

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
FOR RAILWAYS FOR 1953-54.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS  
AND TRANSPORT (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for expenditure of the Central Government on Railways for the year 1953-54. ~~Placed in Library.~~ See No. S-21/54. —

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE  
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We resume discussion on the President's Address. Syed Mazhar Imam. You took five minutes yesterday and you have ten minutes today.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar):

سید مظہر امام (بہار)۔ آپ کو یاد ہوگا کہ کل میں اپنی تقریر میں ملک کی فارن پالیسی (foreign policy) کے بارے میں ذکر کر رہا تھا کل میں نے اپنی تقریر میں پاکستان اور امریکہ کے فوجی معاہدہ کی مخالفت کی تھی۔ اس پوائنٹ (point) کو لیکر میں آج بھی ہاؤس (House) میں کچھ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔

جناب صدر! وجہ یہ ہے کہ پاکستان اور ہندوستان کا فرنٹیر (frontier) ہزاروں میل پھیلا ہوا ہے۔ اور وہ اوپن (open) ہے۔ ہمارے اور ان کے درمیان کوئی نیچرل فرنٹیر (natural frontier) نہیں ہے۔ اگر پاکستان اور امریکہ کے بیچ فوجی

معاہدہ ہو گیا تو وہ ایک گروپ (group) میں شامل ہو جاتا ہے۔ تو اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوگا کہ جب دنیا میں لڑائی چھڑ جائیگی تو وہ لڑائی میں شریک ہو جائیگا۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوگا کہ لڑائی سے جو نقصانات ہونگے اس سے ہمارا ملک بھی محفوظ نہیں رہ سکتا۔ اسکی وجہ یہ ہے کہ آج کل کی جو لڑائی ہونی ہے وہ ایٹمی ہتھیاروں پر کی جاتی ہے اور اس سے کوئی بھی قریب کا ملک محفوظ نہیں رہ سکتا اس لئے یہ نیچرل فیڈلنگ (natural feeling) ہے کہ اس طرح کے نقصانات سے بچنے کے لئے ہماری پالیسی نیوٹرل (neutral) ہونی چاہئے اور اس طرح کے پیکٹ (pact) کو پسند نہیں کر سکتے ہیں۔ یہی پالیسی ہمارے ہندوستان کی ہے اور یہاں کے سارے لوگوں کی ہے۔ اگر ہم کسی گروپ میں شامل ہو جاتے ہیں تو لڑائی کے دوران میں ہمکو بھی ہر طرح کے نقصانات کا مقابلہ کرنا ہوگا۔ جیسا کہ ہمارے بعض دوستوں نے یہاں پر کہا ہے کہ ہم کو بھی کسی گروپ میں شامل ہو جانا چاہئے تو میرا یہ کہنا ہے کہ یہ پالیسی ہمارے لئے فائدہ مند ثابت نہیں ہوگی۔ میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب کی جو پالیسی ہے جس پر وہ ملک آزاد ہونے کے وقت سے چل رہے ہیں

وہ ایک نیوٹرل پالیسی (neutral policy) ہے اور دنیا کے لئے ایک پیغام امن کی پالیسی ہے - وہ پالیسی کسی دوسرے ملک پر قبضہ کرنے کی نہیں ہے اور نہ زیر اثر لانے کی ہے - ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب یہ نہیں چاہتے کہ ہم کسی پر اپنا انفلوینس (influence) قائم کریں - ہمارا ہندوستان کا موقو (motto) تو یہ ہے کہ ہر ملک اور اس کے باشندے آزادی سے رہیں اور اپنی رائے کے مطابق حکومت کریں - چاہے وہ کمیونزم (Communism) پسند کریں یا ڈیموکریسی (Democracy) کو پسند کریں - یہ ان ملکوں کے باشندوں کو اپنے آپ طے کرنا ہے -

آج صورت یہ ہے کہ دنیا کی دو بڑی طاقتیں، روس اور امریکہ، ایک طرف مزدوروں کی آزادی میں دنیا کے ملکوں کو اپنی طرف کرنا چاہتی ہیں تو دوسری طرف ڈیموکریسی کے نام پر دنیا کے اکثر حصوں کو اپنی طرف کرنا چاہتی ہیں - اسکی خاص وجہ یہ ہے کہ دونوں ملک یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ دنیا میں جب جنگ ہو تو ان ملکوں کو جنگی اذیتوں کا اور ہر طرح سے مدد حاصل کر کے استعمال کیا جائے - اس لئے میں نے عرض کیا تھا کہ ہمارے ملک کی جو نیوٹرل

پالیسی ہے وہ دنیا کے لئے ایک پیغام امن کی پالیسی ہے - دنیا والے اسکو اچھی طرح سمجھیں - یہی وجہ ہے کہ میں پاکستان اور امریکہ کے فوجی معاہدہ کی مخالفت کرتا ہوں - ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ جس طرح ہماری نیوٹرل پالیسی ہے اسی طرح وہ بھی اپنی پالیسی بنائے اور کسی گروپ میں شامل نہ ہو - اسکی خاص وجہ یہ ہے اور میں اسکو اچھی طرح صاف کر دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم لوگ ہستری (history) کو بھلا نہیں سکتے ہیں - پاکستان بھی چند سال پہلے ہندوستان کا ہی ایک پارت (part) تھا - آج اس کا نام پاکستان ضرور ہو گیا ہے - ہم لوگوں نے جب اس ملک سے دوسری قوم کو باہر کر کے اپنی آزادی حاصل کی تو اس حصے سے بھی انگریزوں کو باہر کیا گیا اور اس کو آزاد کرایا گیا - اسی لئے ہر ہندوستانی کی یہ نیچرل فیلنگ ہو سکتی ہے کہ اس ملک میں کسی فارن کلتری (foreign country) کا اختیار نہیں ہونا چاہئے - میں اپنے پاکستانی بھائیوں کو یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ مغل بادشاہ نے انگریزوں کو صرف تجارت کی اجازت دیکر اور دیوانی دیکر سارے ہندوستان کو ۱۵۰ برس تک غلام بنایا اس تواریخ کو وہ اپنے ملک میں نہ دھرائیں - اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ انگریزوں نے بہادر شاہ کو

[Syed Mazhar Imam]

ساری زندگی رنگون کی جیلوں ہی میں دکھا اور ۱۵۰ سال تک ہندوستان قلام رہا - اس لئے میں اپنے پاکستانی بھائیوں سے یہی عرض کروں گا کہ وہ بھی اس دیہی کی پالیسی کی طرح اپنی نیوٹرل پالیسی بنائیں - جس سے دونوں ملک اپنی جنت کی ترقی اور بہبودی کے لئے کام کرتے رہیں - یہ تب ہی ہو سکتا ہے جب کہ کوئی بھی ملک کسی گروپ میں شامل نہ ہو - اسلئے یہ ہماری نیچرل فیلنگ ہے کہ ہمارا پیڑوسی ملک اس طرح کے کسی گروپ میں شامل نہ ہو -

دوسرا سوال یہ ہے کہ آخر ہم کو اب کیا کرنا چاہئے - اگر جنگ ہو گئی اور پاکستان کسی گروپ میں شامل ہو گیا اور اس کی سر زمین میں فوجی آدے قائم ہو گئے تو ہم کو اس بات سے ڈرنا اور کھبرانا نہیں چاہیئے - آپ لوگوں کو اچھی طرح سے معلوم ہوگا کہ ہمارے لیڈر نے سیلف ڈیٹرمینیشن (self-determination) کے موٹو سے ہی اس ملک کو انگریزوں سے آزاد کرایا ہے - اسی سیلف ڈیٹرمینیشن کو ہم کو اختیار کرنا ہوگا - اگر ہم نے ایسا کر لیا تو مجھے پورا یقین ہے کہ ہم کو کسی طرح کا نقصان نہیں ہو سکتا ہے - میں اپنے عام دوستوں سے دوسری پارٹیوں سے یہ عرض کروں گا کہ وہ

ستحیح معنوں میں اپنی گورنمنٹ کی ہر طرح سے مدد کریں اور ہمارے ملک کے رہنما جواہر لال جی کی رہنمائی میں ان کے ہاتھوں کو ہر طرح سے مضبوط کریں - اگر ہم سب لوگ ان کی رائے پر چلیں تو مجھے پورا یقین ہے کہ ہم اپنے ملک کو زیادہ سے زیادہ فائدہ پہنچا سکتے ہیں اور ہمارے لئے کوئی خطرہ پیدا نہیں ہو سکتا - اس وقت آپس کے اختلافات کا موقع نہیں ہے - حقیقت یہ ہے کہ اس وقت ہم سب لوگوں کو جتنے بھی آپس کے اختلافات ہیں ان کو دور کر دینا چاہیئے اور اپنے لیڈر کی رہنمائی میں ہندوستان کی بھلائی کے لئے ایک آواز بلند کرنی چاہیئے -

اس وقت سب سے زیادہ خطرہ جو ہے وہ ملک کے اندرونی اختلافات سے ہی ہو سکتا ہے - اگر ہم ان اختلافات کو قائم رکھتے ہیں تو باہری خطرہ بھی ہمارے لئے زیادہ ہو سکتا ہے - اگر کوئی ملک روس کے ساتھ رہتا ہے ، امریکہ کے ساتھ رہتا ہے ، یا کسی دوسرے ملک کے ساتھ جاتا ہے تو اس سے ہم کو کوئی نقصان نہیں ہو سکتا - اگر نقصان ہو سکتا ہے تو اپنے اندرونی اختلافات سے ہی ہو سکتا ہے - اگر ملک کی تمام پارٹیاں ایک ہو کر ہمارے لیڈر اور اسکی سرکار کے کاموں میں ہاتھ

مضبوط کرنلگی تو یقیناً ہمکو کسی طرح کے خطرے سے نقصان نہیں ہو سکتا ہے۔ اس سے ہم اپنے ملک کو زیادہ سے زیادہ فائدہ پہنچا سکتے ہیں۔

اس وقت ہمارے ملک کے اندر جو ڈیولپمنٹ (development) کے کام ہو رہے ہیں وہ صرف ملک میں ایکٹو اور جی نیوٹرل پالیسی ہی اسی سے ہی دورے ہو سکتے ہیں۔ میں ترکی کی مثال آپ کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔ بجھلی جنگ میں ترکہ نیوٹرل رہا اور وہ کسی گروپ میں شریک نہیں ہوا۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ اس نے اپنے ملک کے اندر ڈیولپمنٹ کیا اور ملک کو ہر طرح سے آگے بڑھایا۔ انگریزوں نے جاپان نے بجھلی لڑائی میں حصہ لیا، لڑائی جیتی مگر وہ اقتصادی طور پر لڑائی میں ہار گئے۔ اس لئے ہم سب لوگوں کے لئے ایک ہی راستہ ہے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ ہم سب لوگ خواہ کوئی بھی بارتی کا ہو آپس میں ایک ہو جائیں جو کچھ بھی ہمارے آپسی اختلافات ہیں اسکو دور کر دیں اور اپنی سرکار کے ہاتھ ہر طرح سے مضبوط کریں تب ہی ہم اپنے ملک کو مضبوط بنا سکتے ہیں۔

دوسری بات جو مجھے عرض کرنی ہے وہ گلوبل میلہ کے بارے

میں ہے۔ ہمارے کمیونسٹ بھائیوں نے اور دوسرے دوستوں نے اسکا پولیٹیکل کیپیٹل (political capital) بنایا ہے ہمارے بھائیوں نے سنٹرل گورنمنٹ اور پروونشیل گورنمنٹ کو اس بارے میں ذمہ دار تھہرایا ہے۔ میری سمجھ میں نہیں آیا کہ اتنے بڑے مجتمع میں ہر آدمی کے پیچھے پوائس یا فوج کا انتظام نہیں کیا جا سکتا تھا۔ ۴۰ لاکھ آدمیوں کے مجتمع میں کسی بھی سرکار کے لئے یہ ممکن نہیں تھا کہ وہ اس طرح کا انتظام کریں کہ کوئی بھی آدمی کسی دوسرے کو دھکا نہ دے۔ یہ جو حادثہ ہوا ہے وہ بہت ہی افسوس ناک بات ہے۔ حقیقت تو یہ ہے کہ ایک آدمی دوسرے آدمی پر کود رہا تھا تو اسکو یہ خیال نہیں تھا کہ وہ کیا کر رہا ہے۔ وہ یہ بھی خیال نہیں کر رہا تھا کہ وہ خود بچے کو دبائے جلا جا رہا ہے۔ جب تک ہر ایک کے دل میں یہ خیال نہ ہو کہ ہمکو اس طرح کا دھکا ایک دوسرے کو نہ دینا چاہئے تب تک اتنے بڑے مجتمع میں اس طرح کے واقعات کا ہونا ناممکن نہیں ہے۔ اس میں گورنمنٹ کا کیا قصور ہے کمبو کے میلے میں ہمارے گاؤں سے بھی بہت سے لوگ گئے اور میں نے خود ان لوگوں سے پوچھا کہ وہاں پر کس طرح کا انتظام تھا تو ان میں سے کچھ بڑے لوگوں نے جو کہ کئی

[Syed Mazhar Imam.]

کمیوں میں جا چکے ہیں بتایا کہ اس سال سرکار کی صفائی اور دوسری چیزوں کا جس طرح سے انتظام تھا ویسا پہلے کبھی نہیں ہوا تھا - ۴۰ لاکھ کے مجموعے میں اگر کوئی حادثہ ہو جائے تو اس پر سرکار کو الزام دینا مناسب نہیں ہے - سرکار کو یہ کہنا کہ اس نے تھک طرح سے انتظام نہیں کیا یہ صحیح بات نہیں ہے -

ان لفظوں کے ساتھ میں پریزیدنٹ صاحب کے ایڈریس کی تائید کرتا ہوں -

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure No. 26.]

3 P.M.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, the President's Address this time is so delightfully short and vacuous that it is difficult to speak much in detail about what the Address contains. It is easier to discuss matters which it omits to mention; and with your permission, Sir, I shall very briefly dwell on one or two of those points, which, I am rather surprised to find, have not found a mention in the President's Address.

Of course, there have been developments which are really welcome to all of us in this country, since we met last year discussing the President's Address. I shall only mention one or two of these points. The Andhra Province or the Andhra State has come into existence; I do not want to dilate on the unhappy events which preceded the formation or the ushering in of the existence of that State. Let that be a dead chapter. We are all very glad that

the Andhra State has after all come into existence and is now functioning.

Then the widespread demand for linguistic provinces (or provinces based mainly upon linguistic divisions) is also met to some extent by the creation of the States Reorganisation Commission which has commenced its labours, and we all hope that out of the labours of this Commission some good will come, and the inter-provincial wranglings and bickerings with which the atmosphere of our mother country has been vitiated for years together will cease, and that this Commission will be able to come to some decision more or less satisfactory to all the parties concerned.

