

[Mr. Chairman.]

The Norwegian Parliament says :

On occasion of the opening of the first Constitutional Parliament of India the Norwegian Parliament conveys its respectful greetings and hearty wishes for the future of the people of India.

I am sure you would all like me to convey to the respective Parliaments our deep thanks for their kindness in sending the messages.

MOTION OF THANKS ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

MR. CHAIRMAN : The next item in the List of Business is the motion on the Address by the President. Diwan Chaman Lall is the mover of the motion.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, I beg to move :

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 16th May 1952.

Sir, on such an historic occasion as the meeting of the first Parliament of free and independent India, it was meet and proper that the President of the Republic should indicate the road along which we have been travelling since the arduous days of our bondage when our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, roused the passion of our people for the achievement of freedom, and that freedom, Sir, we have realised now, under these new surroundings here where we formerly received orders from a foreign power but where we today function under the guidance of your most distinguished leadership.

Now, Sir, the President has wisely indicated the various land-marks along this road to which reference has been

made by him. What are those various land-marks ? The first and foremost, as stated by the President, is the question of the unity of India. It is well-known that in the pageant of the history of our country, whenever our nation has been divided, that moment in our history has been a moment of weakness. In fact, division has often destroyed this great and noble and ancient land of ours, but when unity has been observed, it has been a source of strength and greatness for this nation. And it is significant, Sir, that today, after five years of freedom, we can legitimately claim that that particular unity which we have always found in the diversity of the various peoples that inhabit our land is the one basic principle running through our civic life, and that that unity has been achieved in a large measure under the leadership of our two great men, Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru.

The second land-mark that has been indicated by the President is that we must not shun but follow the usual democratic processes which have been sanctified now by the holding of a colossal electoral experiment unknown in the history of the world, when a hundred million people or more marched to the polling booths in peace and decided upon the future of their own Government in this country. Now, with that democratic process comes the desire for continued co-operation on the part of everyone in India and, as the President has said, in choosing the methods of co-operation, it is necessary to realise that the means must equally be as righteous as the ends are righteous.

The third land-mark that emerges from the President's speech is that the Government and those who are in charge of the destinies of this nation are fully aware of the fact that they must realise the ideals of social and economic justice and equality. Those are the basic principles and we must strive our level best to develop an economic basis of progress for ourselves in order that we may achieve in

a few years what we should really legitimately have achieved in the past had there been a Government of our own. Alas, it was not to be !

The fourth principle that emerges from the Address of the President is something so important that very little attention has been paid to it in this country except by certain carping critics, and very little attention has been paid to it in foreign countries as well, but that aspect is changing. That fourth principle is what I may be permitted to describe as the Nehru doctrine—the doctrine of seeking peace and friendship and freedom throughout the world and basing India's polity upon that doctrine.

Now, the document that has been presented to us, namely, the Address of the President, is not an exhaustive document. Nor is that document meant to be exhaustive. It has indicated, as I have said, the salient factors which govern the polity of India, with a passing reference to certain important aspects of the legislation that will be placed before this honourable House. But I notice that there are many carping critics who do not realise what achievements have been won by the leaders of this country in very difficult and desperate conditions. It is not realised sufficiently that when the British left India they left us with what one may call a *damnosa hereditas*—a bankrupt inheritance. It is significant that although we are a very great country, and possess mineral and other resources in equal measure with the two great powers, Soviet Russia and the United States of America, except perhaps oil, and possess more than the combined man-power of those two great powers, yet we cannot call ourselves a great power, although we can legitimately and rightly call ourselves a great nation. But we were left, as I said, with a bankrupt inheritance ; we were left with an economy that was completely shattered. Those who will presently talk about the production of

food and the existence of dire conditions in the country—famine and so forth—conditions which have to be put right at all costs ; conditions which I am positive the Government is determined to see are put right—I say those who consider all these things now must take their minds back to those days not long ago when as my hon. friends from Bengal will remember, famine conditions prevailed under the British when we were horrified, and the world was horrified at the tragedy of millions of starvation deaths. That was the inheritance that was left to us by the powers who ruled over our destiny. Not only that, but throughout the many years of their rule we were unable to build up what was absolutely essential in the modern world, namely, basic industries. It was against the policy of the holding power that there should be any development of such industries in this country, because that would directly menace the prosperity of Great Britain, which drew something like four shillings out of the pound of its income from its assets in India. The result was that most of our necessities, the necessities of a great nation like ours, with a population bordering on 400 million people, had to be imported from abroad because they were not available here. That left us in a terrible state of unbalance. On the 3rd of September 1939, the day World War II started, our note issue was 79 crores ; by the time the British left, our note issue was something in the region of 1,300 crores. And this not only shattered the unbalanced economy of India, but left us in a state of utter chaos through which it is a miracle that India has survived.

Then, Sir, immediately after power was assumed, the country was divided, and we saw the tragedy of millions of our countrymen marching destitute from one corner of India to another. The burden that was borne by the authorities in controlling that situation can be realised only by those of us who were intimately connected with that terrible business from day to day. The tragedy of it cannot be mentioned.

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

Soon after this tragedy had overtaken us, we were confronted with a situation bordering upon chaos. I remember that in the City of Delhi—I do not know if many hon. Members have any experience of those days—at that time the situation was such that temporarily even the Prime Minister, even the Education Minister, found themselves cut off from food and fuel supplies; communications had broken down; civic life had almost come to a standstill.

Having controlled that situation, the Administration was immediately faced with another terrible issue—the menace to Kashmir—the war in Kashmir. It was fortunate, Sir, that we survived all these calamities. We have not allowed the country to go to rack and ruin or fall into the clutches of those who would drag this country through chaos. We have built this nation, I believe, Sir, on very sure foundations—the foundations of the unity of our people. Never in the history of India was India so united constitutionally and geographically; never was she knit together as she is today—not even during the period of the British invasion and rule could this be achieved.

That, Sir, has been the achievement of a very few years of independence. While this was taking place, a still greater tragedy overtook the nation in the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. But Providence has been favourable to us, and we must accept humbly this gift of Providence, that we have had two leaders who are the giants of Asia, who would be giants anywhere, in any part of the world. Sir, you yourself, one of the greatest philosophers of our time, would appreciate the reference in the Bhagwat Gita where it says :

Whenever unrighteousness prevails on this earth, it is then that I am born again and again to put an end to that unrighteousness.

We are fortunate, therefore, that during the time of need and distress and

misery, during those tragic, dreadful times, we had the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi. And when that guidance was denied us, we had the guidance of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, our leader today commands the allegiance of millions of people not only in our country but of millions outside India. He commands that allegiance not because of any intrinsic merit in any particular individual although merit there is, but because of the policies that he has followed. We are fortunate, therefore, that we have that guidance in these critical times—much more critical than most Members of this honourable House probably are aware of.

Sir, we have survived famine, war and chaos. We have survived many difficulties and tragedies. We have survived the complete collapse of law and order. We have survived many an assault, and there is no doubt that we have been able to achieve something and it might be of interest not only to hon. Members but to the people of this country to know what those achievements are. Let me briefly draw your attention, not in the spirit of wanting you to make an assessment of what should have been done and what has not been done, but in order to focus your attention on the difficulties of the situation facing those of the leaders of this country, who took charge of the destiny of this country after partition, so that realising those difficulties, you may contrast them with the achievements, however humble they may be, that go to the credit of the Administration of this country. Firstly, constitutional unity has been achieved. Secondly, you have now colossal plans for development, each vying with the other for priority. You have great schemes for rural, industrial and riverine development which, on paper, sound difficult to understand but whose impact upon the economic life of this country is going to be so colossal that the social face of India is bound to change within the next five or ten years.

Then, Sir, we have shown the world an extraordinary thing. We have shown the world the ways of democracy. We have shown this Western World that what they tried and what we tried can be achieved in this land in a manner never before heard of in the history of mankind. These millions of people—most of them illiterate—marching to the polling booth in order to register their vote in favour of the people of their choice is one of the most inspiring sights not only for India but for the whole of Asia and for the whole of the world. Such an experiment will fortify the democratic spirit not only in Asia but equally in the West.

Then, Sir, another change was—and it is not an insignificant one—that we have done with the days of invasions and wars, little or big, that we have done with the days of supreme imperial shadows passing over lands that do not belong to us and that we have changed our policy into a policy of peace and understanding. Now these are the basic things of which any nation should be proud and it is not for us to decry the achievements of the Administration which are so palpable, which are so amazing in the context of the difficulties that we have been faced with.

Now, may I say a word to critics of this nature, the carping ones? Governments come and Governments go. I do not expect the critics to fall in love with any particular State Government or even with the Centre. You are perfectly justified in keeping any Government you like in power. But may I say that these are times for constructive criticism? These are times when each man's shoulder has to be placed against the wheel to get the cart out of the rut in which it has found itself for the last two centuries.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : I ask what is the rut now ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : My hon. friend is very impatient. He is the sort of man who would like to climb

to the moon and who would like everything to be done overnight and have the full benefit of a new Government, a welfare State, a socialist Government, a Government of the people achieved within a matter of an hour, a day, a month or a few years. I am very fortunate that we have somebody here who is as optimistic as that. But I want them, and I am dealing with the opposition as well as everybody else, to place their shoulders to the wheel that has got into this rut.

AN HON. MEMBER : Only be camp followers !

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : My honourable friend talks of camp followers. I say we are all camp followers. I do not know what kind of camp follower my hon. friend is. It is not a sin to be a camp follower. I want you to be loyal and show your loyalty not to anything outside India but certainly to India, loyalty to your own people, to your own country. Now, Sir, I would request my hon. friends, therefore, to see that in the next few years which are fraught with so much menace to the world, all of us together put our shoulders to the wheel and see that the chariot marches along the path of progress—the progress that has been outlined by the President in his Address.

