with the Members belonging to the Communist Party, saying that unemployment is increasing in this country. Sir, I do not believe in academic discussion. I would like to test the questions that are before us by common sense. Industrial production has no doubt increased everywhere. Agricultural production has increased. What does it show? A fall in production can certainly mean that there is a fall in employment opportunities. But if you see the statistics, you will find that there has been increase in agricultural production as well as industrial production. These two things—a rise in production and a fall in employment—cannot go together. If the figures are correct, one can justly claim that there has been an increase in employment opportunities. It is quite a different thing to say that there have not been sufficient opportunities for increased employment. It is quite a different matter altogether. The question of unemployment is not a new one in this country. It has been with us for a number of years. The question of removing or decreasing unemployment has to be tackled in a different way. You know very well that our country is mainly an agricultural country. Many of our people, the major portion of our population, are in the villages, and therefore if you want to increase employment opportunities, it is for you to find out ways and means of increasing employment in the rural areas. No doubt the question of unemployment is to a certain extent very acute in the rural areas. In the urban areas, there may be some type of unemployment, but it cannot be compared with the rural area unemployment. The reason for this unemployment is not far to seek. One of the reasons, as you know, is that for two or three years now we have been very deficient in rainfall. Our agriculture mainly depends on the vagaries of the monsoon.

[Shri P. T. Leuva.]

If there is failure of the monsoon, agricultural production goes down and consequently unemployment in the rural areas must increase. Fortunately for us, for the last two years, we have had good rainfall, but the effects of the good crops that we have had will not be evident for some time to come, as unemployment also does not necessarily increase with one failure of the monsoon. Therefore with these two good crops, we can surely expect rising opportunities for employment.

Correlated with this problem there is another problem which has got to be very carefully considered, and it is this: In the rural areas, there is also under-employment. Under-employment is a question which can be tackled only if we can put our hearts into the question of improving the small-scale and cottage industries which can be very fruitfully developed in the rural areas, but the main difficulty that has been encountered here is that the cottage industry goods are not finding a good market in our country. These problems can only be solved if the cottage industry goods can be marketed in our own country, because necessarily the cost of production in the small-scale and cottage industries is higher than the cost of production in the large-scale industries. Therefore we will have to increase the marketing facilities of small-scale industry goods. If you look at the statistics of handloom cloth, you will find that out of a total production of nearly 1200 million yards, export has been only to the extent of 64 million yards, which comes to about 5 per cent. of the total production of cotton cloth. In the cotton textile industry, export is of the order of 10 per cent. Therefore, necessarily the handloom cloth has got to find a wider market in our own country. Every now and then the cry is being raised of the interests of the consumer and it is said that the prices of handloom cloth are prohibitive, and that they are not within the reach of the common man. Now, if the prices of handloom cloth are not within the reach of the common man in our own country, how can we expect the

foreigners to pay a higher price for our handloom cloth? Therefore it is all the more necessary for us to expand the market for our handloom cloth in our own country. How can we do it? It has been the practice all over the world to give preference to one's own goods. Sir, very recently I came across two reports of the delegations which went to Japan. In one of the reports the delegation has said that in Japan it is the practice of the Japanese people to use their small-scale industry and cottage industry goods more than their large-scale industry goods. The goods which are manufactured by their large-scale industries are generally meant for export. If we follow the same practice in our country, not only will we be able to export more of our large-scale industry goods, but there would also be ever-increasing markets for our small-industry goods in our own country, which is necessary for the purpose of maintaining the level of employment in the country. This question has always been with our country. So far as our party is concerned, we have always been patronising these small-scale industry goods.

PROF. G. RANGA: The whole lot of us are neglecting it, not only your party.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Therefore it is that I am appealing to all that it is the duty of everyone of us to use small-scale industry goods in an ever-increasing measure.

Sir, I would also like to make a reference to one of the amendments tabled by a Member of the Communist Party in respect of the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and backward classes. It is a revelation to me that Members belonging to the Communist Party have become suddenly alive to the distress of these classes. It was in the year 1940 that one of the members of the Communist Party wrote out a pamphlet on the conditions of the scheduled castes. For 11 years they forgot all about these poor people. Now after 11 years they have woken up from their deep slumber.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: You do not know what we have been doing. Ask Mr. Ranga.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: So far as this party is concerned, this question of the removal of untouchability has been on the planks of the Congress Party for more than forty years. It is no new thing. So far as the Congress Party is concerned, there was no necessity for the Government to make a reference to this problem, because this problem is being tackled every day. The Government of India and the State Governments have been trying to improve the conditions of the scheduled castes within their limits and within their capacities. They have been giving educational facilities to these people, they have been giving reservations in the services. Unfortunately I have not got the time to refer to the various measures that they have taken in any detail, but I can prove to the hilt that any Government could be proud of what the Congress Government have done for the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes. I will give you one instance. During the course of the last year, the Central Government used to give a general grant of Rs. 40 lakhs by way of award of scholarships to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, but the scheduled castes people made certain representations to the Finance Minister, and the later was good enough to increase the grant to Rs. 50 lakhs with a further promise that he will see to it that no student coming from the scheduled castes or scheduled tribes will suffer for want of funds. The removal of untouchability is also dependent to a large extent on propaganda in the villages. The Government of India have realised this and for this purpose they have allotted a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs. I cannot for a moment imagine that the actions taken by the Government in this behalf can in any manner be interpreted as apathy towards the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.

With these few words, I support the notion.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, before I refer to the two aspects of Government policy, viz., foreign and internal, which have been the subject of the Presidential Address, I should like to concern myself first with a matter of very recent occurrence which has agitated the public mind of all sections all over the country.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE) in the Chair.]

Sir, I should like to refer first of all to the tragedy that happened only a few days ago, not very far from where we are sitting, and that was at the Kumbh Mela. Before I go into the actual one or two things which I think the Government has been guilty of, I should like first of all, to state this, Sir, in answer to certain criticisms that have been levelled that certain political parties are trying to take advantage of a tragedy.

Sir, I should like to ask the Government and its supporters who have been parties to this kind of criticism whether they want the Opposition Party or any other party to keep quiet when a tragedy occurs. If the tragedy has occurred due to the fault of the Government or due to what the public feels to be some omissions on the part of the Government, do they expect a large section of opinion—even a minor section of opinion—to keep quiet in the name of tragedy? It is the duty not only of the Opposition Party but of everyone else to be concerned with the reasons that led to a tragedy on a very auspicious occasion so far as the Hindus are concerned.

Having said that, I should like first of all to dwell on one or two principles that ought to guide such national festivals. I should not like such big festivals in which people from all over the country congregate to be the sole responsibility of the Provincial Government. After all in this case also the State Government was unable to cope with the arrangements that had to be made for the safe and orderly conduct of the Mela. They had asked for a very large contingent of our armed forces



