

Officer) Rules, 1952. [Placed in the Library. *See* No. S-2/ 53.]

(ii) The Delhi Road Transport Authority (Service of Notices and Orders) Rules, 1952. [Placed in the Library. *See* No. S-3/53.]

(iii) The Delhi Road Transport Authority (Valuation of Assets) Rules, 1952. [Placed in the Library. *See* No. S-4/ 53.]

#### REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMISSION

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Finance Commission together with an Explanatory Memorandum as to the action taken on the recommendations of the Commission, as required under article 281 of the Constitution. [Placed in the Library. *See* No. IV.0.9(449).]

#### AGREEMENTS BETWEEN RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND THE RAJPRAMUKH OF MYSORE

I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the Principal and Supplemental Agreements executed under section 21A(1) of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, on the 24th December 1952, between the Rajpramukh of Mysore on the one hand and the Reserve Bank of India on the other, as required under section 21A(2) of the Act. [Placed in the Library. *See* No. IV.0.3(38).]

#### THE LIVE-STOCK IMPORTATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (DR. P. S. DESHMUKH): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Live-stock Importation Act, 1898.

'MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is: "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Livestock Importation Act, 1898."

The motion was adopted.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We pass on now to the discussion on the President's Address.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, before we pass on to that discussion, may I ask the Government, through you, information on one point. We understand that lots of Bills are coming up before this Session and it will help us if we know beforehand what are the Bills that will be taken up so that we can prepare ourselves in regard to those Bills. It will also conduce to the better working of this House-

MR. CHAIRMAN: A statement will be circulated to Members very soon.

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

SHRI RAMA RAO (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

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

"That the Members of the Council of States assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 11th February 1953."

Sir, the Address of the President is doubly important to us. It is the Address not only of the Head of the State, but also of a singularly distinguished Congressman who was one of the foremost captains of our liberation struggle. As one who is in the apostolic succession of Mahatma Gandhi, it is but appropriate that when the policy of applying peaceful methods to national and international problems is being pursued by us, a man who is such a distinguished disciple of Mahatma Gandhi should be the Head of the State.

It has been said that the reputation of Cromwell at home was only a shadow of his reputation abroad. That applies in an eminent measure to the Prime Minister of India. Recently, speaking at the Gandhian Seminar, in a mood of reverie, he compared his relations with Mahatma Gandhi, with the relations of Plato to Socrates. May I take the liberty of modifying it further and say that he is St. Paul to the Christ of the new Indian dispensation?

The application of the principles of the Mahatma to international politics is something that is extraordinarily vital to the civilisation of today. Memory travels back to the scriptural language of the Great Liberator, Abraham Lincoln, uttered in 1858:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, or bristling sea coasts, our army and navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defence is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors."

This great passage of Lincoln applies much more to the policies of India than to those of his own land today.

The Address may be summed up in a few words. It is a report on the State of the Union; it is a record of achievements and perhaps of failures; it is a picture of the difficulties not solved and yet to be solved; it is a triumphant vindication of the national and foreign policies; it is a reaffirmation of the cardinals of our creed and creeds; it is a re-dedication of ourselves to the cause of universal humanity; it is our reconsecration to the cause of peace. We offer our allegiance to the United Nations and its Charter.

At home we are setting out to be a Welfare State and that is stated for the first time in a State document. We are out for economic rehabilitation, we want better education, we are bringing about greater financial unity and integration. Generally speaking, we are working out, in our own humble way, our great and abiding national destiny.

One remarkable thing—especially those who have come out to India have noticed—is the extraordinary freedom of the Indian people from the war psychosis and that has made us much admired. Go to U.S.A., go to Russia, go anywhere you please, and there is not one citizen who says to himself, "I am captain of my soul, master of my fate." The war psychosis is all-pervading. Our answer to Communism of which we have too much clap-trap, is bread and butter. Our answer to colonialism is nationalism and liberation. Suspicion we eliminate, and trust we beget. The answer to fear is *abhaya*. Division we replace by unity. If there is injustice, we try for justice. and where justice is not enough, we supplement it with charity.

The Address may be divided into three parts—domestic problems, intermediate problems, and international problems. Under the head of domestic problems we get first the tribal policy. About July last year, *The London Times* examined it sympathetically. That policy we may describe as second in the glory of its achievement, only to our foreign policy. The British used to intimidate the tribes where they could not bribe them. Christian missionaries were employed for purposes other than of religion. Now we are following a policy of broadbasing the safety and security of our frontiers on the affections and good-will of the people of these territories. We invite their co-operation while we offer them opportunities of self-expression.

Parliamentary democracy, the next democratic problem, before us has been an enormous success in this country. If people are asked how, after centuries of foreign rule, we have not

[Shri Rama Rao.] only been able to have a stable and tranquil country but also to establish and work democratic institutions with tremendous success, the obvious answer is, we may be new to the modern political stage, but we are heirs to an ancient civilisation.

Our friends of the Opposition and opponents of the Congress here and elsewhere speak a good deal about this defect and that deficiency. They must not forget that it is our business to make Parliamentary democracy a success and we are doing it. India has set an excellent example. Look at any country in the world today. Outside the U.S.A. and U.K. you don't find a stable, really free Government. France has a new Government on the average every five months. Take away American help and the Government of De Gasperi will crumble to dust in Rome tomorrow. Western Germany is occupied. The small countries of Western Europe don't count for very much and they hourly fear for their existence as a result of two wars. Far away, far removed from the threats of doubt, suspicion and fear, we are functioning, and functioning effectively. We have excellent leadership. We are a people trained to the discipline of battle—thanks to Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress liberation movement. We have inherited an excellent administrative machinery. Above all, we stand as neutrals between two glowering giants.

Sir, paragraph 10 of the Address refers to linguistic provinces. I find that a number of amendments have been rushed into the Secretariat of this House. I am afraid my friends who have done so have been somewhat in a hurry. I hope I shall never be charged with want of enthusiasm for this great and fundamental question of the re-making of India. I am a fanatical believer in linguistic redistribution. But the Address makes it clear that certain problems have got to be solved, that certain answers |

have got to come, before linguistic redistribution can be taken in hand. With this I agree. Meanwhile an attempt is being made to lift this question from an emotional to an intellectual level. Those who ask for linguistic provinces are being asked to explain several pointed questions. Conditions are laid down about unity, security, financial stability, administrative feasibility, economic progress, so on and so forth. I know that when the Congress agreed in 1920 or 1921 to linguistic provinces absolutely, there were no conditions attached. Today some conditions have been introduced. Those who are for linguistic provinces have got to prove their case and I have not the slightest doubt that before any impartial judge they will be able to prove their case.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Are they on trial?

SHRI RAMA RAO: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Get on.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I ask if they are on trial.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are all on trial.

SHRI RAMA RAO: I don't want such Members as my friend in any case to be jurors. That being the case, there is bound to be a high powered commission. There are many problems to solve in this connection, exercising a lively imagination, which is the privilege of a journalist, I can very well anticipate the appointment of a high-powered commission.

Sir, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to pay a tribute to a distinguished Andhra countryman of mine—the late Potti Sriramulu—for his magnificent self-immolation. He has passed into the calendar of Gandhian saints. He has passed into the pantheon of Andhra immortals. I trust that the declaration on the starting of the Andhra State will be made on Telugu New Year's day. If that is possible, and that this State will

actually come into existence on August 15.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras): You have not got that in the Address.

SHRI RAMA RAO: The Address raises the question of economic stability. A lot of amendments have been sent in, which to my mind, have completely mistaken one of the main purposes of the Address. It is not claimed anywhere in it that we are living in a paradise or even that we have tided over the vast difficulties that have been confronting us for several years. No, if it had said it would amount to boasting. That would not be dealing honestly with the situation. What is implied in the Address is that the very best efforts have been made on a large and concerted scale to bring about better economic conditions. He is not a just critic who says that economic conditions have not improved. Take the dollar which a friend of mine has wittily remarked is the "*Siva Linga*" of modern currency. The rupee does not compare badly with it. While other countries' currencies are in the doldrums, we are doing pretty well and that is the barometer of prosperity.

What do we propose to do in regard to economic matters? We have the Five Year Plan, of which a lot of criticism has been offered. I would say, as a hardened fighter, the more the criticism the merrier. After all that is our purpose here. All the better would it be for the propagation of the ideology of the Plan and for helping in its effective prosecution. My friends, therefore, are at liberty to offer any criticism they please. If there is no popular enthusiasm about it, I ask you what are you doing? What part do you play? Are you not merely standing with your hands in your trouser-pockets, offering academic and dilettante criticism? Or are you, like the people of Uttar Pradesh, taking the spade and the crowbar in hand, and offering *shram* don?

We must have a very important consideration in our minds with regard to economic questions. There is not the shadow of a doubt about the extraordinary position this country occupies in the scale of nations with regard to political influence or the shaping of international policies. But our real fear is that the reputation we have is so high that our physical and material strength may not be able to measure up to it. There is grave danger in that. You can build a great soul, but, along with that you must build the necessary body. There the question of economic reconstruction assumes supreme importance.

For the first time, as I have already stated, the Address commits us to the Welfare State. It is a great proposition. Some may laugh at it as the baseless fabric of a dream. Not uncommon are, however, cloudcapped towers built to live in, not merely to be envisaged.

I see in the amendments that have been brought forward a lot said about famine. We are left to guess, unless we are absent-minded, that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru is personally responsible for the present famines and shortages. That is an extraordinary assumption to make. The Indian budget has been described as a gamble in rains. We are now out to make agriculture a profitable proposition by giving the people plenty of water. The projects are there progressing and ready to yield results. When I think of the great barrages, built by good Englishmen a hundred years ago on the Krishna and the Godavari, and when I recall the origins of the Suk-kur Barrage in 1923 in regard to which a distinguished Englishman, Sir Montague Webb, played a part, I ask myself the question: "How many years shall I live to see these wonderful barrages coming up all over the country?" If you laugh at these barrages, you are laughing at your own rivers.

We are achieving self-sufficiency in a number of ways. Production is going up in cloth, jute, cotton and sugar.

[Shri Rama Rao.] We shall be soon building our own ships. We are nationalising our airways and we shall manage them as efficiently as our railways, if my friend, Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri will permit my saying it. Our exports are going up. From them revenue surpluses will be realised and these will be used for the fulfilment of the purposes of the Plan. Mr. Giri has given us a new ideology. Labour is the dominant partner in our industrial economy. I am happy to hear it because I belong to the working class and we are now fighting the battle of journalism before the Press Commission, to which a reference is made casually in the President's Address. I want to know to what extent the journalists of this country are going to play an important role in the building up of our new journalism.

The capitalists of India have received some wholesome advice from Sir George Schuster. He has told them to behave reasonably and not to be fools. They are only junior partners, they have got to take their place in the new schemes and a very small place, at that, so that they may live. Survival is the main problem before Indian capitalism. Controls are an essential part of the apparatus of the Welfare State and, even if some jib at them, they will be there if production and distribution are to proceed on even keel.

Sir, I now proceed to a discussion of the intermediate problems, as I have called them for the sake of convenience. India and Pakistan have achieved one of the cardinal liberations of this century and it is their business, their joint task and responsibility, to see that Asians, and Africans also became free in the lifetime of the oldest man sitting here. How shall we do it? The position is that we have on us the responsibility not only of making ourselves strong, politically and materially, but also of influencing the thought of the world in such a manner as to make it possible for these vast peoples of Asian and African origin to be liberated at the earliest moment.

I do not know what exactly is going to be the final of the American foreign policy. I shall come to it later, but may I ask American statesmen to remember the wholesome philosophy laid down in two scintillating sentences by Abraham Lincoln? This pamphlet (The speaker showed it to the House) has been supplied to us by the United States Information Services—has just come in handy: "No man is good enough to govern another man without the other man's consent. I say this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor, of American Republicanism." I give another quotation: "I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

May I, Sir, quote a very beautiful sentence from the Presidential Address:

"My Government will continue to work to this end and will pursue a policy of friendship with all countries without any alignment with one group of nations against another. The democratic processes to which we are so firmly committed in our own country involve methods of peaceful approach to problems. If democracy is to survive, the same climate of peace and spirit of reconciliation has to be extended to the international sphere."

—mark the words—I read again:

"If democracy is to survive, the same climate of peace and spirit of reconciliation has to be extended to the international sphere."

There has been a gross failure of democracy in the West, where they are practising self-rule at home and colonialism abroad. My friend Shri C. G. K. Reddy knows about it. In Rangoon....\*.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Does the hon. Member agree with what happened in Rangoon?

SHRI RAMA RAO: I have read your article in *The Hindu*, which is done very well.

The Western Socialists have a guilty hand with regard to colonialism. I suppose my friend does not object to it. Does he?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Certainly not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Get along.

SHRI RAMA RAO: It has been said that Mazzini preached the doctrine of universal humanity; but, from Cavour down to Mussolini, Italian Statesmen practised nationalism at home and imperialism abroad. This has been the unfortunate evolution of the Western politics. The Presidential Address stresses clearly the right and proper process of evolution of democracy. If democracy is good as between citizen and citizen, it must also be good between one country and another. Romain Rolland laid down the doctrine that if an individual is punished for theft or robbery, a statesman also must be punished for robbing other people of their liberties and properties. Well, when we go on to that state, there will be little international trouble.

Sir, I shall not discuss South Africa much, which is another intermediate problem. It is a foreign country no doubt, but it is in the Commonwealth or is alleged to be in the Commonwealth. There are thousands of Indians there. I would only say about Dr. Malan that he is out Hitlering Hitler. Indians in East Africa have expressed their view that they are totally opposed to self-government for it, not because they are opposed to self-government as such, but because they are convinced that it will be government of the people by the whites and for the whites. There is a possibility, according to the foreign papers I have

been reading, of a coup by the whites, somewhat in the manner of the coup that was contemplated against Lord Ripon in Calcutta in the days of the Ilbert Bill agitation. A Royal Commission has been set up; but I can safely predict that it is going to meet with the same fate as the Simon Commission in India. We do not want East Africa so, to be heaven for the white-man and hell for the black man.

Sir, may I now refer to the third category of questions? Foremost of them is the questions of Korea and Formosa. From the amendments that have been given notice of, I am led to think that there has been again, in this case also, a good deal of hurried thinking. What are the fundamentals of our policy with regard to Korea and the Far Eastern problem? We do not recognise the Government of Formosa; we have recognised the Government of Peking. We want a place for China on the Security Council of the United Nations. To that extent, therefore our differences with America, are fundamental. For instance, we want peace in Korea as soon as possible. We hold the view that the so-called repatriation of prisoners' issue is only a pretence and a camouflage for real intention. We detest the doctrine that Asians be made to fight Asians. We feel that it is wrong for any country to get begged down in an unwanted war in an unlucky territory. We are anxious that the United Nations should see to it that its machinery is not used for the purpose of aggrandisement of any particular ideology or any particular country.

As regards Formosa, Mr. Bevan, who is here, has described it in the phrase "willing to strike, but afraid to wound." I do not know to what extent the new policy is seriously intended. If you read the American papers and the comments that are so liberally cabled out to this country, you will see that there is a good deal of confusion. The skyscrapers of New York have suddenly turned into Towers of

[Shri Kama Rao.] Babel. Do they mean it seriously—this blockade, this imposing of Chiang-JCai-Shek on China, the invasion of the mainland? Or is it all a camouflage? Opinion has not crystallized. If you read the morning papers, you will find that Chiang-Kai-Shek says that for months together he cannot invade. Mr. Dulles, wiser for his European experience, seems to be in a somewhat sober mood. President Eisenhower who knows much military strategy if not very much of diplomacy, knows that it would not be so easy to land on the coast of China as it was to land on the coast of Normandy. The story of the Syracuse expedition of ancient Greece is well known. If any one wants more knowledge on such subjects, let him refer to Churchill's volumes on the First World War. Gal-lipoli was a disaster because it violated one of the fundamental maxims of naval strategy, namely, ships must not fight forts. In this case, the China coast has been well fortified.

I would suggest to my friends who are asking our Government to take a "firm" line with regard to Formosa to be a little careful when they talk in that strain. They have the privilege of being not responsible for the conduct of the foreign policy of this country. If they think that, the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of India is not taking interest in this matter, they are very much mistaken. Look at the morning papers and see what Mr. Pearson, Foreign Minister of Canada, has said. He is opposed to any new China adventure by the U.N.O. I have always delighted to call Mr. Pearson the Canadian edition of Jawaharlal Nehru. He is always taking the right line. There is basic agreement on important problems between Canada and India. And probably that is one of the things that makes our association with the Commonwealth pleasant and profitable.

Sir, on international contacts, alliances and friendships, whether they I

are material or spiritual, we have declared our policy. We adopt a friendly attitude towards China. We refuse to believe that the social transformation that has come about in that country is an act of aggression. I cannot understand how the nationals of a country can "aggress" one against another. It is a civil war, if you please. It is a national revolution, if you want to describe it that way. If the people of China want to go in for agrarian reform or any form of communism, it is their lookout. We understand their problems even as we understand our own problems in this country.

What is there for the "free world" to be afraid of? Look at the map. From the Arctic to the Antarctic, how many countries have been roped into America's defensive and offensive alliances? I do not believe for a single moment, that Russia is half as bad as it has been stated to be by some people who are anxious to run down that country. I hold no brief for Russia, as some of my friends over there. I would only quote what my friends probably have not noted, from a leading article in *The New Statesman* of London:

"If ever a country had good reason to wish to avoid war on her territory—as distinct from a possibly advantageous revolutionary war elsewhere,—then that country is the Soviet Union. Moreover, with Communism successful in China long before Moscow expected it, and Peking conveniently cemented to Moscow by American intervention"

—mark the words—

"and Peking conveniently cemented to Moscow by American intervention, Stalin can boast, as he did at the Party Congress last October, that the Soviet world is now one great marketing area largely if not wholly independent of the West. It can detach itself and watch Western countries scratching each others eyes out and driving backward countries into Communist arms by

time dishonoured methods of colonialism and rattling towards their doom to the glory of Communist theory and Soviet prophecy."

I have taken the trouble of quoting this passage just because yesterday we were reading in the papers the reply of Mr. Churchill to a proposal for peace. We are always interested in any proposition for a meeting of the Great Powers for the purpose of peace. Why should it not be done?

I am glad that in this year's batch of amendments very little has been said about the Commonwealth. I was interrupted rather too much last year, while I was speaking on this subject. I take it, therefore, that my friends of the Communist party are now reconciled to the Commonwealth.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras): Not at all.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Not only the Communist Party.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Every section of the Opposition, of course

SHRI RAMA RAO: Well, I give you the pleasure of the opposition; I enjoy the profit of the association. Sir, this morning's papers had a report about a South East Asian defensive pact. What does it come to? This pact is not the sort of thing we desire. It is a pact to underline, to underwrite and to underpin colonialism. Look at India's policy, for a contrast, in this region. It is a policy of fraternal association, political guidance and wise leadership. Indonesia was in trouble. We intervened, held a conference in Delhi, and saw to it that the Dutch went out of Indonesia. We have been foster fathers of Burma's freedom. We have been helping other Asian nations in a number of ways. What effect will a military pact of this nature have on these unfortunate countries? It would only precipitate a crisis with China, because if these alliances grow up, the only object could be some sort of armageddon in this part of Asia.

We have had some anxiety recently about the Middle East, about what has been called MEDO. Opinion has been expressed in high quarters on this subject. I trust that it has been duly noticed in Karachi. Our Ambassador in Cairo, who did excellent work in China, is busy cementing friendly contacts between India and other countries I know he will succeed. This morning's papers report the success of General Naguib over the Sudan. We welcome it. Students of history will remember the enormous trouble the British have been giving for a number of years on this question. By a master-stroke of statesmanship and self-abnegation General<sup>1</sup> Naguib has told the Sudanese, "Let us agree to cut the British out first, and then the question will be settled, and you can have any amount of freedom you want." The British had to agree.

Sir, may I now refer to Pakistan, a country which is so near to us and so closely associated with us? Some correspondence, according to the newspapers, is passing between the Prime Ministers of the two countries and the newspapers have also reported that they are going to meet. It is a welcome move. The Address before us speaks of some improvement in the relations between the two countries. Let us, however, make certain things clear to Pakistan. None of the unfortunate things that have happened these few years is going to expunge the foundations of amity and goodwill on the part of India. It is, however, no use talking about canal waters and evacuee property when these could be decided in a moment at a round-table conference if there is goodwill on the part of Pakistan. There are bigger issues to settle. I would advise, if I could, the statesmen of Pakistan not to bother too much about Kashmir. They are not going to get it by violent methods. The question is on another level today where it will remain. East Bengal minorities, the Address says, should be so governed as to make them acquire

[Shri Rama Rao.] confidence in their Government. Remember, a good deal of trouble has been over the sufferings of women. Often and often I am reminded of the Sanskrit saying that the tears of women undermine the thrones of kings.