Now, Sir, the menace that I have talked about is both internal as well as external. It is a very serious menace. The same principles that have applied to the menace in India, will apply to the menace abroad. We are aware that one of the strongest hopes of the world was the U.N.O. We gave our unstinted support to it because we believed and we still believe that it is only through this great international organisation that the world's troubles can be solved, discussed and decided. Unfortunately a change has come over the U.N.O. It is a very serious matter for consideration. Recently Sir, as hon. Members are aware, Libya was granted freedom by the United Nations Organisation, but a country next door, Tunisia, was denied her freedom. Now it was never contemplated, as far

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

as I am aware, that this great Organisation should shut its eyes and shut its ears to the rights and interests involved in the case of a country like Tunisia and I do hope, Sir, that some action to this effect will be taken by this Organisation. This Organisation must be ready to receive every complaint of a legitimate nature.

We have pledged our faith to the United Nations Organisation and we shall continue to do so. But, alas ! we find the world today divided into two blocs. We are neither members of the one bloc nor of the other. Some voices have been raised in this country regarding the necessity for us to join one bloc or the other. I do not know that many people readily understand the significance of the move that they would have India adopt in joining one bloc or the other. It is a great misfortune that the world so soon after the Great War should have been divided into these two blocs. But none of us can shut our eyes.....

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin): But we do not belong to this bloc or that bloc. We do not want India to belong to.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let him go on.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : My hon. friend will pay me a compliment by listening to what I am saying, that the World is divided into blocs. It is not necessary that every nation in this world should belong to one bloc or the other. But the ideology is there, two ideologies, two different ideologies, attracting a number of nations on the one side and a number of nations on the other. It is unfortunate that it should be so.

Now, Sir, you are aware that we in India five years ago had no foreign policy of our own. Such a thing did not exist. In fact, the rules of procedure of the legislatures, the Council of States as well as the Legislative Assembly, specifically prevented even the asking of a question on foreign affairs on the floor of the House. Until 1947 this country had no such thing

as a foreign policy. During two centuries we have witnessed the war play of the great Powers, the Dutch, the Portuguese, the French, the British, but in each case whenever any invasion had taken place and any territory of ours had been taken over, none of our people had anything to do with foreign policy. We followed under the British, we followed under the British in the wake of a British man-of-war. None of us, therefore, reckoned in 1947 the great change, this sudden change from no policy to the search for a policy. What would be our position in the world none of us reckoned. None reckoned the effect of this terrific blast in the vacuum that was created in our foreign policy in India. I believe—if I am not mistaken,—at that time there was but one solitary official who had some experience of what is known as the Foreign and Political Department. We had no codes of our own. We had very few files to lay our hands upon and we had no staff. We had no facts and we had no figures and we had no policy. It was fortunate for India, therefore, at that time that the Foreign Office portfolio was taken over by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It was fortunate not only because of the big or small problems that faced India, it was fortunate because of the vast and complex problems that faced the Asian countries which were under the compulsion of colonial powers. The advent of Nehru, the decision that he should take over the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, had a most significant and salutary effect upon the policies of the great powers in Asia and in Africa.

Now, our policy abroad in the olden days was neither anti-this nor pro-that. In fact, it was no policy at all. It was merely a policy for the purpose of furthering the imperial interests of Great Britain and in the course of doing that the result was that we did exactly what the British wanted us to do. And this was true whether it was an attack on Afghanistan, or an attack on Burma, or the matter of our involvement in many an imperial adventure. All that policy inherited from the British had had to be changed

practically overnight and instead of the British seeking, and not only seeking, but obtaining what I may call insulation zones around India for their own protection, we had to change that policy into one of seeking friendship and co-operation with our neighbours all around.

Now that was a significant change. It was not the policy of an imperial power seeking to frighten its neighbour, to keep him in check, to keep a barrier, a vacuum round the country in order that it may not be attacked by hostile powers. It was a policy of recognising no one as a hostile power, of recognising all as friends and dealing with them on that particular basis. It was plain, therefore, that after August 1947 there would come a time when we would have to break away from the policy of Great Britain and to concert measures to create our own policy. Now what is that policy that was concerted of which so much has been said and written and which makes it possible for us to say—now my hon. friend should remember that—that we do not join any bloc? That policy is a policy of peace, searching for peace everywhere, utilising our resources, our man-power, our ability, our skill, as evidenced by your presence, Sir, in Moscow, utilising all that skill for the purpose of achieving peace and lessening the tensions that exist in the world. We cannot do that with hostility towards any nation. We can do that only with friendship and in that manner we have succeeded in creating confidence all around us.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin): In the event of a world conflagration, does my hon. friend think that India can keep aloof.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will have an opportunity of raising it in the debate. You need not interrupt the speaker.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend wants to ask a hypothetical question. I refuse to answer any hypothetical questions. I will deal with facts and the facts of the situation at the present moment: I will not deal

with propaganda. I am dealing with the real situation in the country which is of such a serious character that I would like my hon. friend to get away from the debating society level and bring his mind to bear upon the realities of the situation.

Now, the realities of the situation, Sir, I was referring to are these: that we had to make up our minds that we would sooner or later have to fashion a foreign policy, a series of foreign policies—because there is no such thing as one policy except the basic principle that is laid down in what I have already said. We achieved a certain measure of success in regard to that policy. My hon. friend does not forget what we did in regard to Indonesia. What we did for Indonesia was conditioned by our own limitations. Nevertheless, in spite of those limitations the Prime Minister of India took this step and we were able, I hope in a large measure, to make the Government of Indonesia a free and independent Government with the backing of the Arab and Asian countries which met here in Delhi under the Presidentship of Pandit Nehru. That was a great achievement. But it could not have been done had we not immediately adopted a policy which was a policy of peace and friendship.

Now, India is not a great Power, but, as I said, we are a great nation. We have great interests and we are respected throughout the world. As somebody said the other day, it is good to live in a century of Gandhi, of Nehru, of Tagore and of Radhakrishnan; it is good to be an Indian and it is good to be proud to be an Indian.

Now, Sir, India's words, her known decisions, and her constant efforts in securing for others freedom from exploitation and colonial rule day in and day out, were bound to undermine the imperial authority of the colonial powers and it is because of that that we are able to get the respect and attention we deserve. There are other factors, of course, in regard to this freedom. We have but recently circulated under the authority of the Minister for External Affairs, a note

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

with regard to Tunisia. I think, we can look upon the case of Tunisia as one of very great importance to the peace of the world. As I have stated there is evidence of a change in the aspect of the United Nations Organisation. If it takes place, it is going to be a very serious matter for the whole world. But we have taken a great initiative in regard to Tunisia. And to every nation we have sent a note in regard to the position in Tunisia. In this we are concerned not only with the interests of our own country, but equally so with the interests of all our neighbours, the small and the big. Until the achievement of independence for our neighbours, it is necessary that we should develop our policy of support so that social and economic freedom may follow in the wake of political emancipation in those countries which were being governed by colonial powers. As students of history and men versed in international affairs and in the trend of Indian thought would have known, we have been pursuing a policy of freedom and a policy of peace—dual policy. I do not say that we have achieved as much as we might have achieved but the limitations are not of our seeking. The limitations are inherent in the situation itself, which is indeed a serious one both for us and the world today. I say it with full responsibility when I refer to the seriousness of the situation. Since the beginning of 1948 or the end of 1947 till now, there have been at least three occasions when the world has come close to war, so dangerously close to the precipice of war. We have a great task to perform in raising our economic standards, even as other countries like the new China and the countries of Central Europe, the countries of Asia, the countries of Western Europe. The freedom that we have to achieve is not merely political, but also economic. War is the one thing, Sir, which is going to destroy the freedom achieved by any one of us, no matter what type of freedom that might be.

Now we must ask what this dual policy of peace and freedom has

achieved. Sir, the foreign policy of any country is conditioned by two factors. One of them is the capacity of that country to propound and to carry out a particular policy, while the other factor is, "Is that policy worthy of pursuit?" You will notice during these years of achievement, of fulfilment, of despair, and of grief, both these factors have been kept in view in whatever action has been taken by India in the matter of foreign affairs. You will recall, Sir, that we were able successfully to turn the attention of the world towards the new China, because we said it was a ridiculous position that a great country having a great and powerful Government, that Government should not be recognised internationally by the Great Powers. It is we who took the initiative as far as it lay within our powers to do so. I do not know how much that decision of ours has influenced Great Britain, also in following suit and recognizing the People's Government of China. We will know the importance of that when we realise that for this great country of China, India is a sort of window upon the world. I think, Sir, that is a significant achievement.

Sir, hon. Members will remember that in the pursuit of this policy, when first the Korean War started, it was we who warned the United Nations that they should not cross the 38th Parallel, and warned them of the dangers that lay in store for them and perhaps for the whole world, if such a step was taken. We did our duty by peace, our duty to the world. These are achievements and indeed not small in themselves. I referred a little while ago to the existence of two major blocs in this world, one against the other. And to-day what is happening is this. A conflict always exists between the two blocs, each one of them seeking what may be called positions of strength. During the Korean War, many estimates were prepared regarding the capacities of the two blocs, the capacity in steel, in oil, in coal, in aeroplanes, in tanks, etc. It has been held that if a conflict arose the countries of Eastern Europe would obtain by conquest such resources.

as would shift the emphasis in the matter of material strength to their side. Now a similar situation has arisen in Asia too. The march to freedom for which we are now so anxious for these smaller nations, has also been conditioned by this seeking after positions of strength. Had the colonial powers listened to the voice of Mahatma Gandhi or of Pandit Nehru, in 1945, Indo-China today would not be a battle-ground; it would not be a country riven with revolution and war, with a hundred and twenty thousand troops on one side, some of the flowers of the French Army, and a hundred thousand regular troops, a hundred thousand guerillas and perhaps a quarter of a million irregular troops on the other side. Now, Sir, in this situation we find that the policy of seeking after positions of strength has made it possible for the great powers to so control the destinies of some of these nations that the struggle for freedom receives a check. As my hon. friends are aware, the only constitution in the world, not prepared by the people, is the Constitution of Japan. It is a constitution thrust upon them by America at the time she was the holding power, a very good constitution by the way. This is the only Constitution in the world which denies the Government of that country the sustenance and support of an army, a navy and an air force. And, yet, such are the exigencies of this policy of seeking positions of strength that an occupation force of the United States of America has to remain in possession. It is generally thought that the Japanese will cancel those particular clauses of their Treaty and that in the end an army of about 15 divisions will be created. It is these inevitable factors which have constricted the expansion of the policy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to achieve greater results in Asia. I do not think, however, that it will be long before these powers for whom we express our deepest sympathy and friendship will achieve their freedom.