[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]  
to help them in arranging for it. In future I should think it would only be appropriate and perhaps better if the Government of India itself takes up the responsibility on such occasions when people, not of one State but of almost all the States gathered to do what they wished to do.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa):  
They will also send V.I.Ps.?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I shall come to that. Secondly, I should also like to ask the Government and the Government spokesman if he has the authority to speak on this matter in reply to the criticisms that will naturally come from our side as to what indeed is the principle regarding the security of our high personages. I have no doubt in my mind and I have no criticism to offer in so far as the security arrangements which had to be made for the safety of our high dignitaries in so far as their public functions are concerned. If the President or the Governor of a State or the Prime Minister or any other Ministers go about the country to discharge their public duties, it is the duty of the public authorities, it is the public responsibility to see that their person is safeguarded. But I don't think that it is the case in other countries nor should it be the case in our country certainly that people, however highly placed they may be, when they go on their personal trips for their personal enjoyment or for their personal something else, should be given the protection of the State. They cannot under any circumstances claim any privilege over what is normally given to the ordinary men. But in this case, in the Kumbh tragedy, in the Kumbh Mela, a high dignitary—certainly not for Government business or administrative business—had travelled a long distance and come there. Another had come from Vindhya Pradesh and the Chief Minister of Bengal had also come there—perhaps to wash away their sins, and sins there must have been many—and there were other dignitaries also who had

congregated and altogether there could not have been more than ten or twelve but as far as my information goes, a greatly disproportionate area of the Mela grounds was set apart for the so-called very important personages. To say the least, it is most scandalous. First of all in this great country of ours and the great Secular Republic of ours I don't want to give much colour to such strictly religious festivals. It is a sectional festival—it is only a Hindu festival, it is not a national festival, secondly when people belonging to one particular religion believing in certain things, however highly placed they may be, go there, they can claim no special privilege whatever. There must be real democracy especially at a time and in a place where before their religion and before their gods they are supposed to be equal. How dare any high dignitary of this country claim something special by way of arrangement, by way of security and thereby endanger the lives of others, 40 lakhs of people, who had congregated there in the hope of getting succour to their own souls in their own light? That I think is the most shameless part of this Kumbh Mela tragedy and I have no doubt whatever that the Enquiry Committee should and ought to and I hope it will go into this matter and tell the public how twelve of them congregating from different parts of the country—not for public purposes but for their own personal purposes—had been given protection and arrangements had been made for them which they had no business to claim and which they did not deserve.

That I think must be the greatest cause of this tragedy. Mistakes happen. Sometimes even the best of Governments may commit mistakes but there can be no excuse whatever for the obvious callousness that was exhibited after the tragedy, a few hours after five or six hundred people had been stampeded to death. As to why they were stampeded, the Enquiry Committee will tell us but can you imagine that

in any country when a national disaster had taken place when people from all over the country had been killed, stampeded to death, on an occasion which was holy according to them, a few hours after that, a gala party should have been held in which the high personages of this country should have assembled and taken part? I am not concerned with the very contradictory—and obviously some of them must have been palpably false—statements that have been issued in this connection. I am willing to accept the statement that the hon. Prime Minister made a couple of days ago in answer to a question by me. He said that he had come to know of that tragedy at five minutes to four, and at 4 o'clock was the party where there was not only an At Home but there was also music afterwards. I cannot imagine why the Prime Minister of this country—whatever differences I may have with him—with the fine feelings that he claims to have, should not have immediately asked for its cancellation. I shall not even talk about the many things which happened before—what deliberations were supposed to have been going on before 4 o'clock in the Government House or as to the propriety or otherwise of holding the party. The Enquiry Committee is there and others also are there, to find out all about it. But what I am concerned with is this. There is no doubt about it that the Prime Minister knew, according to his own admission, that the tragedy had occurred, before the party had started. Could we think of any other occasion in this country or in any other, where a few hours after the death of so many, under such tragic circumstances, such a party could have been held and gone through? Perhaps they thought that the sweet music that was doled out after would drown the wailings and the screams of the women, of the dying and the moaning. This, Sir, is a shameful thing and that day—the 3rd of February, 1954—will be remembered in this country and in other countries also, as the most des-

picable and shameless performance by the highest in the land.

Sir, having said this much, I wish now to confine myself to the policy of the Government of India as adumbrated in the Presidential Address. First of all I should like to concern myself with the sugarcane agitation which is going on in the Uttar Pradesh. This is a matter which is the direct concern of the Government of India. Both the price of cane and the fixation of the price of sugar by the mills are the concern of the Government of India. We all know the history of the fixation of the price of sugarcane. A few years ago it was Rs. 2 per maund and hon. Members will be aware that just a little over a year ago it was Rs. 1/12. And they will also remember the objective with which the hon. Minister for Food—he is not here now, but I hope he will come here and give an explanation of this tomorrow—came to us and said that he is reducing the price of Rs. 1/12 per maund by 25 per cent. The price at one stroke was reduced to Rs. 1/5 with the very laudable objective of reducing the price of sugar. That was, if I remember correctly, some time in August 1952 or towards the end of 1952, I am not quite sure. But immediately after that, for some strange reason which I am not able to understand, instead of the price of sugar going down, it shot up. It actually went beyond the control of the very capable hon. Minister for Food. He fixed the price at Rs. 27 and it was being sold at anything between Rs. 35 and 40. All hon. Members here are also aware, as also the whole country, that the Food Minister was forced to take recourse to the import of more and more sugar to stabilise the internal price of sugar. The price given to the agriculturist, to the grower of the cane was slashed at one stroke from Rs. 1/12 to Rs. 1/5 in the name of the consumer, in the name of the sugar purchaser, in the name of those who want to sweeten their tea or.....

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** When it shot up to Rs. 1/12 what was the price of sugar?

**SHRI C. G. K. REDDY:** The minimum price of cane fixed by the Government of India was Rs. 1/5 and as far as I know—and my hon. friend there who is most intimately connected with these things also knows that the cane grower did not get more than Rs. 1/5. In any case, even there, there are arrears to be paid to them, as he himself knows. Even at the rate of Rs. 1/5 per maund, till today, for the last season they have not been paid in full.

So that is the history of this question. What was the objective with which the price of sugarcane was reduced? It was reduced for the purpose of keeping down the price of sugar. But when the price of cane was reduced, the price of sugar rose up and it went higher than before. Where did all the profit go? The hon. Minister may turn round and tell us that it did not go to the mill owners, that it did not go to the sugar magnates, but that it went to the wholesalers. I do not know, I am not sure if the hon. Minister knows it, but we who have tried to give a little study to this question, to the machinations of the famous ex-Sugar Syndicate know that there is hardly any difference between the whole salers of sugar and the sugar magnates. More often than not, they are both the same set of people but manipulating it all under different names.

Now, so far as excess profits are concerned, it all went into the pockets of the sugar magnates, whereas our agriculturist, he had to suffer a cut of 25 per cent. in the price of his sugarcane. I remember only seven months ago, because of certain special conditions prevailing in Hyderabad and Mysore and in the South the hon. Minister for Food said that special consideration would be shown to those people, that a little more—one anna or two annas—would be added to the cost, because of the higher sucrose content of the cane and for other reasons. But even they did not get anything more than that Rs. 1/5

in spite of that, the price of sugar went up.

As we all know, and all who have studied this question of fixation of the price of sugarcane during the last five or six years will know that a little increase or a little reduction of the price somehow synchronises with the general or other elections in U. P. It may be remembered that when the District Board elections came, they increased the price of cane. And then they reduced it. When the general elections came, they increased the price again. After they had sat safely on the Government benches for five years, they reduce it. This is how it has been going on.

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** 'This is a baseless insinuation, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

**SHRI C. G. K. REDDY:** It may be a very strange coincidence, but coincidence there is. If you want, I shall read out the figures. In 1947-48 it began with Rs. 1/10 and then it shot up to Rs. 1/12 during the elections. And again in 1952-53 it came to as low as Rs. 1/5 and Rs. 1/3 and then it rose up in December last. And then it came down after the elections were over. This is the history of the price of sugarcane. I do not want to trace the connection between the sugar magnates and the Congress Party in the Uttar Pradesh. I do not want to trace the personal friendship between the sugar magnates and certain individuals in the Government...

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE):** Nothing personal, please.

**SHRI C. G. K. REDDY:** No, Sir, I do not do any such thing, I do not want to and therefore I leave it at that, and I leave it to the country to its conclusions.