Everything does not seem to be lovely in the garden of Pakistan. Recently, *Dawn*, the heirophant of Pakistani journalism, was speaking about "cracks in the Cabinet", "wars of succession", the "disloyalty" of the Muslim League to the State of Pakistan. Let me assure the people that we are sorry to hear these things. We want Pakistan to be a strong state and a good neighbour. If there is anything that India could do in this respect, she will only be too happy to do it.

I would ask Pakistan to remember the original assumptions of the partition. They were common defence, common foreign policy, common communications. It was as if two brothers had divided but they would continue to live in amity. Unfortunately that has not happened. And so our troubles have arisen. We are in particular opposed to Pakistan going into the so-called Middle East Defence Organisation. That would be totally wrong. As the Prime Minister said in his speech at Hyderabad, it will bring the Cold War to the doorstep of India. It is wrong for any country of the East to go after strange alliances and scarlet friendships. We would tell Pakistan to remember that her destiny, apart from her political independence, is an Indian destiny. Moreover, we both should keep out the foreigner and liberate our fellow Asian nations. Together we could do wonders. If we quarrel and go more and more apart, it will be mutually disastrous. In this connection I am reminded of a stanza in Mahabharata, addressed to the Kauravas: "If we are together we make 105. If we are separate, we shall suffer badly." The simile is given of the forest and the lion. The lion protects the forest

and the forest protects the lion. That must be the relationship between Pakistan and India. If that warning is realised in our everyday lives, then there will be very little trouble between the two countries. I have no doubt that these two countries with a common culture, with a common heritage, with common problems will have to come together with increasing understanding. In that case it will not be impossible for us to realise the dream of one of the illustrious presidents of the Indian National Congress, that this sub-continent may one day become the Light of Asia and the Radiant Splendour of the World.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. R. D. Sinha  
Dinkar to second the motion.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR  
(Bihar):

**श्री० आर० डी० सिन्हा दिनकर (बिहार):**  
सभापति जी, मेरे माननीय मित्र श्री के० रामाराव ने राष्ट्रपति के लिये धन्यवाद अर्पित करने का जो प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

श्रीमान्, राष्ट्रपति के भाषण के रूप में बहुत दिनों के बाद एक ऐसा प्रामाणिक विवरण देश के सामने आया है जिससे मालूम होता है कि हमारे बुरे दिनों का अन्त अब समीप है और हम धीरे धीरे अच्छे दिनों की ओर बढ़ने लगे हैं। सामग्रियों का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये जनता और सरकार ने मिलकर जो कोशिशें शुरू की थीं वे अब कामयाबी के लक्षण दिखाने लगी हैं और ऐसा लगता है कि जनता के दुःख अब, निश्चित रूप से घटने के रास्ते पर आ गये हैं। खाद्यान्न की स्थिति सुधर रही है, नियंत्रण में ढिलाई करने से लोगों को चीजें भी मिलने लगी हैं। जो लोग कंट्रोल को कस कर पकड़े रहने के फेर में हैं, मेरा ख्याल है उन्हें अब अपने बहम को छोड़ देना चाहिये जिससे इस देश की जिन्दगी कंट्रोल रूपी राक्षस के कब्जे से छूट जाय

और लोग उस तरह से जीना शुरू कर दें जैसे वे आज तक जीते आये थे।

श्रीमन्, हमारी बड़ी बड़ी नदियों को बांधने की दो एक योजनाएं भी अब पूर्णता के पास पहुंच रही हैं और बाकी योजनाएं भी प्रगति की राह पर हैं। उम्मीद है कि अनेक क्षेत्रों में अब बाढ़ के प्रकोप रुक जायेंगे और वहां खेती में तरक्की भी होगी। मगर अब तक जो कुछ हुआ है उससे कई गुना ज्यादा काम हम पंचवर्षीय योजना के अधीन पूरा करेंगे। शर्त सिर्फ यह है कि देश के हृदय में अपने भविष्य के प्रति पूरा विश्वास हो और हम यह सोचकर अपने काम में लगे रहें कि हिन्दुस्तान की किस्मत हिन्दुस्तान में ही गढ़ जायेगी और मदद चाहे हम जहां से भी लें मगर काम को पूरा करने की जिम्मेवारी इस देश की जनता को छोड़कर और किसी पर नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में देश की प्रगति का जो विवरण है उससे हमारा आत्म विश्वास बढ़ता है। हां सिर्फ एक बात है जो हमें चिन्ता में डालती है और जिसे देखकर हमें शंका होती है कि हमारी राष्ट्र की असांप्रदायिकता अभी खतरों से मुक्त नहीं हो पायी है। पाकिस्तान की विधान परिषद् पाकिस्तान का शासन-विधान धर्म के आधार पर बनाने वाली है, यह बात सुनकर हंसने वालों की संख्या हमारे देश में भी अपार है, किन्तु, कितने दुःख की बात है कि जहां हम पाकिस्तान की संकीर्णता और उसके विचारों के पिछड़ेपन पर व्यंग्य करते हैं, वहां इस देश में भी ऐसे लोग हैं जो असांप्रदायिकता को राज्य की कमजोरी मानते हैं और जो रह रह कर ऐसी उत्तेजना फैलाने का काम करते हैं जिससे इस देश में सभी जातियों का मिलकर रहना मुश्किल हो जाय। असांप्रदायिकता का पाठ हमने नया नहीं पढ़ा

है। यह कम से कम सम्राट अशोक की देन है जिन्होंने राज्य की ओर से सभी धर्मों की सेवा करने की परंपरा का आरम्भ किया था और जिनका चक्र हमारे राष्ट्रध्वज पर विद्यमान है। यह महावीर वर्द्धमान की शिक्षा है जिन्होंने स्याद्वाद और अनेकान्तवाद के द्वारा लोगों को यह संदेश दिया था कि किसी भी धर्म या वाद के प्रेमी को यह कहने का अधिकार नहीं है कि केवल उसी का धर्म या उसी का पन्थ ठीक है। यह उपनिषदों और पुराणों के नेतिवाद का अभिनव स्वरूप है जिसके जरिये प्राचीन भारत ने यह घोषणा की थी कि जीवन के अन्तिम सत्य को हम कहीं भी बांध नहीं सकते। यह भारत के उन ऋषियों और महात्माओं से आई हुई विरासत है जिनके उपदेशों के कारण हम शारीरिक ही नहीं, एक प्रकार की बौद्धिक अहिंसा को भी अपना धर्म मानते रहे हैं और अनुचित हठ पकड़ने की वृत्ति को बराबर पाप समझा है। भारत की यह बहुत ही प्राचीन परंपरा अनेक युगों के हिचकोले खाती हुई आखिर को उन्नीसवीं सदी के जाग्रत भारत के ऋषि राम मोहन राय, रामकृष्ण और विवेकानन्द को मिली तथा गांधी में आकर उसने अपना पूरा चमत्कार दिखलाया। अगर आधुनिक दृष्टि से भी देखा जाय तब भी इस असांप्रदायिकता का वरण हमने उन्नीसवीं सदी में किया और तब से हम बराबर यह दुहराते आ रहे हैं कि सभी धर्म आपस में समान हैं और राज्य के लिये यह उचित नहीं है कि वह एक धर्म की प्रतिष्ठा तथा अन्य धर्मों की अवहेलना करे। अहिंसा, स्याद्वाद और अनेकान्तवाद के रूप में भारत ने जो कुछ भी अर्जित किया था वह सब का सब मिथ्या हो जायगा अगर यह देश असांप्रदायिक नहीं रहा। असांप्रदायिकता ही वह वर्तमान भाषा है जिसके द्वारा हम अपनी बौद्धिक अहिंसा का

[Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar]

अर्थ दुनिया को समझा सकते हैं। असांप्रदायिकता ही वह नया धर्म है जिसके भीतर हमारे स्याद्वाद और अनेकान्तवाद का तत्व झलक सकता है और असांप्रदायिक हो कर ही हम अपने पुरखों की ऊँची विरासत को गौरव से ढँक सकते हैं।

श्रीमन्, उन्नीसवीं सदी से लेकर आज तक असांप्रदायिकता हमारी सांस का नाद, और जिह्वा की भाषा रही है। असांप्रदायिकता को बचाने के लिए हमने अगणित अपमान सहे, अगणित यातनाएं झेलीं और अन्त में, गांधी जी जैसे पूज्य नेता का बलिदान दे दिया। लेकिन, यह अन्तिम बलिदान नहीं होगा। आसार ऐसे हैं कि अपने इस नवीन धर्म को दीप्त रखने के लिये हमें और भी कुर्बानियां देनी होंगी, और भी बलिदान करने होंगे। अगर आगे के कुछ वर्षों में हमने इस बलिदान में कंजूसी दिखलायी तो पिछले साठ-सत्तर वर्षों में हमने जो कुछ भी किया है वह व्यर्थ हो जायगा। और उसके साथ विनष्ट हो जायेगा यह गौरव कि भारतवर्ष अनेक धर्मों अनेक जातियों और अनेक संप्रदायों को मिलाकर समन्वित मानवता का नमूना उपस्थित करने में दुनिया के और सभी देशों से आगे रहा है।

श्रीमन्, अपनी राष्ट्रीय नीति और अपने राष्ट्रीय इतिहास की परंपरा की पृष्ठ भूमि पर मैं प्रजा परिषद् जैसे किसी भी आन्दोलन को विपैला और कुरूप मानता हूँ तथा राष्ट्रपति ने जो उसे केवल "पथ भ्रष्ट" कह कर छोड़ दिया है, वह एक तरह से उसकी निन्दा में रियायत की बात है। यह आन्दोलन इस बार कुछ राजनैतिक और कुछ आर्थिक रूप ले कर प्रकट हुआ है, किन्तु, वह शुद्ध साम्प्रदायिक आन्दोलन है जिसका उद्देश्य इस देश में अखण्ड हिन्दू राज्य की स्थापना है, अखंड हिन्दूराज्य का वह आदर्श जो गुजरे जमाने का आदर्श

था, जिसके खिलाफ हमारे सारे स्वातंत्र्य संग्राम का मोर्चा रहा है और जो इस उन्नत युग में हीन जाति का ही लक्षण माना जा सकता है।

3 P.M.

श्रीमन्, हमारा देश अभी अभी आजाद हुआ है और उसके हर कोने में उन शिकायतों का अम्बार लगा है जिन्हें ले कर जनता चाहे तो खलबली भचा सकती है। मगर जनता को यह ज्ञान है कि ये शिकायतें धीरे धीरे दूर हो जायेंगी। इसलिये वह धीरज के साथ सरकार का साथ दे रही है। यह ठीक है कि जमाने के उलट फेर का झकोरा काश्मीर और जम्मू में जरा बहुत तेजी से चला और परिवर्तन की आंधी वहां ज्यादा सजीव रही है। बहुत सी ऐसी बातें हैं जो हमें दूर से भी दिखलाई पड़ती हैं। उदाहरण के लिये, काश्मीर सरकार ने भूमि सुधार के लिये जो कानून बनाया उस कानून से जम्मू की जनता को कष्ट है क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि काश्मीर की तराई की जमीन केसर उगलती है, जब कि जम्मू की जमीन ज्यादातर ऊसर और बंजर है। इसलिये यह समझना आसान है कि जमीन की एक सीलिंग बांधने से काश्मीर और जम्मू के किसानों को एक सा फायदा नहीं होगा। जिस सीलिंग से काश्मीर के किसान सुखी होंगे उसी सीलिंग से जम्मू के किसान सुखी नहीं हो सकते। दूसरी बात यह भी है कि काश्मीर की सेना के विघटन के कारण बहुत से बहादुर नौजवान बेकार हो गये हैं जिन्हें रोजी और ग्रैचुइटी देने का काम अभी बाकी है और यह आवश्यक है कि काश्मीर और भारत की सरकारें मिल कर इन समस्याओं का कोई अच्छा हल निकाल डालें। जहां तक मुझे मालूम है काश्मीर सरकार ने अभी हाल में जो फाइनेन्शियल कमीशन नियुक्त किया है उसको यही हिदायत दी गई है कि वह इन शिकायतों की तह में जा कर वाजिब सिफारिशें सरकार के सामने पेश करें। इसके सिवा हमें इस बात

का भी ख्याल रखना है कि जम्मू के डोगरे अपने को काश्मीर का विजेता समझते थे इसलिये हरीसिंह की गद्दी के विनाश में उन्होंने अपने गौरव के विनाश का प्रतीक देखा है और वे आज उस तरह से बेचैन हो रहे हैं जिस तरह से कि मणिघर मणि के छीन लिये जाने पर बेचैन होता है। लेकिन ये बातें ऐसी नहीं हैं जो कि केवल काश्मीर तक ही सीमित हों। ऐसी अनेक काठनाइयां हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ और भागों में भी हैं। आज बहुत से व्यक्ति दल, वर्ग और जनता के समूह निराश हैं, विभुब्ध हैं, बेचैन हैं। मगर, हिन्दुस्तान के किसी और भाग में जनता ने बगावत का रास्ता नहीं पकड़ा है। इससे मालूम होता है कि जम्मू की जनता को भड़काने का उद्देश्य इन साधारण कठिनाइयों का समाधान नहीं, बल्कि कोई और बात है।

यह भी मानने की बात नहीं है कि जम्मू में जो प्रजापरिषद् का आन्दोलन चल रहा है वह सिर्फ़ शेख अब्दुल्ला या काश्मीर सरकार के खिलाफ़ है। असल में काश्मीर के साथ समझौते के अनुसार जो विशिष्ट प्रकार का बर्ताव किया गया है और जिससे प्रजापरिषद् के लोग चिढ़े हुये हैं, वह शेख अब्दुल्ला का फैसला नहीं है। उसका फैसला भारत की विधान निर्मातृ परिषद् ने किया था और उसकी स्वीकृति तीसरी संसद ने दी है। यह भी नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि जिस नीति के खिलाफ़ आज आन्दोलन शुरू हुआ है उस नीति का आरम्भ पिछले जून, जुलाई समझौते से हुआ बल्कि असल में, उसका आरम्भ सन् १९४७ में हुआ जब कि विधान निर्मातृ परिषद् में देश के बड़े से बड़े लोग बैठे हुये थे और जब कि राज्य सम्बन्धी समस्त नीतियों का निर्णय हमारे प्रातः स्मरणीय राजनायक सरदार पटेल किया करते थे।

मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि यह कोई स्थानीय विषय है और स्थानीय बातों  
65 C of S.

को लेकर यह आन्दोलन चलाया जा रहा है। इसके पीछे मेरे ख्याल में कोई और भी बड़ा रहस्य है। असल में, मनोवैज्ञानिक रूप से हमारे देश में जो एक दुरावस्था चल रही है, जो साम्प्रदायिक और राष्ट्रीयता के बीच का संघर्ष है वह संघर्ष अभी मरा नहीं है, खत्म नहीं हुआ है। साम्प्रदायिक ताकतें भारत में रह रह कर अपना सिर उठाती हैं। जब यहाँ अंग्रेज थे तब जो ताकतें इस देश में सभी जातियों को एक साथ जीने देने के खिलाफ़ थीं उनमें एक हाथ उनका भी था और जब वे यहाँ से गये तब भी उनके दिल में यह कलक ज़रूर रह गई कि हिन्दू और मुसलमान यहाँ साथ रह गये और आज भी उनको यह विश्वास नहीं होता होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में हिन्दू और मुसलमान साथ रह सकते हैं। जब जब हमने संसार में कोई सुयश अर्जित किया, जब जब संसार में हमारा असाम्प्रदायिकता का झंडा ऊंचा लहराया तब तब ये शक्तियाँ हमारे पीछे पड़ गई और हम पर उन्होंने नो मन कालिख पोतने की कोशिश की। की जब १९४६ में हमने एशियाई सम्मेलन कर के कुछ यश प्राप्त किया, तो उसके थोड़े ही दिन बाद भयंकर झगड़े देश में शुरू हो गये और जब पश्चिमोत्तर प्रदेश में प्लेबिसिट चल रही थी तब बिहार और नोआखाली में मारकाट मची। यही नहीं, मैंने सुना है कि राष्ट्र संघ के पंच जब जब जम्मू या काश्मीर में पहुँचते हैं तब तब उनके सामने प्रजा परिषद् की ओर से भेदे प्रदर्शन करवाये जाते हैं।

श्रीमन्, अभी थोड़े दिनों से भारत की साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियों में जो एक ताजगी आई है वह भी कोई अचानक नहीं आई, वह भी कोई आकस्मिक बात नहीं है, बल्कि उसके पीछे एक सुचिंतित पड़यन्त्र का हाथ है। पिछले चुनाव के दिनों में जनता के कानों में बड़ी बड़ी आवाजें पड़ी थीं। लेकिन जो सब से बड़ी आवाज थी वह यह थी कि चुनाव

[Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar.]

के बाद जो राज्य बनेगा वह असांप्रदायिक राज्य होगा जिसमें सभी जातियों को एक साथ सुख से जीने का अधिकार मिलेगा। जनता ने इस नारे का साथ दिया, इसका आदर किया और सांप्रदायिक पार्टियाँ एक एक कर के खत्म होने लगीं। जब इन पार्टियों ने यह देखा कि सांप्रदायिकता के लिये जनता के दिल में कोई हमदर्दी नहीं है और जो लोग सांप्रदायिक बातें करते हैं उनको विदेश से कोई सहानुभूति नहीं मिलती है, तब उन्हें अपने चेहरे पर “नया-भेक-अप” मलना शुरू किया। उन्होंने अपनी शब्दावली बदल दी और प्रगतिशील आन्दोलनों की शब्दावली अपना ली। उन्होंने अपनी सदस्यता का दरवाजा मुसलमानों के लिये भी खोल दिया और जिस प्रकार से देश की प्रगतिशील पार्टियाँ बाणी और विचार की स्वतंत्रता के लिये लड़ती हैं या मौलिक अधिकारों की दुहाई देती हैं उसी प्रकार ये भी जोर जोर से इन बातों की दुहाई देने लगीं। साधन के क्षेत्र में उन्होंने अपनी टेकनिक बदल दी है और अब वे दंगे नहीं करवाते हैं बल्कि दंगे को छोड़कर उन्होंने सत्याग्रह का आश्रय लिया है। उन्होंने अब स्नायविक युद्ध या वार आफ नर्व्स शुरू किया है। यद्यपि जम्मू में जो कुछ काम हुये हैं उनमें आतंकवाद का कुछ कम हाथ नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी सामान्य-रूप से यह हम मान सकते हैं कि उनके साधन में थोड़ा परिवर्तन हुआ है। उनके सामने अब एक उपाय है कि जहाँ जहाँ असंतोष की चिन्ता मिले उसे खोज खोज हवा दो जिससे सरकार की ताकत कमजोर पड़े और उनकी पार्टी की ताकत बढ़े। सब मिला कर देखने पर यह बात बड़ी विचित्र सी मालूम होती है कि जिन लोगों की कृपा जम्मू में प्रजा परिषद् के आन्दोलन पर है, उन्हीं की कृपा सौराष्ट्र और बम्बई विप्लव-आन्दोलन पर थी। पंजाब में शिक्षकों की हड़ताल पर और उत्तर प्रदेश में पंचायत और पटवारी संघर्ष पर थी।