Now, Sir, I have seen articles in the Press, I have seen correspondence also

in the Press, advocating that India should join one bloc or another. May I say with all sincerity that the writers have not in mind anything except the good of India, but I believe they do not know what the consequence of joining a bloc means in the world situation today, which I have been trying to place before hon. Members this morning. It would mean, first of all, the going back by India to the days before freedom, the days of British rule in India. Advocating joining a bloc means a lack of any understanding of our own policy. This policy of joining a bloc means following the policy of the bloc and not the policy of a free and independent country. Not only that, hon. Members will remember that I laid down two conditions regarding foreign policy. One of these conditions was that any policy that is adopted is such as is worthy of being carried out and joining a bloc means what?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar) : We become camp followers of others..

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Yes, and we become the followers of policies which are not worth pursuing. I do not mind anybody becoming a camp follower but certainly mind my country being asked to follow a policy which is unworthy of this country. I want that policy to be a policy of freedom and independence. It is not merely a question of camp followers. It is a fundamental question of principles. We should not be tied down to the dominating policies of others. We cannot decide what is wrong and what is right.

Now, Sir, with regard to the balance of power. I remember what Mr. Bernard Shaw said many long years ago—as long ago as 1915—when the first Peace offer was made in the Reichstag by the German Chancellor, Bethman Hollweg. I happened to be discussing this matter with him that very morning and he astonished me by saying that the balance of power doctrine was a very democratic doctrine. As you will remember, at that time, the balance of power doc-

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

trine was anathema in all liberal and progressive circles. Shaw thought that so long as the balance of power was preserved, there was no fear of war. The moment the balance of power is disturbed, then arises the danger of conflict and the danger of war, one side thinking that it is more powerful than the other side and therefore seeking the opportunity of dominating the other side. We unfortunately, Sir, have been witnesses in the last few years of a shift in the balance of power. It has shifted in Europe, it has shifted in Asia and today, so far as Asia is concerned, we possess practically half the population of the world and one-third of that population—I may be wrong—I believe one-third of the population is dominated by communist principles. In this situation, India has a most significant role to play—not the role of a camp follower but the role of a friend. The resources of India, the man-power of India, the potential of India, is so important that in the last resort it is my belief that India may possibly be the deciding factor (when the balance of power is so upset as to bring about a conflict), for the preservation of peace throughout the world. If India throws in her might, her resources, her man-power, who is there to say “no” to her and deny that particular policy?

I do hope that that choice will never arise.

11.45 a.m.

Our policy, Sir, was enunciated a few months ago by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This is what Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said regarding that policy on December 12, 1951 :

I can say confidently that basically our foreign policy has helped the world situation from becoming worse. I do not take any special pride over this fact, but feel it is only a chance provided by history at this moment that enables us despite ourselves to create some influence over world affairs. This does not show any special greatness on our part, for we have neither a powerful army nor wealth. We can neither tempt anybody with wealth nor create pressure through force. The reason why our foreign policy exercises an influence is that even countries opposed to us fully trust that our policy is honest and independent.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin) : On what occasion was that speech made ?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : Let me explain. That speech was made at Allahabad, which is not the seat of this Government. It was made on December 12, 1951. My hon. friend probably is quite new to procedures of this nature. Foreign Ministers all over the world make policy speeches all over the world.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE : Where are we to look for Government policies? Are we to refer to these speeches, or are we to look for the policies somewhere else?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I do not know why my hon. friend is getting upset over something which is absolutely unessential. You look for the policy adumbrated at Delhi or Allahabad ; you look for the policy as adumbrated by the man who makes it.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE : I want to know whether we have any authentic source where we can look for Government policies.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Foreign Minister made that speech. Wherever he makes it, it represents the foreign policy of the country.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Even in election meetings ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is said there is the declaration of the foreign policy of India.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : I do not quite understand why my hon. friends are so particular about where the statement was made. Anyway, it is not necessary for my hon. friends to take up a hostile attitude regarding that statement. That statement was made by the Foreign Minister of India. That statement is certainly on all fours with the thinking of India and of all those sitting in this Chamber ; it is on all fours with the basic principles of the

policy laid down by Nehru, it is on all fours with the tradition of India—the tradition of tolerance, the tradition of peace, the tradition of freedom, the tradition of friendliness and not of factious dispute, not of conflict, not of war.

There is another statement that was made by the Foreign Minister of India, and I would ask my hon. friends to pay attention to that as well. The first statement was with reference to world policy. The second statement is specifically with reference to policy in Asia. On October 15, 1950, the Prime Minister of India issued a statement on the Far Eastern situation which laid down, as he said, some of the basic features of that situation as seen by us. I am saying this because I want my hon. friends to get a correct idea of the policy that is guiding this country under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This statement was important because of its clear analysis of the problems confronting us:

This vast area connoted by the expression 'the Far East' includes in its scope great countries with ancient cultures, with many dynamic movements and different problems in different areas. The common features of Asia today are: a reaction from the previous colonial regimes, a resurgent nationalism, agrarian movements, a desire to get rid of economic backwardness and a passionate urge for freedom. These Far Eastern countries desire to develop democratic institutions—most of them oppose totalitarianism either Communistic or Fascistic.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Does that foreign policy still hold good ? The hon. Member is reading a statement by the Prime Minister who was Foreign Minister in a previous Government. I take it that we are discussing the President's Address after the House has been reconstituted, and today the foreign policy has still to be stated by the Government.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend, I hope, has read the Address of the President which specifically mentions matters of foreign policy with particular reference to Asia. If my hon. friend has read that, he will see that I am merely enlarging upon the scope of that foreign policy as outlined by the former and the present

Foreign Minister of India. There no change in that particular poli today:

These Far Eastern countries desire develop democratic institutions.

Is my hon. friend against that No. My hon. friend is in full sympathy with that statement:

The idea of social justice as embodied in Communism attracts many people.

Is my hon. friend against that statement?

But the methods and the ideology of the Communist Parties have been greatly disliked and have come into conflict with democratic nationalism. Although world communism sometimes appears in the guise of a liberating movement, as an expansionist movement, it is considered dangerous to peace and freedom. The situation in the Far East, therefore, is conditioned by certain important factors which cannot be ignored in a correct understanding of this area's problems.

Now, Sir, all those factors I have already delineated and I have suggested exactly what those problems are that face these little countries or great countries and how it is that India can be of service to those countries under the policy of the Government of India today as declared by the Foreign Minister of India—the policy of peaceful friendship and cooperation.

Now, Sir, what is the role that we should ask the Government to accept in the near future not only in respect of our country but in respect of other countries which are near our border and are allied to us, and in many ways depend on us for assistance and guidance—not material assistance, but spiritual assistance, political assistance in order that they may also come into their own, as we have come into our own ? This is conditioned by the fact that there is not only a political resurgence abroad, in Asia and in Africa but there is a great desire to see that there is speedy economic development so that the underdog is no longer a menace to the grabbing colonial powers who may cast their hungry eyes upon him. That is the dominant situation in the Far East which can be dealt with successfully neither by colonial exploitation nor by communist influence, nor by doctrinaire

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

slogans, but by a recognition of the dignity of man in a democracy. In fact the situation in the Far East is the world situation confined to this most important area, subject to the same stresses and strains as elsewhere. A release from these strains and stresses is what the world and Asia need and demand. The common man everywhere wants to build his house in peace and he wants to live in it without fear as a free man, free from economic exploitation and political slavery, living not in slavery but in co-partnership with other human beings everywhere, so that he may seek for himself and his fellow beings a rich and beautiful harvest of civilization providing him with a fuller life just as easily as civilization provides the jet interceptor and the atom bomb for the ultimate annihilation of the human race. It is against this that the policy of India under Nehru has been consolidated. It is for the furtherance of the freedom of the human spirit that the policy of India works, whether it works abroad, in Asia or elsewhere, and it is these very fundamental principles, Sir, both in relation to domestic and foreign affairs, of which each one of us is proud. And I want my hon. friends to join me in considering that this policy is fundamentally honest, this policy is fundamentally practical, this policy is fundamentally an honourable policy to pursue. This policy of the preservation of our independence demands that all our neighbours should also be free. There can be no doubt about it and there can be no dispute at all. Somebody said—I do not remember who—that freedom cannot be cut up or split up into various sections. Freedom is indivisible. Just as freedom is indivisible, the desire of other countries or neighbours to achieve the same type of freedom that we have achieved is also a desire which cannot be prevented from being expressed or achieved. Our domestic policy has also to express itself through the development of economic strength and that is the object of what has been stated by the President in his Address, so that we should be a powerful nation, able to protect the independence that

we have won. With hunger and misery, with low standards of life, sub-human standards of life, it is not possible to preserve that freedom. To preserve that freedom, therefore, serious efforts have to be made for the purpose of putting India on the map not only of Asia but on the map also of the world—a world of common men which looks today to Nehru with hope of ultimate rescue.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now I call upon Begam Aizaz Rasul to second the motion.