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh):** This happens with other parties also. Is not the Kumbh Mela tragedy being made so much of because of the elections in PEPSU and Travancore-Cochin?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I hope the charming lady there would leave the Kumbh Mela tragedy alone, because I have with difficulty dealt with it in a balanced and restrained manner.

Sir, this is only a piece of the general internal economic policy of the Government of India. I am only trying to quote this instance because it is of recent occurrence. I only want to tell the House—I do not know if it is possible for me to convince my hon. friends on the other side—but I would certainly try to point out in what manner the economic policy of the Government of India is being pursued. It is being pursued for the benefit of the sugar magnates and the big guns in every industry and the landlords and such others, not for the benefit of the agriculturists, not for labour, not for anybody else. Any manipulation of the price structure at any time, by any of our Ministers, although they have stated that it is all done in the interest of the consumer, has always resulted in the betterment and in the interest of the bigger guns of this country.

Sir, since the Presidential Address has devoted more than half of its contents to praise the Government of India on the course that India's foreign policy has taken, I should like to dwell for a few minutes on this subject of our foreign policy. Much has been said on this side as well as on the other and the mover of the motion took quite a long time in telling us how fruitful our foreign policy has been. I do not want to repeat the criticism that I have offered time and again whenever an occasion arose; but I would like to examine our foreign policy, this continuing foreign policy, in the background of very recent events.

Now, the House is aware and I think others are also aware that I had been pleading, and my party has been pleading, that if we are going to be true to our objectives, there is only one course for us to follow. The objectives are a neutral, independent, non-alignment policy, a policy of peace, and we have said, "If you want that

policy to be effective, there is only one course to follow and that is to bring together such others—may be our neighbours, may be others outside—who will come together to pursue this policy. You were, Sir, just a few minutes ago, when you were sitting there, good enough to say that we are today between the devil and the deep sea. But, unhappily, situated as we seem to be at the present moment—I am sure that the House will agree with me when I say that—even in this uncomfortable position, if we had company it would be very good indeed. But today we find that we are alone, absolutely alone, and I had been during the last two years—and my party during the last four or five years and more—agitating for nothing except for this company.

We call it the Third Force, the Prime Minister calls it the Third Area, but I should like to know what attempts had been made during the last two years to cement together those nations and those people who think alike or who have the same objectives. In what manner have we done something about it? I think my friend Dr. Raghu Vira was referring to the Indonesian case. It was indeed a very laudable thing that we did in 1946. It was because of India and the Asian Conference that Indonesia was able to get independence. but, what did we do after 1946? Practically nothing, absolutely nothing. We did not try to pursue that objective of binding together, of cementing together the peoples and nations who believed like us or who had the same objectives to follow.

Apart from that, the Defence Minister of Burma had tried to put out a feeler suggesting that there should be a Mutual Assistance Pact between India, Burma and Indonesia. What did the hon. Prime Minister have to say about it? Absolutely nothing. Again in Egypt, a spokesman thought of this kind of Assistance Pact but practically nothing was done and today it has not been given to India to invite the countries to come together and discuss com-

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

mon problems of security and mutual assistance but it has been given to the Prime Minister of Ceylon to call for a conference of Prime Ministers, immediately after the news of the proposed U. S.-Pakistan Pact, to come together to discuss mutual problems.

We could have done it before and I have no doubt in my mind whatever that had we done it perhaps the U. S.-Pakistan Pact might never have come to take place at all. If sufficient precautions had been taken in this direction, if sufficient public opinion had been organised in this direction, then I am sure that Pakistan, whatever ambitions it may have had, would never have come to think of this pact at all. I do hope, Sir, now that we have been proved to be wrong, and we have been proved to be alone in this fruitless policy of so-called neutrality, we will try to help more and more nations to come together, like-minded people to come together, like-minded forces to come together, so that we may be able to build up a really genuine and a powerful force which would be independent of these two blocs and which would be able to assure for its various component parts the prosperity which we are all after.

Of course, Sir, one of the two tests by which my friends opposite would like to judge our foreign policy is the fact that the President of the United Nations happens to be a citizen of this country. I do not want to deride the election of a citizen of India as the President of the United Nations but I should like to remind hon. Members that three or four years ago, long before this happened in our country, the representative of Iran was the President of the United Nations. If they think that the world recognised Iran's part in foreign affairs and its contribution to peace, I have nothing to say. I only want to tell them that we cannot judge issues by these tests. Just to humour us they have given us the Presidentship; tomorrow if they do not like us they

will not allow us to come anywhere near. Similarly, any other nominations that our citizens may have got on international commissions have no significance whatever. They have absolutely no significance and we cannot depend upon them whatever. They may have glamour but they will certainly not give us any good result. So, once again, Sir, I should like to repeat—and I have repeated this again and again—that the Government, that is the Prime Minister, that is the Foreign Minister, because it is he who dictates this policy and none else, will at least now realise the manner in which he has been pursuing the objectiveless policy—if I may say so—correct himself and try to build a powerful bloc geographically stretching between Egypt and Indonesia so that we may be able to be quite independent of these two blocs and will be able to stand together for the pursuit of our own foreign objectives uninfluenced by any power influences that may be playing about in the world today.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion before the House. At the same time, I am sorry to say that I have the great misfortune to succeed Mr. C. G. K. Reddy every time. On several occasions, on every occasion that I have been called upon to speak, I have found myself succeeding Mr. C. G. K. Reddy and I find on each such occasion that he has given a provocative point for me to reply. The first point that he has given today is a very provocative point and that is, of course, the point about the Kumbh Mela. The hon. Mr. Sundarayya has also spoken about it but I did not then think of dwelling upon this point because the Prime Minister's statement made it clear about the facts. The way that Mr. C. G. K. Reddy has put it now persuades me to dwell upon it. I have decided to dwell upon it because the hon. speaker whom I mentioned is a very eloquent speaker and eloquence often carries away sense, I mean to say that it conquers sense.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: He has influenced you.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Fortunately he has not done so.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: But you come from the same place.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Eloquence always has got this virtue or power that it throws people away from rational thinking, at any rate. Here, Sir, the presumptions which he has made and which the hon. Mr. Sundarayya has made—and I dare say many others on the other side may make—are, first, that the police force, the forces of law and order, were diverted from the place of pilgrimage, from their duty of attending to the pilgrims, to safeguarding the persons of the President, the Prime Minister and the Ministers. That is number one; number two is that there was an At Home and party after a sad occurrence. Let us see how much this argument can hold water and whether it can bear any criticism at all. Sir, the State which arranges for a fair of such magnitude will not presume and I do not expect my friends to agree that the State will have to presume that every man who comes there comes to create trouble. In such a big gathering a State will take enough precautions to see that the anti-social elements do not create trouble, that people do not come to suffering from thieves or dacoits or some such things or some such untoward incidents. They have drawn in such police force as would safeguard that position. Here, it is an undisputable fact that there were at least 40 lakhs of people congregating. Well, the State must have had sufficient police force under normal circumstances to attend to the situation. Could it be said, Sir, that in a congregation of 40 lakhs of people the authorities could foresee the spot of trouble or could it be said that they could presume reasonably that at every spot there would be trouble, and, in such a congregation, what is the force that could be kept at every point? Could any State, Sir, anywhere in the

world bring in at a particular moment or at a particular period of time, forces enough to keep 40 lakhs of people in order? Could it be possible at all?