श्रीमन्, बहुत सी बातें हैं जिनसे मालूम होता है कि जनता को भड़का कर, गलत तरीकों पर भड़का कर, सरकार के पक्ष को कमजोर करने के लिये इस देश में लोग काम कर रहे हैं। जनसंघ के एक नेता जम्मू गये थे, तब उनके वहाँ जाने से पहले जम्मू में जो हिन्दू और सिख शरणार्थी बसे हुये हैं उनके बीच इस बात का प्रचार किया गया कि शेख अब्दुल्ला तुम लोगों को हटा कर वहाँ पर मुसलमान शरणार्थियों को बसाने वाले हैं। इसी तरह अखबारों में खुल्लम खुल्ला इस बात का प्रचार किया जा रहा है कि सरकार के यहाँ नौकरियों के जो इश्तेहार निकलते हैं उसमें साफ शब्दों में यह लिखा रहता है कि जो लोग मुसलमान नहीं हैं वे इन नौकरियों के लिये आवेदन-पत्र न भेजें। श्रीमन्, सुन कर तकलीफ होती है और मेरा ख्याल है कि सभा को भी तकलीफ होगी कि जो लोग दुर्भाग्यवश प्रजापरिषद् के आन्दोलन में मारे गये उनकी हड्डियाँ जम्मू में प्रजा परिषद् की ओर से धुमाई जा रही हैं। ठीक उसी तरह से जैसे बिहार के दंगे में मारे हुये मुसलमानों की हड्डियाँ पश्चिमोत्तर प्रदेश में धुमाई गई थीं जब कि वहाँ प्लेबिसिट होने को था और इसी कारण पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में कांग्रेस को हार खानी पड़ी।

प्रजा परिषद् की ओर से कहा जाता है कि हम जम्मू और काश्मीर को भारत के ओर अधिक समीप लाना चाहते हैं, मगर मुझे हैरत होती है कि वे क्यों ऐसे काम कर रहे हैं जिन कामों का नतीजा भारत और जम्मू तथा काश्मीर की दूरी को बढ़ाना है। वे जम्मू और लद्दाख को भारत में रखने के लिये बैचैन हैं, मानों, इसके लिये भी किसी खास आन्दोलन को जरूरत पड़ेगी। मगर वे इन बातों पर सोचना भी जरूरी नहीं समझते। असल में उनके हाथ में एक बड़ा भारी पत्थर आ

पड़ा है और वह उसे सीधे जवाहरलाल के माथे पर दे मारना चाहते हैं।

श्रीमन्, इन बातों के अन्दर जाने से तबीयत को बड़ी तकलीफ़ पहुँचती है। मगर क्या किया जाय ? बात बिल्कुल सच्ची है और इन बातों पर पर्दा डालने से काम नहीं चलेगा। एक बात तो बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो गई है कि इस देश में एक संगठित साम्प्रदायिक शक्ति शेष है जो भिन्न भिन्न रूप से देश की प्रगति को रोकने की कोशिश करती है और उसका सामना करने के लिये सरकार को कुछ उपाय करना चाहिये और वह उपाय यह है कि वह जनता को समझावे कि इन आन्दोलनों का असली राज क्या है। उसके असली राज को जनता को समझाने की सरकार कोशिश करे और जहाँ जहाँ असंतोष के बीज हैं उन बीजों को दूर करे क्योंकि इन्हीं बीजों के कारण साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियों को ताकत मिलती है, उनका बल बढ़ता है।

लोग काश्मीर समस्या पर तरह तरह से विचार करते हैं। सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि हम में से हर एक भारतवासी यह चाहता है कि काश्मीर भारत के साथ रहे। लेकिन वह हमारे साथ तभी रह पायेगा जब कि उसे दिल से यह विश्वास हो कि भारत के साथ रहने में उनका कल्याण है। काश्मीर की जनता अन्धी नहीं है। भारत और पाकिस्तान में कहाँ क्या हो रहा है इस पर उसकी नज़र है और हिन्दुस्तान के साथ वह तभी रहना चाहेगी जब कि वह यह समझे कि हिन्दुस्तान में रहने से उसकी इज्जत, दौलत और उसकी आजादी सब कुछ महफूज है। श्रीमन्, मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि काश्मीर समस्या का फ़ैसला राष्ट्रीय संघ के इजलास में नहीं, बल्कि इस देश में बसने वाले हिन्दुओं, मूसलमानों और सिक्खों के दिलों की अदालत में होगा। इतना तो साफ़ है कि काश्मीर

भारत के साथ तभी रहेगा जब उसे यह विश्वास हो कि भारत का सच्चा प्रतिनिधि जनसंघ और राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ नहीं, बल्कि कांग्रेस और जवाहरलाल है।

श्रीमन्, आपकी दृष्टि घड़ी पर है, इससे मैं सहमा जा रहा हूँ। लेकिन मुझे एक महत्वपूर्ण विषय सभा के सामने ओर रखना है। उसके बाद मैं अपना स्थान गृहणकर लूंगा !

अफ़्रीका के साथ भारत की खटपट बहुत पुरानी है, मगर, अफ़्रीका में आज जो कुछ हो रहा है उसका सम्बन्ध सिर्फ़ भारत से ही नहीं बल्कि सारे सम्य संसार से है। अफ़्रीका में हमारे बन्धु, हमारे भारतीय और अफ़्रीका बन्धु आज आजादी, प्रतिष्ठा और इज्जत के लिए मलान सरकार के विरुद्ध अहिंसक लड़ाई में कन्धे से कन्धा मिलाकर लड़ रहे हैं। इन सत्याग्रहियों को दबाने के लिए अफ़्रीका की पार्लियामेंट में Public Safety Bill और Criminal Law Amendments Bill नामक जो दो विधेयक लाये गये हैं उनका उद्देश्य नागरिकों का सारा स्वत्व हरण करना है। ये जो दो कानून अफ़्रीका की सरकार बना रही है उनसे ख़राब कानून अभी तक शायद ही किसी देश में बने होंगे। श्रीमन्, अगर आपकी आज्ञा हो तो इन दो विधेयकों की शर्तों के बारे में जो कुछ "न्यू स्टेट्स मैन एन्ड नेशन" ने अपने ७ फ़रवरी १९५३ के अंक में छपा है उसे मैं सभा के सामने पढ़ दूँ। इन विधेयकों में उत्तेजना का अर्थ यह है :-

"The Bill's definition of incitement—for which the penalties are extremely severe, going up to a fine of £500, five years' imprisonment or 15 lashes—reads thus: "Any person who (a) in any manner whatever, advises, encourages, incites, com-

[Prof. R. D. Sinti Dinkar.] •mands, aids, or procures any other person or persons in general; or (b) uses any language or does any act or thing calculated to cause any person or persons in general to commit an offence by way of protest." Among many preventive provisions, the principle of opening letters is now made legal. Penalties for "protesting—i.e. for taking any part whatever in the non-violent campaign against racial laws—go up to a fine £300, three years' imprisonment or ten lashes."

श्रीमन्, इन विषयों में यह प्रबन्ध किया गया है कि कानून की आलोचना या विरोध करने वालों को ३०० पाँड जुर्माने और १० कोड़ों की सजा होगी तथा जो कोई कानून के विरुद्ध उतेजना फैलायेगा उसे ५०० पाँड जुर्माना और १५ कोड़ों की सजा होगी। इन्त-जाम ऐसा है कि मुद्दालेह के साथ कोई भी निर्दोष आदमी इस कानून के शिकंजे में लाया जा सकता है और अगर वह अपने को निर्दोष साबित नहीं कर सका तो कोड़े उसे ज़रूर लगाये जायेंगे। यह भी कि ४८ घंटों में जुर्माना अदा नहीं करने से सारी संपत्ति नीलाम की जा सकती है। अगर इस कानून पर बेरहमी से अमल किया जाय तो इनकम टैक्स पर बेजारी जाहिर करने वाला आदमी इसके शिकंजे में आसानी से लाया जा सकता है और हैफ़ तो यह है कि जो आदमी उसकी बगल में खड़ा होगा सजा उसे भी दी जा सकती है। निहत्थे और शान्तिप्रिय सत्याग्रहियों के दलन के लिए इतने कठोर कानून बने और सभ्यता खड़ी खड़ी तमाशा देखे यह नजारा इतिहास ने पहले कभी नहीं देखा था। राष्ट्रसंघ मलान सरकार के द्वारा कई बार अपमानित हो चुका है। मगर तब भी उसका फ़र्ज है कि वह ऐसे घृणित कानून के विरुद्ध विश्व में जनमत को जाग्रत करे। राष्ट्र में अन्तरराष्ट्रीय नियमों और संबन्धों के कारण हम जो कुछ कर सकते हैं वह राजनीतिक घरातल पर ही कर सकते

हैं। मगर जिस समय अफ़्रीका के लोग अपने अधिकारों की रक्षा के लिए गांधी जी के बताये हुए मार्ग पर चल रहे हैं उस समय हमारा धर्म है कि हम अपनी हार्दिक समवेदना उन्हें भेजें और उन्हें प्रोत्साहन और बधाई का सन्देश दें।

श्रीमन्, मणिलाल गांधी महात्मा गांधी के पुत्र ही नहीं बल्कि उनके उत्तराधिकार को ढोने वाले योग्य पुत्र हैं। उनके नेतृत्व में सत्याग्रह का आन्दोलन सफलतापूर्वक चला है और अब तक वहाँ के सत्याग्रहियों ने कोई हिंसा नहीं की है। हम मणिलालजी के नेतृत्व में चलने वाले अफ़्रीका के इन सत्याग्रहियों को अपनी बधाई और अपनी सहानु-भूति भेजते हैं। संसार देख रहा है कि सत्य और अहिंसा एक बार फिर अपनी कसौटी पर है। गांधी जी से किसी ने पूछा था कि अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ़ तो आपने अहिंसा का प्रयोग सफलता से किया है मगर क्या आप जापानियों के खिलाफ़ भी अहिंसा का प्रयोग कर सकते हैं? इस पर उन्होंने कहा था हाँ, मौका मिलने पर मैं उनके खिलाफ़ भी अहिंसा का प्रयोग करूँगा। गांधी जी को वह मौका नहीं मिला, लेकिन, किस्मत ने यह दिन उनके पुत्र के लिए रख छोड़ा था। जो प्रयोग गांधी जी ने नहीं किया वह मणिलाल गांधी अफ़्रीका में कर रहे हैं क्यों कि मलान सरकार जापानी तानाशाही से कहीं अधिक बर्बर और पाशविकतापूर्ण है। अफ़्रीका में जापानी तानाशाही से कहीं बर्बर तानाशाही के खिलाफ़ आज अहिंसा की आजमाइश हो रही है।

श्रीमन्, अहिंसा एक बार फिर अपनी कसौटी पर चढ़ी हुई है। अफ़्रीका में जो लोग सत्याग्रह आन्दोलन कर रहे हैं उनके साथ हम सब लोगों की हार्दिक सहानुभूति होनी चाहिये। हमें आशा है कि जिन लोगों ने गांधी जी के साधन से काम लिया है वह उनके नाम पर कभी भी धब्बा नहीं लगायेंगे और

किसी प्रकार की हिंसा का प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे। और हमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि अहिंसा विजयी होगी। हमारा विश्वास है और मैं समझता हूँ कि सारा हमारा देश इस बात में विश्वास करता है कि आज नहीं तो कल, अफ्रीका में अहिंसा की विजय होगी और जो लोग अपने अधिकारों और प्रतिष्ठा के लिए लड़ रहे हैं उन्हें इसमें सफलता अवश्य मिलेगी। हमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि अहिंसा विजयी होगी, मलान का मान मर्दित होगा और संसार गांधीवाद से नया प्रकाश प्राप्त करेगा।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 1.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion that has been moved and seconded is:

"That the Members of the Council of States assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 11th February 1953."

We have a list of amendments that have been received. All the amendments can be moved except Nos. 4(b), 7, 11, 35, 44 and 47 which are disallowed.

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

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

"but regret to note Government's failure to—

(a) arrest the deterioration in educational standards; and

(b) reorganise and remodel the system of education in the country."

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

"but regret to note that the first Five Year Plan does not satisfy people's hopes and expectations and

has failed to enthuse and mobilise people, particularly the youth, for the reconstruction and development of the country and has also neglected the under-developed areas."

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

"but regret to note that the Government has no appreciation and grip of the real situation in the country and has also no grip over its own administrative and executive machinery."

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret—

that in the Address no mention has been made of the creation of a separate State of Mithila."

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA (Madras): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that there is no categorical condemnation in the Address of the recent statements of the President of the United States of America which aim at spreading the conflagration of War to People's China, a friendly nation, and to the whole of Asia, and no declaration at all has been made that India would oppose all such attempts to spread the War."

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

"but regret that no specific policy has been laid down to bring India and Pakistan together and to bring about the unity of the people of both the countries on the basis of long-term agreements and trade pacts between the two countries."

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

[Shri E. K. Imbichibava.]

"but regret that a picture of "all round progress" in the country has been painted in the Address, whereas the real picture is one of mass unemployment, famine, and growing crises in industry and agriculture, etc., and that in order to minimise the sufferings of the people no proposal at all has been envisaged to give employment and free rations to the people of unemployed and famine-stricken areas of the country."

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

"but regret that no concrete proposals to set up a Commission have been made to re-divide the States of the country on a linguistic basis, on the following clear-cut lines:

(a) dissolution of the Hyderabad State with a view to facilitate the formation of Vishala Andhra, Samyukta Maharashtra and Samyukta Karnataka;

(b) the formation of a Vishala Andhra State by integrating the Telugu-speaking areas of Hyderabad State with the Andhra State to be formed out of the Telugu-speaking areas of Madras State, the French possession of Yenam in Madras State being merged with Andhra State;

(c) the formation of a Samyukta Maharashtra State with the Marathi-speaking areas of Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay States; including Bombay

1 City, the Portuguese possession of Goa being merged with the Samyukta Maharashtra State;

(d) the formation of an Aikya Kerala State by integrating the Malayalam-speaking areas of Madras and Travancore-Cochin States, the French possession of Mahe being merged with the Aikya Kerala State;

(e) the formation of a Samyukta Karnataka State by

integrating Mysore, Coorg and the Kannada-speaking areas of Hyderabad, Bombay and Madras. States;

(f) the formation of a new Tamilnad State by integrating the Tamil-speaking areas of Madras, and Travancore-Cochin, the French India possessions of Pondicherry and Karaikal being merged with the new Tamilnad State;

(g) the formation of a Maha Gujarat State by integrating the States of Saurashtra, Cutch and the Gujarati-speaking areas of Bombay State, the Portuguese possessions of Diu and Daman being merged with the Maha Gujarat State;

(h) the formation of a Punjabi-speaking State, and as a prerequisite to this, the present PEPSU State being dissolved and merged with the East Punjab and Himachal Pradesh States;

(i) the redrawing of the boundaries of States where such border questions exist on the basis of the above-stated just and democratic principles."

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

"but regret that the question of food subsidy to specially deficit areas like Malabar, where the prices of food stuffs are rising, and the quantity of food rations allowed as well as the purchasing power of the people are decreasing alarmingly, has not been examined at all in the Address."

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

"but regret that not a word has been mentioned in the Address about the alarming crisis in Coir Industry affecting thousands of families in Kerala, and no steps envisaged to revive the collapsing Handloom Industry."

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

"but regret that no mention at all has been made about the alarming deterioration in the economic situation in the life of the people of Kerala as a result of slump and fall in prices of commercial crops of Kerala, like pepper, ginger," carda-mon, rubber, coffee, tea, betel leaves, etc."

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

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

"but regret—

(a) that the Address does not contain unequivocal condemnation of the extension of war in *JC. rea* that is threatening the peace of the world at every moment, and any assurance that in any event India will remain neutral, so long as her territories are not attacked; —

(b) that the Address does not contain any indication for a peaceful settlement of the Praja-Parishad agitation in Jammu and Kashmir;

(c) that the Address makes no mention of the necessity of setting up a Boundary Commission to readjust the existing boundaries of West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, on linguistic and cultural basis;

(d) that the Address has taken no notice of the deteriorating economic conditions of the people in the country;

(e) that the Address does not contain any assurance to stop forthwith all food imports from foreign countries, based on a chimerical food deficit, so that the money spent on this account might have contributed substantially towards i the financial resources of the First Five Year Plan, thereby obviating the necessity of incur-

ring foreign loans or initiating direct taxation measures;

(f) that the Address has sought to exaggerate the picture of 'good progress' in certain multi-purpose River Valley Projects; and lastly

(g) that the Address does not take into consideration the case of underdeveloped areas for more help and attention under the First Five Year Plan."

SHRI S. BANERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that the reference to the policy of peace and friendship with all the countries of the world is inadequate and unsatisfactory and that the avoidance of the specific mention of Formosa in this connection is highly deplorable."

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

"but regret that the Address contains no indication of the means as to how unemployment which has been progressively growing can be removed from the country."

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

"but regret that in spite of the fact that the human element *i.e.* labour is the most essential factor in the implementation of the first Five Year Plan, no reference has been made to it in the Address."

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

"but regret that no reference has been made to stop retrenchment which is casting a gloom over the families of workers and employees throughout the country."

[Shri S. Banerjee.]

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

"but regret that spirit of drift and complacency permeates the whole Address."

MAJOR-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY  
(Nominated): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret to note that the External Affairs Ministry of the Government of India does not discharge one of its most important duties to the people, that is of keeping the people fully informed of happenings in the international field by placing at their disposal true facts as far as known to the Government regarding the issues of the day to enable the people to form considered views on foreign affairs and thus build up solid support for the Government to form free covenants openly arrived at to which procedure Government is committed as a democratic Government and as a member of the United Nations."

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA  
(Madras): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret—

(a) that the Address does not contain any mention about the amelioration of the landless peasants and agricultural labourers, specially Harijans, who are the born-refugees in our country, by way of settling them on large tracts of cultivable waste lands, and

(b) that the problem of providing cheap houses for these landless agricultural labourers and peasants on co-operative basis, who are the only source of our food production, has not been adequately dealt with at least on a par with the industrial labourers."

*President's Address*

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

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

"but regret to note that—

(a) no positive steps are taken for the rapid industrialisation of the country;

(b) no scheme is being implemented for the removal of mass illiteracy in the country; and

(c) no measures are being adopted for providing proper medical facilities for the rural population."

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret—

(a) that the Address while referring to the present condition of the tea industry fails to take

• note of the fact that the employers in their effort to throw the burden on the shoulders of the labourers are resorting to large-scale retrenchment, cut in wages, curtailment of the other facilities enjoyed by the labourers and also to victimisation for the latter's participation in trade union activities; and

(b) that the Address fails to declare that immediate steps will be taken to provide relief to the labourers already unemployed as well as steps to stop retrenchment, closure of gardens, wage-cut and victimisation and to assure civil liberty in the tea gardens."

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

"but regret—

(a) that the Address while proposing to set up an expert Committee to enquire about the tea industry fails to take note of the fact that the domination of British capital is acting to the

detriment of the national economy; and

(b) that the Address fails to declare that the Committee would include members of Parliament, representatives of the labourers, small traders as well as those of the Government and the tea garden-owners."

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

"but regret that the Address while referring to the general economic situation in the country fails to take note of the fact that large-scale retrenchment of labourers are taking place in many industries thus throwing large numbers into unemployment and thus further worsening the economic situation in the country."

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

"but regret that the Address while referring to the aim of a Welfare State fails to assure its own employees of security of service and of their fundamental right to form trade union organisations."

SHRI B. GUPTA <West Bengal>: Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that the Address sadly fails to recognise the all-round deterioration in the economic situation in the country and indicate any step whatsoever even for minimising the dreadful effects of the present economic crisis or for restricting the scope of its operation."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not propose any concrete steps to prevent the spreading of War to the Peoples' Republic of China in the

first instance, and later to the whole of Asia and even throughout the world, which is the aim behind the recent policies of the Government of the United States of America."

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

"but regret that the Address does not propose immediate cease-fire in Korea, but proposes to continue the same old policy of aiding America and British Imperialists."

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

"but regret that the Address speaks of all-round general progress at an increasing pace, whereas the only progress that is seen in the country is the all-round progress of devastating famine and the growing retrenchment and mass unemployment of workers and of the 4Hucat-ed youth."

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

"but regret that the Address, instead of announcing a Commission to adjust the boundaries of Indian States on the basis of linguistic and cultural homogeneity, as per the cherished desire of the people, tries to raise the bogey of economic and administrative stability and even talks of national unity and security being jeopardized."

SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret to note that the Address—

(a) does not give any assurance to the people that their demand for linguistic States will be granted within a definite period of time; and

(b) fails to recognise the fact that the condition of the large masses of people is deteriorating

[Shri K. C. George.] and that mass unemployment and growing famine are two very serious problems that the Government have to solve."

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that the Address has not indicated any specific date or time-limit for the formation of a separate ANDHRA STATE."

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

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

"but regret that there is no adequate appreciation in the Address of the deteriorating economic condition and growing unemployment in the country nor any indication of any effective measures to tackle it."

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that there is no mention in the Address of a logical and consequential policy to the creation of ANDHRA, for the redemarcation of States on a linguistic basis."