BEGAM AIZAZ RASUL (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in seconding the Motion of Thanks so ably moved by my honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lall expressing thanks to the President for addressing both Houses of Parliament. May I say, Sir, that I feel it a great privilege and honour to be asked to associate myself with this motion. This is indeed, Sir, a great and historic occasion. This Parliament meets for the first time in history as the Parliament of a free democratic Republic. India, Sir, has been under subjection and despotic rule for centuries and it is for the first time that the common man has come into his own. We have today a Constitution framed on the basis of equality for every man and woman, in which the rights of every individual are guaranteed, and all barriers of caste, creed and community have been done away with. The most important feature of this Constitution, Sir, is that women have been given equal status with men and an equality of opportunity. The shackles that women have worn for centuries have been cast aside and women have now come into their own. Sir, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my deep sense of satisfaction at the fact that Muslims have been returned at the polls in large numbers in every State of this great country of ours. I say it because I was one of the chief supporters of the motion for the removal of reservation of seats for Muslims in the Constituent Assembly. There were many who

doubted the wisdom of this move. But I was not in doubt for a single moment. I did it in the full faith of India's secularism. I believe that by winning the goodwill and friendship of the vast numbers of peoples living in this great country the Muslims would be gaining a special case for themselves. I am glad, Sir, that that hope of mine has materialised. It speaks very highly of the efforts that have been made in fighting the forces of communalism, sectarianism and casteism by our great leader, the Prime Minister, and speaks very highly for the future of our country. Sir, the Address of the President is inspiring and realistic. It is a notable survey of the troubled world scene and briefly indicates the general relationship of India with the world and also the work we have to do. The foreign policy that has been followed by the Indian Prime Minister has been ably expounded by the honourable the mover. So I will not go into any details of that policy. But I would just like to emphasise that India as a newly independent nation has been following a policy of peace, friendship and goodwill towards every country in the world. That policy has been clearly laid down by our Prime Minister and has earned the respect and admiration of many countries of the world. May be that some foreign blocs may not approve of that policy because they want that this country of ours, which occupies such an important position in world politics today, should join them. It was because of that desire for peace that India joined the U.N. and has been staunchly supporting it believing in its capacity for ensuring world peace and bring about feelings and goodwill and friendship between different nations. But, Sir, as has been aptly remarked by the President: "Gradually, the noble aims of the founders of the United Nations and the Charter that they framed appear to be getting blurred." It is, indeed, a sad state of affairs.

The case of Tunisia which was not allowed even to be discussed in the U.N.

has shocked and disappointed us profoundly. If the United Nations cannot even allow the discussion of such an important subject, we do not know how that institution is going to preserve peace and how it is going to further the aims for which it was established. The weak and downtrodden nations had looked upon it as a place where wrongs could be redressed and justice secured. The hope expressed by the President that this great organisation on which the hopes of the world had been built will return to its old moorings and become, as it was meant to be, a pillar of peace and freedom, is earnestly shared by us as well.

Sir, the case of South Africa is engaging the attention of the world and I am glad that the President has again drawn our attention to it. The policy of racialism that is being consistently followed by the South African Government is fraught with great dangers and is a serious denial of human rights. It is a policy of racial discrimination. South Africa is violating its own Constitution, it is defying the United Nations. It does not realise that it is treading on very dangerous ground and a time may come when the whole of Africa may rise against this policy of colonialism and then it will be difficult for the South African Government to control the situation. We are grateful to our Government for mobilising world opinion against this racial discrimination and we hope that this policy will be continued and that the South African Government will realise its mistake soon and set matters right.

The position of Ceylon, Sir, is different. India is bound to Ceylon by age old ties of friendship and culture. Our Prime Minister through his foreign policy has always tried to bind those ties of friendship closer. But, unfortunately, recent events in Ceylon have called for our attention. It was due to the hurried elections in Ceylon that a great number of Indians could not be registered. The Ceylon Government should have given some latitude and should not have taken

[Begam Aizaz Rasul.]

technical advantage of this, but I am glad that the tension is easing. A large number of Indians have gone to Ceylon and settled there ; they have built up the economy of that country and it is right and proper that they should be given citizenship rights. It is of course understood, Sir, that Indians going and settling abroad will accept citizenship of those countries. India can only help them from the point of view of human rights.

Sir, turning to the internal problems which have been mentioned by the President in his Address, there is no doubt that the food problem today is the most important problem of our country. It is undoubtedly engaging the attention of our Government, and they are giving deep thought to various aspects as they affect the people. Lately the subsidy has been withdrawn by the Central Government. Orders to the tune of about Rs. 90 crores were placed for food from outside. Since the withdrawal of this subsidy, Sir, the demands of the States had been reduced by about one million tons. This means that the amount of the order is reduced also and we only want about 4½ million tons of foodgrains and therefore we save several crores of rupees for irrigation projects and other schemes. This subsidy was given to about 20 odd towns in the whole of India, mostly industrial towns. It was not given to all rationed towns. By withdrawing this subsidy, Sir, Government has also removed discrimination between one set of people and another. That, I think, is all for the good.

My suggestion is, Sir, that there should be free movement of foodgrains and that Government should only provide food to the deficit areas. Government would thus reduce its commitments to a great extent. We are very glad to see, Sir, in the Address of the President that we have for the first time in recent history large stocks of foodgrains. But India unfortunate-

ly depends so much on physical conditions, rain and other things, that we cannot be very complacent and must build up reserves. It is necessary also that a permanent solution of the whole question is found because unless we can find a permanent solution of this food problem, we can never have a sense of security and contentment. We should find ways and means of bringing down the food prices so that every man should be able to afford to buy foodgrains at a reasonable price. It is also necessary that the purchasing power of the people should go up. That is a very necessary adjunct to this food problem and unless these two things are achieved, unless the prices of foodgrains come down and the purchasing power of the people goes up, I am afraid that this question of food will not be solved and there will be a very justified agitation against conditions in this country. I know, Sir, that all these matters are under the constant consideration of the Prime Minister and I hope that some solution will be found.

I am very glad, Sir, that Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai has been appointed Food Minister. With his drive and energy he should be able to achieve great results. We know that some times he is very unconventional in his methods. But we hope that even if he adopts an unconventional policy in the matter of food, it will help to achieve desirable results. Before passing on to other things I should like to express our feelings of gratefulness to the U.S.A. for coming to the help of the Indian people at a time of great stress and need. I am very glad to see in the Address of the President that a Ministry of Production has been created. This shows that Government is responsive to criticism and is conscious of the vital importance of these undertakings. This together with the fact that the Minister for Planning has been put in charge of River Valley Schemes, is very satisfying. These form today the major part of our economy and on them depends the future of our country. This

Ministry of Production will have under its control, I understand, all State industries, such as the Fertilizer factory, the Machine Tool factory, the Telephone factory, the Ship-building yard, and other such nationalised industries. We hope, Sir, that this Ministry will be able to achieve good results, that the production in all these factories will go up, that new factories will be built and that India will become more and more industrialised because today in this machine age, we have to cope with competition with other countries of the world, and unless our country is adequately industrialised, we cannot hope for prosperity for the people of this country.

I would like to mention my sense of satisfaction at the fact that the Hindu Code Bill will be coming up for discussion in this session. Hon. Members of this House will remember the controversy that was attached to this Bill in the last Parliament. Now that Parliament has been elected on adult franchise, and the Congress party has been returned in such overwhelming majority, we know that the people of this country are behind the Hindu Code Bill. I hope that provision will be made to pass it as soon as possible. There are certain aspects of the Bill, which, instead of improving matters, had a reactionary result on the existing provisions of divorce and other social rights that were already enjoyed by the people and it was therefore necessary to split up this Bill into several parts.

I would like again to express my sense of gratefulness for the honour and privilege given to me in having been asked to second this Motion. I hope under your guidance we will be able to set up high traditions in this House, which will go a long way in building up the framework of democracy and that we will be able to be of some service to the people on whose votes we have all come here.

With these words, Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding this motion.

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

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 16th May, 1952."

Now, I find, the next subject in the agenda is the discussion of this motion. I would like to invite the attention of this House to the constitutional provisions on the matter. Article 87(2) of the Constitution of India says that provision shall be made by the rules regulating the procedure of either House for the allotment of time for discussion of matters that are referred to in such Address. It is emphasized there that the matters referred to in the Address shall be the topics for discussion. The same is reiterated in rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business which also says 'for the discussion of the matters referred to in the President's Address'. Rule 14 says that the Council shall be at liberty to discuss such matters referred to in such Address on a motion of thanks moved by a Member and seconded by another Member. It is repeated again in rule 19 that the Chairman may allot time for the discussion of the matters referred to in the President's Address. It is my anxiety that there should be a free, frank, and full discussion of all the topics raised in the President's Address. I know from the list of amendments that have been given to me that strong views are held on different questions. And it is my desire that full freedom should be given for the expression of these views on both sides. If such a thing is to happen, then we have to concentrate our discussion, and not allow it to fritter over a large number of amendments. That is the request which I have to make to you. Will it be possible for the groups to come to an understanding as to what the amendments are which they would select for discussion ? Or, if it is not possible,

[Mr. Chairman.]