Another happy development that has taken place during the year under review, which unfortunately and surprisingly has not found mention in the President's Address, is the development in Kashmir. I remember having said about this time last year when discussing and speaking on the President's Address, that that much-discussed and vexed question of plebiscite, about which a pledge is purported to have been given by the Government of India as long ago as October 1947, might be decided by a resolution or a decision by the Kashmir Constituent Assembly ratifying the State's accession to India. It grieves me to recall that if this decision so happily reached only a fortnight ago by the Kashmir Constituent Assembly had been reached a year ago, much of the trials and tribulations through which India passed during the last year might have been avoided. The great Praja Parishad agitation which convulsed northern India need not have been there, or even if it had come into existence at all it might have been called off, because after all the head and front of their demand was the affirmation or ratification of the accession of Kashmir to India. And in this connection one grieves also to think that the life of one of the valiant sons of Mother India—I mean

the late Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee—might not have had to be sacrificed at the altar of this cause if this decision had been taken in time, in February 1953 instead of in February 1954. However, we welcome this decision.

The only fly in the ointment seems to be this, and that is the rather ambiguous attitude of the hon. the Prime Minister of India with regard to the plebiscite. We understand that even Sheikh Abdullah now of course fallen rather low in public estimation, at the time when the Kashmir Constituent Assembly was constituted, offered to take up this question of ratification of accession (now performed by the Constituent Assembly), but it was stated (or rather reported) that the hon. the Prime Minister of India at that time stood in the way. And I am afraid that even after the recent February resolution of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly ratifying the accession, we are not yet out of the wood, because already the parties interested in Pakistan have raised the cry that this particular resolution ratifying the accession is against the U.N.O. decision and is against the pledge of plebiscite and all that. We shall all be glad if the hon. the Prime Minister of India now stands firm and says that since the Kashmir Constituent Assembly is a representative body representing the will of Kashmir, elected as it is on the basis of adult franchise, its voice may be taken to be the authentic voice of Kashmir and the absurd idea of holding a plebiscite in the State be given up. That will solve the Kashmir question—at least a part of it—to some extent.

Then there remains the other question viz., that of the recovery of the portion of Kashmir that is under enemy occupation. It is a bigger question that involves a lot of consideration from all points of view, and I hope that the Government of India will not go on tinkering any further with the problem, but as becomes a nation with a sense of

dignity and self-respect, will take effective steps to recover that territory in any manner that seems fit in its opinion.

This brings me to the other question which is agitating the public mind very much today, and that is the question (or rather reports) of Pakistan, seeking an alliance with Turkey and the United States of America and possibly with some other Middle East States. It is good and cheering to see that our Prime Minister has taken up quite an uncompromising attitude over this reported alliance; and I suppose, speaking from one side of the Opposition as I am, it can be said without any fear of contradiction that if our Prime Minister persists in this attitude of hostility to this proposed alliance, then he will get the support of all parties, not merely in this House, but in all parts of the country. Only I wish that the reasons that have been set out by the hon. the Prime Minister and the other critics of this so-called alliance were set out in a more straightforward manner. The hon. the Prime Minister has based his opposition mainly on the thesis that this alliance between Pakistan and one of the great Powers of the world belonging to one of the two gigantic blocs, will bring the war nearer to India, will upset the balance of power in Asia, or at least in Southern Asia, and will more or less confuse the situation regarding the balance of power as existing in the world, and such other world-wide or universal arguments based upon world peace or the peace of Asia in general. I should think that though much can be said in favour of these arguments, that is not really the issue which is troubling and agitating the Indian mind today. The balance of power in Asia has been changed in very recent years since the end of the last great war in various ways but India has worried very little about it. In China has emerged a great and strong military power which has effectively upset the balance of power in the

[Principal Devaprasad Ghosh.]

Far East. This is not merely a question of the composition of that Government—whether it is of the Communist variety or any other variety—but the fact remains that a great military power has emerged on the scene of Asian politics, and that by its actions in relation to Korea and in relation to Tibet, it cannot be denied that the balance of power has been upset or changed a good deal. That may be fortunate or unfortunate, but there it is. As to the question of this alliance bringing war nearer to India, about that too, there may be two opinions. As world morality is constituted today, and the mentality of the great Powers being what it is, if it comes to a clash between these two titanic Power blocs, then the neutral nations, willingly or unwillingly, will be dragged into it. We need not stretch our minds very far back into the realms of history.

We remember the first Great War of the 20th century, the war that began in 1914, when the neutrality of Belgium could not save her from being converted into a cockpit of fighting. Nearer our times, we have seen in the second Great War of the 20th century, that neutral powers, inoffensive powers, like Norway, like Denmark, like Belgium and Holland, which never dreamt of entering into conflict with other countries, were not saved by their neutrality from being drawn into the vortex of war. So it is clear that even if India or Pakistan or any other country wants to remain neutral, it will not succeed in remaining so, if any of the great warring blocs, when it comes to actual clash, deem it in their interest to violate that neutrality. That unfortunately is the state of things today. But really what India feels in this matter is something different. I think even our Prime Minister feels that way, although he finds it diplomatic not to say it in public. I am glad, however, that one of our Ministers,

the hon. Shri Mahavir Tyagi, Minister for Defence Organization, has spoken out and given expression to this feeling in a recent speech. He has pointed out that the relation between Pakistan and India is not a normal relation—not the relation of two peaceful nations living side by side. In fact, technically speaking, the two States are in a state of war and their relation is one of belligerency. That need not come as a surprising statement to anybody, because, after all, on the high hills of the Pir Panjal range in Kashmir, the armies of India and Pakistan stand face to face. Only active hostilities have been suspended for the time being under a “cease fire” order. Exactly the same as is the case in Korea, where the United Nations armies and the Communist armies stand face to face, though hostilities there too have been suspended under a “cease fire” order. Technically speaking, therefore, Pakistan is in a state of war with India, and it would have been more straightforward to tell America, “Well, look here, Pakistan is at war with India, and if you enter into military alliance with Pakistan, that will be regarded as an unfriendly act”. That would have been a very straightforward statement to make and that would have carried more conviction than a general disquisition regarding the danger of war coming nearer home or the upsetting of balance of power in Asia. I welcome, however, the opposition of our Prime Minister to this military alliance of Pakistan with other powers.

I shall not take much more time, but I want to take only a few minutes more in connection with the appalling tragedy that took place at the Kumbh Mela about a fortnight ago. Fortunately or unfortunately, I am one of those who were present at the Kumbh Mela on that fateful *Amavasya* day, in the morning about 9 A.M., when the tragedy took place almost under my eyes. I do not like, Sir, as you know, to indulge in

superlative statements, nor do I like to go into even comparative estimates of casualties, whether it is 500 killed or 1,000 wounded or whether it is 1,000 killed or 2,000 wounded (as is generally estimated at Allahabad). I shall confine myself only to a positive statement of what happened. It is most surprising that in the Mela area there were no roads fixed for coming separately or going separately. No one-way traffic was arranged. What happened was this. From about 2 A.M. there began the Kumbh Muhurt possibly the most auspicious period of the *Amavasya*. People began to bathe in the Sangam from very early morning, that is to say, from shortly after midnight—in fact from 2 A.M. people began going to the Sangam and having their bath and then returning and after 6 A.M. many other people were going to the Sangam—thousands and tens of thousands of people. The hon. Members of this House will be surprised to learn that when we were making our way toward the road or lane reserved for the Sannyasi processions in order to have a good view of them, we were pushed in all directions, jammed between the dense masses of the incoming and outgoing pilgrims. For such a huge gathering no separate ways for coming and for going were provided for; it was a most astounding thing and was the fundamental cause of the great tragedy occasioned by the stampede.

I should like now to advert to another very surprising thing. We have had a statement by the U.P. Government that though this tragedy happened at about 9-30 A.M., the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh got this news only at about 4 P.M. Our Prime Minister also said here the other day, in reply to a question put by the hon. Mr. C. G. K. Reddy, that he received that news only about 5 minutes to 4 P.M. This is most surprising because by about 10 or 10-30 A.M. the whole of the Kumbh Mela was stunned with the news,

with all sorts of rumours spreading like wild-fire. Now, if that be a fact—and it must certainly be a fact, because the hon. the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister of the U.P. must be telling the truth so far as they know it—then that is the greatest condemnation of the efficiency of the work of the officers concerned. Possibly the officers tried to suppress the news only to save their own skins, or they did not want to disturb the complacency of the big people assembled. It is most unfortunate, and we are all exceedingly distressed at what happened there; and let us pray that there will be no repetition of such appalling incidents due to official bungling and mismanagement.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Motion of Thanks to the President for his message to the Parliament. I think the message represents both in spirit and in content a very realistic, very modest and very humble approach to the whole problem in the domestic field, Sir the message carefully notes the progress that has been made, the progress that can be very easily checked and verified by every one who is impartial and who cares to check it up, and at the same time the message acknowledges with a great deal of candour and frankness the slow progress that has been made. And I am sure, Sir, all of us, regardless of our party affiliations, realise that in the domestic field we have yet to go a long way and none of us from this side need be goaded by the opposition or anybody else in realising that we have to travel a long way in abolishing poverty, ignorance, superstition, illiteracy and all the rest with which our great country is still afflicted. Those problems are still with us.

And in the foreign field, Sir, I think the President has very appropriately said that the new year begins with both hope and fear. I think it



[Dr. Anup Singh.]

summed up the situation in perhaps the most impressive and realistic way. I personally would have thought that after repeated discussions of the foreign policy of the Government of India critics would have been at least less vocal at this time. But unfortunately they would not be doing justice to their loyalty to the group if they were to acknowledge even in a fit of absent-mindedness that the Government of India has been pursuing the right policy. And I was really surprised that the role of the Government of India even in Korea came in for criticism.

We should not forget the basic pattern of our foreign policy. That has been enunciated over and over again by the hon. the Prime Minister, and I for one take it for granted that the principles and general pattern have been overwhelmingly accepted by the people of this country, regardless of their party affiliations, and I need not say at this stage what has been said already. The Indian National Congress in the pre-independence days was pursuing a certain policy which was based upon India's heritage and India's principles and the conditions then prevailing in India. And as I look back, I find that it was a denunciation of aggression anywhere by anyone. It was a policy of self-determination and support for racial equality. And I think our Government has been pursuing precisely the same policy now with varying emphasis here and there. Since independence we have pursued a policy which is known as a policy of non-alignment, or neutrality, this, that or the other. But so far as I can see, Sir, it is our desire not to get mixed up, not to lend our weight and support to the aggressive designs of anyone, whether it is a A, B or C. And it has been our constant desire and attempt to strengthen the United Nations.

Secondly, Sir, we have refused to prejudice any issue in terms of ideo-

logical differences or in terms of historical prejudices in the past. We have judged every issue as it came according to our own lights. And furthermore, Sir, we refuse to join the blocs because we know it by experience, and history has shown, that the League of Nations was wrecked when attempts were made to by-pass it. And today I regret to say that the United Nations might suffer the same fate if the great powers do not resist the temptation of building up various spheres of influence outside the United Nations. And so, that has been our attempt. We have been criticised, and our policy is being criticised today from various points of view.

I would first like to say a few words about the hon. Mr. Sundarayya—about the criticism that emanates from the Communist circles. The hon. Mr. Sundarayya is an amiable and an enviable idealist, and I have no quarrel with him. He will not be satisfied with the foreign policy of India so long as there is one single British soldier in Malaya, in Kenya, or in any part of the world wherever there is any domination. Unless that is cleared up, he will not be satisfied. I fully agree with him. He will not be satisfied so long as there is one single British base anywhere. That is perfectly true, and there should be no foreign bases. He would like to see the foreign bases completely eliminated from India. And there again I fully subscribe to his views. He would like to see poverty abolished from India. There again we all agree with him. He would like to see the Congress also abolished, but there I disagree. The hon. Mr. Sundarayya and his colleagues have never made it clear what precisely India can do. Without resources, and under the existing geographical conditions, what precisely is the hon. the Prime Minister or the Government of India expected to do to ameliorate the conditions of all these down-trodden people? I am perfectly convinced that the Government of India has made every effort within its

power, whenever any occasion arose, keeping in mind the difficulties of the situation and the diplomatic difficulties. India certainly cannot be expected—and I think the hon. Mr. Sundarayya will agree—to go on a crusade, take her few thousand soldiers all over the world and set conditions right. I think that simply cannot be done. And I think the hon. Mr. Sundarayya realises that.

Now the hon. Mr. Reddy has his perennial theme of the Third Force. This time he has come with a new idea that since the Asiatic Conference the Government of India has done nothing. I think that is certainly a very unusual remark. I am sure that the hon. Mr. Reddy realises that during the last four or five years, in spite of its preoccupation in her domestic problems—and they have been of a very great magnitude—India has not been lying idle. India has not been sleeping. There have been interchanges of missions, cultural missions. I need not consume any time in cataloguing the list of the missions that we have sent abroad and that we have received. But he is not satisfied because he would like to see a Third Force instituted and organised under India's leadership. I think, without the label of a Third Force, in a way, and indirectly, very quietly we have perhaps been working to the same end. In the United Nations during the discussion on the Korean problem the late Sir B. N. Rau, the great jurist and our great leader, in his own way, mobilised the opinion of the Asiatic countries, who refused to join any of the blocs. I personally do not see what purpose will be served if we say A, B, C or D belongs to a third bloc. They are all joined and lined up behind India's leadership and we can call it a Third Force. There are two Forces already. What precisely are we going to gain by giving it a name? But the hon. Mr. Reddy will not be satisfied, and I am quite sure he will keep on repeating his griev-

ance that even this proposed and contemplated conference of Premiers is not coming through India's initiative. I ask in all earnestness: Is it necessary that every conceivable conference in this part of the hemisphere should always be convened through India's initiative? So long as there is a conference, we agree with its purpose and programme, we subscribe to the larger aim and we are willing to join it, what difference does it make whether Burma calls it, Indonesia calls it or Ceylon calls it? I for one fully agree with the hon. the Prime Minister when he goes on repeating over and over again that we are not anxious to be put in the position of assuming leadership of anyone. We subscribe to certain ideas, we follow a certain path, and we would like to have the co-operation of those people who think like us. And, therefore, to my mind, it does not make the slightest difference where the conference is convened and who takes the initiative. So much for the hon. Mr. Reddy's criticism.

Something has been said, Sir, about Korea. I have said enough on two or three occasions as I happened to be there before the war and a few months after the war. I think the President has rather been very restrained in his admiration of the work that our forces and our representatives have done in Korea. I think he could have said much more. The difficulties that our people had to face in Korea are something which can be understood only by a person who has been there. Even before the war there were two boundaries, the north and the south. It was an atmosphere of poison where it was utterly impossible to function normally. And you can well imagine what might have happened during the last two years and a half since the war.