6 P. M.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: If they had not brought out the *nanga sadhus*.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: The second thing is about the At Home. They say it is callous. Certainly, Sir, I do not think there is any Member on this side or any side of the House who would not agree with them in calling that attitude callous, if such an occurrence were within the knowledge of authorities there. The Prime Minister has made a statement and we have heard that statement. The President who, I dare say, commands respect in every corner of the country including our friend's there.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Not now, after this.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: The President is known for his integrity, for his sympathy, one who for the sake of the poor and the down-trodden has sacrificed his whole career and who has not hesitated from taking upon himself every strain.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE): It is not desirable to bring in the President under debate.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I am referring to these facts, Sir, just to appeal to the good sense of my friends. Could it ever be imagined that people of such authority when they come to know of an occurrence of this magnitude would go on feasting themselves? Our friends here seem to attribute to people of such authority callousness and on the face of the statements that have been made here, it is first class opportunism. From what my hon. friend Mr. C. G. K. Reddy was saying, he was asking this House not to believe any of the statements made by the Ministers on the Congress side that the political parties are making capital out of this misfortune.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Question, question.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: It is perfectly true and it proves.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: How were the Calcutta papers full with this story before six o'clock that evening? (Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. JEGDE): Order, order.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: No, Sir. I am only interrupting him because he is misleading.....

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Of course, if my hon. friend can prove that to be the fact, I will be one with him, but as things are today—none of us was there and the Prime Minister who was there has given a statement—it cannot be said; of course, there is an enquiry proceeding and if facts come to light that the authorities had knowledge of the occurrence.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The Prime Minister himself made the statement that he came to know about five minutes before four.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: What he said was this. He was standing on the turret. He was seeing the whole thing moving and the occurrence might have taken place. He came to know that two or three people were dead. That was the first statement that he received and he said that at that time they had not realised the magnitude of the incident. Well, Sir, I do not prevent the Opposition from condemning the Government for its callousness, if it is callousness, but when it is proved that they had knowledge of it, and only after that. An Enquiry Committee has been appointed and when it is going into this question, to attribute callousness to such authorities is first-class opportunism and this is a very mean attitude to take.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: No, no.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, the next point that I would like to come to in Mr. C. G. K. Reddy's speech is the foreign policy. Well, much has

been said on foreign policy. Mr. Reddy's point on organising a third bloc is a very pet theory of his.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

He agrees with the policy that India follows but he suggests that India should have organised a union or bloc of countries which think alike. I do not think that he has for a moment stopped to think what this step would involve. Why does he advocate a third bloc? Because there is one bloc on the Anglo-American side and there is another bloc on the U. S. S. R. side. And he says, you don't be with either bloc but organise a third bloc. Well, what does that mean? In order not to join this bloc or that bloc, if we should create a third bloc, I ask Mr. C. G. K. Reddy, how are we different from one or other of those blocs? Why should we now—we who have the opportunity of interceding and playing the part of a third disinterested party—lose this chance and become partisans in the international field? When we begin to muster other countries on our side, naturally the U.S.S.R. would think that we are forming a bloc in opposition to them and the U. S. A., U. K. and other countries would think that we are forming a bloc in opposition to them. Then would there be any chance left for India to play the role of a mediator, of a pacifying force, of an impartial pacifying force in the international field? I suggest, Sir, that the argument of Mr. Reddy is basically wrong that a third bloc should be created or that we should attempt to create a third bloc. It would therefore be dangerous to India and it would keep away the cause of peace from being solved for ever.

I would also like to refer to two or three points raised by Mr. Sundarayya on this question of foreign policy. One is the Indo-Ceylon Pact. I am taking this pact because I consider it to be important and I feel that my time may run short if I do not take it up now. This agreement which has been arrived at, of course, is not much. India tangibly does not stand to gain

much by this agreement but the Prime Minister has said and the President also has referred to it in his Address that it is a step forward. Well, to know that this step which has been taken is a great step and that it is pregnant with beneficial results for Indian nationals in Ceylon could be understood and realised only by those who have knowledge of Ceylon. I am telling my friends that I have knowledge of Ceylon. I have visited that island thrice and I have stayed on each occasion for several days and with those people who are in the field. I know the President of the Ceylon Indian National Congress, Mr Thondaman. I have spoken to many of them and have discussed this question with them, and have also approached the Government side on this question. Some fundamental facts are to be realised if we are to appreciate the step taken by the Prime Minister. I congratulate the Prime Minister on his immense foresight in taking this step and the force of this will be realised when these facts which I am going to place before the House are understood. Well, Sir, apart from the million and half nationals we have there, we have sunk in Ceylon at least a crore worth of capital. The bulk of business in Ceylon, if not the entire business, is in the hands of Indian nationals, and most of the estates are manned by Indian labour. Of course, other vocations also are followed by Indian nationals in Ceylon. The Ceylonese by nature are a very good people. They are a people who are more hospitable than ourselves. The relations between the Indian nationals and the Ceylonese were always good until the new Parliament came to be set up. When elections were ordered, Indians being very industrious people, very active people, they went to the booths in large numbers.

*(Time bell rings)*

Two minutes more, Sir, and I will finish this subject although I have many other subjects to touch upon. Well, they were able to secure more seats and this naturally gave a fright to the Ceylonese. Thereafter the rela-

tion between the Ceylonese and the Indian nationals embittered and after that several laws—and this is what I am asking this House to realise—have been passed discriminating against the Indians. One such law is about capital remittances. We have a crore worth of capital there. If the Ceylon Government today should not permit us to remove our capital we would be losers not by 10 lakhs or 20 lakhs but by a crore. And then we have property. Our nationals own property. Well, if these relations are embittered, we have no chance of getting a pie from there. So the chances of recovering all our belongings depend upon the goodwill that the Ceylonese will have towards Indians. The Prime Minister very shrewdly realised this and therefore, in order to restore the past goodwill that was prevailing between the two nationals he has persuaded the Prime Minister of Ceylon to come to this arrangement. Well, I am sure, Sir, that this agreement goes a long way to harmonise the relations between these two nationals and we will see better times. Anyway, we can rest assured that our people's lives and properties are safe. There was at one time just after the outbreak of the second world war a chance of our people being done away with. Well, fortunately something intervened and they were safeguarded. And today this agreement smoothenes these relations and we hope that this step will be succeeded by many other steps forward to the benefit of Indian nationals.

**SHRI H D RAJAH:** Sir, I heard the speech of the President with the rapt attention it deserved, and I heard the speech of Mr R M Deshmukh, a balanced diplomatic speech, that he was good enough to make, when he sponsored the Motion of Thanks in this House. But, Sir, if anybody has gone through the newspapers of this country for the past six months, he would certainly feel that this speech is antediluvian and out-of-date. The Government is supposed to address, through the President, the Parliament on their policy of the coming year.