(Principal Deuaprasad Ghosh in whose name stood amendment No. 37 was absent.)

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, I move:

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

"but regret that the urgency of the formation of Linguistic States is not clearly appreciated."

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

"but regret that the exposition of our foreign policy is shrouded in ambiguous terms capable of dangerous misinterpretation and misunderstanding."

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

"but regret that the mounting unemployment in the country is not seriously assessed nor adequate remedies suggested to check the same and assure full employment to -all."

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

"but regret that too much reliance is placed in the Five Year Plan and the fifty-five community projects."

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

"but regret the absence of any mention regarding the prolonged crisis in coir industry in Kerala which keeps several lakhs of people in dire poverty."

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

"but regret that the economic and social disabilities of the Scheduled Castes and the tribal people are not considered nor any assurances extended to them to put down these racial inequalities in the near future."

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

"but regret that there is no promise of relief to the educated unemployed persons."

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

"but regret that there is no mention of the creative role of labour in national reconstruction nor advancement in their living conditions."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the main Resolution and the amendments -are before the House for discussion.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Mr. Chairman, the war clouds are darkening in the Far East and spreading to the very borders of our country and with famine stalking our countryside and growing mass unemployment in all our industrial centres, it is our duty to voice the protest of millions of our people against the dangerous and complacent policies which the Government of India proposes to follow as outlined in the President's speech. The mover of the Resolution Mr. K. Rama Rao and the seconder also follow the same pattern as the President's speech. The President expresses grave concern of the Government at certain statements recently made and the consequences that might follow from them. We ask 'Why is the Government so apologetic and so vague?' Why does not the Government pin down those who made the statements and who want the consequences from that statement to follow? Why is the Government afraid to pin down the guilt on the American Government who want to extend the present Korean war to the whole of China—not only to the whole of China but to the Far East, the whole of Asia and even the whole world? The Government may be submissive because most probably they are anxious to get American dollars as loans but our people are not afraid of the might of the dollar and they are not going to be silent. What do the American policies mean? The President of America wants Asians to fight Asians so that the dollar empire may spread throughout Asia. They want, in the name of deneutralisation of Formosa, to help Chiang Kai-Shek to attack the Chinese Republic whom our own Government recognizes, who are carrying on a tremendous social reform and where agrarian revolution has been achieved. They want to help Chiang Kai-Shek to attack the Chinese Republic and the American Government proposer) to help indirectly with their Navy and Air Force. And not only that. The American Government's President says

that his policies would also affect Indo-China, Malaya and even Burma. Burma, as we all know, is bordering our own country. The American Government wants to help the French Imperialists to suppress the independence struggle of the Indo-Chinese people, to suppress the Malayan patriotic struggle for independence by helping the British Imperialists, and the President of America also says that he is going to help the West European Nations in suppressing the African people and our own Indian people who have migrated to South Africa and suppress the struggle of the African people for their equality, for their liberty. It is no use our Government saying that they are very much concerned over these developments. We want the Government to look back on their own foreign policies and find out whether this American bellicosity is not due at least to some extent to the foreign policies which our own Government has been following during the last 5 years. Government says "We are following a policy of friendship with all countries without alignment with one group of nations or against another". We deny this. They have been following a policy of alignment with American Imperialists and British Imperialists and it is this that encourages the American Imperialists today to openly come out against the People's Republic of China. We accuse the Government for following policies which go to support the American Imperialists and their chief partners the British Imperialists in their bid to create world war, in their fight against the people of China, the Soviet Union and against the independence and sovereignty of every country including ours. Take Korea. What was our Government's policy in Korea? In June 1950, the South Korean Fascist Government, headed by Syngman Rhee, instigated by Mr. Dulles who is now Secretary of States for Foreign Affairs in America, attacked the North Korean Peoples' Government. And when the U.N. moved a resolution our Government sided with the American Government and branded North Korea as the aggressor. From that day onwards our Government has been following, whatever they might be saying in words,

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] : a consistent policy of supporting America. They did not send armies, it is true, as per the American demand, to Korea to fight North Korea. But to keep on good terms with America, they have sent a medical mission. It refuses to condemn the mass bombing that is taking place on civilian populations there. The Government refuses to condemn the bacteriological warfare, the germ warfare that America has been conducting there. In fact, they are not even prepared to give facilities to eminent Indian scientists, for instance ■our own Member here, Gen. Sokhey, when they wanted to go and find out how far this bacteriological warfare is being conducted in North Korea.

Lastly, the Government keeps silent over the butchery of the prisoners of war by the Americans in North Korea. In the last session of the U.N.O. our Government proposed peace proposals for Korea and said that these proposals were intended to bring about peace and a peaceful settlement, that their objective was peace. But I fail to understand why our Government did not demand an immediate "cease fire". They should have done that and demanded an armistice so that the war might cease. There will then be no war continuing, and whatever questions remain unsettled, like the question about the prisoners of war, could be left to conferences. Not only did it not propose an immediate cease fire, but on the other hand, due to American pressure, our Government watered down its own resolution and agreed that the question of the prisoners of war, if not settled, would be left to be decided by the U.N. and this when the U.N. itself is a party to the war, and is managed by the Americans and the British imperialists who are in a majority there. Leaving the question of the prisoners of war to the tender mercies of the U.N. authorities, to the American and British imperialists is the one thing calculated to see that no peace is established, that no settlement is possible under the Indian proposals. Because the Indian Government, in its anxiety to be in the good books of America watered down its own resolu-

tion, because it did not demand an immediate cease-fire before taking up any other question, America and Britain have taken advantage of that resolution on Korea and have supported that resolution. The result of it is that today America is blatant and thinks that the whole of Asia, all the Asian nations are behind it and with this background they have openly come out and want to extend the Korean war to the Peoples Republic of China and to the whole of Asia. America now also wants war bases in India and to get them she is using Pakistan. America is using also Pakistan Government against the Indian Government and trying to coax Pakistan to join the Middle East Defence Organisation and they are offering Pakistan Kashmir as a bait to get these bases. If Pakistan agrees, they could have bases in Kashmir as well as in India so that they could conveniently bomb the Soviet Union and the Chinese Republic.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Where does India come in?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Whatever the Government may say, they allow Americans to roam about in India, to photograph all our strategic points and other such things. In this House, Sir, we have found during the last session, how there are American specialists from Kashmir to Bombay, from Srinagar to Bombay under the plea of Cosmic Research. There is an American Air Force Officer on the Secondary Education Commission. We find an American Naval Officer on the job of Professor at Waltair. The Americans are sounding the depths of our coast, noting the temperatures of the coast and all that so that American submarines, whenever they want, could wander freely in our territorial waters. And the American Ambassador goes to meetings all over the country, visits the strategical frontiers, Manipur and the north-eastern frontiers. He is addressing our army officers. And in spite of these things our Government says that it is following a policy of non-alignment. That is totally false. It follows a policy of alignment with American imperialism and its great partner—the British imperialism. The

Government continues to be in the Commonwealth. Of course the name is only "The Commonwealth" but it is nothing but British imperialism. British officers are supreme in our Navy. They are supreme in our Air Force and we depend for everything, for our Navy, for our Air Force, on British officers, on British sources and even on British repairs. The Indian Government till recently, allowed facilities for recruitment of Gurkha soldiers on the soil of India, for being sent out to Malaya and even Korea and also to Hong Kong. When this was pointed out to the Government and when an agitation started, they said they would stop the recruiting of Gurkha Soldiers on Indian soil; but that they would allow the Gurkha soldiers recruited in Nepal to be transported over Indian territory so as to join the British army to suppress the Malayan people who are fighting the British imperialism. If the Government really wants peace with the Peoples' Republic of China, why is it that it allows Britain to continue to recruit in Nepal or at least allow the recruited Gurkha soldiers to pass through our country and then attack Malaya and Korea also? Why does the Government allow British aeroplanes to land and refuel at our aerodromes and then go to bomb in Malaya and in Korea also? And what is more, we continue to go to the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' conferences, the Commonwealth Defence Ministers' conferences and the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conferences. On the top of that, even our Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, is prepared to go on a visit at the time of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth because Queen Elizabeth is the head of the Commonwealth. And this when the same Queen Elizabeth is the head of a country which allows a policy of racial domination, of colonial domination in Africa. It is shooting the African people in Kenya. As the previous speaker Prof. Dinker, just now said, that is the Government in South Africa which is going to whip our own countrymen and the Africans for their protesting against these laws of racial discrimination. That is exactly why we demand that this Government must

give up its present foreign policy, its so-called neutrality. In fact it is no-neutrality at all. It is nothing but alignment with the British and American Imperialists against the democratic forces of the whole world. So, we want the Government to immediately come out with a foreign policy and demand immediate cease fire in Korea.....

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar).. and join Russia?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: .....demand withdrawal of all foreign armies from: every country; then, our Government must demand that no aid should be given to Chiang against the Chinese Peoples' Republic, no aid should be given to Bao Dai against the Viet Minh people and not aid the British in Malaya. No Gurkha soldier recruited in Nepal should be allowed to pass through India and join the British Armies. We demand the Government to break from the British Empire and to have nothing to do with these British Imperialists racial and colonial policy. If our 36 crores of people take a definite stand against the British and American Imperialists and war-mongers and support the peace demand of the Soviet Union, China and all democratic forces throughout the whole world then, the-American and British Imperialists dare not unleash a" new war.

We feel that this anti-democratic foreign policy of alignment with American and British Imperialists has its counterpart in its pro-landlord and pro-monopolistic policy which the Government of India is following in its internal policies. Now, the President, in his Address, says that "An over-all view of the situation in India indicates all-round general progress at an increasing pace". This is a most surprising statement to have been made by the Head of the State. What is happening in the countryside? I have been recently in Rayalseema Districts, the famine districts of Andhra; there, the picture of famine and starvation is patent. In a number of talukas, I have seen wells dried up completely; I have

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] seen gruel kitchens being closed and people knocking to these gruel kitchens which have been closed. The crops have failed and only 2 annas crops have come and even these will be exhausted by February end, at the latest. Afterwards, we have no work, we have no food and we will be starving. So, see at least the gruel kitchens are opened. The Government has closed these kitchens **and** does not provide any work. These gruel kitchens, let us remember, are being run with the relief grain sent by the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Republic of China. When the help has been sent by the peoples of the Soviet Union and China, it was expected that this relief would be used to open new gruel kitchens or to increase the ration of the starving population. Instead of that, what the Government did was to stop its own relief and, in place of it, use the Soviet grain to run these kitchens, and, on the top of it, even though the grain is not completely exhausted—they are still in godowns—Government is closing these gruel kitchens. It is **not** only in Rayalaseema but, in parts of Hyderabad also, that famine is prevalent. In Maharashtra the Central Famine Relief Committee has submitted many memoranda only the other day; in 8 districts, nearly 40 lakhs of people are affected by famine and relief provided by Government is very meagre. In Malabar, prices have doubled; even now, they sell a maund of rice—it used to cost Rs. 18 in the fair price shops—somewhere between Rs. 25 and Rs. 34 per maund. Yet, Government is closing the fair price shops and, this is the position immediately after the harvest. In Uttar Pradesh, in Deoria, Gorakhpur, Farrukhabad, Fyzabad and Allahabad districts there is famine and Government denies that starvation deaths ever took place there; even as eminent Congressmen as Pandit Sunder Lai and J. C. Kumarappa have to come out contradicting these things. Even in Tamil Nad, there are famine areas and the Government, without looking into these famine conditions, goes on

closing the gruel kitchens and the result is that in Kangalakurichi in Coimbatore District a young woman, who walked many miles from the village to come to the gruel kitchen, was told that the kitchen had been closed—and, there was nobody to give her anything—and she fell down and died there. Even her body could not be removed and her flesh was eaten by vultures and dogs. Here is a photograph of the skeleton in the land of our India.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Was there no Communist there?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: There are Communists and there are Congressmen and this is the result of Government closing down the gruel kitchens.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Which is the paper?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The name of the paper is "Cross Road" and here is the paper.

SHRI RAJ AGOP ALAN (Madras): Where was it taken?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: In the same Tamil Nad from where you come and about which you do not know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, get along; you will get a chance to reply.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: In Bengal also, famine conditions are worsening. I have been recently to see some of the refugee camps in Bengal; the refugees have turned forests and desert lands into beautiful colonies with their labour and, now, the Bengal Government has given them notice because the land has been improved so that the landlords can take hold of them and sell them at an exorbitant price. This is the policy which the Government continues to follow.

What happens is this: harvest has just come over—December and January are the harvest months—but already migration has started in

different parts of the country because the 2 annas crop has been completely exhausted and people have nothing to fall upon. All the same, for the President and for the Government, ■"An over-all view of the situation in India indicates all-round general progress at an increasing pace", whereas the real picture is all-round famine that is spreading and all-round mass unemployment that is spreading. This picture, the Government does not see; the Government sees the all-round general progress which is not there.

Take the question of linguistic provinces, which was agitating the people in all parts of the country. The Congress, in its session in Hyderabad, says that it is not going to constitute any other linguistic provinces till the stability of Andhra Province is assured. The President in his Address puts half a dozen conditions, like national security, national unity, administrative feasibility, economic progress and so on, and says that if all these conditions are satisfied, he does not see any reason why the linguistic-provinces question should not be settled. Instead of all these generalities which\* the Congress goes on repeating, why cannot the Government appoint a commission? Then the provinces will be established in no time. Take the question of Andhra Province itself which the Government went on postponing for five years, and at last, they conceded it and appointed a commission. Even now, this Government is so wooden-hearted, this Government is so completely lacking in imagination, that it wants to postpone it. Andhra people have got their Telugu New Year Day which they consider to be an auspicious day, and they would certainly like their province to come into existence by March 16, their New Year Day; But the Government goes on thinking whether there should be President's rule or Governor's rule, and they would not come to a settlement, and therefore this question is being postponed. This creates unnecessary problems. Half-hearted measures create new problems. Now, there is the problem whether Madras should be the

capital, even a temporary capital, and whether Madras city should be a Chief Commissioner's province or not. Our people are opposed to any of the big cities being converted into Chief Commissioners' provinces. It is an anti-democratic procedure. These cities are the focal points of the culture of linguistic provinces and of their trade, and as such our party will strongly oppose proposals to make cities like Madras, Bombay and Hyderabad, and even—as suggested in certain quarters—Calcutta and Bangalore, all these multi-lingual cities, into Chief Commissioners' States. We are opposed to this move. But the Government goes on without clinching these issues. Government should come out with an integrated policy for readjustment of boundaries; it should come out boldly with the proposal to abolish Rajpramukhs and adjust the boundaries of their States on the basis of cultural and linguistic homogeneity. If they do that, without creating any new province, they could solve the problem of the capital cities, the problem of administration, the problem of economic progress and so on. Take for instance, the Malayan' speaking districts. They can easily attach the Malayali speaking districts in Madras (Malabar) to Travancore-Cochin and detach from Travancore-Cochin the Tamil speaking taluka; then we would get the Travancore-Cochin State functioning as Kerala State. 'And if to Mysore are attached Coorg and the Kannada speaking portions in Madras, Bombay and Hyderabad, without any further trouble, Mysore State itself with these additions could function as Kannada State. And with Hyderabad as capital of the Telugu speaking areas of Hyderabad State and Madras, and with whatever other adjustments that are required, Andhra State could function. The Gujarati speaking portions of Bombay, Kutch and Saurashtra could form Gujarat State with its own capital at Ahmedabad. And the Maharashtra speaking portions of Hyderabad, Bombay and Madhya Pradesh could certainly form a consolidated Maharashtra province; the remaining Hindi speaking portions

• [Shri P. Sundarayya.] of Madhya Pradesh, with Madhya Bharat, Bhopal and parts of Vindhya Pradesh or the whole of Vindhya Pradesh, would really become Madhya Pradesh south of Uttar Pradesh. In that case there would be a reduction in the number of provinces and not an increase. There would have been no further financial commitments. There need not be trouble over capitals, because all the capitals already exist. Yet Government does not do it. Government goes on putting forward unnecessary arguments that the creation of linguistic States is against the interests of national unity, that it is against the interests of national security, that it is against the interests of economic progress, and so on. This is nothing but evasion. Take again, Punjab. Instead of a scattered State like Pepsu, with no contiguous territory, and with a Rajpramukh who goes on doing all kinds of tricks .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Instead, Pepsu could have been easily merged in Punjab, and gradually a Punjabi speaking province could have been formed, and even the communal propaganda carried on by the Akali leaders would have been undermined. But the Congress does not carry out its own policies which it once enunciated, because today it is in power, and it wants to divide people by continuing this division.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: We do not like to make Sikhistan.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: If the hon. Member does not understand our point, we cannot help it.

That is why we characterise the President's speech as a very complacent speech, ignoring the present international situation, to which the Government's own foreign policies have contributed much, ignoring the famine conditions, and the growing unemployment that is stalking the whole land. And we demand once again that Government give up its pro-

landlord, pro-monopolistic, and pro-imperialistic policies. If it persists in its policies, it will lead our people into greater and greater famines and unemployment, and will even mortgage our national sovereignty to the dollar and to the British imperialistic commonwealth, and will even drag India into a third world war behind the American and British war mongers. We demand that Government give up its anti-people's policy. If they do not do it, the people are not going to keep mum; the people will not allow this Government to continue the present policies which will bring ruin to this country and to our people.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great care to what my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya has been saying. I am glad that for the benefit of the House he summed it up all in the end by saying that the whole of the Address is suffused with a spirit of self-satisfaction, and that the policy of the Government is pro-landlord and pro-monopolistic. I was just wondering whether there has been any substance at all .....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: And pro-imperialistic.

PROF. G. RANGA: Yes, and pro-imperialistic. Evidently my hon. friend is not quite sure whether his charges that the Government is pro-landlord and pro-monopolistic would be good enough to be sustained, and therefore he brings in the third one.

Now, let me take this pro-monopolistic charge. To think of nationalising and bringing under a corporation all the air companies of our country —can it possibly be styled pro-monopolistic.

AN HON. MEMBER: State monopoly.

PROF. G. RANGA: State monopoly is not very alien to my hon. friend\* and to their studies and to their traditions. (*Interruption.*) To have nationalised the shipyard at Vizagapatam, to try now to increase its efficiency, and

io open a fourth dry dock—is it a concession to monopoly interests? On the other hand, it was taken over from monopolists.

SMKI B. GUPTA: At what price?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: YOU paid four crores of rupees!

PROF. G. RANGA: My hon. friends do not want to pay any compensation.

*(Interruption.)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. If the hon. Member Mr. Bhupesh Gupta interrupts, he will lose his right to speak tomorrow.

PROF G. RANGA: They do not want to pay any compensation to anybody. One can under-4 P.M stand that. And of course, we are not prepared to accept that proposition. That is a charge we are prepared to accept. I am prepared to accept it because we want to pay compensation. We want to pay compensation to vested interests in a reasonable way in order to be able to liquidate them in a peaceful Gandhian fashion and not in the manner in which my hon. friend would like to liquidate them.

Then, Sir, pro-landlordism is the charge. I have already answered it once before but my hon. friends are never tired of repeating themselves. Let them just scan the list of the tenancy Acts that are being passed and that have been passed in different States of this country. They are an evidence of the fact that the Government here and this House including these friends are not pro-landlords.

Then there is this Five Year Plan. My complaint against the Government is not that they are pro-landlords or anything like it, but that they are anxious to join hands with my hon. friends in liquidating millions and millions—more than hundred millions —of cultivating land-owners of this

65 C of S.

country who are known, as peasant proprietors. They want to bring in the mechanism of so-called compulsory co-operatives—which would be known' of course, in their own fatherland', as; collectives—in order to drive all our independent peasant proprietors, most of whom own less than ten acres of land.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Is your fatherland different from ours?

PROF. G. RANGA: ..... which is less than an economic holding—drive them into these compulsory co-operatives and make them the tools and slaves of their managers under the managerial revolution, of which my hon. friends are very fond. I am opposed, to this and I have already said so in this House last time when the Five Year Plan came up for discussion. That is why I voted against it last time. I voted against this Government because of this reason and I express my views in regard to it once again.

Then there is the question of the tenants who are working under some of these peasant proprietors who happen to have possessed holdings bigger than economic holdings. In regard to them it is but right that we should demand protection that they should be given a fixity of tenure for a particular period of years—five or ten. that the rents to be charged should not be usurpatory but should be reasonable, should never be more than half of net value or something like that. That is a reasonable demand to make. My hon. friends have not made that but some of the State Governments have already proceeded in this direction and some other State Governments are beginning to proceed in this direction. They have already got Bills on the anvil. Therefore, even in that direction. Sir, the Government cannot be said to be pro-landlord.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Seven hundred crores—compensation to the landlords!