I would like to take this opportunity of saying one word about Dr. Syngman Rhee. Up till now I have

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

never said anything about him, because I thought it would not have been proper for me, but now Dr. Syngman Rhee has reached the limit where some one has to say something about him. He has indulged in the most abusive language against the Indian people, against the Indian forces there, and he has threatened to annihilate them. He continues on the same path. I happen to know something about this gentleman. I recall how, when the war broke out at about 3 o'clock in the morning, Dr. Syngman Rhee suddenly disappeared and not one single member of his Cabinet knew where he was. He went to the farthest corner of South Korea to save his life. Now, it is this gentleman who is blustering and bluffing about annihilating the Indian forces there. So far as the Indian forces are concerned, I think our representatives there treated his threats with the contempt that they deserved—not in anger but with real sympathy for the Korean people and the country of Korea. I am personally convinced that Dr. Syngman Rhee is today jeopardising the cause of Korea and of the Korean people whom he claims to love. He has been thrust upon the Korean people. He has virtually established a police State. I do not hesitate to say that it is nothing more than a police State under a camouflage of constitutionalism. If any one under him dares to oppose him—whether he be the Prime Minister or the Chief of the Police or a Governor—he suddenly finds himself either dismissed or locked up. This is the kind of thing that we are called upon to defend in the name of democracy. Now, Dr. Syngman Rhee would like to unite North Korea and South Korea by force even if there are no Koreans left to be united. Finally, Sir, I would like only to say that in the long run he will have to come to terms with his own people whose affection he does not command and also with his next door neighbours, if there is going to

be any peace in that part of the world.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I want to say something first about the Kumbh tragedy about which so much has been said. If I say something on it, it is because I was there at Allahabad in the Mela for a week before and after that day, the 3rd of February. What I say is from my own personal knowledge and from what I have seen myself. It would not have been necessary for me to say all this, had it not been for the fact that many wrong statements have been made, many accusations have been made against all sorts of people and attempts have been made to exploit the situation. It was an occasion when Hindus from all over India had gathered. Suppose, Sir, the Government had not made proper arrangements for their coming and for their lodging. What would have happened? I can only imagine it. I was there from the 1st February to 8th February. I saw the arrangements that were made on the 1st and the 2nd. I think anybody could be proud of the arrangement. In our country there is no discipline and people do not behave in an orderly way. We could actually see a big town coming up at a modest cost. I say that it was at a modest cost because a leader has said in the other House that it was a luxury show or luxury arrangement. All the arrangements for proper sanitation, food supply, roads, amusements, conveyances—in fact everything was going on very well. People were coming there even earlier than 12th of February—five lakhs, 10 lakhs and 15 lakhs of them were already there. Not a fly could be seen. We could find no trace of any smell although there was such a big crowd. Arrangements had been made for proper drinking water for all. All the arrangements were going on very nicely, but suddenly this thing happened on the 3rd. I was there when this thing happened. I can say that, so far as the Government was

concerned, their only fault was this: Pantji is not responsible, the hon. the Prime Minister is not responsible, nor anybody higher up. You know there is that confluence of the Ganga and the Jumna, which is called the Triveni Sangam. There is some dry land there which used to be much bigger before than it was this year. It used to be about a mile in length. I know this, because I am more or less a resident of Allahabad. I have a house there. I frequently go there. This year that area was considerably reduced on account of change of the course of the Ganga. The Government foresaw it, and so the whole Mela was arranged on the other side at Jhansi. It was there that the whole Mela area was established. What happened was this: Early in the morning, people started taking bath. One friend said that there was no two-way traffic. I know that there was two way traffic. I went by one road and came back by another road from Triveni. Actually there were four roads. In fact, there was no congestion where actually people were taking their bath.

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** Was the hon. Member one of the V.I.P.s?

**SHRI M. P. N. SINHA:** I was not one of them, but I know something about the V.I.P.s, who have been unnecessarily condemned from every quarter. At this point people were going and people were coming. These Sadhus whom we call Nagas were to a great extent responsible for what happened. The Government is not responsible at all. If at all the Government is responsible, it is only responsible for allowing these Sadhus to go there. These Nagas started parading on elephants and camels, etc., in that small place. I saw it with my own eyes. Some of these Sadhus have given evidence before the enquiry committee that there were no weapons in their hands, but with my own eyes I saw spears, swords, trisuls, etc. With

all these weapons they were parading, and if somebody wanted to pass that way, they rushed at him. All this was going on. My grouse is that the Government officials allowed these naked people to go to the Mela. A few thousands of people were sitting on the sands between the Ganga and the Jumna, and what happened was that when these people started this parade, there was a stampede. They would not permit people to come that side, and about a lakh or fifty thousand people who had already taken their bath at the Sangam and who were in no great hurry had not the sense to wait for even ten minutes but jumped over the few thousands of people who were sitting there on the ground, crying 'Ganga Mata ki Jai'. I can understand people being in a hurry to take bath because Muhurt might finish, but these people who had already taken their bath, did not have the patience to wait. They rushed upon the sitting people and trampled them down.

How on earth, to be fair, is the Government to be blamed for this? Now, Sir, it is said that the people who were in the management of the Mela were looking after the V.I.P.s. They are certainly not the Governor and not the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. (*Interruption.*)

Please listen, don't be impatient. If you have seen the thing with your own eyes you narrate it. If you have not, then have the patience to hear it from me.

The V. I. P. was a camp, a small place where the ladies of the officials or the Ministers or anybody, if they wanted to go there and stay for the night so that they could have the *Tirtha Snan* the following day or so, could stay. It has been spoken of as the Governors' camp. It was not that. There were only two Governors at that time in Allahabad, both staying at Raj Bhawan. One

[Shri M. P. N. Sinha.] Governor—the Governor of Punjab—fortunately or unfortunately is related to me. I went to receive him at the station because he happens to be my natural brother. I found that there was not a single person other than a petty secretary of the U.P. Government to receive him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why 'petty Secretary'?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: What I meant to say was that he was not the Chief Secretary or the main Secretary. There was no police arrangement. Ordinarily if a Governor went there there used to be the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police and others to receive him. They were all otherwise busy in connection with the Mela arrangements and not busy with the so-called V.I.P.s or their bathing arrangements. The Punjab Governor and his family had to take a boat on rent at Rs. 20 near the Fort and they went to the Sangam by the river route and took their bath and came back by the same route. I think Mr. Munshi, Mrs. Munshi and Dr. Rajendra Prasad and his family went and took their bath by the same river route. When the Governor and his wife went through the river route, where was the question of their making any congestion? Not a man, who was connected with the Mela arrangement was actually attending on these persons.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Who are the V.I.P.s?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: That is a phrase. You are a V. I. P. and suppose you, as an hon. Member of Parliament, went there and sought the help of the Mela authorities, which you have a right to ask. Was there anything wrong in this?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: On a point of information. Is 'V.I.P.' a feminine gender, I want to know?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: Both genders—you are one.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): It is a very improper phrase and it should not be given currency on the floor of the House when we are aiming at a classless society by making a beginning on the railways by the abolition of I class.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: So if anybody is responsible for this, I should say that it is the Hindus who went to take the bath. Who could ever think of such a stampede at that place?

Now about this business of 4 o'clock party. The Prime Minister has said that he heard of the incident at five minutes to four. Suppose he had heard of it at 2 o'clock, suppose Pantji had heard of it at 1 o'clock was there any earthly reason for them to say that they heard of it at about 4 P.M.?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: They could have cancelled the party.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: Was there any earthly reason for them to say that they heard of it at five minutes to four or at 4 o'clock? The moment the Chief Minister, Mr. Pant, the Prime Minister and the Governor heard of it, they left the tea half in the cup and ran to the place.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Did you measure it?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: I know it. The hon. the Prime Minister, in his modesty, did not say so, but I may mention it for the information of the House that he did not take his food that night. He was so sad and so afflicted that he refused to take his dinner that night. Just think of it. A man does his duty as he should do and a man feels as he should feel and yet you accuse him unnecessarily. (Interruption.) Just think of it!!

I know. I have almost personal knowledge of it. It is indeed a mystery why it was not made known to them up to 4 o'clock. That probably will be found out by the Commission of Enquiry. I have had a talk at about 5 o'clock with the District Magistrate, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police and a few others in the camp. I went there three times and saw the dead bodies myself. (*Interruption.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have got only two or three minutes more to speak.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: It is over the interruptions, Sir, that my time is taken up. Anyhow, Sir, I shall finish within the time. What I wish to say, Sir, is this. It is just possible that the local officials lost their head and they did not know whether to inform or not to inform the higher authorities. That is still a point to be found out. I do not want to say anything on that, but so far as the Government is concerned, so far as the higher people in the Government are concerned, they did their best. We should be obliged to the U.P. Government for making the best arrangements for the Mela. In future these *Sadhus* should not be allowed to parade naked with weapons in hand.

Then I come to this America-Pakistan Pact. Of course I have a lot of things to say in connection with this, but I have not the time. One thing is however clear, that leaders of every party in India have condemned it. They have all said that there should be united effort to ward it off. Well, I do not agree that Pakistan has any design against India. My own impression is that Pakistan is a weak country. Pakistan has many limitations and probably for self-defence they want to be stronger. They have no money to venture on large defence equipment and purchase of arms, etc. I am not one of those who believe that there is any bad design on the part

of Pakistan against India, but the best means for preserving the peace, is to be prepared for war. Therefore, Sir, we should get strong, but how shall we get strong by doing the job we are doing, namely, by fomenting trouble, by accusing and by abusing one another amongst ourselves? I do not spare even my Congress friends when there is occasion to criticise them. What happens is this. When a Praja Socialist Party Member stands up, he abuses the Communists and then the Congress, and then the Congress and the Communists will abuse the P. S. P., for example. It is but natural that this kind of utterances and acts end only in acrimony and lack of co-operation for nation-building activities. This should cease in the present state of affairs in the country, at least for the time being and there should be an honest attempt on the part of the leaders of all parties to strengthen the hands of the hon. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and his Government to bring about fusion and try to find out in what points and up to what limit we can all unite. Let us unite. Let us give military training to every one in the country. Let us educate the people. It is the general wish of everybody that India should be made stronger and there is a wish on the part of everybody to work. It is only some leaders that do not want that there should be unity among the people. But it is hoped, Sir, that the Congress which has been voted to power by the people, will realize it and try on its own part to bring about a situation in which it will be possible for all to co-operate with it. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, as I was at Allahabad when the Kumbh tragedy occurred, I should like to say a few words about it. I was myself at the place where the tragedy occurred only a few minutes before it happened. It was lucky that I was enabled to extricate myself from the crowd and get back to the embankment which is popularly known as

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

the bund through that shallow pool of water which the officials call a ditch and in which a large number of people fell and died.

Sir, we have been told by the previous speaker that there was no large crowd in the area between the west bank of the Ganges and the bund on the 3rd of February. My experience.....

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: I did not say that there was not a large crowd. There were a few thousands sitting.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My experience differs from his. I saw that there was so large a crowd that it was impossible for me to advance even a few feet towards the Sangam. Usually the area between the right bank of the Ganges and the bund is about 600 acres. This year, owing to the Ganges having changed its course, it was reduced to about 80 acres. It was known that at every Kumbh there is a vast gathering of pilgrims from all over India. It was known that the gathering this year would be greater. Nevertheless free access to what I may call the bathing area was allowed on the 3rd February. When I went to the Mela area I thought at first that the Government had been at pains to make as good arrangements as were possible to enable the pilgrims to bathe in security and comfort but when I saw that no arrangements had been made to control the flow of pilgrims to the bathing area, I feared that a disaster might occur. (*Interruption.*) My hon. friend, Shri M. P. N. Sinha, is not acquainted really with the arrangements that are made in these Melas and if he will only let me go on, I shall explain what might have been done. I do not accuse the Uttar Pradesh Government Ministers or officials of wanton cruelty. I do not accuse them of having deliberately failed to take steps to secure the safety of the pilgrims, but, in point of fact, the arrangements that were made were highly inadequate in this

important respect. The principal bathing ghat at Hardwar is a very small one in area. The area at Allahabad available for the pilgrims was about 80 acres. At Hardwar it is much less—it is only a few hundred square yards but the concourse of pilgrims at Hardwar is much smaller than that at Allahabad. Now how is it possible for the Government to control the access of pilgrims to the principal bathing ghat known as *Harkepauri* by means of barriers all along the principal roads? Every enclosure contains, I think, not more than 700 or 800 people and, consequently, the flow of pilgrims to the bathing ghat is regulated. Barriers, I understand from the newspapers, were erected on the Basant Panchmi day, i.e., on the 8th February. Had these barriers been erected earlier, I am sure that this tragedy would have been averted. Formerly no barriers were used. I do not think people who can remember what happened during the last 30 or 40 years can remember any occasion on which barriers were used but this year the circumstances were special and it should have been realized that the uncontrolled flow of the pilgrims to the bathing area would result in a large crowd too large a crowd—collecting in that small area.

Another defect in the official arrangement was that while there were many roads leading into the bathing area, there were very few that could enable the pilgrims, after having their dip in the Ganges, to go back home. There were roads provided for that but anybody could have seen that those were not the roads that would be taken by the pilgrims unless they were compelled to do so. At this particular spot where the tragedy occurred, pilgrims from many directions gathered together. That was the point at which pilgrims from many directions converged. Had this been foreseen and had the pilgrims coming from one side—from Daragunj side—been enabled to go over to the other side

even when there was an *Akhada* standing on the road, I am sure that it would have contributed greatly to the comfort and safety of the pilgrims. Let me say again that this has never been done before, but, then, the area was so large that even when a few lakhs of pilgrims were bathing in the Ganges, you did not realize how vast the crowd was. As the situation this year was special, the arrangements that should have been made to deal with the traffic should also have been special. What had been done before should not have been regarded as a precedent.

Then, Sir, the previous speaker has said that the presence of important people in Allahabad on the 3rd February imposed no burden on the police or the Mela authorities. Well, I do not know whether as a matter of fact it did or did not. The Chief Minister of U.P. denied in a debate that took place the other day in the U.P. Legislative Assembly on this subject that any man belonging to the city police was used to help these important persons but I can say that there was a general complaint in Allahabad that too much attention was being paid to these people.....

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: What did you see?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: .....and that the passing of the cars which were supposed to be theirs added greatly to the inconvenience of the passengers. What I saw was not the occupants of the cars but a number of cars passing along the principal roads towards the Sangam, or cars coming back from the Sangam. I cannot say whether they were police cars or whether they were cars.....

श्री टी० पाण्डे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ३ तारीख को मोटरें चल रही थीं ?

†[SHRI T. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): I wish to know whether cars were plying there on the 3rd February?]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him continue.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is not merely the 3rd that matters. The police arrangements were such that the people made these complaints on the last bathing day. As I could not reach the Sangam area, I cannot say from personal observation what arrangements were being made to enable the important persons to bathe in comfort. But 4 P.M. whatever may be said on this subject by those who think no special arrangements were made for these important persons, the news published in today's paper shows that Government themselves have come to the conclusion, as a result of the tragedy, that the arrangements made for providing escorts to the Ministers and other important people stand in need of revision. It has been proposed that the formalities observed when a Central or State Minister goes on tour should be reduced to the bare minimum. The proposal has also been made that the existing practice of sending police escorts with very important persons should be abandoned except during tours by the President and the Prime Minister. Now, if really no special arrangements were made for these people, how is it that at this very time, the authorities have considered it necessary to revise the rules relating to the ceremonies, if I may say so, that should be observed when an important person arrives at a place?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: A mere coincidence, like our trade treaty with Russia at the time when Mr. Nixon was visiting India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinha, please do not interrupt. Let him go on.

†English translation.



**SHRI H. N. KUNZRU:** The Central Home Minister was also at Allahabad on the bathing day, on the principal day—the 3rd of February—and he did not ask for any special arrangements for himself. He went to the river as an ordinary pilgrim. He and his family did not go there as important persons and I wish that other people had followed his example.