[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

It is one of the functions of the President every year, under our Constitution, to make a speech in the Parliament and thereby indicate to the Parliament what steps his Government will take for the future course of events in our country. But what do we find in the speech? We find a recital of events which have happened in Korea, the part played by the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission of which we were the Chairman, and all glory to our Government that in such a difficult condition in Korea, where two mighty contesting forces were killing each other and destroying the fair land of Korea, our Government took an olive branch and went there, presided over the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and did a mighty good job. For that the country is grateful to the Government. And they have done well in a situation which was very difficult. And, Sir, true to the traditions of ours, our policy in respect of foreign affairs, according to the President, is a policy of neutrality. I will call it a policy of neutralism. In a country like ours, which has struggled and come out of the imperialist orbit of Britain, we have to develop a new orientated policy to suit the economic requirements of our country. And so we have to be very very careful. But we are just like the bat. In the war between the animals and birds the bat is hanging in the middle, with the teeth in the mouth and wings in the body, neither owned by the animals nor accepted by the birds. What is this policy that we will be in a position to adumbrate and enforce? You should be adopting a policy of peace based upon the theory of non-violence advocated by the Father of the Nation, who once had an occasion to talk to me and tell me something in the following words. I asked him, "What shall we do in case of aggression on this country?" He said, "My dear boy, don't you know that if you have faith and the fire which I have in me, you will find that I will be able to train an army of one million non-violent volunteers and they will be asked to

stand on the frontier and become victims of aggression and they will give up their lives, thereby demonstrating to the world that the efficacy of non-violence will always stand supreme as compared to the brute and mighty force and the bullets?" Sir, if you are true to your cap of white which you wear and which is based upon Gandhian ideology and philosophy, I would ask the Prime Minister to disband the army of this country, because I know as a matter of fact that this army is equipped with the old rotten discarded junk of the British. This army, in this modern concept of hydrogen bombs and atom bombs, cannot stand the onslaught of any rival modern well equipped army. I can understand anything done by my friend Mohammed Ali, the Pakistan Prime Minister, who is doing things according to a well laid out plan. Sir, our Intelligence Department has to be scrapped. When Mohammed Ali displaced Nazimuddin as the Prime Minister of Pakistan, he came out with a settled plan in America. Nazimuddin was replaced overnight. Our Government and poor Nehru did not know it till it was announced in the Radio. We have a foreign department in America. We have our Ambassador in America. We have our own sources of information in America. But our Government was not aware of what happened. Today's Anglo-American-Pakistan military pact is based upon a well-settled plan executed ably three years back in America. And when Mohammed Ali has come and has taken over the charge of the Premiership in Karachi, well, it is under a well-settled plan. Don't you know, Sir, that the policy of the Americans is to make Asians fight Asians? And why is it that they are so much concerned for equipping the military forces of Pakistan? It is to get possession of Kashmir as a base against Soviet Russia and China. They are not so much worried about these poor Indians who are half-naked and half-starved. They are worried about a mighty nation which threatens their way of life, which threatens their un-

mitigated exploitation of the whole world and which threatens in fact the very existence of America, because the Soviet Union has developed a hydrogen bomb as compared to the atom bomb developed by Americans. Sir, our policy of neutralism must be based upon strength. If you believe in your peaceful existence, come to terms with Pakistan regarding Kashmir. Definitely, you cannot be a nation of peace loving people with quarrels all over. Either you have quarrels, in which case you take the strength of others and carry on your fight, or you say, "We are a peace-loving people. What are our differences? Let us square them on a table and settle our matters and live in peace with each other." Now, is that possible so far as Kashmir is concerned? Mohammed Ali has spoken in public that Nehru would not like to play a second fiddle to Moscow, but he was prepared to play a second fiddle to America. He is seeking to equip his army and then to talk to Nehru on terms of strength and equality. I can understand it. He is patriotic about his country. He knows his mind. He knows his country's requirements and desires. But do we know our mind? Are we patriotic enough? If we are patriotic enough, we will have no truck with these imperialists. We will tell them; "Get out of our country. Your entire policy is based upon the fact that you want to swallow us and blackmail us." I can understand the policy of Pakistan. They will march over this country. Their army will be made modern and powerful with American military aid. They say "*Hanse hanse leeya Pakistan, ladkey ladkey lengay Hindustan.*" That has been the slogan which the Muslims of Pakistan have been made to chatter.

Therefore what I suggest is this: Let us follow a positive and dynamic policy. When the Nazi hordes of Hitler threatened the very existence of Soviet Russia, that brave man, Stalin, though professing Communism, was one hundred per cent. patriotic about his own country. He did not bother about differences in ideologies. He

only bothered about the defence of his own country. He sent out his Ambassadors to America and Britain and asked them to equip the Russian Army with weapons. Stalin said, "I do not want any one of your soldiers in my country. Only give me Lease-Lend weapons, and I shall finish these hordes of Hitler and his Fascist gangs", and he did it. I suggest this to the Prime Minister. I am very sorry that no body from the External Affairs Ministry is here when important matters are being discussed.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Parliamentary Secretary is here.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I beg your pardon. With all due deference to her, I respectfully suggest that if the country is uppermost in your minds, if the rulers of this country are genuinely anxious that our country should not be attacked by any forces from anywhere, have a defensive alliance with Soviet Russia and China. Do what Stalin did in those difficult days for Russia. The mighty strength of Russia and China combined with the man-power of this country will deter anybody, any would-be attacker, and the country will be free from all these troubles and turmoils.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar): And accept Russia as your master.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Certainly not. All right, you accept the rule of Britain. Face that music. I have no quarrel with that. That is your fate. You have to be the tools of Britain and America. My suggestions: Let us conclude an alliance with China and Russia, a defensive pact, not an offensive pact. Then we will see what the attitude of the Americans will be. If such a step were taken, the catastrophes which we are facing today in this country would never have happened. We are wobblers. On the one side we accept gifts, and on the other side, military equipment, on a well-planned basis, is being given to the other side. Sir, we are gerrymandered. In this position, what is the foreign policy of your own, that you can claim

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

to be you own? Get out of the Commonwealth. That one step alone will make these imperialists tremble in their shoes. That one step alone will deter the Americans from taking this disastrous step that they are taking against us. The very fact that the Pakistanis are going to be armed by the Americans should be taken as an unfriendly act against us. But what can we do? They are as much independent as our country is. Therefore, Sir, I want a positive foreign policy. So far as our national honour is concerned, I will not yield one inch either to Soviet imperialism or to American imperialism. But for purposes of strategy, I am prepared to hug even Communist Russia. For what purpose? For the same purpose for which Communist Russia hugged America and Britain when they were threatened by the Nazi hordes. This is the positive contribution I make to this foreign policy aspect of our debate.

Sir, the next point that I come to is with regard to the food production in this country. There has been a continuous improvement in the general economic situation. Food production has increased by about five million tons. Sir, I accept figure. It means that the country has turned the corner, because our deficit was only 10 per cent. of the total production, according to the statements of the Food Minister, which he has been making in season and out of season. If that is so, I should expect a ray of hope for our countrymen, so that prices will fall. But what do we find? The food prices have not fallen. On the contrary, in the Madras State people have to pay for one measure of rice Rs. 1/5 and not twelve annas. Prices have gone up in spite of the fact that food production has increased. Where is the rat hiding, I want to know. What is this miracle of increased food production on the one side and increased food prices on the other?

Then I want to say something about the Air Corporation business. Some old junks, the capitalists were able to hand over to this Corporation, are in

flight and within three months of that, a big crash took place, and twenty precious Indian lives were lost in that crash. I want to ask the Government this question: "Is it part of your plan to liquidate the bourgeoisie in this country by flying such useless rotten aircraft and making these accidents happen every now and then? Have you conspired with the Communists of this country for saving this country from these capitalists who travel generally in aircraft?" These accidents continue and there is no positive step taken by the Government to prevent such disasters.

Then, I would come to the last paragraph of this Address, viz., "The new year begins with hope and fear evenly balanced." I only find fear unevenly balanced and hope receding into the background. If I have to be hopeful, I have to make the Congress party shed its sanctimonious humbug and come out in its true colours. They do not believe in what they say and act according to their belief. If they are true to the nation, I will respect them. I will say, "Do not hand over the country to chaos and confusion. Do not hand over your regime to the Communists who believe only in violence and dictatorship. If you act in the interests of the people, if your acts are in the interests of the people, all of us will be with you."