PROF. G. RANGA: Oh, that I have already answered, Sir. Again the habit persists. What is to be done?

MR. Cb.AiKJ.vIAN: Even though they repeat themselves, we should not.

PROF. G. RANGA: only refer to the habit. I do not repeat. Then there is the accusation of the Government being pro-imperialist. I was myself a party to the resolution moved by the then Parliament and also the then Congress Working Committee that we should certainly remain in this Commonwealth. My friend Mr. Sundarayya says: "Look at South Africa, look at the way in which they are behaving, think of the resolution that my hon. friend Professor had read out today about the whipping and the rest of it. In spite of these things, why do you want to remain in the Commonwealth?" I would like to know why it is that Soviet Russia and her friends are continuing to remain in the U.N.O. even when my hon. friends have no faith in the U.N.O. at all. And no charge is drastic enough, is rash enough, is rude enough against it. Yet they are remaining in the U.N.O. for certain purposes. They think those purposes are useful, although for other reasons they do not like their own place in the U.N.O. And therefore, they are unhappy. Similarly so far as the Commonwealth goes, we are not there at all—as the hon. Prime Minister has repeatedly told this House as well as the other House—to bolster up any of the British policies. Our freedom to criticise and fight against the policies of South Africa is in no way fettered. We are completely free to express our views whenever we want and to take whatever action we like. We have already taken drastic action against South Africa. We are not on diplomatic relations with South Africa at all. The Commonwealth has not come in our way and I think I have said enough in regard to that charge—to refute this charge of my hon. friends.

Then there comes the question of the Kojé Camp, Korea, Formosa and all the rest. My hon. friend has made a number of demands on this Government and would like this Government to make a number of demands

on the rest of the world. Well, if my hon. friend would only be patient enough to wait until this country becomes strong enough and powerful enough in every possible manner to be able to make these demands on the rest of the world, then it is quite possible that the Government of the day—we do not know which political party it might possibly be—might certainly be in a position, if not to make demands, at least to tell the other nations what it would like them to do. Under the present circumstances, knowing as we ought to do the weaknesses from which we suffer, including some of the political weaknesses in this country, it would be wrong—it would be false—on our part to go on expecting our Government to make these demands. Then he makes demands on our Government. It is the duty as well as the right of every citizen in this country to make whatever demands he thinks fit upon his own Government and if the Government does not carry out his behests, then it would be open to him to go back to his own constituents and take them into his confidence. But what is it that he wants our Government to do? Now, instead of congratulating the Government upon the Korean resolution that it has sponsored and has been able to get the maximum possible support for it—and in that way raising the status of this country in the councils of the rest of the world and in the U.N.O.—my hon. friend finds fault with the Government. Now it is quite clear that he is not interested in the prestige of this Government; he is not interested in the statesmanship of this Government; he is only interested in seeing to it that this Government is made a sort of an instrument with which the purposes for which my hon. friend stands and the other political allies in the rest of the world stand are served. That is the real difficulty for him. I sympathise with him. But I would like to assure him, so far as I am concerned and those who are behind me are concerned, that we certainly are not willing to allow this Government and this country to be turned into a sort of instrument in

order to subserve the interests of 'Other countries which are not conducive to the national development of our country.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Including K.L.P.

PROF. G. RANGA: Including K.L.P. the Congress, the Praja Socialist Party but excluding my hon. friend and his party.

Sir, my hon. friend talks of engagements. Well, the great difficulty is that in their dictionary there are no engagements. There are no marriages. Then, I take up the economic side of this Address. Sir, I am prepared to refer to certain things in the President's Address—famine conditions prevailing in different parts of the country. He has not kept quiet about them. He was not blind to them. He has admitted them. Therefore, my hon. friend is only repeating what the President has said about them. There is nothing new. True, I am not prepared to deny the authenticity of these photographs themselves. This is a country of more than 300 millions of people. I am not prepared to deny that such things have happened and it is no justification that they should be allowed to happen today with our national Government. I am prepared to join hands with them there in saying that such things should not have been allowed to persist even today—up to that and no further. But at the same time, let us remember that all these miseries have been there with us for so long. Our friends have been talking of unemployment among the educated people and also the misery of the agricultural workers, the misery of the industrial workers, retrenchment here, retrenchment there. If you were to scan through all these amendments that my hon. friends have been pleased to table, you will find all these grievances here. They have been with us all along. What has not been with us is what the President has said in this Address and that is the improvement in all these sectors. Sir, as soon as the war was over, there was a bottleneck on

the railways. The hon. Minister for Railways happens to be a happy successor to a long number of years of earnest effort on the part of our own national Railway Ministers—Joha Matt'hai, Gopalaswami Ayyangar and others and today that bottleneck is removed. There was a bottleneck on the mines. That bottleneck is removed. There is greater production.

Then there was the bottleneck. Sir, in regard to cloth, handloom and mill-made; and my friends were saying "Where is the cloth"; they were in doubt. Now, Sir, that has been overcome. There is plenty of cloth in this country and much more so. There were the bottlenecks for yarn supplies, for sugar, for oilseeds. But what we forget is that these were there even before. Our own national Government had come into existence. But all these bottlenecks have come to be removed. Of course, it is right that public workers like my friend should not be complacent and not be thinking of all the good things only that we have achieved and go on thinking of the things we have yet to achieve.

Even the President has said so; he has said that we should aim at a welfare State. He took care also to say that whatever we have achieved, ought not to satisfy us so long as there are groups of people in our country who are beyond the pale of these benefits. Therefore the Government are not blind to these things. Let us be frank and honest with ourselves and be fair to ourselves for once. Let us criticise the Government but let that criticism be constructive and conducive to helping the Government also, to show the right path towards further development and further progress.

Sir, I come to the multi-purpose project. I see, Sir, the President has advisedly used the word 'great'. It is time we begin to realise what big things we are having in hand and what we are trying to achieve. My hon. friend, has referred to Rayachoti and the conditions that are

[Prof. G. Ranga.] prevailing there. The Government have appointed a Commission to enquire into the ways in which famines could be averted in future. The President has made a reference to this also. We could\* all expect the Government to take the necessary steps to see that some of the irrigation projects are taken up and executed within the next three or four years. I am sure, Sir, and I have it on very high authority, that it would not be beyond the capacity of this Government to do this and to bring them into the Five Year Plan, and the supplementary plan that they are expecting to evolve. The Siddeswaram project will, I am sure, go to help the Kurnool and Cuddappah districts. The expenditure is expected to be about 30 lakhs of rupees there and it will provide irrigation for one lakh of acres of land. The Tungabhadra project will help the Gooty and Tadpatri taluks which are the worst in that part of the country. The remodelling of the Kurnool-Cuddappah canal can bring 11 lakhs of acres of land under irrigation at the small cost of Rs. 30 lakhs. The Gondikota project will protect Proddatur and Tammalamadugu taluks and cost Rs. 50 lakhs. The Someswaram project—the Someswaram dam—will help the Cuddappah as well as the Nellore districts. The famous Nandikonda project, when completed, would bring under irrigation more than 40 lakhs of acres in the Andhra as well as the Hyderabad area. These are the projects that are to be undertaken by the Government and I expect the Government to find funds for these and other projects. I expect them to go even to the World Bank for this purpose.

Then, Sir, my hon. friend was very eloquent about the Andhra State. Naturally, we should try our best to help the Andhra State to make a good beginning. There is the Vansadhara project in Srikakulam; this can be attempted at a cost of only Rs. 8 crores. Now, in order to achieve these things, my hon. friend is not prepared to let any American come into our country.

I say, if not an American, a Russian may come to this country. I am not afraid of a Russian being here, certainly not. But I am not unwilling to allow an American here for he is willing to help us in our project. There is the Hirakud project; and it is making such good progress. This Hirakud and the Bhakra-Nangal projects are developing fast. Let us be enthusiastic, let us be proud of these multi-purpose projects. Unfortunately, Sir, my hon. friend, instead of being an admirer of the multi-purpose project; especially when the eyes of the country, and of this House and of the whole world, are turned towards this, he by-passes it and dilates on a series of minor things.

Sir, I am also in favour of linguistic provinces being formed everywhere. But let us be honest enough to wait till the present one that is being formed has time enough to crawl and stand on its own feet.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Why?

PROF. GL. RANGA: I will tell my hon. friend that lots of people in this country especially in North India are labouring under very many misapprehensions in regard to the linguistic redistribution of this country: I have here a sister of mine who was born in the South but has adopted Northern India. There are her objections, wrongly and mistakenly held; according to me, but we have to disabuse her mind by making a success of this Andhra State. Those of us who are in favour of the linguistic-provinces should make a success of these new ventures and work in such a way which is likely to be conducive to the progress of the country as a whole and help it to go ahead with these linguistic provinces.

Sir, my hon. friend, in the end, has said that we are going backwards and not forwards, that we are not making any progress at all. But the people are aware of the progress. The President is naturally right in maintaining that we are definitely making progress. Only look into the list of new

.institutions that have been brought into existence in the last five or six

. years, by the Education Ministry. Let them pass through the Talkatora Road; let them look at the two stately buildings. What do they stand for? They stand for the development of our ■culture. Only the other day we had the Fine Arts Society brought into

. existence and two great musicians of this country have come to be recommended for the President's award.

"My hon. friend would like many more Indians to go to Moscow in order to get Peace Awards . from Stalin. I

. am more anxious to see that the great : intellectuals of this country, the culturally great people, should be given more and more awards of that type by our President, so that there

would be greater inducement, greater incentive, for our people to become

•votaries of fine arts. In that direc-

'tion. Sir, we have made very great

; progress indeed.

It is true that education has not

•made as much progress as we would like, but you yourself, Sir, are a wit-

•ness to the fact how our universities have got themselves multiplied. Lakhs

• and lakhs of the young people of this i country are becoming graduates every year, whereas according to my hon. friend, who is a revered Member of this House and a leader of the Praja Socialist Party, there were only 25 thousand graduates in a whole year in Soviet China. Lakhs of people are

■studying in the universities. This is progress according to me. I know, Sir, in my own State of Madras how (he number of high schools have gone up, how the number of middle schools and elementary schools have gone up. But this is riot enough. I want five times as many schools before we can say to ourselves that we are making adequate educational progress, but that does not mean that we are not making any progress. Here is the Finance Commission's Report which has been circulated to us now. If you look at the appendices of that Report, you will find the money that is being spent on education and other

■developmental services in this coun-i try during the last five years. You

will be impressed by the growth of that expenditure. Well, you might say that it is only expenditure but there are no results. My hon. friends are very eager, along with other Members, that the salaries of the elementary school teachers should be increased, that the number of rural doctors should be increased, and that their pay should be increased. We have not increased them, but in spite of that, the expenditure has gone up double, treble That shows we are making progress. Unfortunately for us, we do not have enough resources. What could we do. We are raising many taxes, and when we raise money by taxes, we know the difficulties also We are spending so much money on the social services. And if my hen. friends would only co-operate with us. in going to the people and asking them to co-operate in developing more, not only the community projects but also community activities all over the country, we would be able to make much progress. Only yesterday or the day before we heard that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia had co-operated in completing one of these projects. The President himself has expressed satisfaction that hundreds of miles of roads are being constructed and have been constructed in the last few months. Sir. within the next five years we will have thousands of miles ot roads constructed in this country with the help of voluntary labour, with the help of the masses, the agriculturists, and our own villagers, and if only there is unity amongst ourselves, if ray<sub>s</sub> hon. friends would be willing to co-operate with us. If only they co-operate with us, I am sure that by the time the Plan is completed, we would have achieved much more than what the Planning Commission itself has set for us.

SHRI B. GUPTA: But the Planning Commission itself does not say so.

PROF. G. RANGA: My hon. friend says that the Commission does not say so. The Commission only lays down what the Governments are expected to do. But they do expect a lot from us. It is for enlisting public co-operation, the co-operation of **all**

[Prof. G. Ranga.] people, that they have created the Bharat Sevak Samaj. It is the duty of the Bharat Sevak Samaj to go ahead. My friends flaunt certain photographs of certain incidents in which some of them carry earth. I make an appeal to them and also to the public to give their unstinted cooperation. If only public co-operation is forthcoming, we would be able to achieve much indeed in this country, because this country is rich *in* labour, though poor in money, instruments and machinery. Now, you do not want machinery from America. If you do *not* want implements from America, if you do not want foreign loans, then at least you co-operate with us in utilising the whole of this labour. Do not stand in the way when we go to the villages and ask the peasants, artisans and everybody else, to co-opt rate with us by offering their labour, if possible, freely, wherever necessary on half payment or part payment. It is in this way that we can develop our countryside.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.)

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to accord my wholehearted support to the resolution which has been so ably moved before this House, viz. that this House expresses its gratitude to the President for the gracious Address which was delivered by him before the two Houses of Parliament the other day.

The method that I should like to adopt in discussing this Address is that I do not think it is proper for me to traverse any ground that has not been covered by that Address and import into my speech rather irrelevant subjects. I should like only to discuss some of the points that arise out of that Address and submit humbly my own suggestions for consideration by the proper authorities, because the problems that are dealt with in the President's Address are of very far-reaching importance, and this is an occasion on which we may give to the Government, suggestions that

decure to us on the basis of our own experience.

First of all, I find that the President I has referred to what he calls alignments in foreign policy. On page 2: of the speech he says;

'My Government will' continue to-work to this end and will pursue a policy of friendship with all countries without, any alignment with one group of nations against another."

He further says:

"The democratic processes to which we are so firmly committed in; our own country involve methods of peaceful approach to problems."

My submission in this connection is; this that we should know fully the implications of the fundamental assumption that India stands firmly committed to democracy. Now all Members know that the whole world is now sharply divided into two opposing; ideologies and schools of thought, represented broadly speaking by Communism, and democracy. If India therefore stands firmly committed to democracy, I do not know how long it will be given to India to maintain a-position of neutrality in the whirlpool of international politics. In that connection I would like the-authorities to ponder deeply over a most important event that has happened in world politics viz., the election of the new President of the United States of America and his inaugural message. In that message President Eisenhower has- stated very clearly that U.S.A. will stand for the proven friends of freedom and in the offer of assistance to these friends of freedom all over the world, the U.S.A.. Government expects that within the-limits of their resources, these proven: friends should bear the full and just burdens in the common defence of freedom. This raises certain fundamental issues of international politics which India must be able to consider beforehand so that we should have definitely to state to what extent we should defend democracy against the •

attacks that may be levelled upon it from different schemes of Communist or imperial expansions in Asia and Europe. Now in that connection we have also to consider the implications of this statement. Well, I think that since we want to be at peace with all the nations of the world, there is *no* reason why we should cultivate an attitude of coldness or indifference towards U.S.A. As the Five Year Plan shows, we still shall depend upon foreign aid in carrying through some of our development plans, and it was given to the Ambassador of U.S.A., Mr. Chester Bowles, the other day to make a very significant remark in an article called 'New India' published in *The Foreign Affairs of U.S.A.* In that article he has stated that he thinks that the withdrawal of American aid will seriously jeopardise the success of some of our Five Year Plans. I don't like, on this occasion, to exhaustively discuss the implications of all these recent statements on international politics but I would like the authorities to see that every point of view that has been raised at present in the world should be thoroughly considered so that we may be ready beforehand for such changes of external policy as may be required under the exigencies of the situation that may arise in the near future.

Now, Sir, the next point that has been referred to in the President's Address is the Kashmir issue. No doubt the President has discussed in a very able and statesmanlike manner all the internal and international problems that face India but I think the Kashmir problem has both a domestic as well as a foreign aspect. So far as the foreign aspect of the Kashmir issue is concerned, we should always remember that we really approached the UNO for a very definite purpose viz., that we lodged with the UNO a complaint against a sister nation launching an invasion upon India but for these 5 or 6 years the UNO has been turning a deaf ear to this complaint and has been going on raising other irrelevant issues on this subject. Instead of pronouncing a final verdict as to the fact of aggression committed by Pakistan upon India, instead of

giving a straightaway answer to this question which was brought by India before UNO, they simply brushed it aside and raised other issues with which really we should not be concerned. That issue is the question of plebiscite. On that question my humble view as a student of history and politics is this that there is no power on earth which can claim that under law India is bound to the plebiscite in order to make good the accession which was offered by Kashmir to India. The process of accession is a complete process, complete in law and in fact, as was stated the other day before the House by the Prime Minister with his grip upon the facts of foreign politics. Therefore, accession cannot be challenged on any ground whatsoever. Accession is accession unreserved and unconditional and it is not permissible in international law to reopen the question of accession and to say that a State that has acceded to a Federation is at liberty to secede according to its own sweet will. That is not permitted under international law. In fact international law is so definite on this subject that the U.S.A. went to war on this issue that led to a civil war between the States under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. Therefore this question should be set aside completely and should be taken as settled. I am afraid the present talks that are going on in Geneva may again lead to a breakdown and therefore we have to think beforehand what should be our next step under the circumstances. No doubt we may say that although there is no legal commitment on the part of India to hold a plebiscite, there is a question of moral commitment and India is always anxious to prove its honesty in regard to international moral commitments but unfortunately politics knows of no morality or generosity and therefore the response that was given to this gesture of goodwill from India by the other side has been hopelessly inadequate. On the contrary it has been grossly misused in order that fresh claims could be made upon India. Therefore if this is the situation, we must revert to the original legal position. That position

[Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.] makes it quite clear that the accession of a State to India, even under the provisions of the Indian Independence Act passed by the House of Commons, —an Act which left every State in India after the withdrawal of the British sovereignty completely free either to accede to India or Pakistan —when this freedom is exercised by the States, there the matter is final and therefore the question of accession will never be allowed to be reopened with India under any law. Now our friends in Pakistan deliberately try to raise other issues. Therefore it is time that we should fix our attention very closely and concentrate upon the main issue.

Now as regards the plebiscite. I think we must remind those who are entrusted with these negotiations that from the historical point of view the plebiscite is already over in Kashmir and that was taken on that great occasion when Pakistan launched the invasion of Kashmir. How did the Kashmiris behave under the stress of that invasion? Did they fraternise with the invaders as an army of liberation? If they had done it, then the whole issue would have been solved automatically. On the contrary, far from fraternising with them, those soldiers of freedom—the Kashmiris—fought them to a man and then in the fateful days of October 1947 when the Kashmiris felt that single-handed they could not stem the tide of that invasion which was really planned and financed by Pakistan, when the small band of heroic Kashmiris felt that there was no other way to save their capital—Srinagar— and when they found that 5,000 tribesmen were advancing in military escort towards Srinagar after marching across 200 miles of Pakistan territory capturing Muzaffarabad and Poonch on the way and when Srinagar was about to be attacked, it was at that moment that the Kashmiris sought India's help.

(*Time bell rings.*) DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI—Is it the time limit for me?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. you have had 15 minutes.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I did not know, otherwise I would have cut my coat according to the cloth. Since there was no time-limit for the previous speaker .....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only the mover has 30- minutes.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Could I have 3 minutes more?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: At that fateful moment the Kashmiris felt that" it was a hopeless case and they then approached India for help and at that time the Government of India under Lord Mountbatten said that no military intervention could be given in aid of Kashmir unless Kashmir had acceded to India. Then Kashmir, of course, offered accession to India. This offer of accession was made not merely by the then legal Government of Kashmir, but it was also offered with the backing of the National Conference, under the leadership of Sheikh Abdulla. Therefore, both the popular party as well as the Government were implicated in this offer of accession to India. So my point is this, that this process of accession was completed according to law, and Kashmir has signed the same instrument of accession as has been signed by other States like Mysore and Travancore-Cochin. Therefore there is no reason why we should make a separate case with reference to the accession of Kashmir and say that it depends upon its ratification by a plebiscite. I say that if there is a break-down in the Geneva talks, we should return to the original legal position and say that we may hold a plebiscite in Kashmir through the Kashmir Constituent Assembly which for our purposes would be sufficient to decide this domestic issue as between Kashmir and India.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: May I take 20 minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Fifteen minutes.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I would like to have 20 minutes. Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Go on.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, I wish I could be as enthusiastic as was Prof. Ranga in discussing this Address. I do not deny that there are bright spots in it, but I must confess that taking it by and large, the Address is rather disappointing. Before I come to discuss the subjects mentioned in the Address, I might refer, just for a brief moment, to one topic which Prof. Ranga referred to, namely that we are doing big things, and this we should advertise to the rest of the world; that we do not quite appreciate the great achievements that have been worked out in this country. But to me it seems, the less we do it the better. I may refer to one subject only, namely the establishment of research institutions in the country. We have got very big buildings for research and whenever a foreign visitor comes we take him round and show these buildings to him. But if my information is correct, we are importing the atmosphere of the secretariat into these research institutions, killing the spirit of real research. If research is to be done, it should be done more in our universities. I think an enquiry committee should be set up to examine how far any fundamental and applied research has been done in these institutions. I am told that the Council of Scientific Research has taken out thousands of patents. It is pertinent to ask how many of them have been commercially utilised, and if not so utilised, what is wrong with them.