Sir, we were all astonished when the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh said in the U.P. Assembly the other day that he came to know of the Kumbh tragedy only at 4-15 P.M. And we were equally astonished when the hon. the Prime Minister said here the other day that he came to know of it only at five minutes to four. Now, how has it happened that these persons were not informed by the magistracy and the police of the disaster that had occurred? This is a matter that requires full investigation. That so tragic an event should take place and that the Head of the Government of India and the Head of the Government of Uttar Pradesh should know nothing about it for hours, is a matter that requires more explanation than has yet been given for it. I do not know whether this is within the scope of the enquiry that will be carried on by the enquiry committee that has been recently appointed. But if it is not and if it is outside the purview of that committee, I trust that the U.P. Government will take all possible steps to find out how the officials concerned failed in their duty to inform these persons of the serious events that took place on the morning of the 3rd February.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, there is one more point connected with this matter that deserves special attention. In the old days, the Associated Press of India, whenever it sent out an important message, sent a copy of it to the Governor-General, to the Governors, to the Members of the Executive Council and so on. Does the P.T.I. in the

same way now send copies or these messages to the President, the Governors, the Prime Minister, the Ministers at the Centre and the State Ministers or not? If it does not, the rules require revision. But if it does, how is it that the officials concerned, the officials connected with the Uttar Pradesh Government, did not come to know of the tragedy till 4 o'clock? The message sent by the P.T.I. from Allahabad was, I understand, received here at about 1-30 P.M. on the 3rd February and the A.I.R. announced it at the same time. How does it happen, then, that the P.T.I. message did not come to the knowledge of the Governor and the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh? That is another matter that requires to be looked into. If there has been a failure of duty on the part of the P.T.I., serious notice should be taken of it.

Lastly, Sir, I should like to say a word about the committee of enquiry. It consists of three persons, two of whom are retired officials and one a serving official. Now, I do not think that anybody will say that the retired officials were under the control of the Uttar Pradesh Government. The Chairman of the committee is the ex-Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court and I am sure that he will discharge his duties independently and with a full sense of his responsibility. The other retired official who is a member of the committee is Dr. Pannalal who belongs to the I.C.S. He, too, I am sure, can discharge his duty independently because he too is not under the control of the U.P. Government. Nevertheless it is a fact that this committee has not inspired public confidence in Allahabad. The fact that non-officials have not been included in it has been criticised at several public meetings. No one has asked for the exclusion of any existing member of the committee; but the demand at every public meeting has been that three or four non-official members ought to be added to the committee in order to strengthen

it and to ensure that no fact connected with this tragedy would be overlooked. I think, Sir, that this is a reasonable request. The committee has already begun its work; nevertheless, I do not think that it is too late for the U.P. Government to expand the personnel in the manner desired by the public of Allahabad. It will lose nothing in prestige, but gain enormously by taking this action.

Now, I would like to say a word about another matter that has been referred to in the President's Address, namely the Ceylon Agreement.

I do not want to discuss the agreement in detail but I should like the spokesman of the Government to explain its provisions to us. I find it difficult to understand one or two provisions of this agreement. Now, I have tried to understand what India has gained by this agreement. The Prime Minister of Ceylon said the other day that India had generously made many concessions to it. Sir, India is a big country and if it can make concessions to a small neighbour like Ceylon with which it has old historical and cultural ties I should personally welcome it, but as the position of hundreds of thousands of Indians now in Ceylon was under examination when the Prime Ministers of India and Ceylon made this agreement, it is necessary to ask to what extent this agreement benefits the Indians in Ceylon. How far does it safeguard their position? So far as I can find out, the only undertaking given by the Ceylon Government is that the registration of persons qualified under the India and Pakistani Citizenship Act will be expedited and that every endeavour will be made to complete the disposal of pending applications within two years. I understand that during the last two years only 15,000 applications have been disposed of while their total number is about 240,000. It is undoubtedly a question that the

Ceylon Government should have agreed to see that about 200,000 applications are disposed of during the next two years. I do not know how the Government of India has agreed to the placing of the persons registered under the Act I have already referred to, on a separate electoral register. This question of separate electoral rolls has not arisen for the first time. It is an old question and arose many years ago, more than about 25 years ago in East Africa. It has also arisen in South Africa but nowhere have we agreed to the placing of Indians on a separate roll and I fear that the agreement of the Indian Government to this will weaken the position of persons of Indian origin in East Africa and South Africa. Whatever the Governments of those countries may have done, Sir, the Government of India has never been a party to the arrangements made by those Governments. Here, for the first time, the Government of India, is a party to this kind of arrangement.

Another point—and that is the last that I should like to draw attention to, it is the last point that I wish to deal with—is the position of those who are considered to be eligible for Ceylon citizenship. What is to happen to them? The agreement says that it would be open to such persons to register themselves as Indian citizens if they so choose at the office of the Indian High Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of article 8 of the Constitution of India. It is noted that Ceylon proposes to offer special inducements to encourage such registration and that these inducements will be announced from time to time. The Government of India will offer administrative and similar facilities to all persons of Indian origin to register themselves as Indian citizens under the Constitution of India if they so choose, etc. Now, Sir, so far as inducements to the Indians to return to India go, they are very

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

similar to the inducements offered to the Indians by the Government of South Africa some years back to leave South Africa and return to the country of their origin, but the Indians who were living there were not asked while living there to register themselves as Indian citizens. Since Ceylon is so near India, some Indians may have been living there only for 2 or 3 or 4 years but others may have been living there for 10 or 15 years and what is to be their position? Are they to be compelled or are they to be given inducements to come back? In either case, Sir, *the position accepted by the Government of India is not one that we can regard with satisfaction. That the people who elect to remain in Ceylon should be stateless and should be the responsibility neither of the Ceylon Government nor of the Indian Government is a matter that must cause serious concern to every Indian.* It is for these reasons, Sir, that I should like the hon. the Prime Minister or some other Member of the Government to explain clearly the provisions of this agreement to us. It may be, Sir, that the understanding arrived at between the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Ceylon could not be translated into words. The spirit of the negotiations, I suppose, defied definition but the specific points which I have referred to, I think, need to be cleared up. It is true that a separate electoral register for the Indian citizens of Ceylon—for the Indians who may become citizens of Ceylon in future—has been agreed to only for ten years but that is for a long period and future Ceylon Governments may say that the principle having been once accepted they saw no reason to depart from it.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President's Address has been discussed for a long time. The three principal matters on which a great amount of discussion has taken place are the in-

cident at the Kumbh Mela, the foreign policy of the Government and the Pakistan-American agreements. I am not going to say anything on these three because I shall not be able to add anything useful. But in the noise and din created on these three questions, other matters in the Address of the President, which require to be dealt with, have been forgotten. I am particularly interested in the very brief reference made by the President in paragraph 16 of his Address (English), page 6. There, there is a single sentence referring to the Bills that are pending and the President was pleased to say, "*Among these are the Bills dealing with the reform of the Hindu Law to which my Government attach considerable importance*".

These are the only words that refer to a very important matter like the reform of the Hindu Law which has been hanging fire for about 12 years since first of all the late Sir B. N. Rau was called upon to deal with certain portions of the Hindu Law. And as one connected with the reform of this law in its various aspects, I might tell this House that at least about a dozen notes were sent by me from time to time and I personally attended some of the meetings called by the then Law Minister, Dr. Ambedkar. Having spent a lot of time over this, I am concerned that there was only a very brief reference to this important domestic matter of the reform of the Hindu Law. I think it is high time that the Government made up its mind whether it is going to deal with the whole of the Hindu Law or whether it is to tinker with this portion or that portion, deal with marriage and divorce, then special marriage and then, at some time or other, take up the Succession Act and so on. This is placing the cart before the horse. I should prefer that the most contested point, the Law of Succession, should be placed first or really the whole of the Hindu Law that remains to be codified should be placed

before the two Houses for discussion and a special session be held or some special time be assigned for the purpose of finally disposing of the reform of the Hindu Law. I know there are various angles of looking at the Hindu Law and there will be a great deal of controversy. I have seen that on the three matters which I have referred to at the beginning of my speech there have been opinions expressed which were poles apart. We cannot avoid controversies, and particularly in a democratic Republic. Therefore I wish to draw, without saying more, the attention of this House and those who represent the Government—unfortunately only the hon. Mr. Biswas is present here; there is nobody on the Government side except him—and I would strongly urge the Government to make up its mind that the whole of the Hindu Law, that has not already been dealt with, should be dealt with, not in a piece-meal manner, but should be carried through in one session at a sitting.

**SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was very carefully listening to the hon. Dr. Anup Singh of the Congress Party who began with an appeal that we should not discuss very much matters of foreign policy which have been discussed very many times in this House, but unfortunately he himself mainly dealt with foreign policy and ended his speech with that. That is because this Congress party which is holding the reins of the Government has nothing to offer as regards domestic achievements. Even in this Presidential Address which I think is nothing but a progress report like the one that the school teacher submits to the guardians. In this progress report the school teacher (the President) has told us (the guardians of the Ministry, the boys) that they have done very well in the last year. 'The progress is slow; they have improved. Do not bother very much. They will do well'. Well, he has not pointed out as to how and in

what manner they are going to improve, but it is a very good certificate and it gets very good publicity outside, because the Ministers, if they speak about themselves, may not get that much of publicity. Sir, although the hon. Dr. Anup Singh did not follow what he said, I will try to confine my remarks to the domestic policy.

In this progress report, Sir, if you refer to page 5, para. 10, he has said satisfactory progress has been made in the great River Valley Schemes and some of the projects have already been completed and are yielding results. Sir, it is a surprisingly strange claim. I maintain that the progress is wholly unsatisfactory. If you go into the details of the working of the projects which are under construction and which are being executed by the Central Water and Power Commission and if you notice the manner in which they are being supervised and carried out by this Commission, it is a very sad story. Corruption, nepotism, favouritism and inefficiency are rampant in every sphere. Wrong drawings and estimates have been prepared by this Commission which has cost the country an enormous amount of money. Not only that, but sometimes we hear about the paucity of technical staff and engineering talent. There is no paucity actually in the country so as to make us import from outside engineering talent to complete the work in these projects. But there is a clique working in the Central Water and Power Commission which prevents others from coming into it. If you really want that these River Valley Projects should be successfully carried out, then this conspiracy to defraud the Government and public money must be broken and the Central Water and Power Commission must be represented by people belonging to all States who have the necessary technical knowledge.

Sir, if you make a review, you will find that in recent years in the case of almost every project, hardly

[Shri S. N. Dwivedy.]

there is one estimate which has not been revised under some plea or other. Take the case of Hirakud. I do not want to go into the history of it, but the fact remains that it started with an estimate of forty-seven odd crores, but now it has gone up to 100 crores. It was contemplated first to be completed by 1952-53, but now we hear that it will be completed by June 1956. Recently, Sir, I have visited Hirakud. The present Chief Engineer claims that he will be able to complete this work within the target period, but the talks I had with his subordinates and other engineers gave me the feeling that further extension would be inevitable. The target period is being changed and extended with the change of every Chief Engineer. There have been three Chief Engineers for this project. The third man is in charge at present and every Chief Engineer extends the time by a further period.

Therefore, Sir, we must have to go to the roots of the problem and find out as to why such things are occurring when we are investing such vast amounts of money in these projects.

Sir, we want that Hirakud should be completed as soon as possible. I think every countryman of ours desires this. Now, we cannot tolerate any further delay, specially when the location of the Steel Plant has been decided upon—however much it might have taken unnecessary parleys for months and years. It is a great thing. Therefore what we want is that not only the present plans of the Hirakud Project should be completed within target period, but the subsidiary dam scheme which was postponed and for which machinery worth crores of rupees are lying idle, should be received and completed within this period. Unless this is done, I feel, probably the electric energy that would be required would not be had. Because, along with the steel factory, we have the aluminium and the ferro-manganese factories and all these would require power

to the amount of 1,10,000 kilowatts; but the present plant, when completed, would at best be able to give about 85,000 kilowatts. Therefore it is very essential that this project should be worked successfully and efficiently.

I do not want to repeat here the irregularities and waste, etc., about which much has been said before. But my fear is the way in which the present men in charge of Hirakud project manage the whole affair, they would not be able to finish the work within the time-limit. I am prepared to excuse and forget the past, but I cannot forget the picture I have seen there. I don't want to deal with the waste of corruption. I have no desire to wash the dirty linen here.

But, Sir, there is discontent, discriminatory treatment, not only amongst the 30,000 labourers, but surprisingly even amongst the higher officers who are in charge and are responsible for carrying out the work. If one visits the place and sees the condition of the labourers, one would realise.

Sir, a few months back, the Chairman of our Council visited the place and I am sure he must have had an idea about the wretched condition of the labourers. The hon. the Deputy Minister for Irrigation and Power is not here; he visited that place very recently. The hon. the Labour Minister also has been there just before the present labour trouble which started in the last week of January.

The labourers there live in a hopelessly miserable condition—they are treated like anything but human beings. Even ordinary demands such as housing, water, medical facilities have not been satisfactorily met. If you look at the big palatial building built for the officers and engineers side by side and compare that with the deplorable conditions of housing of the labourers—who are not in hundreds, but in thousands—you will simply be surprised. Such big officials and authorities of the Government of India visit this place so often, yet

nothing has been done so far. To my mind, Sir, the labourers are as important for the completion of this dam as the Chief Engineers. You cannot make them work at the point of the bayonets with a hungry belly.

Let me come to the recent labour trouble. I am not connected with the labour organisation there and I am not very particular here for my discussion to express any opinion about all their demands such as wages, or whether a particular union is to be recognised or not. All that, I think, is not very relevant for my discussion. But it is a fact that all these years—the work began as far back as 1948 or some such year and thousands of labourers have been working there since then—it has not yet been decided as to which Labour Department—Government of India or Government of Orissa—would look after the labour conditions in Hirakud. It is a pity that thousands of labourers were left to the entire mercy of a few unsympathetic officials. Even a labour officer who could act as a liaison was not appointed. A month back, I am told, some one was appointed who hardly knows the Oriya language.

The present unrest started on the 22nd or 23rd of January 1954. When the trouble started and some people pressed for more money, housing, medical facilities and the like, without trying to mitigate or conciliate them, the Chief Engineer left that place without authorising anybody to do anything, and handed over this affair to the police and the magistracy. And what was the result? It is a very sad story. During the seven days that passed between the actual happening and the beginning of that trouble, services of any of the labour officials either of Orissa or of the conciliation officer, who lives in Cuttack, were not taken to conciliate in this dispute. But if my information is not wrong, the Chief Engineer sat tight over the enquiries made by a certain labour official about six months before in regard to the facts. No

reply was given. Nor were any steps taken to satisfy them. And when they asked for a better deal, they were handed over to the police and the magistracy. And what did they do? There was no violence, there were no arms with the labourers, no reports of any assault on anybody. They might have been misled. Communists were, of course, there to make political capital out of it. I have denounced them publicly and I think that is besides the point. The fact is that dissatisfied labourers came and wanted to go to the residence of the Chief Engineer with their ordinary demands; they were peaceful and wanted to get an assurance from the Chief Engineer at least to the effect that this time their demands would be satisfactorily settled and considered by the Central Board or the higher authorities whoever they were. But the police lathi-charged them and two persons, according to the official report, died as a result; many more were seriously injured. It reminded me of the story of Jallianwala Bagh.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Who are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh! Oh!