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the President so ably moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Deshmukh. It is the British practice to present a vote of thanks to their Sovereign for the Address he delivers to the Members of Parliament. We have, it appears, bodily lifted that practice of the House of Commons and incorporated it in our Constitution but as a matter of procedure. Our President is the President of a Republic. Our President is a democrat. He does not stand in need of any thanks from a Government of his own choice. The Britishers owe allegiance to their Sovereign. Theirs is a Constitutional monarchy. Ours is a democracy and a Republic. We owe allegiance to the Constitution that we have given unto

ourselves. There is no monarchy, there is no Sovereign here. Everybody and anybody can be the President of the Indian Republic. All the same, I do wish to associate myself with this vote of thanks to the President for the good wishes that he has expressed for the prosperity of the country in the months to come and in the year to come and his praise to the Government—our Government—for the good things that it has done during the past twelve months.

Now, Sir, my vision is not perverse. My eyes are not jaundiced, and therefore I do not see that the President's Address does not contain any good points and that it is dull and colourless. I find that the entire Address of the President from beginning to end which I have read carefully, line after line, paragraph by paragraph, rings with sincerity, simplicity and sobriety. These are the things with which we are primarily concerned.

Now, coming to the Address itself, the question of the foreign policy of India has been so exhaustively dealt with by the mover of the motion that I cannot add anything to it. For my part, I will be a thousand times wrong with Jawaharlal Nehru in the matter of foreign policy rather than be right with anybody else, howsoever great he may be. May I remind you and the hon. Members of this House that whenever a matter relating to the foreign policy was referred to the Father of the Nation—whom I prefer to call Mahatmaji—he always said: "Go to Jawaharlal, I don't know anything about foreign affairs. You go to him and refer the matter to him." Now, with such a man as our Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, what else do we want? What else can we aspire to have? I am sure that the foreign policy that India has adopted for itself is the best policy under the circumstances. For my part I am not at all panicky or shocked at the so-called pact which is being entered into between Pakistan and America. I say a thousand Americas and million Pakistans united together cannot snatch away from me the freedom to attain

which I have contributed for forty years and it shall never be so snatched so long as the last breath last in me, India cannot be the slave of any country.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE. We are concerned with things after that.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA. Let me deal with the cane grower's strike. There is much talk about sugarcane price being raised to Rs. 1/12 per maund. I say it is all bunkum, sheer nonsense to think that any Congress people or any Congress Minister can ever be guilty of entering into an unholy alliance with the sugar magnates or with the capitalists. They have been undermining for the last 30 or 40 years the very existence of the millowners and the capitalists and the sugar magnates so far as their nefarious designs to exploit our people are concerned and how can it be even imagined that they shall be a party to the exploitation of our own workers by the millowners. Now, let me remind my friends who are the supporters of the cane growers like myself that mere raising of the prices will not help the cane growers. We want to have a sort of economy where the income—the national income—will be evenly balanced. You should not forget that this high price business after all is not going to last long. World forces are at work and the time will soon come—sooner perhaps than we think—when the prices will go down. The price of cane similarly cannot remain at this level. There was a time when cane used to be sold at four annas a maund. It may not come to that low level but at the same time it will have to be commensurate with the prices of other commodities particularly . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Sugar perhaps

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: . . . particularly the food grains. So far as the policy of the hon. Food and Agriculture Minister regarding the import of sugar is concerned—I am not defending him—I don't defend anybody simply because he happens to be my

[Shri H. P. Saksena.] friend—that is not my business—so far as his policy is concerned, I think it is stroke of a very shrewd imagination which has prompted him to import sugar so that the prices of sugar may not rise and even if I am prepared to allow cane growers a little more price for their cane, it ought to be according to a suggestion that I made in the last session when I said that a time will soon come when these labourers and cane growers too, it may be, will share equal profits with the millowners and if there are 5,000 people i.e., 4,999 labourers and one proprietor and if there is a profit of Rs. 5 lakhs, a sum of Rs. 100 each will be divided and the proprietor will not get a pie more than what the worker gets. With that end in view, the Food Minister wanted to establish the practice of giving a share out of the profits of the sugar to the cane growers but our friends of the P. S. P. would not allow the Government to have.....

PROF. G. RANGA: Why?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Why? It is in your own minds. You want perhaps the present Government to fail. Well, you will get an opportunity in 1957 but till then you have got to take the things as they are.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: We can change them.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Change them by all means—non-violently. Now, Sir, our armoury is non-violence. We don't believe in competing in arms and ammunition and H. bombs and atom bombs and all that. Our Chairman advised us to have the peace and tranquillity of the spirit as our armoury and with that and with non-violence as our creed, we shall go on progressing from step to step until at last we reach the goal. I may dispose of the speech of my hon friend Mr. Sundarayya by saying that.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: That is the usual one.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: .....that he does not look at things in their true

perspective. It is not statesmanship to be trying to find fault with things and not see them in their true perspective. Please cultivate that habit, please take this little suggestion from me and cultivate that habit. My hon. friend Mr. Reddy is treading a very wrong path. He was a very fine public worker, intelligent but he is being spoiled by somebody. Somebody is responsible for it and I hope he will, like the prodigal son, again come back to senses.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: No, never.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: So far as internal affairs are concerned, the President in his Address gave a resume of what had happened and what we were attempting to accomplish during the next year. That was the only thing that the President of the country could have said. He cannot dictate to his Ministers. There is a Prime Minister, he has Cabinet and things are done when they are approved by the Cabinet. Now, with this set up, there is nothing else for the President to say than to point out certain things. The President has been so careful as to praise the Government only for those things where there have been achievements. Now he has so rightly pointed out; where there has been no progress, he has said that he was disappointed at the progress and at the very small progress which had been made so far as the cottage industries were concerned. Now this plain-speaking, this truthfulness should be an object of pride for us, that we have got such a truthful, honest and plain-speaking dignitary as our President. There has been rise in production including food grains and textiles. There has been community projects and irrigation works and all that. All these things do not matter in the estimation of our friends opposite. I don't know with what they will be satisfied if they are not satisfied with these things. I am simply disgusted. I want to love them but they simply don't reciprocate. Do some constructive work and as a united India, let us face the dangers that are ahead, standing shoulder to shoulder.

With these few words, Sir, and without tiring the House, I support the motion.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must say that I am in agreement with what Mr. C. G. K. Reddy said about that most unfortunate event that occurred in Kumbh Mela. I think this House as well as the other House will have another opportunity when they will be able to go in great detail into that tragedy and then express their opinion in regard to the behaviour of the local Government as well as these great dignitaries of the Central and the State Governments in the different parts of the country. But I must say that I was disappointed at the tenor of the reply that some of our friends from the Congress benches had attempted to give in regard to this question. I do not think anything can be gained by any Administration and by any Ministry by trying to explain away a tragic mistake that happened, that came to be made by some, if not all of their own Ministers and others connected with them.