Let me now come to the Address itself. The Address may be broadly divided into two parts—the national and the international parts. Except for a brief observation on the international part, I would like to confine my remarks to domestic matters. Last year, in enunciating our foreign policy the President said:

"We have consistently pursued a policy of friendship with all countries of the world; and that policy though sometimes misconstrued has been progressively appreciated by others and is yielding fruit."

It is pertinent to ask, what fruit has it yielded? Has it brought peace nearer or made war remoter? Has our policy of independence and neutrality, which is supposed to be the key-stone of our foreign policy, been strengthened by the part we recently played in the U.N. by bringing up our Korean resolution? I do not know what actually happened. But how came it that these proposals of ours on Korea which at the time were bruited about as having been drawn up in consultation with the parties concerned, were totally rejected by Russia and China? We looked rather small because of the initial propaganda build-up in the process. It appears to me that the policy that we have been pursuing so far in the international field, though good as far as it goes, does not go far enough. The policy of non-involvement is good, but only, as I said, as far as it goes, and it is a negative policy. What is it that we do? We react, more than we act and this has not done us the good that we expected. We are supposed to be neutral; but here, my friend has stated categorically—and I suppose he represents also the viewpoints of some of the countries on this policy—that this cannot be called a neutral policy. So why keep up this camouflage? I feel, Sir, that there must be some more positive content in that policy, and that is what our party believes. While we must not get ourselves entangled in any blocs that exist today in the world, we must pursue a positive policy and also get together other countries with a similar bent of mind, and try to create a force which will act as a stabilising and effective force between the two warring blocs. But as I said, I do not want to dilate on the foreign policy. That will be taken up by other Members of our party.

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

Before coming to domestic affairs, I would like to make a brief mention to one aspect of our relationship with Pakistan. In his Address the President stated in para 6 that:

I trust that this effort will be continued and directed towards the removal of the basic problems that still confront the minorities in East Bengal."

This, Sir, is a problem in which we from West Bengal, are very vitally interested. These sentiments expressed in the Address are generous. But may I ask, Sir, what concrete measures have the Governmen\* taken or have in mind to remove these basic problems? I am afraid that with the introduction of the passport system, as this will make large-scale emigration well nigh impossible, the fate of millions of Hindus left behind in Eas\* Pakistan will, as usual, be relegated to the dungheap of oblivion.

Coming now to domestic matters, I feel that here we find, except" in one important matter, some improvement in the over-all food position about which I shall have to say something later on—there is very little in the Address to enthuse over. Apart from platitudes, hesitancy, lack of policy and inadequate appreciation and sometimes incorrect representation of vital problems are some of its unfortunate features. About food. Sir, it is true that during the last few months there has been some over-all improvement in the food situation but, it would be foolish to forget that there are danger spots as well, although it is quite heartening that we had a stock of about 1! lakh tons by the end of 1952. These are the danger spots which we should try to keep in our mind: firstly, the improvement, partially at least, has been due to the deteriorating economic condition and growing un-employemen\* resulting in loss of purchasing power; secondly, there are, still, large number of famine and scarcity areas in the country; thirdly,

prices of foodgrains, as the indices of food prices show, are still very high; the cost of living index also shows that expenditure on food has been increasing. All these, on the demand side, have had a satisfactory effect and, I believe that the Food Minister is one of the beneficiaries of the present deflationary economic conditions. On the supply side again, it is true that removal of some vexatious controls have had a salutary effect. But,, in every place, we are again having certain measures which may also prove to be vexatious. For example, in West Bengal, the levy system has been introduced and it is causing hardship to many people. If its evil effects are not removed, I am afraid that, in future years, production and, therefore, procurement, may be affected. We should, therefore, take note of these features and not gloat over the improvement that has come about, although we must acknowledge that improvement.

As example, Sir, of hesitancy and lack of policy. I may refer you to paragraphs 10 and 20 of the Address regarding linguistic provinces and the future of cottage industries. On linguistic provinces, the Address states: "Keeping all these factors in view," namely, the unity of India,, national security, financial and administrative aspects and economic progress, "there is no reason why the question of the reorganisation of States should not be considered fully and dispassionately so as to meet the wishes of the people and help in their economic and cultural progress." The statement. Sir, as you will see, is platitudinous; it betrays an anxiety to shelve the real issue and an unwillingness to face realities. The effect that it will have, will be, to keep alive the agitation on this linguistic question and divert people's energies from the task of national reconstruction. Our party, therefore, believes in the following. It accepts the policy of linguistic provinces; it does not believe that the creation of linguistic provinces will in any way affect the unity of,

or the forces of progress in this country. — It feels that this problem must be solved once and for all and it should not be always kept up on the agitational level. Our party, therefore, believes that a high power Commission, to which reference was also made by my friend Mr. Sundarayya, should be set up, which would examine all questions of territorial readjustment in new or existing States and decide the issues finally. Because, once this is done, then, people's attention will not be diverted by agitation on these matters and may be harnessed for other national work.

Utter lack of policy also characterises Government's attitude towards cottage industries. What we get is all platitudes and an attempt to shirk the issue. Instead of setting up committees, let us face the real facts. The crux of the problem is this: assuming that cottage industry cannot successfully compete with mill-made competition, shall we give it any protection as against mill production? That is the problem that we have to examine and decide upon. Our party has a definite policy in this matter also. We feel that cottage industries, in deserving cases, should be protected, while, at the same time, we must try, in every way to increase their efficiency. Their case may be likened, in some measure, to the case of protection afforded to indigenous industries. There are two reasons primarily why we favour protection to certain cottage industries: firstly, in the present conditions, when we have an abundance of labour and scarce capital, our policy should be geared to be labour intensive because that will also be wholesome so far as employment is concerned. That is an economic reason. But, there is a more fundamental reason why we support such industries like cottage industries. We believe that if democratic socialism is to flourish and not be sabotaged or strangled by authoritarianism, decentralisation in economic activity should, as far as possible, be encouraged.

Incidentally, Sir, I have no doubt that you will also have noticed that both the Congress and the Communist parties favour larger and concentrated industries which, within themselves, bear the seeds of authoritarianism which, when they flower, are likely to destroy personal freedom and individual liberty.

Again, in the matter of education, the same vagueness occurs. We get only platitudes in paragraph 29 of the Presidential Address. The problems are again repeated. Commissions after Commissions have enquired into the matter and there is nothing that the Government do not know; they have to take action, but they are afraid or they do not want to take the necessary measures.

As examples of incorrect representation, or inadequate appreciation of vital problems, I may draw your attention, Sir, to paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Address.

In paragraph 11, it is stated that the "Planning Commission has completed the first part of its labours by finalising its report on the Five Year Plan. The other and more difficult part of implementing this Plan now faces the country and to that we must address ourselves." I should have thought, Sir, that the task of implementing the Plan faced us not now but two years ago. About 40 per cent, of the Plan should have been implemented by now.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Supposed to have been.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Instead of giving us a resume of what has already been done or, whether there has been any short-fall or excess achievements, whether it is necessary to redeploy our resources in the interests of the Plan, instead of giving us all these things, we are now told that we must divert our energies to implementing the Plan. I am constrained to ask, Sir, whether this Government is at all serious about implementing this Plan.

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

In paragraph 12\* the Address states that the general economic situation in the country shows distinct signs of improvement. I rubbed my eyes when I read that statement. I thought first —and that appeared to be confirmed by the context in which this was stated—that it referred to the food situation. But, if it was really the economic situation that the President was referring to, he must have been very ill-advised in making this statement. For, only the other day, in Hyderabad, the Finance Minister stated that there is perhaps a certain amount of deflation at the moment. I am aware, Sir, that the Finance Minister was probably preparing his ground for undertaking fairly large deficit financing, but, even so, it cannot be denied...

(Time bell rings.)

..... that economic indices and business experience testify that depressed business conditions are to be found in our economy today, whether we call it recession or deflation. But, Government appear to have no policy to remedy this state of affairs. They are doing nothing to stem the tide of growing unemployment. I may refer you, Sir, to what the President stated last year: "My Government are closely watching the situation to ensure that production and employment are not affected". I submit, Sir, that production and employment have been affected during the last few months and what have the Government done?

Practically nothing. I wonder 5 P.M. whether this Government adequately realises that hunger and acute distress are the handmaids of social upheavals.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, my Deputy Leader has already addressed the Council in so far as the economic and other aspects of the Presidential Address are concerned. I shall at least today confine my remarks to the state-

ments in the President's Address referring to the foreign policy of the Government of India.

We have already had one or two criticisms from this side about the foreign policy of this country. We are told not only in this Address but also elsewhere and for the last five years, that we are supposed to be following what is called an independent neutral policy. As my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya has already stated, it cannot by any stretch of imagination be called an independent neutral policy. He has named occasions when our Government has sided with one bloc. I fully agree with what my hon. friend states, namely, that it is not a neutral policy, and that it has been a policy of alignment with a bloc now and again. I also agree with him when he stated certain issues on which the Government of India through its delegates and through its representatives at the U.N.O. has taken the side of the United States bloc. While fully agreeing with what my hon. friend has already stated, I do not mean to suggest that I shall accept the conclusion to which he has made veiled reference. While I agree with him, while I agree that what he has stated is true, I must also say that he has only stated half the truth, because I believe that while there have been occasions when the Government of India has sided with the Atlantic bloc, there have been an almost equal number of occasions when they have unnecessarily, unthinkingly, sided with the Russian bloc. I have already said in my previous speeches, in fact in my first speech in this honourable Council, that the so-called neutral policy of the Government is nothing but rendering alternate service, if I may say so, to one or the other bloc. We see an exceedingly fine expression of this policy when, in one sentence after another sentence they refer to one bloc and then to another. Incidentally I may say that I also agree with what my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya said, that the Government has failed to name the country and the person who; it is

assumed, is trying to extend the war in the Far East. I would go further and say, so far as the previous sentence is concerned, that the Government of India have failed to put the true position before this country so far as the Korean peace proposals are concerned. There was a question in the other House during the last session when the Government was asked the history and the progress of these peace proposals in the United Nations. The Hon. Minister for External Affairs, who is also our Prime Minister, made a sort of hesitant reference to a certain not definite understanding or undertaking by China, and he also tried to defend her when it was not necessary. If the hon. Members of this House or the other House or the people of this country have to judge the foreign policy of this country, it is essential that the Government of India must place the entire truth before this country so that we can judge our friends and our foes alike.

When I said that these two sentences were a very fine expression of the present foreign policy of this country, I meant that in every case you find—I can quote any number of examples —\*hat so far as our activity in the United Nations is concerned, and so far as our activity elsewhere is concerned, whenever we have taken the side of one bloc, feeling that the other bloc would accuse us of partisanship or alignment, as it were, feeling that they would have to face criticism in this very House that the Government of India is aligning itself with the United States bloc, they have immediately taken the other side needlessly and unthinkingly, if I may say so. sided with the other bloc, so that we might establish to the people of this country, and to the whole world, and also to hon. Members of "Parliament, that th'e Government of India is the only neutral, that India is the only neutral, what is called dynamically neu\*ral. country in the whole world. Now. these two statements have come together, because if *one* statement had

been made, then one bloc would have said, "India has aligned herself with the other bloc". Now we have made • two references and we are happy and are absolutely satisfied tha+ we are the only neutral country in the world. .

I may quote another example so far as the unwise neutral policy is concerned. Hon. Members of this House will please recall that during on<sub>e</sub> of the discussions in the United Nations about Korea, of which we hear so much in this House and elsewhere, and quite rightly too. that they tagged on two proposals together. First, our Government proposed that China should be admitted to membership of 'he United Nations, and, secondly, they said that North Korea was the aggressor and we must stop the aggression. Now, placing these two things may be quite correct, but to make the admission of China as a member of the United Nations a condition precedent for peace in Korea only reflects the confused policy of the present Government. We could have made it on another occasion. It was not necessary to link them together. So far as the Korean issue itself is concerned, I believe, and my party also believes, 'hat it was the most illogical policy that our Government has been guilty of throughout its career. First of all, you brand North Korea as the aggressor. Already it has been refuted in this; House. Not North Korea, but South Korea was the aggressor. it was claimed. Whatever the truth, whatever the argument may be. if you were committed to the view that North Korea was the aggressor, and if you have accepted \*he United Nations principle of collective security, the ■ logical consequence of that stand is ; to send your troops to North Korea. But no. We shall brand North Korea as the aggressor, but we shall keep our troops at home, so that we do not unnecessarily antagonise the other -bloc. When I give this example I do • not mean to say that I plead that our -forces should be sent to North Korea. I will state what I feel should have •

[Shri C. G. K. REDDY.] ' been the correct policy of the Government.

DR. D. H. VARIAVA (Saurashtra): On a point of information. Did not our Government say that the People's Government of China should be admitted to the U.N.O. before this Korean business started?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: That is exactly what I was referring to. I said it myself, that the Government of India made the admission of China into the U.N.O. a condition precedent to peace in Korea.

After all this criticism. I do have to pay a very handsome tribute, a wholehearted tribute, not a left-handed tribute, to the Government of India for having followed what I believe to be the correct policy on one or two

occasions. If you take for instance the Resolution branding China as aggressor, the Government of India took a very sane and correct policy of abstention. This policy ought to have been the guiding force behind every decision that we have taken in international affairs. There have been

other occasions when we have acted independently and in pursuit of what we believe to be a fundamental concept of our way of life. In regard to the North African colonies. I should also like to express—so far as I am

concerned and so far as my party is concerned—a special debt of gratitude and thanks to the President to have categorically said so.

But these two things appear to be the only examples. As I have said, it has been more or less a ding-dong game. It is not as if we cannot project our own dynamic neutrality. The idea may be there. But the actions that have guided and that have projected this idea have been so senseless. As I have already said, we ought to be courageous. I may also state that if anybody in India or elsewhere, or in this House, thinks that India, by projecting a few stunts, if I may say,

in the U.N., may take a romantic, path but certainly not an effective one.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Let us know what is your concrete suggestion.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I have first to demolish your 'unwise' policy. Now, as I was coming to it, my hon. friend Mr. Hegde anticipated what I was going to say. I was going to say, Sir, that it was possible to project this policy in a very effective way. I have already said on one or two occasions that we have acted in a very sane manner, in a manner which reflects our real intentions.

Now, Sir, we have so many countries in the world who think exactly like us and who have, on one occasion, acted concertedly with us—as I have already said, in so far as the colonies question is concerned. We have done very good work in this instance in developing concerted action with all the countries who believe like us, who do not believe that alignment with one bloc or the other is going to do any good to the world or to themselves. This policy does not contemplate leadership for any one country. But we could have shown the example. All these countries look up to us even today, in spite of many disappointments. They could have come together. As I have already stated, on any question, whether it is peace or war, militarily we are not going to be effective. But it would have been strategically important, strategically effective if we had developed co-ordination with these countries, who, fortunately for us, lie side by side geographically, if we had developed this vast belt which could have really been an effective force against the development of these two blocs. But we have done nothing in the matter. As I have already stated, on one or two occasions we have acted concertedly. It is not too late even today. We can see to it that all those countries who think like us, who are convinced that alignment with one bloc or the

other is not going to do any good to peace in the world or to themselves, we could see that we develop more contacts, cement our friendship and develop a very strong belt for peace and for *wh&i* I might call, a third force.

*(Time bell rings.)*

I am aware, Sir, that the originator of the third force is not extremely popular in the opposite ranks. Call it any name you like. If this is an idea that the Congress Party accepts and believes in—and I think they do, although they do not want to say—and even if they do not agree with the originator of the idea, if they do not want to give a compliment to him or to the party to which he belongs. I do not have a quarrel; but if you believe in it, it is time that you put it into effect. That is why my amendment has said that we have failed so far to develop and project this force and it is necessary now more than ever to develop this force. And I will just say one more sentence so far as this is concerned, to those who say it is not practical. I can assure them that there are countries who lie in this geographical situation, who think like us, who think of a dynamic neutral policy, who want the development of this belt. I have, Sir, just come from a conference where all these countries were represented. Maybe, only certain sections of these countries were represented but certainly the Government parties of some of the countries were represented who have agreed to this policy and it is possible for us to contact them, cement our friendship and co-ordinate our actions.

If you will permit me, Sir, I will take only two minutes to refer to another question on which I have moved an amendment. It concerns the linguistic provinces. My Deputy Leader has already referred to it. I come from an area, Sir, as you know, where this linguistic question greatly agitates the people. Now I thought, Sir, after the decision regarding

Andhra the policy with regard to linguistic provinces in other regions would follow as a matter of course—and logically it should follow. But we find that Andhra has been put on probation and if Andhra passes the probationary test, then other provinces—if once they are arraigned as criminals and pass certain tests, as my hon. friend Mr. Rama Rao was saying today—would be formed on a linguistic basis. I do not know how the issue of Andhra greatly differs from any other linguistic issue. It may be that Andhra is being formed today because of the sacrifice of a man—a great man—who gave up his life. It may be the Government's hands were forced. I ask the Government whether it is waiting for a time until the people force its hands in that manner or whether they will anticipate public feelings. It is not as if the Congress Party does not know the feelings of the people in this matter in all these regions. Will the Government anticipate public feelings and be alive to the agitation of the public mind in this matter before it is too late?

SHRI KARTAR SINGH (PEPSU): Mr. Deputy Chairman. I want to speak something in connection with paragraph 23 of the President's Address which says: "My Government has been paying special attention to the tribal areas in the North-East and other parts of India and help is being given for their development. A Commission to consider the problems of backward classes has been appointed." So, the President has been pleased to observe that special attention is paid to the interests of socially, economically and educationally backward classes.

The Five Year Plan to which a reference has been made in the Address, provides a sum of Rs. 37 crores for the advancement of these backward classes. In India, as we all know, the population of the scheduled classes according to the census of 1951 is 4 crores and 98 lakhs and in another

[Shri Kartar Singh.] Report which was submitted by the Scholarship Board of the Ministry of Education it was put down as 5 crores and 14 lakhs. So it is a thing which concerns the welfare of more than 5 crores of people, besides schedule tribes who number 191 lakhs.

In the Constitution, so far as the scheduled caste people and other depressed classes are concerned, they have been granted certain concessions and certain privileges

The concessions given to these backward people are in the nature of free education, in the nature of stipends, Scholarships, provision for books, stationery and other equipment. In some of the States they are given further concessions; lands are allotted to them. waste lands and Crown (State) lands are allotted to them. In the constitution we find that under article 330 of the Constitution, seats in the House of the People are reserved for the scheduled caste people. Again, in the States legislature, by virtue of article 332, special seats are reserved for them. Under article 335, you again find that they have a special claim to services and posts both in the Union and the States and there are government posts reserved up to a certain percentage of vacancies and *are* filled from mainly these scheduled castes. Then, the Constitution has also provided for a special officer to be appointed by the Government to look into the affairs of these people and see whether these concessions are properly given to these persons. There is yet another provision in the Constitution that the President may, by virtue of article 340, appoint a Commission for the purpose. So we find that the Constitution has given certain safeguards to the poor people who are economically unsound.

In the first place. I fully associate myself with the motion of thanks that has been proposed by my hon. friend.

I fully associate myself with it. There are, however, certain suggestions. The point that I wish to make out is a minor yet a very important point. It is minor and small because it concerns only about half a million of people; it is important, in the sense that there will be the question of principle involved in it. The point is with regard to these concessions to be granted to members of all the Sikh scheduled castes and their inclusion in the list of scheduled castes and that they should be brought within the purview of the Commission, mentioned in paragraph 23 of the address of the President.