then I have to take up amendment after amendment and say which of them can be brought under the constitutional provision, even by a great stretch of imagination, even subjects remotely connected with the topics mentioned by the President. I may allow only such amendments to be moved, one, two, three etc. And then the main motion along with the amendments shall be before the House. In that case, I would like the Members of the non-Government groups to give me a list of names of people whom they would like me to call for speakers, and the Government Members may also give me a similar list, so that I can alternate one speaker on this side with another on the opposite side. This will allow fair discussion of the different points of view. Then, ultimately, at the end of the discussion, the Leader of the House or some Minister of the Government will reply on behalf of the Government, and then the amendments and the main motion will be put to the House. I feel, therefore, that it will be necessary for you to come to an understanding as to what amendments should be moved. If that is not possible, allow me to say that this question of railway re-grouping may be taken up on the Railway Budget. There is no reference to it in the President's Address and so it need not be taken up here. There are other questions also to which no reference has been made in the President's Address. So, I must go forward and call upon the movers of amendments to say: "I move No. 1, 2, 3 or 4". Some amendments there are which can be taken up as a whole. There are other amendments where only (a), (b) or (c) may be moved and not (d). I leave it to you to tell me which procedure commends itself better to you—whether you would allow the House to adjourn now so that you can come to an understanding on the amendments you propose to move and then we will meet and sit longer if necessary, in order to make up for lost time. Or would you allow me to go forward according to my own judgment and say: "These are the amendments which I am prepared to allow." I may assure you that on almost all the topics on which you are interested you

will have an opportunity of discussion in the course of the debate.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I think, Sir, it would not be possible to come to an arrangement at this late hour. There is also conflict as regards some amendments. The points of view of different groups will be conflicting. So, not only because it is so late but also because of the other reason, I think it will be better for you to choose the amendments. The House leaves it to you, Sir.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : It is not possible for these groups to come to an agreed decision. You expect the Members in the Opposition to come to an agreement. It is not, in the existing circumstances, possible. Therefore, with all respect, I would press upon you to take the amendments in the order in which they have been presented to you and then ask people to speak on them. If, according to your judgment, certain amendments closely follow one another, there will not be any objection for these amendments to be clubbed together and Members speaking on them. But, within the time allowed, it is not possible for the various groups and their representatives in this House to give you an agreed solution. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that the matter is entirely in your hands.

AN HON. MEMBER : I want to know, Sir, whether a general discussion will be allowed first and then a Member will be allowed to speak again on the amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may tell you that in the short time at our disposal it will be difficult for us to go forward with amendment after amendment and ask every individual to speak on it. Every Member of this House will be at liberty to speak only once and not more than once, because, there are so many Members and every one would like to have an opportunity. The best procedure in that case seems to be that I should tell you what the amendments are which are admissible according to a

liberal interpretation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Then, those persons in whose names they stand can get up and say : "I move". Then the main motion and the amendments will be before the House. Then I will call on Members alternately, one Member of the Government and one Member of the Opposition so that there will be a fair and free discussion of all the matters which are brought before us. That seems to me the only way in which we can get on with our business.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Government Members are more in numbers than the Opposition Members. They should get more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All that I say is they have already got $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours now and they will get an hour for the reply, and after all, in a democratic set-up the Opposition has to be given its fair share.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) : I would suggest all amendments being put together for discussion and we can choose, if possible, on the last day, which amendments will be pressed for division and voted upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All I can say is that there are certain amendments which by no stretch of imagination can be brought under discussion of matters referred to in the President's Address. There are certain questions like food production, land revenue, foreign policy and preventive detention which are referred to in the President's Address and the amendments which have a bearing on them may be moved.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Have all the amendments that have been presented been admitted or not ?

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR (Bombay) : The procedure followed in the Provisional Parliament was this. Perhaps it is not a new thing. It is going on for the last two or three years since the Constitution has come into operation. As far as I remember—there are many Members of the Lower House; they will

correct me—the procedure followed by the Speaker of the House of the People was that he would allow all the amendments to be moved in the beginning. Of course, those were amendments that could be admitted. Subsequently, he called upon the proposer of the different amendments to make speeches in support of their amendments. It was always understood that because a person has moved his amendment, he necessarily will not have any right to speak. But the Speaker, out of consideration for the fact that certain gentlemen had indicated their intention to move an amendment, did allow them a chance of making a speech. That was the procedure that he adopted. I think the same procedure might be adopted here also.

With regard to one other observation, I should like to say with the deepest respect that in making the reference to what happens in the House of Commons, you indicated that only those amendments which refer to subjects which have been expressly mentioned in the Address of the President would be admitted. With all respect I think that the rule ought to be the other way round. The purport of a debate on the Address is this. Government is pleased to inform the House, through the Address of the President, the subjects to which they allot what may be called priority or urgency. Article 87 of the Constitution of India says that the purport of the debate on the Address of the President is to inform Parliament of the causes of its summons. The purport of the Debate on the Address is to let the Opposition tell the Government what are the purposes which they ought to have included. Therefore, any subject which is not included in the Address of the President, for that very reason becomes a matter of urgency, because, Members of the Opposition may feel that Government has given priority and urgency to matters which they think important but which, in the opinion of the Opposition, are less important than other matters. Secondly, I submit that merely because an amendment refers to a subject which has not been referred to in the Address

[Dr. B. R. Ambedkar.]
of the President, it should not on that account be ruled out. But the Opposition should be given an opportunity to discuss and to place before Government any particular subject, which is the subject matter of the amendment, as a matter of urgency which must be given priority over subjects which have been spoken of by the President in his Address. I thought I should make these observations so that you might be in a position to regulate the procedure about the amendments.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
(SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : I greatly sympathise with the point of view which has been urged by my hon. friend Dr. Ambedkar.....

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR : Nobody is "Honourable" in this House any longer.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I referred to him as "my hon. friend". That is not taboo.

Sir, the real point for our consideration on this question is whether the Constitution and the rules that have been framed for the procedure of this House permit of giving effect to the suggestion that has been made by my hon. friend. The Opposition no doubt feels that it is not just to them that the Government should omit to make a reference in the President's Address to certain matters which the Opposition might consider to be important or urgent. But we have got to take the Government as a Government, anxious always to place before the House what it considers to be the most important things that the President ought to refer to in his Address. And that is why in the Constitution and the rules that have been framed under it a restriction has been placed that, instead of allowing the debate to range over from China to Peru, it should be confined to matters which are referred to in the President's Address. We cannot, I submit, Sir, and it is not perhaps correct for you as Chairman, to interpret the rule to mean that when it says that the debate should be confined to matters referred to in the President's Address, you can permit the

debate to range over matters which are not referred to in the Address. Therefore, while I am all out for giving the Opposition the fullest opportunity for debating what may be even very remotely connected with the points referred to in the Address, it would not be quite right to allow the debate to range over matters not referred to in the Address.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh):
Mr. Chairman, if our business here were to consider only matters referred to in the President's Address, then all we should have to do would be to pass a formal Resolution of thanks and disperse ; there would be no need for a debate. A debate can arise only when the Address is not regarded as adequate by some Members of the House. Unless there are some Members dissatisfied with the Address, there can be no debate. And the purpose of this debate is to have the policy of the Government discussed not only with reference to the matters to which it attaches importance but also with reference to matters to which people unconnected with the Government attach importance. In the Provisional Parliament this was the procedure that was followed, and my hon. friend Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar never got up there to protest so vehemently against the procedure followed by the Speaker. I do not know what procedure the Speaker of the House of the People will follow today, but I take it that he is not going to change the practice followed by him so far. I submit, therefore, that in order to make the debate fruitful, the procedure followed in the Provisional Parliament should be adopted by us too. The Speaker was just as well aware of the article that you have referred to as anybody else ; yet amendments regretting the omission of certain topics from the President's Speech were allowed, and if these amendments are not to be allowed today, there need be no debate at all ; we may go through the formality of a debate, but we cannot have an opportunity of drawing the attention of the Government to those matters to which, in our opinion, importance should be attached but which

have been omitted from the President's Speech. I hope, Sir, therefore, that you will follow this principle in dealing with the amendments tabled by those hon. Members of the House who do not belong to the Government Party. In the House of Commons too, so far as I remember, the procedure referred to by me is followed. We read in the newspapers of amendments regretting the omission of certain topics from the King's Speech. And we, who are trying to learn from England in respect of the procedure that we should follow in Parliament, can do no better than adopt the practice followed in the House of Commons.

I do not think that any one in the Constituent Assembly thought for a moment that article 87 would be so rigidly interpreted as to exclude any debate on topics not included in the President's Speech. I doubt whether even those Members of the Constituent Assembly who belonged to the Congress would have allowed article 87 to be passed in its present form had they felt that it would be interpreted in the narrow sense in which it seems, with all due deference to you, Sir, you think that it should be interpreted. This is one of those occasions when we can say that the letter killeth ; and I hope that you, who have always stood for the spirit, will allow those amendments to be moved which regret the omission of certain topics from the President's Speech. If there are any matters which the House will soon have an opportunity of discussing in connection, say, with the Railway Budget, they may not be discussed. But, broadly speaking, the debate should not be confined to matters to which the Government attach importance. We should be given a fair field and free opportunity of asking the Government to take into consideration those matters which it has neglected so far.

12.46 p.m.

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI
(N o m i n a t e d) : Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words. We

have got a Constitution which provides what exactly are the topics germane to be discussed in the Address. For various reasons this provision has been advisedly put in. In the domain of Constitution, *e.g.* either in the Australian or in the South African or in the Canadian Constitution, there is no provision relating to the King's speech corresponding to the President's Address in our Constitutions. The procedure of the House of Commons has therefore been brought in, where as for obvious reason an explicit provision has been made in our Constitution in regard to the President's Address. I submit, Sir, the House cannot deviate from the express provision of the Constitution and my own feeling is that it has been advisedly inserted to check a good deal of public discussion over all sundry topics in which any Member may be interested because of the number of days, the number of hours and the time that might be taken up and the public expenditure involved in such wide discussion. The other course will be to permit discussion on every topic under the sun. It may be a matter in the State List, it may be a matter of administration, it may be a matter of legislation. That would result in every Member discussing every conceivable topic under the guise of an amendment to the Address. Therefore, my submission to you, Sir, is that you may by all means give as large freedom to Members as possible with regard to the points referred to in the President's Address. It is quite open to the Members of this House to enlarge as much as possible the scope of discussion of foreign policy, etc. but it should be confined to the President's Address, *i.e.* the topics referred to therein. There is a wide scope for discussion on the food problem. In regard to that, various proposals have been put forward. But I do submit, Sir, that advisedly the Constitution has made provision to the effect that you can only discuss matters referred to in the President's Address. Under no circumstances, Sir, in the interests of the taxpayers' money and in the interests of limited time at the disposal of this House, while giving full scope for discussion, and putting as liberal an interpretation as possible you cannot allow the

[Shri Alladi Krishnaswami.]

hon. Members to go beyond the subjects referred to in the President's Address.