Sir, my hon. friend Shri H. D. Rajah, courageous as he is, has made two bold suggestions today in regard to our foreign policy. I am inclined to make an experiment with one of those two suggestions and suggest to our own Government that it might not be a bad thing if they began to consider seriously the advisability of giving notice to the Commonwealth of our intention to leave it. I am not prepared to go with him in his other suggestion that we should straight-away begin to negotiate for a defence alliance with Soviet Russia and Soviet China.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Not Soviet China

PROF. G. RANGA: Rather with Red China. I do not know what will happen in the future. But for the time being, I am extremely anxious that the present policy of the Government of India should come to

be accepted by all as a 'national policy', a policy of non-involvement as between these two competing power blocs. But I do not wish the House or the Government to be satisfied with that alone. I have a grievance against the foreign policy of our Government and the leaders thereof that they have not done all that ought to be done in developing this "Non-Involvement" front. I do not mean to say that they have not been doing something—possibly not so very publicly—in that direction, but they have not done all that ought to be done to explore the possibility of building up what has been suggested, or rather what has been styled by our P. S. P. friends as the third front, and by so many of us here as the peace front even much earlier, of building up an area of all the peoples, a combination of all the peoples who would be keen on remaining in this non-involvement front. It is absolutely necessary that we should consider active measures in this direction, especially in the present context. Let us not forget what happened, Sir, with Iran during the last war. It did not take more than two days, I think, for Soviet Russia and Britain to simply walk into these areas and take them over, ostensibly for the purpose of the war and for the war period and when Riza Shah was not willing to co-operate with them, they sent him away, afterwards for him to die in exile. The same thing would have happened to Turkey if only the two protagonists had agreed upon it. And where is the guarantee, Sir, that next time, when a war takes place, these two great protagonists may not compete one with the other as rivals and between them or one of them might not jump over us or might not agree at a particular stage in that war, because of the exigencies of that war itself, to cut us up as Poland was cut up or take us over completely? After all, all these possibilities and many other possibilities will have to be taken into consideration by our experts in the Foreign Office as well as by the Prime Minister who is also the Foreign Minister. Keeping these things in view, it would be best, I think, if the Ministry took

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

active steps to explore the possibilities of getting as many peoples as possible, their Ministers and their Governments to agree upon, informally or formally, a combination of the peoples of the countries wedded to non-involvement, who would be able to co-operate with one another and in that way build up another commonwealth, a more peaceful, a more democratic and a real commonwealth of peoples who put their faith in peace. As I said, I have a grievance. Again and again several of us have been telling them in private and in public also that we ought to try to build up this kind of a front, but no ostensibly effective step seems to have been taken. I welcomed the move recently made by the Prime Minister of Ceylon and endorsed by our own Prime Minister here, of calling a conference of the Prime Ministers of all the countries as are willing to come into any such front. But I do not know whether our Prime Minister had any opportunity at all of discussing this matter with the Prime Minister of Ceylon when he happened to be here recently. Anyway, I would like the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to begin to take active steps in this regard. In this connection I want the start to be made somewhere near Morocco and come all the way, *via* the Suez Canal, Aden and then come right up to the Philippines. I do not know if the Philippines will be willing to come with us—possibly not—but there is no harm in trying and asking them whether they will be willing to come or not. There are the other countries also. We have already, fortunately for us, built up good relations with our neighbour Burma and we are improving our relations with Ceylon—another neighbour of ours. We have also been fortunate enough to develop good relations with Afghanistan and I think it ought not to be impossible for us to develop such relations with Iran in spite of the fact that Iran seems to have gone too far in the other direction. Then Egypt is friendly with us. There are the non-selfgoverning peoples of Morocco, Tunisia and Algiers. We should organise contacts with them

all. It ought to be possible for us to contact these peoples and their organisations. Is that such an extraneous consideration? Before we became free, were we not expecting the American people and the American Government to support us in our fight for liberation and to develop friendly relations with us? Did we not expect Chiang Kai Shek and his party to develop friendly relation with us and our Congress organisations?

Similarly, is it, under the present circumstances, such a wrong thing or such a hopelessly undiplomatic thing to recognise some of these non-official organisations which are fighting through their own freedom movements and that way develop our own "Non-Involvement" front? I was very glad indeed that our Government has to its credit one definite achievement, that is, the assurance given by our Government to the colonial people in different countries that whenever it would be possible for our Prime Minister as well as for the Foreign Ministry to express our own sympathy in support of their own struggles for freedom they would be ready and would have the courage to say so and do whatever would be possible. At the same time, I was very unhappy indeed that our Government was not prepared to come out openly in support of Appa Saheb who did extremely good work in East Africa and also in mobilising our own people in support of the freedom movement of those countries in East and Central Africa. We have done that. It is an achievement, as I have said, but we have got to build much more on that basis and along those lines.

Having said this, I am certainly in agreement, Sir, with what fell from my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayy in regard to some of the foreign pockets. It is not right to simply dismiss the suggestion merely because it comes from a quarter with which we are not generally in agreement. He has told us that there are certain villages, certain small pockets which are imbedded in our own area as apart from the bigger areas that would be there like

Fondicherry or Goa or any of those places. Now, should it not be possible for us, not necessarily for the Congress Party or for the Communist Party or for the P S P or for the K L P but for all these non-official organisations, non-governmental organisations to come together at some stage, on some platform, devise some kind of a programme and a plan and then execute it in such a way that the people of those areas could be strengthened effectively and rightly? In that way it may not be impossible for us to help them to achieve their own freedom. Long before we attained our own freedom, Sir, I think it was Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia who went over there to Goa; so many of us had supported him. We were all in the Congress then and the Congress did not oppose him, but unfortunately we were unable to succeed. What is there preventing all of us in our country to make a common cause in regard to this matter and to see to it that these foreign pockets are liquidated long before the American and the British people establish their own bases in those areas?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Who has prevented?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: So many attempts were made. The hon Member will remember that in Mahe the Government of India betrayed the people's movement in 1946.

PROF. G RANGA: You have provoked something which I did not wish to fling. My point is this. I am not blaming anybody, I am only making a suggestion to the Foreign Ministry, I do not want the foreign policy of India to be looked at in a partisan manner and that is exactly where I agree with Mr Mathur who criticised the Government—or rather criticised the President of the Indian National Congress who also happens to be the Prime Minister of India—in taking up this as a party issue. At the same time, let me congratulate him because although he happens to be the Prime Minister also, he found it necessary

to support that campaign that the Congress Party was taking up. I would have wished—I am not prepared to condemn that but I would have wished—that he did not pursue that policy but, on the other hand, pursued the other line of action suggested by Mr. Mathur in regard to the foreign policy. He should have taken steps to call a conference of all the political leaders and parties in the Legislatures as well as outside and sought their co-operation and should have built up a national front against this threatened pact of Pakistan with America.

I do not know, Sir, how much time I have got.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

PROF G RANGA: In regard to this pact, it is not such a surprising thing America had been thinking of it for a very long time. They wanted bases either in India or in Pakistan or in Indonesia, or Ceylon or in any of these places. They wanted cannon-fodder, they wanted manpower, the one thing which they lack and which is in surplus in all these places. When they could not find India in a suitable mood or very pliable, necessarily they had to go to Pakistan. I am not prepared to quarrel with America, which was thinking of its own interests. Dr Raghu Vira had traced very nicely the manner in which we have offended them and upset them and annoyed them. We were pursuing that particular line but was it not the duty of our Foreign Minister to have taken sufficient care also to build up our own strength? That is exactly where we made a mistake. Moreover, Mr Deshmukh was saying that there was no need to be panicky. It has become fashionable to say, either for the Prime Minister or for any one to say "No, no, we are not panicky". It is all very well to say in a heroic manner that thousands of Stalins, thousands of Russias and thousand of Hydrogen bombs are not going to destroy us. Let us be realistic. Therefore, we have to



[Prof G. Ranga.]

take into account what is happening on the other side and when we do that, I think, it is right that we call a national conference of all leaders, both inside as well as outside, the Parliament as I have told you, and then concert measures. Let us discuss Kashmir frankly between ourselves without trying to draw any sort of partisan advantage or disadvantage one against the other but to see whether the policy we have been pursuing in regard to Kashmir is all to the good of India? We do not know what is happening in Kashmir. Did the Prime Minister know? Did the Government know fully what was happening until Sheikh Abdullah began to create trouble? Did Sheikh Abdullah take the idea into his head all of a sudden? Why has it become necessary for them to put this bosom friend, political twin friend of our Prime Minister, in jail for all these months? How much money are we spending and how much more? All that political accounting has to be taken in regard to this matter. Therefore, I want this question to be placed before the conference along with the question of our relations