We had very interesting and, of course, very encouraging speeches made in the other House about the 13th of December last year. Dr. Katju, the hon. the Home Minister, while speaking on the question of scheduled castes was pleased to observe that, the nation had taken a pledge, a solemn pledge to root out untouchability. The nation has taken a solemn pledge to create a classless and a casteless society. These are the very words uttered by the hon. the Home Minister. Again he said that the problem of amelioration of the conditions of the scheduled castes was not one for the legislature but it was a problem for the conscience of the community. Mark the words "conscience of the community" which were used. Again he said that these persons, the members of the scheduled castes, must be considered as members of the same family. I do not think a more encouraging attitude on behalf of the Government could be expressed in better terms than what was said by Dr. Katju on the 13th, of December 1952.

Then, Sir, Dr. Mookerjee rose up; and he too said that a psychological change had to come about in the country for discriminations to disappear. In free India there should be no disjunction between man and man. Very encouraging remarks indeed. The Government and the opposition are trying their various best to see that SCJ

Jar as the case of the scheduled castes goes, it is not to be taken on party-lines, but it should be taken up on a higher level.

Then, Sir, Shri B. N. Datar, the Deputy Home Minister, replying to the debate in the course of his speech said this. The point that was put before him was that there are scheduled castes among the Christians, among the Muslims and among the Sikhs, who were not included in the list of the Scheduled Castes, that was announced. Shri Datar, while making the statement observed: "a point was made that there were untouchables among the Muslims, the Sikhs and Christians and that they should be brought under the purview of the Commission that the Government was going to set up shortly." He said that the whole framework of the scheme granting concessions to the scheduled castes was based on the fact that they were members of the Hindu community, and so long as they do not satisfy that condition, Government sees no reason for the extension of these concessions to untouchables among non-Hindus. That was stated in so many words by Shri Datar in the statement made in this House. This statement has created a certain amount of confusion. My case concerns only the Sikh scheduled castes. For the purpose of law the Sikhs are considered and are deemed to be Hindus for all practical purposes. This fact may not be known to the members of the House and may not be known to so many others outside this House. In the case of Sikhs, the presumption is that a Sikh is governed by the Hindu Law. It is not so for the last so many years, but for the last so many centuries. The Government are also of the view that the Sikhs are governed by the personal law that is, the Hindu law

The second point is in the case of the Hindu Code Bill which was under consideration. The point there was whether the Hindu Code Bill should apply to the Sikhs or not.

65 C of S.

The provisional Parliament passed that the Hindu Code should be made applicable to the Sikhs; after a good deal of argument, the decision was taken.

Thirdly, the Hindu Marriage and Divorce Bill 1952 has already been introduced in this House; legislation has been taken up, and brought before this very House by Shri Biswas, the hon. Law Minister. It is a Bill to amend and codify the law relating to marriage and divorce among Hindus. The word Hindu in it applies to all persons who profess the Hindu religion in all shapes or forms or developments including Brahmo Samajists or the Arya Samajists and so on. It provides that the word "Hindu" shall include Jains, Buddhists and Sikhs. Further it was given that the word "Hindu" would not include Muslims and Christians.

Then, fourthly, we have article 25 of the Constitution wherein it is given that wherever the word "Hindu" occurs, it shall be deemed to include Sikhs, Buddhists and Jains. Again the Minority Sub Committee in its report dated 11th May, 1949 stated that the Sikh scheduled castes suffer same disabilities and recommended their inclusion in the list of scheduled castes.

Then I come to the biggest point. My first four points arise out of the legal position, but my fifth point arises from the orders issued by the President that in the States of P.E.P.S.U. and Punjab, four categories of Sikh scheduled castes would enjoy all the concessions allowed to the Hindu scheduled castes. So the Government have also accepted this position in unequivocal terms. Now, what is the total population of the Sikh scheduled castes? The total population of the Sikh community is not more than 6½ millions, and the total population of the Sikh scheduled castes throughout India will not be more than 11 lakhs. Out of these 11 lakhs the four Sikh scheduled castes that have been recognised will be about 6½ lakhs per

[Shri Kartar Singh.] ■cent., so that it is a matter only of not more than five to six lakhs. At present these four Sikh scheduled castes are only recognised in the States of P.E.P.S.U. and Punjab. Supposing two sons of the same father, one a Hindu and the other a Sikh—this is not barred under the law—are residing, say, on the west side of the River Jumna. If they cross the river, they are not recognised as scheduled castes on the right side of Jumna (i.e. in U.P.). Again if a Sikh scheduled caste man in Rohtak crosses a few yards and enters the State of Delhi, all concessions are withdrawn from him. I will give you still another example. Take the case of a Sikh scheduled caste man who is in the army and is posted at Ambala or Jullundur, or at Patiala or anywhere in P.E.P.S.U. he will enjoy all the concessions that are granted to him in P.E.P.S.U. or Punjab, but if in the national interests he is transferred to any other military station in India, all the concessions are withdrawn. This is discrimination. Discrimination and domination are referred to by the President in paragraph 5 of his Address. I am in perfect agreement with him that in matters of social and racial domination and discrimination, the policies of the South African Government are to be condemned in the severest possible terms, because such things do not fit in with modern ideas, but when I see that there is discrimination in my own country as between Hindu scheduled castes and Sikh scheduled castes, I am really sorry for this state of affairs. So, I pray that, when the President's attention is drawn to the arguments I have given, he will be pleased to see that the concessions that are granted to the Hindu scheduled castes are also given to the Sikh scheduled castes and that their case also would come within the purview of the Commission now set up. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have heard

the President's Address at a time of grave crisis when the future of humanity seems to be hanging in the balance and we have been relieved to hear that any tendency to extend the war in Korea would be checked by all possible means by the Government of India. But the vague manner in which this major policy statement has been made leaves some doubts in our minds. We still remember the electioneering speeches of General Eisenhower. He indicated his foreign policy long before he took office as President of the United States. What he said in so many words was that the white interests of the West would be served by the mutual bloodshed of the Brown and the Yellow in the East. Now has come the demilitarisation of Formosa and we find in the Press that the U.S.A. is encouraging the army of Chiang Kaishek to launch an attack on the Chinese mainland. We further find that this unworthy protege of America is planning to launch an attack on Sinkiang which adjoins India. We further understand that the U.S. superfortresses are bombing military bases on the Yalu River. All these developments strengthen one's apprehension that these two major powers—the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.—are going to have a fight to the finish. The Third World War is bound to come and if it comes, it will mean the end of civilisation; it will mean the end of the human species on this planet. Therefore at this moment an unequivocal denunciation of this murderous tendency, an unambiguous declaration of neutrality, of non-alignment by India would go a long way in bringing about peace to humanity.

But the question that remains to be answered is whether "India is in a position to lead the vanguard of Peace"? The question is agitating the minds of all critical sections of public opinion. This House might remember that only last year we amended certain vital provisions of the Indian Companies Act to facilitate the operation of two oil j companies—of America the S.V.O.C

and the California and Texas Oil Co. In India with a total investment of 70 million dollars. We not only amended the vital provisions of the Act but we also undertook not to nationalise those two concerns for 25 years—to come. Now this incident has to be viewed against the background of Iran's epic struggle for nationalising her oil industries which meant Iran's struggle for economic liberation. At that time if India would not have yielded to Anglo American pressure and would have refused to allow the American Oil interests to operate in that manner, we could have probably strengthened the cause of the Iranians in their struggle for economic liberation. But what did we do? We not only allowed them certain latitudes at the cost of Indian investors but we also went to the humiliating extent of giving an undertaking not to nationalise their interests for 25 years to come. The Finance Minister while piloting the Bill said that though these oil installations are presumed to be military installations, this will in no way involve India with any power bloc in the event of war. But whatever he might have said *The New York Times* commenting up on the deal said:

"Granting that India would eventually be on the U.S. side, in the event of another world war—as all Western observers here do, and this agreement is another evidence of it—refineries in India would mean an immense saving in construction, maintenance and manpower for refining facilities that otherwise would have to be established further ■from the probable source of conflict."

If you call this non-partisanship, I 'don't know what partisanship means. If you call it non-alignment, I don't know what alignment is. Now here is a pamphlet 'New India' which has been circulated by the U.S. Information Service which contains a reprint of an article of the American Ambassador. I will read out a few extracts from it. •On page 9 Mr. Bowles §9yg; - .

"In theory, at least, most Indian leaders would prefer an economic system based on democratic Socialism. But in practice there are few who believe that Socialism could actually work in India except under the thumb of a dictatorial government, which would be no more welcome in India than in the United States."

He says in another place:

"Fortunately, more and more Indian leaders are beginning to recognise that our American system of private enterprise is both far more efficient than Socialism and infinitely more socially conscious than the cartel capitalism which they have seen introduced from Europe."

—and again—

"The human material is here; the physical resources are here. The will to move ahead and to accept the challenge of Communism is also here."

I am not an admirer of communism. In fact I will oppose Communists to the last drop of my blood, if they go to establish here a dictatorship of the variety of which we get reports from Eastern Europe but the issue is not between democracy and communism. I for one, am not prepared to believe that America is the symbol of true freedom and democracy.

I am prepared to concede that foreign policy is not an absolute concept, that foreign policy is not related to facts and realities. I am also not the one who says that foreign policy is an end in itself. Foreign policy after all is a means to an end. **But** the fact remains that in the event of a war it will be one between two totalitarian powers scrambling for more power, more territories and for more slaves. Therefore this leaves nothing to choose. Here, not only India but all those countries who have faith in human freedom, faith in the dignity of man should remain neutral.

[Shri S. Mahanty.] Not only that, by their action they should indicate that any such expansion of war is going to be very stoutly contested.

Sir since the time at my disposal is short, I will not further dilate upon it. I will now go to another aspect *viz.*, the economic aspect of our country. Sir very rosy pictures have been sought to be painted in the President's Address. I am reading out a news item that was published in the Statesman of yesterday where it says that an entire family in Jodhpur district died of starvation; then the same report says that in that area about 75,000 people are either unemployed or inadequately paid. There are 1,800 widows in abject poverty without anybody to support them. This is only one side of the picture. If the correspondents of well-established dailies here were to go to the multitude of villages in India, they will probably report many such heartrending stories. Any one can sit in the Moghul gardens and meditate upon the 80 varieties of roses and say that "God is in His heaven and all's right with the world." But I am ashamed, I am stunned that a responsible man like the President of India could talk like that when people were dying from starvation. I come from a part which is permanently famine-stricken. I have seen before my eyes children sucking the shrunken breasts of mother's famished skins— and yet people have the audacity to say that the country is rolling in self-sufficiency or in economic abundance.

Now some wrong impressions have been created about the river valley projects. I am not in a position to talk about the projects executed elsewhere. I will only speak about the Hirakud project which is being worked out in my own State. You will be astonished Sir, to learn that since 1948 6 Committees have been appointed by the Government of India to go into the many allegations of acts of omission and commission going on in Hirakud. They are:

1. The Savage Committee of 1948.
2. Mr. Lalbhai's Committee.
3. The Committee of French Consultants.
4. Estimates Committee of the Indian Parliament.
5. Mazumdar Committee.
6. MacKelvie Committee.

Two more Committees are also at present engaged in conducting enquiries. One is the Sub-Committee of the Public Accounts Committee and the other is being conducted by Mr. Sivsankar of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power. Above all today I was given to understand that our hon. Minister for Planning is visiting, tomorrow Hirakud to conduct still another enquiry. You will be astonished to learn that the Mazumdar Committee which was appointed last year had, under its terms of reference, to enquire into the technical feasibility of the Project. I wonder if the Congress Government has got any method in its madness at all. This is not a matter of joke. From 47 crores which was originally estimated, we are going to spend 100 crores over this project. After having undertaken that, you are now going to consider the technical feasibility of the plan. In spite of all this, you say "good progress" is being achieved regarding river valley projects.

Then I would come to the linguistic distribution of provinces. I would, for one thing, welcome the President's Address because it has recognised the principle of having States on linguistic basis but certain consequences follow out of that recognition. You should not wait for other Potti Sriramulus to die of hunger strike extending over 54 days. You should not wait for railway property worth 2 crores of rupees to be looted and you should not wait for further firing and lathi charges. The creation of Andhra province should be followed by the creation of

similar other linguistic provinces or States. Then the question which is inevitably linked with that is the readjustment of the existing boundaries of States. I should like to refer in this connection to the case of Seraikela and Kharswan. These two States were originally integrated with Orissa, ■which are cent per cent Oriya in culture, in language and in everything. ' But our Bihari friends perhaps anticipating that these might provide the spring-board for an agitation for the amalgamation of the Oriya speaking District of Singhbhum with Orissa, overnight got this area integrated with Bihar, even though today the agreement of the Rulers of these two States with the Government of India is that these two areas should be merged with Orissa. Sir, I do not want to go deep into this matter because it will create animosity. But I am quite sure that one day or the other this problem will have to be solved. This issue will have to be faced. We will have not one Potti Sriramulu but a number of Sriramulus quite willing to undertake fasts for undoing the wrong.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Why not you take the lead?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you should do it.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: While summing up. Sir, I would like to say that our neutral foreign policy—to which most of us are committed demands that we should follow a domestic policy which will strengthen the hands of the Government to follow that sort of foreign policy. And what is that? It is this, that our Government should try to obtain the maximum amount of co-operation and understanding between the Government and the people over all outstanding domestic issues. This brings me also to another suggestion, that everywhere, in the Centre and also in the States—where Congress, though in a minority has been in power, through some unholy manipulations or by duping some Harijan or scheduled cast members.

AT in Orissa, there should be coalition\* governments.

(Time bell rings.)

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Can I have two more minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken three minutes extra.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Just two more minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: The second suggestion is that all the outstanding domestic issues should be resolved without any false sense of prestige standing in the way. This brings me to the question of Jammu and Kashmir. It is all very easy to dismiss this as a "communalism." But what are the main grounds on which the Praja Parishad agitation is going on? First there is the question of the finality of the accession. If you say that Kashmir has acceded finally to India, why do you hesitate to pass a Resolution in the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir that the State has acceded to India?

Secondly, you may label the Praja Parishad as communal, but what about the Head Lama of Ladakh who claims autonomy for Ladakh and says that Ladakh's remaining with Kashmir is to the extent of Kashmir's accession\* to India. Further I want to ask how many items of the July agreement have so far been fulfilled by Sheikh Abdullah's Government, excepting that they have got a separate flag and a separate Sadar-e-Riyasat? But what about the citizenship, about the fundamental rights and about the Supreme Court? Are all these communal issues? I would challenge anyone to show that any one of these is a communal question.

Sir, we have had enough of word? Let us now come to brass tracks. If you are not going to learn by experience, well, it is only the Devil who can help you, not God.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is with very great pleasure that I associate myself with the sentiments so ably expressed by the mover of the Resolution, Shri Rama Rao. The key note of the President's Address can be summarised in one word, namely, peace, lasting peace, internal and international. And the people of this country welcome this very clear expression of the President that if ever a third world war were to come, if ever there is going to be a conflict between the great nations of the world, India will not and shall not be a party to it, and they can expect no quarter in India. Sir, we have suffered the agonies of two great wars and it is a good, wise and statesman like policy to say that we shall not be the victims of a third world war. Thanks to the Communist Party of India, in Andhra they got a foothold in India and made India the base for attack and exploited the resources of the country for more than five years. But thanks to the Congress Party in power now, that has been changed once and for all. This statement in the Address is a great statement, a noble statement of the expression of the sentiment of the President of India, that we will have only peace and we will not have war at any cost, and it will be the greatest boon to the people of India.

Sir, I will not go and travel over the entire breadth of the Address of the President, but will confine my remarks to a few items in it. The President has been expressing satisfaction over the progress achieved and on the bringing out of the Five Year Plan and on the general improvement in the condition of the country. But with very great humility. I would like to draw his attention to the danger threatening us. I very briefly spoke of it on a similar occasion last year when I drew attention to the conditions in the South where things were going from bad to worse. Things are still worse now and famine is threaten- I ing the entire land. The rains have

failed this year. It is not a solitary year of failure of rainfall, but it is one of a succession of such years—the sixth year. And today we are also faced with another danger—the injury to our industries. The Madras Government has recently imposed a 15 per cent, cut on the consumption of electricity and the entire industry in the South is at a standstill. We have also been warned by the Madras Government that before long, by the end of February or by the 15th March, the supply will be cut by 10 per cent, more. The people cannot get power for three more months. This affects the entire textile industry, the glass industry and the cement industry. These will have to be closed down; and not only will there be loss of production, but there will also be labour trouble. So in the South there will be not only shortage of food grains, but there will be added to it loss of employment and unemployment will loom large before the people there. In order to see that the feeding power to these industries—electric power—is available to them, that they shall not be a gamble with the monsoons, I suggested even last year that the Government of India should seriously take into consideration the construction of thermal stations also, and not depend completely on hydro electric schemes. In this way we could avert similar calamities in the future. The present is not an isolated year in which such calamities are happening, and these industries suffer due to lack of rains and lack of water in the great reservoirs. Therefore I hope the Government will take these into consideration and at least see that the industries are assured a liberal supply of power.

Next, Sir, the President has expressed very great sympathy, the sympathy of the Government of India, to the great industry of the South—the handloom industry. The President said that the Government of India is keenly aware of the utility of the handloom industry. They have spoken of the steps that the Government of

India have taken for the uplift of the handloom weavers and for the establishing of the handloom industry on a very strong basis. But, may I

submit, Sir, that whatever 6 P.M. may have been the sympathies, the real thing has not been put into effect? The Government of India has not done anything except earmarking or reserving 60 per cent, of production of *dhoties* and *saries* for the handloom industry. Sir, the modest demand made by Shri C. Rajagopalachari on the floor of the House of the Madras Legislative Assembly should be conceded as the minimum demand of the handloom industry and for the handloom weavers to survive. Rajaji is not the only person who is putting forward this view; not only the politicians of the South, but the entire people, all the Political Parties of the South are solidly behind that Resolution and there has not even been a single dissident vote. May I appeal that, instead of remaining with the expression of sentiments, the Government of India should also come with a very strong proposal for implementing that resolution? Sir, the hon. Commerce and Industry Minister introduced a Bill, during the last session, for the levy of a cess on mill-made cloth in order to help the handloom industry. It is a sad tale, Sir, that though the Bill got priority in the last session, it has not seen the light of the day till today. It is a very sad comment and I do not know who is responsible for it. May I request the Government to see that the Bill becomes law before 31st March so that the real benefit might pass on to the handloom industry?

Sir, the next question I want to deal with is about refugees. We have done enough, not only enough, but, we have done our best, for the refugees and I am sure the Government will do much more for the refugees who are victims of political vendetta of Pakistan. But, there is another aspect which has been completely ignored or per-

haps it has not caught the eye of the Government of India. Sir, I am referring to the grave situation that has arisen in Ceylon. In Ceylon, Sir, not because of the fault of the Tamilians or the thousands of labourers who are employed there, but, due to political vendetta of the ruling clique there, thousands of Tamilians are being driven away; thousands of labourers of Indian origin are being driven away without rhyme or reason. Insult has been added to injury and life has become miserable for them. Recently, food has been denied to them and all sorts of fourth degree, if I may be permitted to say, Sir, methods have been adopted against Indians to drive them out of the island which is prosperous today because of the toil and suffering of the Indian community. What about those who are coming in thousands, who are being forcibly repatriated to the country? They are not all big business men, but, they are all poor labourers who have staked everything in their lives. They are coming here and they are not looked after. I have seen hundreds of them in begging conditions in the South. Sir, may I ask, may I appeal to the Government to consider them also as political refugees as the Pakistani refugees and extend help to them and rehabilitate them? That will be a great relief; that will be a necessity and that will be a great expression of sympathy that the Government of India owes for our brethren who have been toiling in other countries.