SHRI B. G. KHER (Bombay) : Sir, this is a very important matter and I hope therefore you will allow me a few minutes to describe to the House the origin of this practice of the King's Speech and what is usually done in England. But the point is that we should not do what is being done in other Parliaments and under other constitutions. We should grow our own conventions in the light of our own needs and our own rules. When Parliament used to be opened in the old days in England the King used to drive in State to the House of Lords to deliver his speech there, a word was sent to the House of Commons and then a rush was made by all including the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition. All of them went and formally knocked at the door of the House of Lords. Then the King's Speech was made. I believe it was in later days read by the Lord Chancellor. I have got here my own speech. When the Governor first made this speech in Bombay and a number of points were raised as they are being raised in this House today, I remember I had taken pains to describe to the House the limits of the debate by describing the origin of the practice and, with your permission, I would like to refer to it. We need not be so tragic about it. Our rules may not be so very rigid as to follow this or that particular practice. As you said, Sir, your object is to allow a full and frank discussion. At the same time we have not got unlimited time at our disposal to discuss every point that arises or does not arise out of the speech of the President. Sir, this is what we find in the 'Mother of Parliaments' by Graham :

The King's Speech is not usually a very remarkable production, either from a literary or any other point of view, though many of those for which Gladstone, Disraeli, or Lord Salisbury were responsible were exceptionally lucid and well written. Macaulay has described it as 'that most unmeaningly evasive of human compositions'. As a rule, it exudes platitudes at every paragraph; its phraseology is florid without being particularly informing. 'Did I deliver the speech well?' George III

inquired of the Lord Chancellor, after the opening of Parliament. 'Very well, Sire' was Lord Eldon's reply. 'I am glad of it', answered the King, 'for there was nothing in it'. If speech was given us to conceal thought, the King's Speech may often be said to fulfil its mission as a cloak to drape the mind of the Ministry. Lord Randolph Churchill once declared that the Cabinet had spent some fifteen hours eliminating from it anything that might possibly have any meaning. From the ambiguous suggestions it contains, the public is left to infer the exact form of Legislation foreshadowed. The King's Speech is popularly supposed to be written by His Majesty himself. But though approved by him, it is composed by the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, of which probably each member contributes the paragraphs referring to his own department. It expresses, therefore, the Government's rather than the sovereign's views. (*Bombay Legislative Assembly Proceedings, Vol. 16, Part 1, 1950, page 303—24-2-1950*).

The point was that the Government described the policy in several matters which they wished to pursue and also gave an indication of the legislation that they wanted to put before the House. If you will permit me, Sir, I will sit and continue. I hope I am not boring the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes. Continue.

SHRI B. G. KHER: But the way in which the King's Speech was treated in the Houses of Parliament was most amazing:

.....Queen Victoria discontinued the reading of her speech after the death of the Prince Consort, delegating this duty to the Lord Chancellor. Another Royal personage treated the speech with far less respect. George IV, when Prince Regent, is said to have bet Sheridan a hundred guineas, that he would introduce the words 'Baa, baa, black sheep' into the King's speech without arousing comment or surprise. He won his bet and afterwards Sheridan asked Canning whether he did not think it extraordinary that no one should have noticed so strange an interpolation: 'Did you not hear His Royal Highness say, 'Baa, baa, black sheep'?', he asked. 'Yes', replied Canning, 'but as he was looking straight in your direction at the moment, I deemed it merely a personal allusion, and thought no more about it!

People have dealt with discussion on the King's Speech in different ways. In

the beginning for some years it used to go on without a time-lag for three days and later on for as much as 15 days. Here, Sir, we have said that we will discuss the Address for three days. We have also said that we should not move amendments about matters which are not referred to in the speech and for us that is a very wholesome convention which should be followed. It does not mean that hon. Members cannot have any other opportunity of criticising the policy of the Government because here we have the Financial Statement and the Budget, when they can deal with all other matters. This is a broad outline of Government policy and I submit it will be necessary, if you really want to do something useful in three days, to put a sort of limit on not only the nature of the remarks but the time during which those remarks are made. Some of the speakers have taken over an hour and I think it was very indulgent of you not to pull them up and call them to order. But I would submit that you should ask Members, in moving such amendments as they are going to be allowed to move, to restrict their remarks to a few minutes so that all the others may get a chance of criticising them. I agree that although some other practice may have been followed in other Houses, in this House when we have ample provision for discussing matters of policy from time to time, here, Sir, on grounds of relevance you should give your own interpretation and although Members may be permitted to raise points, they may not be allowed to criticise and go on lecturing; otherwise other people will never have a chance to be heard and I would therefore support the point of view that has been put forward by the Leader of the House and our illustrious constitutional lawyer Shri Alladi.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, the way in which Government wants to proceed in this matter is nothing but to restrict the democratic right of the House. Whatever might have been the actual wording of the Constitution,

it has been the practice in the Lower House or the House of the People or in the Provisional Parliament that the discussion on the Motion of Thanks should be very broad-based and not restricted to a particular matter. The argument that is being brought now that we will have to discuss so many things and therefore there won't be time is no argument at all, because the time is fixed already by the Government as three days and in three days Members can bring in amendments and discuss the whole policy of the Government from A to Z. It is for this purpose only that the Presidential Speech is intended. Otherwise, there is no meaning in this. Already the rights of the House are being curtailed. Now, along with this, if this kind of interpretation goes on, the House will be reduced to a mere formality.

Now, some of the speakers who have spoken earlier said there would be plenty of other opportunities where we could discuss other points which were not actually referred to in the Presidential Speech. We do not know, because of the Constitution made by the big lawyers, what other legal provision or wording they will bring in and then start another discussion. Till today nobody ever thought and even those eminent lawyers also who have given their opinion have never raised this point, either in the House of the People or in the Provisional Parliament, that it is unconstitutional to discuss the subjects from A to Z on the President's Speech. In fact, it is the practice in every House, in every democratic House to take the President's Address and their whole policy, even those policies which the Government refused to bring before the House. And if the ruling is that we can speak only on amendments to those points which are referred to, then it will be very easy for the Government not to refer to any of the important points and make this whole discussion itself a worthless discussion. So I submit that this certainly affects the rights of the whole House. I request the Chairman to define the

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

rights of the House like the normal practice in a democratic House to discuss the President's Address from A to Z on all amendments which are moved. As far as the lack of time is concerned, there won't be any, because three days are allotted. As far as speakers are concerned you can call them on the basis of the parties and give them allotted time, so from the time point of view I request you once more to allow all amendments.

SHRI M. P. N. SENHA (Bihar): I just want to understand the position. Supposing the President came and said "Good morning, gentlemen, welcome and sit down". What would be the result?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): I will not take more than half a minute, Sir. I quite agree with the point of view that the hon. Member has raised. I will, Sir, refer to the article itself and read it:

87. (2) Provision shall be made by the rules regulating the procedure of either House for the allotment of time for discussion of the matters referred to in such address and for the precedence of such discussion over other business of the House.

It does not mean that the discussion shall be restricted to the matters referred to in the Address.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have to adjourn the House now. But what I wish to say is this. I have listened to Dr. Ambedkar who had a great deal to do with the writing of the Constitution.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras): You are not giving your ruling, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Not now. I am merely explaining.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Kindly give us a chance to speak before giving the ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What I want to say is that the House of the People hitherto had been more or less a single Party House. Now the present House of the People and this House are

different. So far as I have looked into the House of Commons proceedings, generally there are only one or two amendments. Is it not so, Dr. Ambedkar?

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras): Quite so.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: There are only two Parties there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here even gentlemen belonging to one Party have given a series of amendments. I just want to draw your attention to certain fundamental things. I do not say that the discussion should be restricted to a narrow interpretation of the matters referred to in it. I did say: "even remotely connected with or implied by the matters referred to in the President's Address" and I pointed out also that there were ever so many topics like land, foreign affairs, Ceylon, South Africa,—almost all the problems in which Members are interested are mentioned in the President's Address. And while the amendments which go completely beyond may not be allowed in the speeches which hon. Members will make, there may be a full discussion of topics which are not included in the President's Address. Well, my interpretation of the thing was more or less on those lines. I only want to make myself clear. Dr. Kunzru said that in that case no debate is possible. A debate is possible to bring about an alternative solution for the land problem, for the food crisis and an alternative way of dealing with our foreign affairs, with preventive detention. A debate is certainly allowed, even according to the way in which I put it, to consider all these alternative ways. My feeling is by reducing the number of amendments it will be possible for us to have a concentrated discussion. And I made it absolutely clear that I would give every Opposition Member who wishes to speak full freedom to express his own views. All that I am indicating is to facilitate full and helpful discussion. But if you tell me, 'In the House of Commons it is that'; if you

say, 'In the House of the People it is that'; well I may say that so many amendments cannot be seriously considered. They are merely put forth and no real discussion on all of them is possible. It is impossible for 300 amendments to be discussed with any seriousness in three days' time. So why should we not as a House come to some kind of understanding.

I will adjourn the House till 2.30 p.m. when the matter will be put to the House.