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: These two persons are workers. Even during the British days, Sir, when we were fighting the Britishers, death on account of lathi-charge was unheard of.

AN HON. MEMBER: There were many.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: I myself have borne lathi-charge and I know the history of national struggle. There have been many deaths for firing, but none, I am sure, by lathi-charge. This is a shameless affair. I am perfectly certain in my mind, Sir, that so long as such a state of affairs continues, the project work cannot be successfully carried out.

(Time bell rings.)

Unfortunately I have no time. But I will say this much. Let an enquiry committee be appointed or let any responsible Minister go into the entire matter. Let him examine and enquire

[Shri S. N. Dwivedy.]

not only into the present happenings but the conditions of the labourers there and suggest measures. If this Government has any regard for thousands of labourers and other men who are working there, they should immediately do these things, punish the police and the magistracy who are responsible for this and also remove such of the officials as have bungled in this matter. The workers' demands should be met without any further delay.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay) :

श्री डी० नारायण (बम्बई) : श्रीमान उपसभापति जी, जिस प्रस्ताव की बहस कल से शुरू है उस प्रस्ताव का स्वागत करते हुये एक खास बात की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में बहुत से कामों का जिक्र है और चन्द कामों की निस्वत राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपना संतोष भी प्रकट किया है परन्तु एक जगह है जहाँ पर कि खास कर उन्होंने अपना दुख और असंतोष प्रकट किया है और उसी की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा है :

"My Government attach special importance to the development of cottage industries. I regret, however, that progress in this respect has not been very satisfactory."

स्पेशल इम्पोर्टेंस (Special importance) जिस चीज को दिया जाता है उसमें प्रगति क्यों नहीं होती है, इसे सरकार को और हमें सोचना चाहिये।

घरेलू उद्योगों को खास महत्व दिया गया है, ठीक है। परन्तु अनुभव यह है कि घरेलू उद्योग प्रगति नहीं कर रहे हैं और इसका कारण यह है कि एक मिथान में दो तलवारें कभी रह नहीं सकतीं। एक तरफ हाथ की घानी शुरू हो, बैल से खींचा जाने वाला कोल्हू शुरू हो, और दूसरी तरफ सामने आइल मिल शुरू हो, तो बतलाइये कि दोनों एक

जगह कैसे चल सकते हैं। कभी बैलगाड़ी मोटर से नहीं जीत सकती। यदि आप घरेलू उद्योगों को चलाना चाहते हैं तो आपको चाहिये कि उनके दायरे निश्चित करें और आपको ऐसी व्यवस्था कर देनी चाहिये कि उन्हें बड़े उद्योगों के साथ कभी कम्पीटीशन न करना पड़े। आज घरेलू उद्योग इसलिये नहीं चल पाते हैं क्योंकि वे बड़े उद्योगों के साथ कम्पीटीशन नहीं कर सकते। घानी वाला आयल मिल के मालिक के साथ कभी कम्पीटीशन नहीं कर सकता। गांव में बैठा हुआ चमार बाटा कम्पनी के साथ कभी कम्पीटीशन नहीं कर सकता। ठेकी चलाने वाला कभी चावल मिल के साथ कम्पीटीशन नहीं कर सकता। तो ऐसी हालत में आप बतलाइये कि घरेलू उद्योग धन्वे कैसे चल सकते हैं। कहा गया है कि खादी ग्रामोद्योग बोर्ड कुछ करेगा और आशा दिलाई जाती है कि खादी ग्रामोद्योग बोर्ड की ओर से बहुत सी बातें होने को हैं परन्तु मेरा अनुभव यह है कि खादी बोर्ड जो बातें सुझाती है उन बातों को सरकार स्वीकृत नहीं करती है। आप देखिये कि तेल के उद्योग के बारे में खादी बोर्ड ने कहा कि नानएडिबिल ऑइल्स (non-edible oils) कारखानों में पैदा किया जाय और खाने के जो तेल हैं उनको गृहउद्योग के लिये छोड़ दिया जाय। इसके बारे में सरकार अभी तक कोई निश्चय नहीं कर सकी। इसी तरह से खादी बोर्ड ने सिफारिश की है कि राइस हल्लिंग मिल्स (rice hulling mills) बन्द कर दिए जाय, परन्तु आज तक उसकी ओर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। खादी बोर्ड ने कहा कि कोल्हू के तेल के ऊपर सबसिडी दी जाय लेकिन अभी तक उस पर भी कोई फैसला नहीं हुआ। हैंडलूम बोर्ड (Handloom Board) से बहुत सी सिफारिशें आई हैं परन्तु उनकी ओर भी कोई खास ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है। इन समाप्त

बातों को देखते हुए आप इस फैसले पर आयेंगे कि सरकार को इस बात को जानना चाहिए कि घरेलू उद्योग तब तक नहीं चल सकते जब तक कि उन्हीं चीजों की ये बड़ी बड़ी मिलें और कारखाने मौजूद हैं। यदि सरकार घरेलू उद्योग को बढ़ाना चाहती है तो मेरी खास राय यह है कि सरकार पहले घरेलू उद्योग निश्चित करे जिन्हें कि बड़े उद्योगों के साथ किसी तरह से कम्पीटीशन का सामना न करना पड़े या सरकार उन्हें कम्पीटीशन से बचा सके। कुछ दिन हुये मैंने यह सवाल यहां पेश किया था कि आज बीड़ी के उद्योग में पांच लाख मजदूर काम कर रहे हैं और एक मशीन ऐसी बनाई जा रही है जिससे कि ये पांच लाख लोग बहुत थोड़े दिनों में बेकार हो जायेंगे और सरकार की ओर से यह कहा गया कि हम देख रहे हैं कि इसमें क्या कुछ किया जा सकता है और उसे रोकने की कोशिश करेंगे। मैं आज देखता हूं कि उस मशीन का प्रचार हो रहा है। कल्याणी में, कांग्रेस की ओर से, कांग्रेस के बगल में जो प्रदर्शनी हुई थी उसमें इस मशीन का प्रदर्शन दिया गया था और वहां मशीन की तारीफ़ की जा रही थी और बहुत सी मशीनें बेची भी गईं। आप सोचिये कि जब यह मशीन चारों तरफ़ फैल जायेगी, तो ये हाथ से बीड़ी बनाने वाले मजदूर बेकार हो जायेंगे और आपके ये पांच लाख निरुद्योगी भूखे मारे मारे फिरेंगे। मुझे एक बात की ओर और ध्यान दिलाना है कि यदि आप घरेलू उद्योगों को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो सिर्फ़ सरकार के सरकुलरों से यह बढ़ने वाली बात नहीं है। या तो यह चीज़ सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लिये अच्छी है या फिर बिल्कुल अच्छी नहीं है क्योंकि देहली तो इस चीज़ को करते रहे और शहर के लोग मिलों की चीज़ें लेते रहें, ये दोनों बातें एक साथ चलने वाली नहीं हैं क्योंकि आखिर को देहात आपका ही अनुकरण करते हैं, सरकारी अफसरों का करते

हैं, नेतागणों का करते हैं और वे तब तक देहली उद्योगों की ओर नहीं दौड़ सकते जब तक कि आप उन उद्योगों को नहीं अपनायेंगे।

हर्ष की बात यह है कि गत वर्ष हमारे देश में अनाज का उत्पादन ५० लाख टन बढ़ जाने के कारण इस देश से कंट्रोल (control) की बीमारी कुछ कम हो गई है। कल कहा गया कि कंट्रोल के निकल जाने से भाव बढ़ रहे हैं। मेरा अनुभव तो इसके बिल्कुल खिलाफ़ है। मैं एक डेफिसिट (deficit) प्रदेश से आ रहा हूं और मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि जब से कंट्रोल खत्म हुआ है तब से ज्वार बाजरे के भाव घटे हैं और घटते जा रहे हैं और मुझे विश्वास है कि जिस तरह से आशा की गई कि १९५३-५४ में अनाज की पैदावार कुछ और भी बढ़ेगी यह बात हुई तो ये भाव और भी घट जायेंगे। चावल के बारे में भी आशा दिलाई गई है कि आगे के वर्ष से चावल पर से कंट्रोल निकाल दिया जायेगा। मैं खास कर अपने अन्न मंत्री को बधाई देता हूं कि उन्होंने इस बात में बहुत ही धैर्य के साथ काम किया है।

पाकिस्तान-अमेरिका करार का जहां देखिये वहां जिक्र होता है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इसका इतना हौवा क्यों बनाया जा रहा है। इस बात का हर्ष है और अभिमान भी कि राष्ट्रपति जी का इतना महत्वपूर्ण भाषण हुआ परन्तु उन्होंने उसमें कोई खास दिलचस्पी के साथ और खास तफ़्तीलवार व्योरे के साथ इस विषय का जिक्र नहीं किया। यह करार कुछ महत्वपूर्ण जरूर है परन्तु आम जनता की निगाह से देखा जाय तो यह ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है जिससे कि हमें डरना चाहिये। यदि इससे सबसे बड़ा डर है, मेरी निगाह में तो वह पाकिस्तान को है, क्योंकि हमें इस बात का दुःख है कि हमारे साथ साथ या यों कहिये कि हमारी वजह से पाकि-



[Shri D. Narayan.]

स्तान भी आजाद हुआ, जैसा कि पंडित जवाहरलाल ने एक जगह कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लपेट में पाकिस्तान भी आजाद हुआ, तो हमें दुःख इस बात का है कि इस पाकिस्तान-अमेरिका करार से पाकिस्तान अपनी आजादी को खतरे में डाल रहा है। यदि इससे किसी को खतरा है तो वह पाकिस्तान को है। वह हमारा पड़ोसी है, हमारे साथ सैकड़ों वर्ष तक रहा है, इसलिये यदि वह गलती करता है तो हमारा यह कर्त्तव्य हो जाता है कि हम कहे कि भाई यह गलती न करो, इससे तुझे धोका होगा और तुझे धोका हो जाने के बाद पड़ोसी के नाते कुछ न कुछ धोका हमें भी पहुँचेगा।

इसलिए हम यह आम तौर से कहते आए हैं कि पाकिस्तान को सावधान होना चाहिए क्योंकि वह अपने लिए और अपने पड़ोसियों के हित में बहुत बड़ी गलती कर रहा है। साथ में हमारे यहाँ यह भी कहा जाता है, एक आवाज चारों तरफ से उठ खड़ी हुई है कि हमें अपनी सेनाएँ बढ़ानी चाहिये, हमें शस्त्रास्त्र बढ़ाने चाहिये, हमें अपने बच्चों को और खास कर के नवयुवकों को सस्ती की मिलिटरी तालीम देनी चाहिए। कभी हम ने यह नहीं सोचा कि हम यह जो कुछ कर रहे हैं इसका क्या नतीजा होगा ? आप यह न समझें कि मैं यहाँ पर कोई नान-वाइलेम (non-violence) की बात कहने वाला हूँ, उससे मेरा यहाँ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं। मुझे यह कहना है कि जिस वक्त आप उन बातों को कहते हैं, उस वक्त दुनिया की आज आम हालत तो देखे। कहा तक शस्त्रास्त्र बढ़ाकर आज हम दुनिया की घुड़दौड़ में शामिल हो सकते हैं। रिआर्मामेंट (re-armament) की जो घुड़दौड़ आज दुनिया में चल रही है, उसमें आपके पास कौन सी शक्ति है, कौन सा पैसा है, कौन से तक्ष हैं

जिनके जरिये आप उसमें बराबरी के नाते चल सकते हैं, और जल्द पहुँच सकते हैं।

दूसरे, आपको यह भी सोचना चाहिए कि आज जो आपका बजट है ४०० करोड़ रुपये का, यदि आप फौज का खर्चा बढ़ाना चाहें—बल्कि उसमें से २०० करोड़ रुपया फौज पर आज आप खर्च कर ही रहे हैं—ऐसी हालत में यदि आप फौज का खर्च बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तब आप दूसरी बहुत सी बातों को फना करके ही उसे बढ़ा सकते हैं यानी तमाम तरक्की की अपनी स्कीम आप बन्द कर दें और फिर फौज के ऊपर सारा खर्चा करें तब यह हो सकता है, या नए टैक्सों के लगाने से यह हो सकता है। आप खुद सोच सकते हैं कि इस सब का क्या नतीजा आ सकता है। ऐसी हालत में हम इन बातों को सोचें कि जल्द से हम कोई सैन्य बढ़ा सकेंगे, शस्त्रास्त्र बढ़ा सकेंगे या अपने नवयुवकों को कम्पलसरी मिलिटरी शिक्षा (Compulsory military training) दे सकेंगे, यह एक अव्यवहार्य बात है, नामुमकिन बात है। और खास कर आप सोचिए, हिन्दुस्तान के नवयुवकों को यदि आप कम्पलसरी मिलिटरी शिक्षा देना चाहे, तो आपके नवयुवक हैं कितने। यह भी सोचा आपने ? कई करोड़ों के ऊपर नौबत आ जायेगी। कितने धन की, कितने आयोजन की और कितने शिक्षकों का यह काम है यह भी आपको सोचना चाहिए। बिना सोचे विचारे हम ऐसी बातें करते हैं जो बिना पैर की हैं। कुछ भाई यहाँ यह चाहते हैं कि हमें तो अब रशिया के साथ सैनिक दोस्ती करनी चाहिए। इधर पाकिस्तान अमेरिका के साथ करार करता है, तो हम उसे गलती कहने हैं और वैसी ही गलती करने के लिये हमसे कहा जाता है कि आप रशिया के साथ दोस्ती करिये। एक तरफ तो हम कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान आग

में कूद रहा है और दूसरी तरफ हम कहते हैं कि आप भी समुद्र में कूद पड़िये । इस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान का कभी भला होने वाला नहीं है । हिन्दुस्तान ने आज तक जो तरीका अस्तित्वार किया है कि वह किसी दुनिया की जंग में शामिल नहीं होगा, वही रास्ता ठीक है, क्योंकि हमें कोई बाहर से लोभ नहीं है और यदि है तो अपने मुल्क से है । उसकी रक्षा करने से है । देश का रक्षण करना हमारा फर्ज है, धर्म है । हमारा यह दृष्टिकोण रहने के कारण हमारे लिये डरने की कोई बात नहीं है । हां, हमारे ऊपर यदि कोई आँख उठायेगा तो हम उसका सामना करेंगे और डट कर करेंगे । सामना किस तरह करना होगा, यह भी हम जानते हैं । आज तक हम ने कैसे किया यह भी दुनिया जानती है । परन्तु, हमें अपनी तवारीख नहीं भूलनी चाहिए । हमारी तवारीख हमें एक सबक सिखाती है कि जब जब हमने बाहर से कोई दोस्त या मित्र को बुलाया, तब तब वह मित्र हमारे यहां आकर हमारा मालिक बन बैठा । यही पाकिस्तान की तवारीख है । आखिर पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान का ही तो हिस्सा है । इसलिये हमें समझ लेना चाहिए कि बाहर से दोस्त कभी नहीं बुलाना चाहिए । बाहर से मित्र बुलाने में धोका है और खतरा है ।

(Time bell rings.)