(Time bell rings)

with America, with the English, with the Commonwealth and with other countries, questions about the supplies that we should receive of armaments, etc

I very much deplore, Sir, the decision of the Prime Minister and of the Government also to give up the former Advisory Committees that they used to have for each department. I wish they had reinstated them again. At least now they should take time by the forelock and consult others, concert measures on a national scale and think in terms not of one party dictatorship, one party unity but think in terms of multiparty unity and coalition not necessarily in Government but coalition on a national plan in order to achieve a national foreign policy to be implemented by us in the interests of peace and in the interests of India

and in the interests of developing this non-involvement area in this world.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar):

سید مظہر امام (بہار):

چھرمین صاحب - ہمارے دوست دیہیں مکہ صاحب نے جو تھیلکس کا موشن (Motion of Thanks) پیس کیا ہے میں اسکو سپورٹ (support) کرنے کے لئے کھڑا ہوا ہوں - قبل اس کے کہ میں کچھ عرض کروں میں حکومت کو اس بات کے لئے مبارکباد دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس نے اسوقت تک ملک کے لئے جو کچھ کام کیا ہے جسکی طرف ہمارے پریسیڈنٹ صاحب (President) نے اشارہ کیا ہے اور آنے والے سال میں حکومت جو کچھ کرنے جا رہی ہے اسکو بھی بتلایا ہے اس پر ایک حد تک مجھے اطمینان ہے - ہمارے دوستوں نے اس پر اعتراض کئے ہیں کہ پریسیڈنٹ کے ایڈریس (Address) میں وہ بہت سی چیزیں ہیں کہی گئی ہیں جو کہ کہی جانی چاہئے تھیں - میں اپنے ان دوستوں سے یہ عرض کر دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایڈریس کا ہرگز یہ مطلب نہیں ہے کہ پورے سال کی وہ سب کارروائیاں جو کہ حکومت کرنے جا رہی ہے اس میں ہوں - معمولی معمولی فرائض کا ذکر کہ کس چیز کی قیمت گتھگی اور کس چیز کی قیمت بڑھیکی یہ تمام چیزیں ایڈریس میں نہیں ہو سکتیں - حقیقت یہ ہے کہ حکومت

کے کام سے تشفی نہ ہونا یہ بات صرف ہندوستان ہی کے لئے نہیں ہے بلکہ دنیا کی جتنی بڑی بڑی قومیں ہیں وہاں بھی یہ بات ہے - کسی بھی ملک کی کوئی بھی حکومت ان ساری ضرورتوں کو پورا نہیں کر سکتی جتنی کہ ڈیمانڈ (demand) کی جاتی ہے - یہ سمجھنا کہ تمام چیزیں جنگو کہ ہم چاہتے ہیں وہ حکومت سے حاصل ہو جائیں ناممکن ہے - کوئی بھی حکومت چاہے کانگریس حکومت ہو یا کوئی دوسری حکومت ہو تمام چیزوں کو پورا نہیں کر سکتی - یہاں تک کہ دنیا میں جہاں کمیونسٹ (Communist) حکومت قائم ہے اس نے بھی انکو پورا نہیں کیا - رشا (Russia) بھی اس وقت تک جو مارکس (Marx) کی پوری تہذیبی (theory) ہے اس پر عمل نہیں کر پایا ہے اور وہ بھی کہہ رہا ہے کہ ابھی ہم اور پبلک (public) اس قابل نہیں ہوئے ہیں کہ پوری تہذیبی پر عمل کر سکیں - تو پھر ہمارے دوستوں کا یہ امید کرنا کہ یہ کانگریس گورنمنٹ پوری چیزوں کو اتنے کم وقت میں کامیاب کر دے بے معنی ہے - ہاں یہ دیکھیں کہ آزادی کے بعد سے کانگریس حکومت نے ملک کی ترقی کی ہے یا نہیں - میں کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ ملک کی ترقی میں کافی کوشش

کی ہے اور ملک کو بڑھایا ہے - جسکے لئے حکومت قابل مبارکباد ہے -

یہاں تک فارن پالیسی (foreign policy) کا سوال ہے میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر ہمارے پرائم منسٹر (Prime Minister) کی یہ پالیسی (policy) نہ ہوتی تو دنیا میں آج جنگ شروع ہو گئی ہوتی - اس لئے کے یہی ایک ایسا ملک ہے جو کہ صحیح معنوں میں نیوٹرل (neutral) ہے اور بیلنس آف پاور (balance of power) کو قائم کئے ہوئے ہے - آج دنیا میں دو طاقتیں ہیں جن میں ایک ڈیموکریسی (democracy) کے نام پر دنیا پر انفلوینس (influence) کرنا چاہتی ہے اور دوسری طاقت بھی ایسی ہے جو کہ دنیا کو اپنے پاور آف انفلوینس (power of influence) میں رکھنا چاہتی ہے - حقیقت یہ ہے کہ آج دنیا ان دو طاقتوں میں تقسیم ہو گئی ہے اور جب تک یہ طاقتیں دنیا پر انفلوینس رکھنے کا دل سے جذبہ نہ نکل دیں گی اس وقت تک دنیا میں امن ہونا مشکل ہے - حقیقت یہ ہے کہ ہندوستان ہی ایک ایسا ملک ہے جو بغیر ان دونوں کے انفلوینس میں اُٹے ہوئے صحیح معنوں میں نیوٹرل ہے - اگر ہم یہ چاہیں کہ ہم امریکہ (America) یا رشا کی طرف ہو جائیں تو ہو سکتے ہیں لیکن میں

[Syed Mazhar Imam.]

کہتا ہوں کہ اگر حقیقت میں ہم یہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ دنیا میں امن قائم رہے تو ہندوستان کے جتنے باشندے ہیں ان سب کو اپنے پرائم منسٹر کا اور انکی حکومت کا ہاتھ بھڑول کرنا ہے تاکہ وہ نیوٹرلیٹی (neutrality) کو قائم رکھیں اور صحیح معنوں میں دنیا میں امن قائم کرنے میں مدد دیں۔ یہ دونوں بڑی طاقتیں دنیا میں اپنا انفلوینس قائم کرنا چاہتی ہیں اور امریکہ دنیا کے بہت بڑے حصے کو الگ کرنا چاہتا ہے۔ اس سلسلہ میں میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم جو ہندوستان کے باشندے ہیں وہ امریکہ اور پاکستان کے اس پیکٹ (pact) کو ناپسند کرتے ہیں۔ اس کی دو وجہیں ہیں ایک وجہ تو یہ ہے کہ یہی ہم لوگوں کی نیشنل فیلنگ (national feeling) ہے اور ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب بھی اسے پسند

ہیں کرتے ہیں۔ پاکستان ایک انڈیپنڈنٹ کلتری (independent country) ہے لیکن پھر بھی وہ ہندوستان کا ایک حصہ ہے۔ ہم اسکو ہندوستان کہیں یا پاکستان کہیں مگر تاریخ کو بھلایا نہیں جا سکتا ہے کہ وہ ہندوستان کا ایک حصہ تھا اور اس حصہ کے لوگوں نے اور ہندوستان کے موجودہ حصے کے لوگوں نے دونوں نے ملکر اس ملک کو آزاد کرایا ہے۔ اس لئے ہر ہندوستانی کی یہ نیچرل (natural) خواہش ہو سکتی ہے کہ ہم پاکستان کو غلامی کی زنجیروں میں جکڑنے نہ دیں۔

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 22.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will continue tomorrow, Mr. Mazhar Imam. The House stands adjourned till 2 o'clock tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till two of the clock, on Thursday, the 18th February 1954.

Editor of Debates,  
Bajya Sabha Secretariat