Sir, there was reference about linguistic provinces. We, the Tamilians, are not generally for dividing the country into various linguistic provinces, but, when the Andhras wanted it, we gave them. We had no objection.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Gave them?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Even now, we have to give.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Give them to understand?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: If we had wanted to put a spoke in the wheel, we could have, but, we did not want to do that. We want Andhras to have a separate province, but, we want to have them without any trouble or without any quarrel. The President has expressed, Sir, the fond hope that there will be co-operation amongst all the people concerned. Co-operation, there will be, Sir, certainly, but, there shall be no provocation. That is the thing that I want to submit today. Sir, we have been receiving disquieting press reports, sometimes contradicted and sometimes not, that Madras City is likely to be capital for 5 years. Sir, the silence of the Tamilians, the non-rioting nature of the Tamilians shall not be mistaken for cowardice. It will be a sad day if that notion is believed. The Tamilians have pledged their belief and have pledged their loyalty with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and they fully believe that the first term?; of reference to Mr. Justice Wancho shall be kept, that the Andhras shall have no place in the City of Madras. Sir, if for other reasons, a contradiction is taken, I submit, Sir, that 30 million Tamilians will have to be counted and reckoned. It will be very difficult; it is not a political question; it is a question of the whole people, the people of the Madras State, and, I am sure, Sir, that this Government or any other Government will not dare to force a thing on them. Sir, if you are going to make the city of Madras the capital for Andhra also, you will be creating a Danzing; you will be creating a Berlin there; the consequences will have to be borne in mind and I am sure. Sir that that decision will not be made and we have implicit faith in the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, finally, I have one grudge against the Government. Today, Sir the life of a distinguished national of ours is in peril. I mean. Sir, one of the greatest Members of the Communist Party of India, Shri A. K. Gopalan, Member of the Parliament and

a

leader of the Communist Party who went to Russia. He went to Russia for attending the Communist Party International Conference in Soviet Russia. The hon. Mr. Sundarayya was very vehement when he said "if Pandit Nehru is going to England for the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, is it not making ourselves subservient to the British interests". Sir, if the hon. Mr. Sundarayya had explained why Shri A. K. Gopalan has been there, he would have been a rather honest man, but, he has not done so. Sir, I am not concerned about the political...

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: A. K. Gopalan has taken a passport and has gone there openly.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Nehru will also get a passport.

I am concerned with the health of A. K. Gopalan. A. K. Gopalan has been in Moscow for the past 4 months. We thought he will return immediately the Communist Party meeting was over. Now, comes report after report that he will be arriving very shortly in India. We find, Sir, that he is laid up in a hospital undergoing operations after operations in Moscow. Sir, it is a serious matter.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Political operations?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: My fear is this: recently, the Soviet Government exposed attempts by learned Doctors, or rather who are termed as hand-maids or spies of Anglo-American capitalists, who are murdering leading Communist Party and Government Officials. Sir, Gopalan is a leading Member of the Communist Party and, who knows his life might be in jeopardy.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: When did you become so solicitous about A. K. Gopalan's health? Gopalan is under-

going treatment and he is going to come. Don't go on giving cock and bull stories.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is only expressing his fears.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Sir, the report that has been circulated in the Press is that Gopalan underwent a minor operation and that he is convalescing. It is strange coincidence, "but, may I say, for the hon. Members' information, that the Secretary of the Communist Party of Italy and the Secretary of the Communist Party of France are also seriously ill and are also undergoing treatment in Moscow. It is very strange coincidence, Sir; so, I would appeal to the Government of India that A. K. Gopalan's life is very precious and he must not be left to the rather lurking dangers that may await him in the hospital in Moscow, according to the Soviet Agency. So, will the Deputy Home Minister kindly see.....

*(Time bell rings.)*

.. ..that A. K. Gopalan is brought here immediately so that he may be admitted into some of the hospitals here?

SHRI B. GUPTA: Why don't you go and see him?

SHRI O. SOBHANI (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the proposition that has been so ably moved by my hon. friend Mr. Rama Rao. When I listened to the Address of the President, my first reaction was that it was rather lengthy, but after I read it I realised that it was a most able document and gave us in a nutshell what the Government had done since May last. If all the amendments which have been moved and all the omissions which have been referred to in the 40 odd amendments were to be referred to by the President. I feel that the Address would be a most cumbersome document. The President told us in a brief 30-minute speech what the Government had done

since May last and what it proposed to do in the near future. Those of us who have heard Government being criticised in season and out of season, by opponents as well as by some friends, must be really grateful that in this speech he has told us what the Government has done. And I submit that what the Government has done in the last three years—not five: it is only five years since the country attained its freedom, but two of those years were, as it is well known, taken up by communal strife of a very serious nature, and those two years have to be left out—so in these brief three years whatever we have done is something that we should be proud of, and if not be proud of, we should certainly be satisfied with.

For the benefit of some of my friends I may relate that a few days back in Hyderabad I met a retired British general who had been in the service of the Indian army for over 32 years, and he told me that, having returned to India after nine years since his retirement, he had found the Indian army to be far more smart and efficient than it was during the British regime. When I heard this I was rather taken aback, and I felt that he was either flattering me or pulling my leg and I asked him whether he was speaking the truth, and he said, yes. He said, "I am not telling you something, for the first time; I am only repeating what I have already written to my friends." And he said, "I may make a confession. I was one of those who was strongly of the opinion that soon after India was given freedom you would find it impossible to administer this country, and you would beg us to return. Well, I find that you certainly had proved that you can manage your affairs and your officers are actuated by a great deal of enthusiasm which was absent during the British regime."

SHRI M. S. RANAWAT (Rajasthan): Did that officer come to India for a job?

SHRI O. SOBHANI: Coming as it does from a retired general, a sunbaked bureaucrat, I think it is a matter for some satisfaction.

I am not one of those who claim that we have attained an El Dorado. I am aware of the fact that we have still several shortcomings, and we have certain complaints about corruption in our administration, and things of that sort, and we have to attend to all these things. But judging from the progress that we have achieved, I submit that anything that has been claimed in the Presidential Address is not exaggerated. When our friends criticise our Government, they must compare what we have done with what other neighbouring countries have done, such as Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon. We have framed a Constitution. We have held general elections, the like of which no other country has yet seen. Then, Sir, we have drawn up a Five Year Plan. We have established a Republic. All these achievements within the brief span of three years are certainly not to be scoffed at. We may not have achieved everything that our friends, and even our Prime Minister, may want to; but we have to judge our record bearing in mind that even during these three years we have had famines, we have had floods, and we have had all kinds of difficulties to face. If we look at the whole picture, I am sure that all of us will agree that there is no exaggeration in what our President said that, "An overall view of the situation indicates all-round general progress at an increasing pace."

Some of the speakers who preceded have referred to linguistic provinces. Well, Andhra is going to be separated. The last resolution that was passed at Hyderabad by the Congress has definitely laid down that the question of linguistic provinces is not going to be shut out. But we are not going to have linguistic provinces merely on the ground of different languages; other considerations have to be examined. We have to see that provinces, when established, will be financially success-

ful, and will be such units as could be satisfactorily administered. Surely even the most ardent supporter of separation of provinces on a linguistic basis will agree that these are factors to be taken into consideration, and that we cannot go on chopping the country into small provinces merely because the people speak different languages.

As regards our foreign policy, during the last session the Prime Minister explained at length what we were aiming at. He emphasised that the most important thing was to have peace. We are a young nation. We need peace for the development of our country, for developing our natural resources, and it is not advisable to adopt a policy that would involve us in the strife that is going on. And all that the President has claimed is that "we have endeavoured, as is well known, to pursue a policy of peace and of friendship with all countries of the-world. Gradually that policy has been understood and appreciated even by those who may not always agree with us, and it is recognised that India stands for peace among the nations-and will avoid taking any step which might encourage the tendency to war." I submit that it is a just claim and the policy that our Prime Minister has been following has kept us on the-path of peace and it should give satisfaction to everybody. I am sure that my friends on the other side certainly do not want to involve this country in war either on this side or on the other.

Mr. Pattabiraman has referred to the development of handloom industry and has expressed his dissatisfaction at what is being done. Sir, the hand-loom industry is a very important industry and in the Five-Year Plan a reference has been made to it and it is hoped that very soon the production will be a little more than doubled. All we want is to find ways and means of providing more yarn to our handloom weavers. It is also necessary, if we want to develop that industry

economically, to give our weavers better kind of looms that will help them to increase their production and to supply the needs of our country. With these words, I support the proposal.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish first of all to dwell upon the first part of my amendment which is about the creation of a separate State of Mithila. Sir, if you will look to the number of amendments and the substance of them, you will find that there are only three things that have been agitating the mind of this House. One is the creation of provinces on a linguistic basis. The second one is the aggressive policy of U.S.A. and the danger to other countries and the third one is the problem of unemployment that is prevailing in this country.

Sir, regarding the formation of Mithila, I do not know if many of our friends here are aware of the history of this part of the country. Bihar as it is, was created in the year 1912. Before that it was linked with Bengal. When the British came to India and afterwards consolidated their power, they divided the country into different provinces, keeping in view their administrative facilities. Bihar, Bengal, Orissa and Chhota Nagpur were tied together and the whole thing was called Bengal. Then there were certain great men in Bihar who thought that we were suffering from many handicaps and that we could very well have a province of our own. So that agitation started and as you know, Sir, it was in the year 1912- that this particular State was created. That is how this province came into existence. So it is of a very recent origin. Then there was an agitation for separation of Orissa from Bihar and that was also done and Orissa was separated from Bihar and Bihar was left with what is today called Bihar and Chhota Nagpur.

At the time. Sir, when Orissa separated from Bihar, the annual income of Orissa was roughly a little over three crores and at the time the Congress Ministry took the administration of the country, in 1937, the income of the Province of Bihar was roughly 9 crores a year.

Sir, this tract of Mithila is bounded on the north by the Himalayas, on the south by the Ganges, on the west by Gandak and on the east by Kosi. It is a tract of land about 20,000 sq. miles in area and today according to the latest census the population of this tract is about two crores. You should note that the population of the whole of Bihar is a little over four crores. The income of the Province of Bihar in the year 1952 was a little over 30 crores. The income which came from Mithila was 15 crores. So far as Mithila portion is concerned, we have a surplus of about 5 crores which is being used to meet the expenses of the other portions of Bihar.

Sir, it has been admitted on all hands that the question of creation of linguistic States should be taken up at once provided other facilities are there and there is no administrative difficulty. Maithili is a language and it is not a dialect as some people have suggested sometimes. The people in that portion speak Maithili. Hindi is understood as it is understood in many parts of India but in that particular tract they all speak Maithili. Maithili has been acknowledged as a language. Not only Maithili is taught in primary and middle schools but you can appear in Maithili in your M.A., B.A. and Matriculation. You find books on different subjects in Maithili that are 12 hundred years or thousand years old. Mithila is a vast tract of land. It has half the population of Bihar. It is a compact area and I can tell you, Sir, that this is the most fertile tract of Bihar today. In that part of the country we have all the money crops—sugarcane, chillies, tobacco, jute, paddy etc. Sir this part of the country which I am referring to has become the

[Shri M. P. N. Sinha.] permanent home of malaria, cholera due to insanitary conditions.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: How many Minister's in Bihar State belong to that area?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: They are not irrosquitos.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Both - of you belong to the same area.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: The other point is how you are going to divide the country into many States. If there is clamour for readjustment of States on a linguistic basis in Bombay, •Gujerat, Maharashtra, the Punjab and -the C.P. and so many places, then why not do it? Sir, my calculation is that if it is done, that will reduce the ■number of States to 22 from 28 as at present. Everybody will be satisfied; the number of States will be smaller and there will be no occasion for good -men like Ramalu to die for such a vcause.

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, .order; Let the hon. Member go on.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: Sir, I am likely to take a little more time. The point I was making was that India will be having 22 provinces. I should like to give some figures Sir, which will speak for the people of the whole of India. India, Sir, may be divided into Assam, Bengal, Mithila, Jorkhand, etc.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your amendment is only about Mithila.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: Sir, I was telling you that Mithila was different from the neighbouring part of the province of Bihar. It is different in everything. It has special law of adoption; they have different customs, different law of inheritance. By creating a separate province of Mithila, no

harm will accrue. Otherwise, the miserable condition of the country cannot be improved. If this is done, the other part of the province will not , suffer for want of revenue. The proposal of the late Dr. Sachidanand Sinha was the same. To make up that loss of revenue and territory, certain portion of Eastern part of the U.P. should be integrated to Bihar. There again the language, the Guiture, the soil and the people are familiar. U.P. is an unwildy province and if this is done it will be advantageous from administrative point of view also. This is point number one.

The second point is about the American infiltration into this country. Well, everybody seems to be asking: "What will be the fate into which we will ultimately fall if we go on taking all these aids and loans from America?" Sir, I am not going into the question of what is happening in Formosa, China and the Far East; but Sir, we must look to our own interest. I can never reconcile myself to seeing one country always depending on another country and standing in need of help from that country.

Why has America suddenly become so solicitous of our well-being? We all know that Americans are out to get markets. That is the main purpose. All highly developed industrialised countries must have markets. They cannot have markers in those countries which are developed. They can have markets only in those countries which are not developed, therefore all this solicitude for Chiang Kai-shek, this anxiety about Korea and this anxiety to help India. You know Sir, why this is happening in China. It is happening in China because they would not allow America to exploit their country. I hope. India will not blindly accept help or loan from America. For heaven's sake—I would appeal to the Government—do stop this kind of business completely. I had much to say about this but my time is up.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I wholeheartedly support the motion before the House. The President in his Address has very clearly set out the progress made in the country during the last one year and I am glad to see that he feels that we are well on the way to success. He has rightly dealt with foreign relations first of all. They naturally take precedence over everything else. I am glad to be able to say that I have seen, during my recent visit to Europe, that the stock of India stands high in all circles including the United Nations. In all the countries of Europe, people feel that we have made a success of democracy. The last general elections have impressed everyone. There were many who thought that elections of that magnitude where over two hundred million voters were involved would never be a success. They thought that there would be bloodshed, there would be fiascos. But we have shown to them that democracy is not a failure in this country. It is a great achievement and in the whole of Europe people feel that way.

Sir, our foreign Legations have done good work. We have amongst our Ambassadors such names as Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Mr. Krishna Menon, Dr. Radhakrishnan and Mr. Panikkar. They have won the esteem of the countries where they have worked and I am glad to say that we have got men of that calibre to look after our relations with foreign countries. Above all, the name of Nehru is something to conjure with in those countries. When we go there they want to know where we come from. If we say India they don't understand it. If we say Nehru's country, they know it and the stock of the Prime Minister is therefore very high. They regard him as a great power for peace and good and for the benefit of the world and the policy of peace followed by our Government has been appreciated all round. There may be some who may shake their heads but by and large the policy has been liked by all concerned. Nobody likes a war and if

there is a man in this world who can show the way to peace, they welcome him. The peace efforts made in the United Nations by our delegations were greatly liked by the people of Germany, France and Switzerland. They drew headlines in the papers and the entire world hoped that these efforts would be successful. Whether they succeeded or not, they have shown to the world that India stands for peace and India is determined to go on pursuing that policy.

I would like now to turn to some of the domestic matters referred to in the Address. I will mainly concern myself with the economic matters to which rightly the President has devoted a good deal of space in his Address. He has referred to the Five Year Plan. There is no doubt that we have been given a blue print of the plan which, if worked out, will make our lives better, happier and more prosperous. There is no doubt also that the Plan has been worked out with great care and if we extend our support to the Government, we should see results in a short time.

It is gratifying to know that as a result of that plan or it may be something else, people have made thousands of miles of roads, constructed tanks and public buildings, schools etc. What I would like to see is that everybody carries out some manual labour. I have recently been in Germany and I was there last year too and I find that within 12 months German have rebuilt their country. Everyone has worked night and day rebuilding his devastated country. No matter, who it is rich or poor you can see him carrying bricks and building his own house and country. We want to see that sort of thing in this country. There is no reason why in one year's time we cannot build a lot of things here in India. I see Prof. Ranga. He is a live-wire, the stormy petrel of many things. Why cannot he lead the peasants and go and build some roads? Instead of sitting here we should all be rendering a great deal

[Dr. J. P. Srivastava.] of service if we put our hands to some work of that kind—constructive work and I am quite sure that with the manpower that we have it would not be long before we change the entire aspect of the country. You go to the villages today and you still find the same old dirty mud huts. Why can't we go and pull down those huts and re-build something better, more hygienic and sanitary? It can be done. We have sufficient manpower here. Germany has nothing but manpower today. They have no money and they are still under the heels of Americans. Still they have done wonders and there is no reason why we should not do the same.

The next thing I would like to turn to is the question of food. The President has rightly stressed the importance of food and there is no doubt that without food we can do nothing, and it is most tragic that we have to import food, that with! all our millions of acres of land, with all our resources that God has given us, we should not be self-supporting in food. In Germany, one year ago you could not get milk, you could not get butter, you could not get eggs. This year you can get plenty of these things and there is no control there. They have produced all these things and they are proud of it. There is no rationing no control and you can buy as much as you like and at reasonable prices, much cheaper than in many countries of Europe.

AN HON. MEMBER: In which part of Germany?

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA: West Germany, of course. I did not go behind the iron curtain, I did not venture. Perhaps some of our friends on the Opposition might get in there, I did not. So, I believe that if we all apply ourselves to this problem of food it will not be long before we get it solved. The President referred to 1½ 2,000 tube wells that are being sunk this year—or is it for the five

year period? Well, I have been consistently advocating the sinking of tube wells, and I have been saying that this would solve the problem of irrigation. I have stated it before that the day we have 30,000 tube wells in this country, we shall produce 4 million tons more of food grains which is roughly the food deficit today. It should not be beyond the means of the country and the exchequer to put down these 30,000 tube wells.

(Time bell rings.)

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA: May I have a little more time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your fifteen minutes are over.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA: Sir, the President has rightly referred to sugar. Last year the sugar factories produced more than the country could consume. This year, the predicament of sugar factories is very bad indeed, as a result of last year's over-production. Now, Sir, what we want is progress in an orderly way, not these spurts which are harmful and which shall not make for progress on a long term basis.

Sir, I would very much like to stress another matter for the success of the Five Year Plan, that is, that something should be done to bring about better relations between labour and capital, the employer and the employee, both in the public and in the private sectors. Unless there is peace and truce between these two, no progress can be made. I think Government should take up this matter in right earnest and should call a conference of the two parties and get them to agree to a working basis for the five years, the period of the operation of the Plan so that there are no strikes or disturbances and work goes on well and smoothly.

Lastly, Sir, I would stress the importance of cottage industries. The Address has rightly referred to them

but, I think, there are lots of cottage industries which require rational help from Government. By rational help, I mean that they should find out the causes which are impeding the growth of those industries. Take the case of handloom industry. Sir. In many cases, the cause is that the weavers cannot produce standard articles.....

PROF. G. RANGA: They do produce now.

SHRI J. P. SRIVASTAVA:.....articles which can compare with their previous production. They must standardise them. There is very great demand for Indian handloom goods even in foreign countries but, their complaint is that they do not get standardised articles; deliveries are not prompt and nobody bothers about these elementary matters. Government should establish an agency which will supervise the production of cottage industries and see that they turn out articles which come up to the standard demanded and which will be delivered in time. That is the most important thing. Scotland today produces a lot of woollen goods on handlooms and all that goes to the United States of America; "dollar earners" they are called, but, they are strictly supervised by the Government. Everything is checked up before it is sent out and the United States is buying millions of dollars worth of woollen goods production in the villages of Scotland. We can do the same thing; we can do even better than that, but, we must organise the industry.

That is all, Sir. Thank you very much and I support the Motion.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the main points of criticism about the Address have been made by my friend and Leader, Mr. Sundarayya. So, I shall limit myself to only certain particular matters referred to in the Address.

Sir, while I was listening to some portions of the Address, particularly about the reference to the all-round economic progress of the country I sat up and rubbed my eyes wondering whether I was listening to references to some other countries than India; but, then, I realised that there is nothing to wonder about. It is a reflection of the anti-people policy that the Government is following. By economic progress Government mean progress of only a few monopolists and foreign interests at the expense of the people of the country. I shall not refer to matters of high finance and trade and other things; I shall leave that discussion into abler hands. I shall simply refer to the question of unemployment. The spectre of unemployment is haunting labourers in the country. Retrenchment is going on in various industries. Already large numbers have been retrenched and they are unemployed. In the jute industry, 10,000 have been retrenched in recent months, and it is apprehended that in the name of rationalisation 50,000 more will be retrenched. In cotton textiles, in West Bengal alone 4,000 have been retrenched. Then, we have got figures relating to engineering industries, particularly small industries, where large numbers have been retrenched and small and medium factories have been closed down. From different papers figures have been collected to show that in India during the last 4 months in the tea industry 64,000 have been retrenched, and that means, 250,000 family members depending on these 64,000 have also been threatened with starvation and death. Not only that, but the entire economy of North Bengal and Assam is seriously affected. Small traders, middle class people, shopkeepers, who were dependent on the purchases of the labourers, are facing a very serious situation. About that retrenchment and unemployment there is absolutely no mention in the Presidential Address. Rather, there is an attempt to paint a rosy picture. Small and medium sized industries are either being closed down or they are passing through a critical situation. That is