एक मिनट और । मैं आखिर में सरकार को बधाई उस काम के लिये देना चाहता हूं जिसके लिए सरकार ने अभी हाल हाई पावर कमीशन (High Power Commission) कायम किया है, देश का पुनर्गठन करने के लिये । इसके कायम होने से जनता की बहुत दिनों की आकांक्षाएं पूरी होने की एक आशा पैदा हुई है । मुझे विश्वास है कि यह हाई पावर कमीशन केवल फाइनेन्शियल मैटर्स (financial matters) या एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मैटर्स (administrative matters) पर

ही ध्यान नहीं देगा, परन्तु इस बात की ओर भी ध्यान देगा कि आम जनता की आकांक्षाएं क्या हैं, उनकी प्रगति में रुकावटें क्यों हैं और जनता क्या चाहती है । मुझे विश्वास है, हाई पावर कमीशन इस ओर ध्यान देगा । आखिर मैं में आशा करता हूं कि हाई पावर कमीशन के फैसले से हमें संतोष ही होगा, इतना कहकर मैं इस प्रस्ताव का स्वागत करता हूं ।

[For English translation, See Appendix VII, Annexure 27.]

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, (having read the President's Address, I find that the last paragraph of his Address in which he says, "This new year begins with hope and fear evenly balanced" calls for little comment. If we look at the Government and its policies, there is no doubt that there is only reason for fear and fear alone, but if we look at the people and the struggles by which they are trying to avert these policies, there is every reason for hope. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in a way there is fear on account of the policies of this Government, and in another way there is also hope, and we have no doubt in our minds that soon the fear will disappear before the rays of hope that are rising not only in Travancore-Cochin but all over India.

Now, coming to the President's Address, one is thoroughly disappointed but disappointment from that quarter is nothing new. I would not make any observations on the question of foreign policy and on the Kumbh Mela. Much has been said and more perhaps will follow. Yet, I would like to say something, since the question has been raised since our Leader has spoken, as to what we would like the hon. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, to do in the field of foreign affairs. It has never been our contention that you should send armies abroad. We never asked him to do that. Since the hon. Mr. Singh asked that question, I have to answer. All that we ask him to do is to stand

[Shri B. Gupta.]

firmly on the side of peace. Peace is an issue which knows no area, knows no barriers. It is an issue which transcends all frontiers. It is an issue which finds its partisans not only in the Socialist world where the banner of the peace always flies triumphantly but finds its supporters and partisans even in the United States of America. Therefore all that I would like to emphasise in this connection is that you should take your stand on the side of peace and fight for the cause of peace, but unfortunately the policy pursued by the Government of India has been something to the contrary in many fields.

I would not refer particularly to the Korean question. I am glad that the hon. Dr. Anup Singh, came at long last to condemn Dr. Syngman Rhee but over the last two years he did not utter these words which he should have uttered before. How is it that to such a man who maintains gangs of assassins and to that pirate of Formosa you have handed over 22,000 Chinese and Koreans for them to be used as cannon fodder or slaughtered? At the Kalyani session of the Congress when Congress speakers, one after another, were speaking against the proposed U. S.-Pakistan military pact, Syngman Rhee was putting out the threat that, if the prisoners were not handed over to him, the Indian Army would be drowned in blood. It was exactly at that time that the American Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was saying that transport had been kept ready for taking away the prisoners to Formosa so that Chiang-Kai-Shek could get them. Therefore with the full knowledge of what would come to them, you handed over these prisoners to them. Sir, that event does not fit in with any policy of peace. On the contrary, it helps those people who believe in war, in extending war, who believe in international tension and not in relaxation of international tension. Now, we can ask you to do so many other things, but we know that they will not be done. What prevents you from stop-

ping Gurkha soldiers being taken across India to Malaya so that they can carry on their butchery there? What prevents you from stopping the passage of munitions and armaments, through India, to Viet Nam and other places? You can stop them. Sir, these are the things, these are the constructive suggestions that we can offer, but we know that our constructive suggestions do not seem constructive to them when they do not fit in with the policies of this Government

I would not say much about the Kumbh Mela. When the history of that grim tragedy comes to be written, as it will undoubtedly be written, it will be said that those V. I. P.s who went there went there as *Jamadutas* and not as very important personalities. Let us see what the investigation shows, but I would like to emphasise that it is the presence of these very important personalities—I do not know to whom they are important—and the consequent diversion of security arrangements which led to this tragedy. For these developments, they will answer—may not be today but definitely—at the bar of history.

Sir, in the economic field, the claim has been made that there has been continued improvement in the general economic situation. This claim is not justified by the facts of life in the country. It is no use telling us that five million tons more of food grains have been produced in the last year, nor is it of any use telling us that certain indices in production have gone up. This does not mean anything. The whole thing should be looked at from the point of view of the people, whether the hungry is getting food, whether the people without shelter have got houses to live in, whether those people who have been unemployed have secured employment. Nothing of this sort is said here. I would like to remind the Government benches that it was during the war, when the indices of production rose very high in 1943, that we had the Bengal famine which took

a toll of 35 lakhs of human lives. Therefore, it is no use producing such figures. According to the hon. Mr. Kidwai, 19 lakh tons of food were in the godowns even in the beginning of last year. But did it mean that 5 P.M. the people got food? Not at all. On the contrary, famine stalked the country. Millions became hungry and they were thrown into the streets for a morsel of food which was denied to them. Such are the things which you must not miss when you make a statement. Therefore it is no use telling us about the production of food grains. We know that this figure is again in question for the simple reason that some of the areas which had not sent in their reports about their production begin to send reports and they go into the Government account as if more food has been produced whereas in fact no such production has taken place. We need not go into this. It is said that the industrial production index rose to 134 in 1953 from 129 and certain industries have been mentioned, e.g., cotton textiles, paper, chemicals, bicycles, cement, salt and most of the engineering industries. Let me take one by one. Let me say that nothing is said about the British exploitation. Some of the industries belong to the British. To give one example, during the last year five foreign banks gave dividends to the extent of 20 to 40 per cent. whereas the Indian banks remained more or less in the position where they were. Most of these banks are British banks and they made enormous profits and they continue to make such profits and if you look at the British industries you will find the same story but nothing is said about those industries here. Profits of the big magnates, of the foreign exploiters, of the multi-millionaires do not enter into the accounts of the leaders of our State because they are so sacrosanct that you cannot talk about them. Take, for instance, the paper industry. The Titagarh Paper Mills, for instance, last year made a profit of Rs. 1,21,47,952 against a paid-up capital of Rs. 1,14,92,000. This is the rate of profit which they are making. Pet-

roleum companies which are again owned by foreigners made profits to the extent of 200 to 300 per cent. over the capital and this is something that has been omitted by the President. Something has been said about cotton textiles but what has not been said—and which is also relevant—is that in November 1953 as compared to November 1952 the price of dhosis registered an increase of 14 per cent. whereas that of sari rose by another 2 per cent. Now the stocks have undoubtedly accumulated but the cloth has been denied to the people at a time when the purchasing power of the people is falling. It is no use trying to point to the stocks of cloth accumulated there when people go unclad and are asking for cloth. It is no use trying to point your finger to the accumulated wealth of Mr. G. D. Birla and tell us how the country is rich and prosperous when people are dying in the streets for a bare morsel of food.

Then certain things have been said about other industries. I would only like to say that the reduction in the production of dhosis has brought about a crisis in the West Bengal industry and most of the mills are about to be closed and this is something which has been communicated to the Government by the mill-owners themselves. It is known that 14 mills gave notice of closure while two actually closed in October. The handloom industry has been referred to by the previous speakers. Much was promised to the handloom industry by the khadi-clad leaders of the Congress but when it came to brass tacks, nothing or very little was given. Now they come and say that "we could not do much". Therefore, I would ask the hon. Ministers there—I don't know how many of them are present—not to make profuse promises because breaches of promises have been too many and we should at least control the breach of promises if we cannot control any other thing.

Mention has been made of coal. The British have been exploiting that industry and the condition of the 4½ lakh workers is so bad that they have

[Shri B. Gupta.]

been forced to give notice of strike. Much has been said about the engineering industry but what has not been said is that a large number of small engineering industries in Bengal, for instance, have had to close down because of certain difficulties which the Government did not at all try to remove. Now, we know even if we take the industry as it is today, between 25 to 30 per cent. of the installed capacity is working and the rest is idle. In some cases it means that 75 per cent. of the installed capacity of the engineering industry in a country like ours—industrially backward in a way—is idle. That does not justify that you are making an advance even in that. Cement has been mentioned—of course it will be mentioned.

(Time bell rings.)

I hope you will give me a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Cement has been mentioned. Undoubtedly, cement has recorded a certain rise in production. The Associated Cement Company which enjoys most of the contracts under the Five Year Plan is enjoying the boom as we know but at the same time it needs to be pointed out in this House that the Chairman of that Company has put out a threat that unless the freight is reduced and the price of the cement is increased, he will restrict the production. That has to be taken note of.

Jute industry has been mentioned and again it is pointed out that 12.50 per cent. of the looms are lying idle and they had not yet been unsealed and the mills are working 42½ hours a week whereas they should work more and yet we find that they are giving bonus dividends to the shareholders who are mainly British whereas the bonus to the workers had been systematically denied. Export and import of jute goods has also been

mentioned but a little reference to these documents will show how we are being exploited. The prices of jute manufactures that go abroad are falling at a rate which is very much alarming and this is something which is not mentioned in this document. It is said that in the last year while our export has gone up by 8 per cent. the price of the jute goods that are sent abroad fell by 42 per cent. This is another way of exploiting the backward countries by brow-beating the prices of raw materials and this is something which had been admitted even at the Sydney Commonwealth Conference, at the Colombo Plan Consultative Conference, and there is not a Minister here to tell us what they are going to do to ensure the interests of India when we export such materials. This is another way of exploitation.....

(Time bell rings.)

I would like to conclude only by saying that many industries have gone out of existence, many industries are on the brink of extinction and at the same time we find that unemployment is growing in the countryside, in the towns and everywhere. In Bengal for instance the Employment Exchange has reached, according to the official statement, the saturation point when they don't have a capacity to register the host of unemployed. So great is the unemployment in one place. Now, nothing has been done. They come with a statement to tell us that something has been done. I know the mighty personage from whom the statement has emanated presides over a regime which can only offer us hunger, tears, sorrow and misery and nothing else, and unless this regime is changed, we cannot have hopes that have been promised here, but only the fears you have mentioned.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion before the House. From yesterday onwards, I have been hearing certain amount of criticisms, unbridled, unrestrained and often-times disproportionate to the facts before the

House. Any right-thinking man will agree with me that this country has indeed made positive progress in the field of economic development during the last five or six years. I am not merely relying upon the experience of individual members. Outside experts who came to this country, persons who are disinterested and who have knowledge of the facts, they have given that unanimous verdict about the progress that we are making in this country. I am not merely referring to the opinion of important personages like the Finance Minister of England, Mr. Butler, or the ex-Ambassador of America here, or several other important persons like Sir George Schuster or Sir Jeremy Raisman and others. I am inviting the attention of my Socialist friends to the opinion of a Socialist M.P. from England who said that although the Congress Party in India does not profess to be a Socialist Party, the achievements of the Congress Party in India far exceed even the promises that have been made by the Socialist Party in England.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My hon. friend there seems surprised. Ignorance seems to be his bliss. But all these are of no avail if we have a cynic before us, or a perverse mind, which is incapable of seeing what is being done, what is being achieved by the country. As we all know, Miss Mayo wrote a book on India, and every one knows it that the facts stated therein may not be incorrect. So also the facts stated by the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may be accurate, but as Gandhiji remarked about Miss Mayo's book, that it is a drain inspector's report, so also I would say that the hon. Mr. Gupta is an unwarranted cynic who looks only on the wrong side of things and not on the right side of development. The hon. Mr. Gupta and his colleagues have got a purpose behind all that they do. Their object is to create chaotic conditions in the country. It is not legitimate criticism or valid or valuable criticism that they are offering for the purpose of advancing the interests of

the country. Sir, it is an open secret that at Madura there were two sets of resolutions passed by the Communist Party, one for publication and another for action. Parliament, they say, is merely for propaganda. The hon. Mr. Gupta also has got another kind of propaganda machine, for like one of Hitler's men, he believes in the saying, "Tell a lie, repeat it *ad nauseam*, then it becomes truth".

Very well. It is known to everybody—and it has not been denied by the Communist Party—that they had resolved that parliamentary activities were of little avail, and that they must take to extra-parliamentary activities, and we know what that means.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Was it told you by some black-marketeer?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I can appreciate the anxiety of my hon. friend to interrupt me and if you are prepared to give me sufficient time, Sir, I am prepared to deal with them.

What really happened? They decided on a programme of work, of creating strikes and trouble everywhere. Today, Sir, you are hearing about the strike in Calcutta. You have heard about the students' strike in Lucknow. You have heard of the strike in Hiraikud. Sir, these are not isolated cases, they are all according to a pre-arranged plan, a master-plan. Sir, I am not exaggerating it at all. I am inviting the House most seriously to consider this matter. What is being done all over the country is to exploit every available avenue, to put into action every measure to discredit the Government, not by parliamentary procedure, but by violence. If corroborative evidence is required in this connection, I would invite attention to two circumstances. The Secretary of the Communist Party, when touring in Travancore-Cochin, was asked the question, "Would you assure us that your party will adopt only non-violent methods?" and he replied, "I cannot commit my party to that. If occasion arises, or if occasion requires

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]  
it, we will certainly take to violence.”  
That is the purport of what he said.

SHRI B. GUPTA: When did he say that?

SHRI PRASADARAO: (Andhra): You find non-violence in Calcutta today.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I will come to Calcutta a little later.

Yesterday, you heard the Leader of the Communist Party here—I would request hon. Members to read his speech over again—I mean the hon. Mr. Sundarayya's speech—where he has said in so many words what the Communist Party mean. He said, “If you do not yield to our demands, we know how to pull you down. Shoot us if you can, but we will force you out.” It is not an old statement, it is quite recent.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The Travancore-Cochin people are forcing you out.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My hon. friend, Mr. Gupta, always lives in a dream-land. I have no objection if he wants to be an opium eater. I will have no quarrel.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Travancore-Cochin will show you where you are.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: So far as the hon. Mr. Gupta and his colleagues are concerned—I would not use the word “agent” with them—but they know what is their *modus operandi*. I am not here to use harsh words, but the hon. Mr. Gupta compels me to do so.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Do, do. You will get it back in the same coin.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: We know that that is the *modus operandi* of the enemies of the country—they are not merely the enemies of the Congress. It does not matter if they are the enemies of the Congress. But what grieves me is that they are enemies of

the country. Shri S. K. Patil very rightly said in Travancore-Cochin that they have branches here, but their roots somewhere else. I would not use the other expression that he used.