The Council then adjourned for lunch till half past two of the clock.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, Mr. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am anxious that we should get on with the real purpose of the debate, namely the motion and the amendments. Therefore I do not want a protracted discussion on the procedure to be followed. I shall allow only just five minutes for all the speakers put together.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Hon. Members are all aware of the practice that obtains in the House of Commons. If I remember aright, the practice there is this. When the motion is moved, first there is a general discussion and any amendments are moved later. The general discussion goes on for a few days and then the amendments are moved and discussed and voted upon. But the conditions there are different from here. We have more Parties here in India, or rather I should say, one Party and many groups here. We have also a written Constitution. My request is that we should be allowed to discuss matters which may not have been specifically touched upon in the President's Speech. I hope, Sir, that you will be very generous in the interpretation of this. Taking a

generous interpretation, I request that we should be allowed to discuss all the amendments to the motions, because there was a sentiment expressed in the President's Speech that freedom by itself is not sufficient, but happiness in a measure has to be assured to all people.

Sir, there is an amendment on the redistribution of Provinces on a linguistic basis. I would like to know whether it comes under the President's Speech or the subjects that have been dealt with under the President's Speech. That is a subject which will not come for discussion during the course of the General Budget discussion or the Railway Budget discussion. But that is also a very important matter. No doubt, Sir, we are also anxious to have this debate conducted very fruitfully and you may leave it to the Opposition groups to select such of the subjects as they want to press.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Sir, you indicated that matters not referred to in the President's Address should not be discussed at all. Rule 14 says: "The Council shall be at liberty to discuss the matters referred to in such address on a motion of thanks moved by a member and seconded by another member." But it does not refer to amendments. The subject matters not referred to in the President's Address can be discussed in the form of amendments. That is the reason why so many amendments have been given notice of. I think, Sir, in the amendments we can refer to any question not mentioned in the President's Address. I request therefore that amendments otherwise in order may not be held by the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I must end these discussions now. The last speaker referred to the amendments being independent of the main motion. The amendments must always be relevant to the main motion and so amendments cannot be treated as independent motions. That is my ruling on this matter.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, would you allow me to inform the House of the observations made by the Speaker of the other House today on this very subject? If the Chair gives me permission, I would like to place this information before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proceedings in the other House cannot be referred to in this House.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, I am not going to read out the complete speech. But surely it is permissible to say that it would be deplorable if the procedure on so vital a matter as the debate on the Address were different from that in the other House. After all, the Constitution that governs both these Houses is the same, and if wide scope is allowed for discussion in the other House, there is no reason why it should be narrowed down here. Referring to the question of the linguistic Provinces, this is one of the very subjects on which discussion is going to be held in the other House. Sir, this House is already weak, and I hope, Sir, that you will not allow it to be made weaker still by the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps let me tell you substantially there is not going to be any diminution of free discussion on almost all the points that are referred to. I find that there is a rule,—rule 15,—which authorises the Chairman to allow only such amendments as he may consider appropriate. In the British House of Commons, if the practice is somewhat different, let us note that there is no such thing as a written provision there as we have in our Constitution. I have to abide by the interpretation I have given, but I do not wish to take any narrow legalistic view of the matter. I want to give as liberal an interpretation as possible. But you do not expect me to ignore the specific provisions of the Constitution. In these

speeches on the main motion and the amendments which will be moved, there may be a general discussion on almost all the topics in which the Members of this House are interested.

Now, I would like to take up the amendments themselves. I shall ask the gentlemen, whose names I would call, to move their amendments formally, without making any speeches. Later on the main motion and the amendments will be open for discussion.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address no mention has been made of any satisfactory plan for tackling the food problem in the country, and particularly the urgency of restoring the food subsidy.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2

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

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

“but regret that the Address does not disclose an integrated land policy to facilitate increased production of food and the elimination of social injustice towards landless peasants and agricultural labourers.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret to find that the Government have not taken adequate steps to tackle the famine in Madras State.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“and submit that the Government have utterly failed in its foreign policy especially with regard to Indians in other countries.”

AMENDMENT NO. 5

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

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

“but regret that in the Address no mention has been made of :

(a) the promoting and projection of a Third Force with the co-operation of small, independent nations, in order to ensure peace and prosperity of the world;

(b) the intention of the Government towards foreign possessions in India;

(c) the Government's attitude towards the treatment of citizens of Indian origin in foreign countries;

(d) the colossal suffering and hardship caused to the people, due to the withdrawal of food subsidies, and the ways and means to mitigate them;

(e) the serious famine situation prevailing in many parts of the country;

(f) the policy of Government in regard to shifting the basis of planning from Capital intensive to Labour intensive and decentralisation;

(g) the Government's desire to bring down prices further and to sustain them at that level; and

(h) the Government's policy in regard to production.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6

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

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

“but regret that no mention has been made about the elimination of microscopic foreign pockets in the Republic of India by integrating minute Portuguese and French possessions in a firm and determined manner, essential to the prestige and integrity of this historic Commonwealth.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7

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

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

“but regret to find that there is neither any mention of solving the food problem by indicating definite ways of increasing production nor any indication of lessening the incidence of taxation on the poorer strata of the masses.”

AMENDMENT NO. 8

PROF. G. RANGA: Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret to note the failure of Government to propose to protect the producers of Jute, Cotton and oil-seeds from the growing economic slump and provide a nation-wide machinery for the fixation of levels of remunerative prices for food-grains and other staple products based upon corresponding levels of decent agricultural wages for labour and also to supplement the Five-Year Plan by proposals for the development of multi-purpose projects, notably the Siddeswaram, Nandikonda and Pulichitala projects on the River Krishna and Ramapadasagar on the River Godavari and those on the Narbada, Tapi and Vamsadhava rivers.”

AMENDMENT NO. 9

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

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

“but regret:

(a) that no reference has been made to the severance of the Sovereign Democratic Republic of India from the Commonwealth of Nations of which the Queen of England is the head and symbol, thus indicating no change in the decision of the Government to continue India's association with it in spite of some members of that Commonwealth pursuing a policy of racial superiority which strikes at the fundamentals of the United Nations; and

(b) that the problem of supply of food grains at cheaper rates within the easy reach of the common man has not been adequately dealt with.”

AMENDMENT NO. 10

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

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

“but regret that while Cottage industries like handloom textiles, coir, yarn, etc. are fast being closed down due to want of markets for their production, resulting in mass unemployment, the Government do not devise ways and means to come to the rescue of those indigenous industries and save the hundreds and thousands of families depending on those industries.”

AMENDMENT NO. 11

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA: Sir, I also beg to move:

The at the end of the motion the following be added, namely :—

“but regret that the Government does not indicate whether it intends to withdraw all Press acts and rules that curtail the freedom of the press in spite of demands from all sections of the press to scrap these legislations.”

AMENDMENT NO. 12

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA: Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that the Government still thinks in terms of extending the life of the Preventive Detention Act, which, besides being a most undemocratic piece of legislation without any parallel in the Statute Books of any other country in the world, has been condemned by all sections of our people, including the highest Courts of Justice in India.”

AMENDMENT NO. 13

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA: Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that nothing is visualised in the Government policy to protect the lives and interests of Indians overseas, especially in Ceylon, Malaya, Singapore and South Africa, where they are treated like slaves and their citizenship rights trampled on with impunity.”

AMENDMENT NO. 14

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret that the Government instead of restoring Civil Liberties by withdrawing all political cases and conspiracy trials and abolishing all repressive laws, proposes to perpetuate the Preventive Detention Act.”

AMENDMENT NO. 15

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret—

(a) that the Government is complacent about the high prices of food stuffs, which is a result of their own policies;

(b) that the Government is glad that the demand for importing food stuffs in large quantities is not being pressed by the State Governments because of high prices, though the people are starving;

(c) that the Government even now refuses to take effective steps to supply the food grains to the population at prices within their reach;

(d) that the Government even now refuses to take over the land from big landlords and hand it over to the peasants gratis and that the Government even now fails to see that only a radical land distribution and abolition of landlordism, will increase

the food production by the peasantry and relieve the food shortage; and

(e) that the Government depends even now for food mainly on American imports while refusing to pursue and conclude trade pacts with Soviet Union and Peoples' Republic of China for our essential food stuffs.”

AMENDMENT NO. 16

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret —

(a) that the Government's Five Year National Plan does not make the development of heavy industry as the key for developing our entire economy;

(b) that the Government pins its hopes of economic reconstitution of our country to American point four aid and American Community Projects; and

(c) that the government has failed to see that this dependence on America and Britain will ultimately lead to the loss of our independence and sovereignty.”

AMENDMENT NO. 17

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret—

(a) that the Government does not propose to cease to be a member of British Commonwealth but continues to be so;

(b) that the Government because of its membership is adhering to Sterling Bloc and attending British Commonwealth Premiers' Conferences, Financial Ministers' Conferences and even going to the extent of allowing Nepalis to be recruited for British Army on Indian soil and allowing free passage to British Army units thus formed to proceed to Malaya to suppress freedom struggle; and

(c) that the Government does not propose to take immediate steps to see that Indian territory under French and Portuguese occupation is restored back, as per the expressed desire of overwhelming people of these territories.”

AMENDMENT NO. 18

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA (Madras): Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret that the President's Address does not contain any reference to the Policy the Government propose to pursue to develop industry like tiles and handloom, boddies, etc. and safeguard the interests of the workers engaged in such industries.”

AMENDMENT NO. 19

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA : Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that no mention was made in the President's Address of the steps the Government propose to take to protect the rights and interests of Indians living in South Africa, Ceylon and Malaya.”