Now there is another section—a sober section, because its ideals are sober. It believes in democracy. But the exigencies of events have driven them into an unholy wedlock with the Communists under special circumstances. What grieves me about the Communists is that every right-thinking man knows that a Communist is an enemy of the country. He has no regard for the development of the country, no knowledge of any prosperity at all, no use for increased food production. We heard one hon. Member cavilling at the hon. the Food Minister. He does not want prosperity in this land for if there is prosperity; then their purpose is defeated. If you present them facts and figures, they say, “We do not believe facts and figures.” If you present prosperity, then the man says, “Well, there is starvation somewhere.” Obviously the starvation is one of imagination rather than real. It is a matter of intellectual starvation in the case of my hon. friend and not a question of real starvation.

Now, let me come to the others, the Socialists. There, what is happening is that in order to catch up with the Communists they are playing into the hands of the Communists. The Communists are deliberately fomenting strikes here and there—they call it *Satyagraha*. And the Socialist Party also believes that an agitational approach to the masses is necessary if they are to build up their party. So what they do is, immediately the Communists start a strike in Lucknow, they start a sugarcane strike somewhere else. For what purpose? Because they believe, if they do not do that, they will be left behind and the Communists would steal a march over them. But they and the Communists are poles apart. But, at the time, when the Socialists start an agitation, the Communists are anxious to jump into it. They do it

for two reasons. First, to take the credit out of the Socialists on to themselves, and, second, to get things so mingled up that later on the Socialists may not have an identity of their own.

SHRI B. GUPTA: You can cut that part of your speech. There is nobody from among them here.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My grievance is due to this unholy alliance that they have had with the Communists. I have great reverence for their ideals and for their leaders. But I am grieved at the contamination that is spread ing to them from the Communists. What really happens in that Party is this. There are two wings in it. There is one with ideals and full of idealism. Theirs is a good idealism. But that idealism is unfortunately submerged by the other group or section which joined the Party later and who hunt for jobs. They went out of the Congress, not because of difference in ideals, but because they did not get offices or lost the offices that they got. So unfortunately this is what happens. You can see what is happening in Travancore-Cochin. They are running into the arms of the very people whom they did not want to touch even with a pair of tongs.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Sir, is the hon. Member speaking on the President's Address or on something else?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is replying to the previous speaker.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My hon. friend will profit if he will only hear me and see if the Socialist Party is on the wrong track or not.

Now, what is happening? Because of this chaotic condition there is a good deal of unrest in the country. The Socialist Party by intemperate criticism, as was done by the hon. Mr. Reddy yesterday almost running up to abuses, creates a vacuum which it is not capable of filling. My hon. friend, Mr. Gupta, is ready bag and baggage to fill it up. That is my grievance.

I have no grievance against a democratic party taking up these things but let the Socialist Party realise what it is doing. Let them realise kindly that the contest in India is not between socialism and capitalism but between democracy and dictatorship. (Interruption.) The only two parties are either the Congress or the Communists. That is the range of things today and if my hon. friends do not realise it in time they are doing great disservice to this country.

Now, I have dealt with this aspect for this reason that there was an unfortunate tragedy in the Kumbh Mela. All of us grieve over it. It is a national mourning. But what is happening? Do my hon. friends really grieve for the death of these people? They seem to be very glad about it because they have got a big stick to beat the Government with.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Nonsense. Such fantastic statements should not be allowed to be made here. What is he talking about?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I agree. If at all any fantastic statements must be made, it is the monopoly of my hon. friends. I am not going to join issue with them or even share the fantasies, but I am telling, Sir, what is happening and what is being done. We must really grieve and mourn for the loss of our sisters and brothers in the Kumbh Mela. The hon. the Prime Minister said that "here is an enquiry going into the matter. We will look into the matter. Let there be an enquiry report". No, these people say that we will first condemn you, we will condemn the Governor, we will condemn the President, we will condemn everyone. For what reason? Not because they want to know the facts about the Kumbh Mela tragedy but because they want to utilise that for another purpose, for political purpose.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.



SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Shame is the only word that could be used. My hon. friend correctly used that. Let us not accept this for any reasons other than what is required. I shall leave that aspect alone.

(*Interruption.*)

My hon. friend thinks of my crimes of omission but he forgets his crimes of commission. Hundreds of people he murdered in Hyderabad and when I say 'he', I mean his Party.

SHRI B. GUPTA: From Kumbh Mela to Hyderabad?

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras): Only on 26th January you murdered two textile workers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Commissions and omissions? Mr. Hegde, your time is finished.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The only unfortunate part is, Sir, that I am not allowed to make my speech. My hon. friend gets into a frenzy. If you will control his frenzy, I have no objection to get along with my speech.

This country is making tremendous progress in several directions. When we got our freedom we were starving. My friends, in 1943, when the Britishers were there, murdered 36 lakhs of people. They were hand in glove with the Britishers and they were a party to the crime of murdering 36 lakhs of people in Bengal and they were running after the Britishers when we were fighting the Britishers.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Must I answer every falsehood that is uttered here? In that case I have to be on my legs all the time.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: You can be on your legs or behind, I have nothing to say but here are the facts which I am bringing to notice. It may be unpalatable to you.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: You have been saying it for the last two years.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Yes, I have been saying it for the last two years.

(*Time bell rings.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is over, Mr. Hegde. You have to wind up. Fifteen minutes are over.

(*Interruptions by Shri B. Gupta.*)

Order, order, Mr. Gupta. Please do not disturb.

PROF. G. RANGA: One is competing with the other with unspeakable words.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mutual recriminations will not help.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: That is exactly what I am saying. For mutual recrimination, if it comes, my hon. friend will have to thank himself. He jumps as a Jack in the Box almost and says whatever is not palatable should not be said on the floor of the House. Would he go and read his own speech in the records?

(*Interruption.*)

The only thing is my hon. friend has neither the ears nor the heart. That is the difficulty. We can leave it alone. I want every countryman of ours to consider the tremendous programme that we have achieved. In the agricultural field our Government is adopting a bold, imaginative policy, a policy that has yielded tremendous results. Take the development in regard to the railways; take the development so far as the Posts and Telegraphs Department is concerned, partially in place of every one Post Office today we are having ten. The achievement of our country for the last five or six years is something which any country can be proud of, any Government can be proud of, any party can be proud of. I am proud of the fact that my Party has achieved a tremendous thing for this country and that in spite of the Communists.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (DR. P. S. DESHMUKH): Mr Deputy Chairman, I am intervening

in this debate only to say that whatever criticism has been offered so far as sugarcane prices are concerned should not go unrepplied to; otherwise my hon. friends opposite will probably complain that sufficient attention was not paid to them and to their utterances and that Government has been very callous to the speeches that they have made. It is only with that intention that I am intervening to point out the correct position so far as the prices of sugarcane are concerned. When the hon. Shri Sundarayya said, Sir, that the price of sugarcane has been reduced, I must correct him and point out that actually sugarcane prices have been raised from Rs. 1/5 to Rs. 1/7 per maund. He also complained that whereas the prices of other things were rocketing high and the sugar prices were also going up the rise in price of sugarcane was not adequate. I would like to point out, Sir, that even by the end of 1953 there had been a continuous lowering of the prices although the open market prices were much higher than was the case for several years past. In spite of that, the tendency of the prices was to come down and so far as sugar prices are concerned also, it would be found that the previous history has not been allowed to be repeated. Three years back when a similar position arose, the millowners came forward and said that they had surplus sugar which they wanted to export. But when the Government was thinking of exporting suddenly it was found that there had been greater consumption and that the sugar stocks would not be sufficient. At that time we know how the prices went right up to Rs. 2/8 per seer and you will remember, Sir, that when we were here just before Dipawali many of the M. Ps. had to buy sugar and take five seers at Rs. 2/8 per seer for Diwali feasts. Now, this calamity was averted by the timely action of the Food Ministry by importing sugar from outside. Even if there has been a slight difference in the sugar prices, I can safely say that the situation has been under control and if we look actually at the prices as compared even

with the year 1953 it will have to be admitted that the prices are lower than what they were some time ago. I will only mention the prices ruling in three ports. In Calcutta, in July 1953, the price ranged between Rs. 30/13 per maund to Rs. 33/12; as against that the prices in 1954 were more or less the same. There was no increase. In Bombay the prices were Rs. 32/12 to 33/6 whereas this year the prices have been round about Rs. 30/6 although in some cases they went up to Rs. 36 which was with regard to internal sugar where we have no price control. This price relates to a very small quantity of sugar. Whatever sugar we obtained from abroad was much cheaper than what was available in India and that sugar was sold at a price which was, on the whole, lower than the prices in most places. In Madras the prices came down from Rs. 30/4 and 32/13 as they existed in July 1953 to Rs. 30/4 and Rs. 30/6.

Mr. Reddy, Sir, complained that we were influenced by the millowners and that we were more keen to give them profit and that is why we reduced the sugarcane prices and did not give that benefit to the growers of sugarcane as was justified by the prices ruling so far as sales of sugar were concerned. Now here also I would like to point out that in consonance with the falling prices, if we were to restore the prices of sugarcane to any higher level, the result would be that the price of sugar will go up and the foodgrains cultivation is also likely to fall. When we raised the sugarcane price by two annas we saw that there was some justification for this small rise but had also to pay attention to the fact that sugar prices should not go up. Those people who complain about higher sugar prices should also bear in mind that there is no control on sugar prices at all and secondly the price that we have fixed for sugarcane is the minimum price and not the maximum. As my hon. friend, Mr. Kidwai, said in the other House, if the people demanded that sugarcane prices should be de-

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.]

controlled, we are prepared to do it but that will affect the cultivators especially in Bihar and U. P. where special Acts are in force and which were passed at the instance of the Central Government for the purpose of helping the sugarcane growers and not for causing them any harm.

PROF. G. RANGA: What is the position when the minimum price actually happens to be the maximum price?

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: It is true that that happens to be the maximum price but that is because there are no effective organisations amongst the cultivators. If we were to raise the minimum price, the consequences which I have just stated are likely to result and therefore no case exists for raising it. Short of raising the sugarcane prices, the assurance that has been given to the sugarcane growers has satisfied them and every sugar mill in U. P. and Bihar is now working normally. That assurance is that if there is any excessive profit made by the millowners, we will try our best to plough back a portion of that and give it to the cultivators by way of bonus.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The hon. Minister said that the sugarcane price has been increased from Rs. 1/5 to Rs. 1/7 but may I point out that it was really Rs. 2 three years back? First it was reduced to Rs. 1/12 and then it was brought down to Rs. 1/5. This increase from Rs. 1/5 to Rs. 1/7 was only during the last year. As compared to the previous price of Rs. 1/12 it is actually reduction in price.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: It is obvious that if we compare it with Rs. 2, it is less but I was comparing it with the previous year's figures. We had Rs. 2 per maund once, I believe, but this was when the prices of other commodities also were much higher. Sir, this demand for a rise in the sugarcane price has subsided on the assurance of our hon. Minister and therefore I am afraid there is nothing

about which the hon. Members opposite can legitimately complain.

PROF. G. RANGA: May I ask for some clarification? What is the machinery that the Government of India propose.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Budget debate is there.

PROF. G. RANGA: Since the hon. Minister is there.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will be there during the Budget debate also.

PROF. G. RANGA: Not that, Sir. If he can give it, let him give it to the satisfaction of the House. What is the machinery which they will devise by which they will be able to see that a portion of this excess profits will be ploughed back again to the benefit of the growers?

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: I am quite sure some formula will be evolved as was done in the case of the South Indian mills. When this assurance is given, it must be taken to mean that some steps will be taken to carry out the intention.

Then there was a reference, Sir, that the South Indian sugarcane growers were paid only Rs. 1/5 and no further. I would like to point out that as a result of a formula known as the Sisma, even in Hyderabad they get one anna and three pies extra per maund and other concessions in the shape of not being charged interest and so on, and the total amounted to more than four annas per maund.

So far as the import of sugar is concerned, the House, I think, knows full well that the consumption has gone up and this year also we do not expect that we will produce more than about 12.5 lakh tons of sugar. Under these circumstances and with a view to keeping down the price we have already proposed substantial imports of sugar. It cannot be helped.

I am very happy that a conference was held at which the hon. Mr. Kidwai was also present, and the growers of U. P. and Bihar have expressed satisfaction at the arrangement proposed. All that I need add is that so far as sugarcane prices are concerned, the Government is aware of its responsibilities both to the growers as well as to the producers of sugar, and we are trying to evolve some method by which the sugarcane grower would not be put to loss and also at the same time the sugar manufacturers will not make exorbitant profits. I do not think there is any other point which I need reply to. This is all the clarification that I wanted to give.

SHRI C. G. MISRA (Madhya Pradesh):

श्री चन्द्रगोपाल मिश्र (मध्य प्रदेश) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति महोदय के भाषण के सम्बन्ध में दोनों ओर से कई प्रकार के विचार प्रकट किये गये हैं अर्थात् विरोध में तथा पक्ष में कई प्रकार के विचार प्रकट किये गये हैं, इसीलिये मेरा कार्य कुछ संक्षिप्त हो गया है। मैं यहाँ पर केवल उन्हीं बातों पर प्रकाश डालूंगा जिनके विषय में अभी तक कुछ नहीं कहा गया है।

मुझे राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण के उस अंश पर ध्यान दिलाना है जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि "समझौते के प्रयत्न बराबर जारी हैं और मैं हृदय से विश्वास करता हूँ कि इन प्रयत्नों के परिणामस्वरूप तनाव के वातावरण में सुधार होगा और पश्चिम तथा सुदूर पूर्व में भावी समझौते का मार्ग प्रशस्त हो सकेगा"। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हमारे शासन की ओर से हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी विश्व में तथा अपने समीपवर्ती राष्ट्रों में शान्ति स्थापना करने के लिए जिस प्रकार सदैव प्रयत्न करते रहे और करते हैं वे बहुत ही प्रशंसनीय हैं। हम लोग पूज्य महात्मा गांधी जी के उपदेशों के अनुसार शान्ति का वातावरण शान्तिपूर्ण उपायों से ही स्थापित कर सकते हैं और इस से अच्छा कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं हो सकता है।

परन्तु इसके साथ ही साथ हमें अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय वातावरण की ओर भी विशेष ध्यान देना होगा। हमारा विशेष सम्बन्ध शान्ति के विषय के सम्बन्ध में पाकिस्तान से है। पाकिस्तान और भारत के बीच में जो शान्तिपूर्ण वातावरण अभी तक रहा है उसका श्रेय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को विशेषकर है। यदि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी उस शान्ति के साथ पाकिस्तान के साथ अब तक व्यवहार नहीं करते तो शायद अनेक विकट समस्याएं उत्पन्न हो जाती और वातावरण जो अब है, उससे भिन्न हो जाता। परन्तु इसके साथ ही साथ हमको यह भी विचार करना चाहिये कि माननीय राष्ट्रपति की ओर से हम यह आशा करते थे कि वह इस विषय पर कुछ प्रकाश डालने कि इन उपाय करने पर भी, हम और पाकिस्तान इस समय किस परिस्थिति में हैं।

पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में प्रारम्भ से ही जो नीति अपनाई और कदम उठाये हैं, उनसे आप लगे बली भांति परिचित हैं। पाकिस्तान ने प्रयत्न करके काश्मीर में जिस प्रकार कबाइलियों तथा अपने मैनिकों को भेजा तथा उनको सहायता दी थी, वह मयुक्त राष्ट्रीय कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में उस समय प्रकट हुआ जब कमीशन ने वहाँ जाकर वस्तुस्थिति का अध्ययन किया। पहिले पाकिस्तान बारबार इस बात से इन्कार करता रहा कि उसका काश्मीर के हमले में किसी प्रकार का सम्बन्ध नहीं है, वह तो केवल कश्मीरियों का अपना मामला है; बाहर के लोग काश्मीर के क्षेत्र में घुस गये हैं और उनको हम किसी तरह से नहीं रोक सकते थे, हमारे देश की सीमा इतनी बड़ी और फैली हुई है कि उनको रोकना हमारे लिये बिल्कुल असम्भव है और इस मामले में हम किसी प्रकार से उत्तरदायी नहीं हैं। जब कमीशन की ओर से जांच की

[Shri C. G. Misra.]

गई तो यह पता लगा कि पाकिस्तान ने इस हमले में सहायता दी है, केवल सहायता ही नहीं दी बल्कि अपने सशस्त्र फौजी सैनिक भी कबाइलियों की सहायता के लिए भेजे। इसके बाद जो कुछ प्रयत्न इस विषय पर अब तक संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की तरफ से होते रहे हैं उसका परिणाम अभी तक यह हुआ है कि इस संस्था में जिन देशों का प्रभाव है वे यह चाहते ही नहीं हैं कि यह मामला शान्तिपूर्ण वातावरण में समाप्त हो जाय, इसमें किसी प्रकार का सन्देह नहीं है। आगे जो कुछ भी कार्रवाई काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में हुई उसका मुख्य विषय यही रहा कि काश्मीर में जनमत संग्रह किस प्रकार से किया गया। काश्मीर की जनता का मत पाकिस्तान के साथ है या भारत के साथ है, इसके विषय में कई प्रकार की कठिनाइयाँ उपस्थित होती रही हैं, उनके समाचारों से आप सब लोग भली प्रकार से परिचित हैं।

अभी हाल में जब मैंने समाचार पत्रों में पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री जी का भाषण पढ़ा तो मुझे यह विदित हुआ कि पाकिस्तान अमेरिका के साथ शस्त्रास्त्र रूप में और फौजी रूप में भी एक समझौता करना चाहता है। इसका उद्देश्य केवल यही है कि जब पाकिस्तान की सशस्त्र शक्ति अच्छी हो जायेगी तो काश्मीर और जो दूसरे विवादग्रस्त विषय पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच हैं, वे सरलता से निबट जायेंगे। इसके मतलब की ओर हमको अच्छी तरह से ध्यान देना चाहिये। इसका मतलब केवल यही हुआ कि पाकिस्तान अपने को सशस्त्र करने के बाद यह समझता है कि भारतवर्ष के साथ सब विवादग्रस्त विषय हल हो जायेंगे और काश्मीर सम्बन्धी प्रश्न भी सरलतापूर्वक हमारे पक्ष में हल हो जायेगा। जो सशस्त्र सहायता अमेरिका की ओर से पाकिस्तान को दी जाने वाली है उसमें बहुत

गूढ़ बातें छिपी हुई हैं, इसको आप लोग जानते ही हैं इस विषय में विशेष प्रकाश डालने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

आप सब लोगों को और संसार को यह भली प्रकार से विदित है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की ओर से पाकिस्तान की सरकार को कई बार यह सुझाव दिया गया कि हम लोग एक ऐसा समझौता कर लें कि “हम किसी भी हालत में आपस में लड़ाई नहीं करेंगे”। परन्तु पाकिस्तान की सरकार ने इस सुझाव को स्वीकार नहीं किया मुझे यह बात भली प्रकार याद है कि पाकिस्तान सरकार की ओर से यही कहा गया कि जब काश्मीर का प्रश्न हल हो जायेगा तब ही इस प्रकार के समझौते पर विचार किया जा सकता है। इस सब का अर्थ क्या है? इसका स्पष्ट अर्थ यह दीखता है कि पाकिस्तान यह समझता है कि यदि हमारी सशस्त्र शक्ति बढ़ जायेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान स्वयं ही डर जायेगा। मैं यह तो नहीं कहना चाहता कि पाकिस्तान को इस प्रकार की सम्मति कोई देश दे रहा है। अगर दे रहा होगा तो यही होगा कि यदि पाकिस्तान सशस्त्र होकर हिन्दुस्तान का मुकाबला करने को तैयार हो जाय तो हिन्दुस्तान को झुकना पड़ेगा और पाकिस्तान जिस प्रकार भी समझौता करना चाहेगा, उसी प्रकार से उसको करना पड़ेगा। इस तरह की स्थिति उत्पन्न होने की पूरी आशंका है और हमको इसके लिए तैयार रहना चाहिये।

उस परिस्थिति में भारतवर्ष क्या करेगा, यह एक बड़ा भारी विचारणीय प्रश्न है। क्या भारतवर्ष शान्तिपूर्ण उपायों द्वारा सदैव पाकिस्तान को समझौता कराने के लिए मनाता रहेगा और यह सम्मति देता रहेगा कि भाई हम लोग शान्तिपूर्वक इस विषय पर समझौता कर लें। क्या यह आशा की जा सकती है कि पाकिस्तान समझौता करने के

लिए तैयार हो जायेगा ? काश्मीर के विषय में पाकिस्तान को किसी प्रकार का अधिकार नहीं है कि वह वहां के मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करे। परन्तु शनैः शनैः वह भी देखता है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय वातावरण ऐसा उत्पन्न हो गया है, जिस में शनैः शनैः हमें काश्मीर के विषय में संयुक्त राष्ट्र में स्थान प्राप्त हो गया है।

काश्मीर के विषय में हमारी सरकार की ओर से संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में यह शिकायत की गई कि इस बात का निर्णय किया जाय कि किस तरफ से अत्याचार हो रहा है, यानी "aggressor" कौन है। मगर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की ओर से आज तक इस बात की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है कि पाकिस्तान aggressor है। हम यह बराबर देखते चले आ रहे हैं कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जिन देशों का प्रभाव है उनकी यही कोशिश रही है कि काश्मीर के विषय में पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में किमी भी प्रकार शान्तिपूर्ण समझौता न हो। इन सब बातों से यही प्रतीत होता है कि पाकिस्तान भारतवर्ष के साथ शान्तिपूर्ण समझौता करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। जब नहीं तैयार है, तो फिर आगे भविष्य में क्या होगा ? हम तो चाहते हैं कि शान्ति बनी रहे। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने भी आशा प्रकट की है कि शान्ति स्थापना हो जायगी। परन्तु यदि नहीं हुई शान्ति-स्थापना और हमारे साथ और भी आगे कोई अत्याचार किये गये तो भारतवर्ष क्या करेगा यह बड़ा भारी प्रश्न है। क्या वह शान्तिपूर्वक उसकी बातों को मान लेगा या उससे प्रार्थना ही करता रहेगा, या यदि पाकिस्तान भारतवर्ष के साथ लड़ने को तैयार होगा तो भारतवर्ष भी लड़ने को तैयार होगा। हमारे यह कहने का अर्थ नहीं कि भारतवर्ष लड़ने के लिये अपनी ओर से किसी तरह की तैयारी कर रहा है। हमारी जो नीति चल रही है वह तो ठीक है। परन्तु अपनी रक्षा के लिए भी हम को किसी नीति को

स्वीकार करना चाहिए या नहीं यह एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न है। और हम यह आशा करने थे कि राष्ट्रपति की ओर से हमको मार्ग-दर्शन के लिए आज हमारे सामने कोई ठोस विचार पेश किया जाता। यूं तो काश्मीर को छोड़कर पूर्वी देशों के अन्दर भी एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न चल रहा है। आप देख रहे हैं कोरिया में क्या हो रहा है, फारमोसा में क्या क्या तैयारियां हो रही हैं, चीन के साथ क्या व्यवहार हो रहा है, आदि। और नाना प्रकार की जो घटनायें इन देशों के सम्बन्ध में होती हैं हम रात दिन उनका अध्ययन करते हैं जिससे यह पता चलता है कि यह एक ऐसा बड़ा भारी भय पूर्ववर्ती देशों के अन्दर समाया हुआ है कि न जाने किस समय विश्व युद्ध प्रारम्भ करने का प्रयत्न किया जाय। कौन यह प्रयत्न करेगा या कर रहा है इसको कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं। परन्तु भय विद्यमान है। अगर इन पड़ोसी देशों में किसी प्रकार का भय उपस्थित हो गया और इनके बीच में कोई लड़ाई छिड़ गई जैसा कि साम्यवादी चीन के सम्बन्ध में, फारमूसा के सम्बन्ध में और अन्य देशों के सम्बन्ध में विचार करते हुए मालूम पड़ता है तो फिर हमारे देश की क्या स्थिति होगी। यह सच है कि हम किमी के ऊपर अत्याचार न करेंगे और न किसी के ऊपर हम प्रहार करेंगे परन्तु अपनी रक्षा के लिये हमको पर्याप्त साधन उपस्थित करने चाहियें। हमको सरकार की ओर से बताया जाना चाहिये कि हम किसी बात के लिए तैयार रहें। सरकार जो कुछ करेगी या कहेगी हम उसका समर्थन करेंगे।

(Time bell rings.)

इसवास्ते इस विषय में मेरा विशेष रूप से यह कहना है कि हमारे लिए सरकार की ओर से कोई इस तरह का मार्ग-प्रदर्शन होना चाहिए इसके अतिरिक्त हमारे देश को मजबूत बनाने के लिए उपाय काम में लाये जाने चाहियें। हमारे देश का एक एक मनुष्य, एक एक बच्चा,

[Shri C. G. Misra.]

एक एक स्त्री-पुरुष इस बात के लिये तैयार रहे कि जब कभी हमारे ऊपर किसी प्रकार की आपत्ति आ जाय तो हम प्रत्येक प्रकार से अपने बचाव के लिये पूर्ण प्रयत्न करने के लिये तत्पर रहेंगे ।

[For English translation, see Appendix VII, Annexure 28.]

MAJ.-GEN. S. S. SOKHEY (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to bring home to the Members here the fact that India is facing a grave crisis. We are at present at cross roads, and this situation demands that we should give our most clear thought to finding a solution to the problems that face us. There is the danger signal of bases in Pakistan. That brings home to us the fact that imperialism is not dead yet. It is still a great danger to us—to our independence and to our liberty. It underlines what is happening in Malaya and then again in Indo-China, in Kenya and elsewhere. That should have made us alive to the fact that we still have our battles to fight. Our struggles still lie ahead. Now it has been suggested that we should arm all our people. I would like to ask in this connection as to where the arms are to come from. Do people want the Government to go to America or to the United Kingdom to get the arms? I think that we should be realistic enough. In the world of today, independence is not preserved by buying arms. And I think in this matter our Prime Minister has given us a very inspiring lead, viz., that the only way to meet the situation is that we should try to be self-reliant and self-sufficient. I think this is a point of view which we should consider very carefully. And we must realise that our strength does not merely lie in arms. Though it is perfectly true that if a country is to safeguard its independence and its freedom, it must arm itself for defence, but those arms must be produced by the people themselves.

However, one thing we must remember. And that is that arms are not everything. In June 1950 when the Korean war broke out, the U. S. A. at that time placed two-thirds of its total armed forces in Korea with some of the most modern equipment available; yet they could make no advance for the simple reason that they were fighting against a people who were united and who were standing shoulder to shoulder for the defence of their country.

That is the lesson we have to learn. We have got to sink our party differences and party affiliations and stand together for the defence of our country. This was the lead given to us. But I would like to say that merely giving the lead is not enough. Government should create an atmosphere in which the lead can operate. The body politic today is suffering from a serious malaise. We had recently a very striking instance of it. What has happened at the Kumbh Mela? What has happened in Calcutta where the secondary school teachers have gone on strike and the Government has been resorting to firing at the crowds are instances of this malaise. These instances indicate the malaise from which the body politic in India is suffering today. If any further instance is needed, it is provided by the failure of the Five Year Plan of development undertaken to increase our productive resources and to improve the living conditions of our people. This failure is underlined by the report of the International Monetary Fund which says more or less that the standards of living have deteriorated since before the war and they have been progressively deteriorating, and now they are among the lowest in the world. This is not what we expected from our effort or programme of development. I want to say that we are working under unsuitable conditions; we are still working under an administration which was developed by the British for their own purposes. They knew what they wanted. We have simply copied them without

thinking whether the administration suits our purpose. Similarly we have adopted with only minor changes the constitution devised by the British in 1935. A constitution is a tool to help a people to do national work in the best way possible. It is not a halter to pull a people down. We have been guilty of framing, or rather imitating a constitution, without taking into account our problems and the background against which they must be tackled. Our problem is the poverty and misery and backwardness of our people.

[Mr. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

We must rapidly develop our productive resources to create better conditions of life for our people. To achieve our objectives, we must have a Government machinery and a Constitution that make it possible for us to develop our resources rapidly and effectively. In order to do it, we must use all the technical knowledge that is available in industry, agriculture and health. These can be employed effectively and to the fullest purpose only if we have an atmosphere in which vested interests do not operate, the status quo is not maintained and, what is more, economic inequalities do not flourish. We have to create a situation in which we can work on a planned economy. That is the only intelligent way of utilising modern technical knowledge for increasing our productive resources as rapidly as possible. Instead of doing the job, we are play-acting. We imitate the parliamentary system of Britain, under which our beloved President is made to give a homily which does not inspire any one, while what was needed was an inspiring speech which would electrify the whole nation to put its shoulders to the wheel and make it go. I would once more say, "Let us be realistic and bring about a better administrative machinery and a suitable Constitution so that we could successfully do the jobs that require to be done."

131 C. of S.

## CALLING OUT OF MILITARY IN CALCUTTA IN CONNECTION WITH TEACHERS' STRIKE.

6 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the discussion on the calling out of the military in Calcutta on the 16th February 1954, in connection with the strike of the secondary school teachers and the situation arising therefrom. I should like to appeal to the Members to speak with restraint and a sense of responsibility so as to help ease the situation and not worsen it.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, we are very grateful that Parliament has been afforded an opportunity now to discuss a problem of very great national importance and concern, which affects not only the educationists of the country but all men of goodwill regardless of political and party affiliations. It is in the fitness of things that we should not have allowed rigid constitutional interpretations to come in the way of Members of Parliament, who are the representatives of the people, taking up this urgent matter when certain vital questions to our cultural life are being decided in Calcutta. Sir, as you have been an educationist yourself, I have not a doubt that you will understand the importance of such a discussion and I wish to engage in the discussion in a spirit in which such a subject should be discussed with a view to easing the situation and solving the crisis, that has unfortunately been created as a result of the policy pursued by the West Bengal State Government.

This situation in Calcutta has two aspects. On the one hand there is the question of the secondary school teachers who have been on strike since the 10th of this month. On the other hand there is the broad question of the civil and democratic rights. Sir, first of all, I would like to take up the question of the secondary school teachers.

As you know, there are about 25,000 secondary school teachers who work in about 1,300 to 1,400 secondary schools