AMENDMENT NO. 20

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

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

“but regret—

(i) that the President's Address gives no assurance of India's withdrawal from the Commonwealth of Nations, confiscation of British capital in India, and vital changes in economic policies of the Government which are urgent for real independence and progress;

(ii) that the President's Address does not assure any real assistance to and solidarity with the cause of the Colonial peoples fighting for their freedom;

(iii) that the President's Address does not offer any solution of the mounting food crisis and famine in the country; and

(iv) that the President's Address fails to proclaim the immediate restoration of unfettered democratic rights and liberties without which India can never progress.”

AMENDMENT NO. 21

SHRI M. MANJURAN : Sir, I beg to move :

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

“but regret that the President's Address does not contain any unambiguous exposition of “certain other urges of the human spirit” and their application to a Secular State.”

AMENDMENT NO. 22

SHRI M. MANJURAN : Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that no mention is made of the Imperialistic manoeuvres leading to an “approaching disaster” and the Address showers undue praise on ineffective American aid harming our national interests and initiative.”

AMENDMENT NO. 23

SHRI M. MANJURAN : Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that no mention is made of the suppression of civil liberties in the Congress regime and holds out no promise of their early restoration.”

AMENDMENT NO. 24

SHRI MANJURAN : Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that adequate attention is not paid to the problem of industrialisation with particular stress in the States where the density of population is very high.”

AMENDMENT NO. 25

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa) : Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret that no indication has been given of cancellation of the harmful and derogatory agreements with the Government of U.S.A. for the so-called technical aid.”

AMENDMENT NO. 26

SHRI S. BANERJEE : Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret that it is proposed to curtail civil liberty by placing before Parliament a Bill dealing with Preventive Detention.”

AMENDMENT NO. 27

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras) : Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret—

(1) that the Address does not indicate further measures that are necessary for providing adequate relief to the suffering people in the famine stricken areas;

(2) that the Address does not provide any indication of the recognition by the Government of the important fact that a proper and adequate price to the producer constitutes a vital factor and indispensable stimulus for increasing food production in the country; and

(3) that the Address does not indicate any definite steps that are to be taken for rehabilitating the most important and ancient of the cottage industries of the country, viz. the handloom industry and such other industries as the coconut and pepper growing industries which have a vital bearing on the economy of the country.”

AMENDMENT NO. 28

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

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

“but regret that the Address contains no reference to the serious food situation in the State of West Bengal, where in the Sundarbans area in particular, almost famine conditions are prevailing.”

AMENDMENT NO. 29

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA : Sir, I beg to move:

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

“but regret that the Government has taken no steps to get out of the British Commonwealth of Nations.”

AMENDMENT NO. 30

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA : Sir, I also beg to move:

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

“but regret that the Government does not propose to find suitable markets for the cash crops of our land like coconuts, pepper, rubber, ginger, copra, coir, etc. by initiating trade contracts with the Eastern Democracies, China and the Soviet Union.”

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those are the amendments along with the main motion. They are before hon. Members for general discussion. As regards the redistribution of existing States on a linguistic basis, no amendment is allowed.

AN HON. MEMBER: But that is also most important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but hon. Members can refer to it in the general discussion.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I have also sent in notice of two amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member who moved the Vote of Thanks went on to narrate the difficulties which the Government had to face in 1947 and during the last five years and said that the Government had done all it could and therefore the motion should be supported. But, in our opinion, the Government during the last four years has been a Government of broken pledges. For instance, I am elected by the representatives of

Visala Andhra on the Communist Party ticket and as such I am present here. We are elected by the Visala Andhra people because we fought for the rights of the people and stood for the unification of Visala Andhra. The Congress, before it took office, promised that linguistic provinces would be established; but what is it actually doing now? It has been in office for nearly five years and yet it has not brought into being a single linguistic province. It brings forward excuse after excuse. The first excuse it gives is that the formation of linguistic provinces will lead to the encouragement of provincialism. This is what the President has also said in his Address. And thus the Congress goes back on its pledge of establishing linguistic provinces. The second excuse that it gives is that there is no unity in those provinces where there is a demand for linguistic provinces. Take a concrete example, that of Andhra. There being the question of Madras City, there being the opinions of certain individuals that Rayalaseema people do not want Andhra Province, they say that Andhra Province cannot be established because there is no unity. This is the same thing which British imperialism did. They trotted out the same excuse and threw the blame on the people by saying that unity did not exist and conveniently pursued their policy of divide and rule.

Then, the other argument is that the units are not viable units. It is a fantastic argument, coming from the Government. If small States like Part C States—Himachal Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh and so on—can be recognised as States, there is no reason why Andhra cannot be established as a State. So, this argument that it must be a viable State cannot be brought forward at all.

Then, another argument which has been brought forward is that the Rajpramukhs are there whom we cannot remove. In Hyderabad, for instance, the Congress Government gave a promise that it would be for the people of Hyderabad, through their Constituent Assembly, to decide the

fate of the Nizam, the Rajpramukh of Hyderabad, and also the question of the division of Hyderabad State. But what did they do actually? They have kept the Rajpramukh, and they pay him Rs. 1 crore, and they deny the right of Hyderabad people, consisting of Telugu, Karnatak and Maharashtra people, to go back to their home-lands. Why is it that they are doing this, especially now, after the elections? They are refusing to form the Visala Andhra Province for the simple reason that the democratic forces there are victorious. They know fully well that Andhra State.....

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): May we know on what particular amendment the hon. Member is speaking? It will be helpful to us if we know on what amendment he is speaking.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am speaking generally.

After the elections, they are refusing to form a Visala Andhra State because they know fully well that if a Visala Andhra State consisting of Madras City, Andhra districts and Telangana is formed, there will be no Congress Government, but there will be a people's Government. (*An hon. Member* : Question!) It is for this reason that they are refusing to concede the demand for a separate province for Andhra.

Now, what is the result? The result is that all the Andhra projects, e.g., Siddeswaram and Nandi Konda, which would have solved the food problem of Andhra in Rayalaseema, Mahboobnagar, and Nalgonda districts—all these projects have been shelved. The Ramapadasagar and Ramagundam projects have been shelved. And added to this, the one thing which would unify Andhra economy—the railway system—is being disrupted and divided into three different zones. Similarly, the Minister for Communications at one time said that the Hyderabad postal system would be linked up with Bezawada. Later on, because it would encourage

the Visala Andhra movement, he purposely removed it from Bezawada and linked it up with Nagpur Circle. This is the way in which the Congress Government has been going back on its promise of linguistic provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there an Andhra railway system?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: In Hyderabad itself, the question of Andhra Province is, of course, linked up with other linguistic provinces—Maharashtra, Karnatak and Kerala. It is a very easy thing, if the Government really makes up its mind, to detach Malabar from Madras and attach it to Travancore-Cochin. It is a very easy thing, if the Government makes up its mind, and does not think of excuses to get out of the situation, to form a Karnatak Province by taking the Karnatak districts from Bombay and Hyderabad and linking them up with Mysore. It is easy to do it; only the Government refuses to do it.

Then, with regard to Rajpramukhs, the Government could certainly bring amendments and see that the Rajpramukh system is removed. The people do not want Rajpramukhs, but the Government of India forces them on the people. Take a concrete example. In Hyderabad the Indian Army intervened in 1948 on the plea that they were going to put down Razakar atrocities which were encouraged by the Rajpramukh. But what did they actually do? They are still keeping the Rajpramukh there; they are still paying Rs. 1 crore; and they are taking away the right of the free people of Hyderabad State to unify themselves.

When the Razakars and the Hyderabad Rajpramukh were being fought, at that time the Indian Government, according to the Standstill Agreement, supplied arms and took the responsibility of putting down the so-called subversive activities. That means those people were fighting against the Nizam, and in spite of this indirect

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

help given by the Congress Government, the Nizam and his Razakars and his army could not suppress them. They established their Village Panchayat Committees, got rid of the corrupt official rule in the villages, got rid of the landlord *zulum* there. From the very moment the Indian armies have entered, they began to hunt and wipe out everything. In the village of Chirakodur, Venkata Ramanujachari a local organiser was detained. In Huzur Nagar taluka one kisan who refused to give the police secrets was caught, tied hand and foot and his whole body was smeared with jaggery and tied to an ant hill. He was kept for three days like that when ultimately he lost his life eaten by the ants. Now, in one military camp Allapalli alone in four days 119 people and workers have been shot dead.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, on a point of order. The Member is making use of this floor for Communist propaganda. It is alright to state that Government is following an oppressive policy. One or two instances I should think are quite enough. But he is giving instance after instance. That is not to be permitted, Sir.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Mr. Chairman, will you kindly protect the rights of Members? If we have got a right to speak, we must speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All that I want to say is that we have not got much time at our disposal.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am giving the most horrible examples only.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, is there any time restriction?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If people do not impose any restraint on themselves, I have to impose. So, first of all, I expect the people to restrict their speeches.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, how much time am I to be allowed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 15 minutes.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. When the Congress speaker moved the motion he spoke for an hour and a half and the Congress has an advantage of all kinds of publicity. We have come here after so many years. We should therefore be given a fair chance to speak and given enough time to speak from the side of the Opposition and the Congress Members here would have their chances of speaking later after we have ventilated the public opinion here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so far as speeches on this motion are concerned, I want to impose a time limit of 15 minutes for every Member. Unless we do that, many speakers won't get a chance at all. So 15 minutes are fixed as the time limit.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, two lakhs of Koya people were forcibly dragged from their abodes and put in concentration camps as a result of which ten thousand people died of starvation and for want of medical aid. Sir, 1000 villages were burnt to drag the people from there. The villages I am talking of are still there in being. You can go and see. Then in Narada village the atrocities committed on women are terrible. 70 women were arrested. They were made naked and beaten and then afterwards forced to wear pyjamas and chameleons let into the pyjamas.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Are these all proved facts? You must be able to give fuller information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I must say that each individual member who makes a statement and refers to a fact is responsible for the statements he makes and he must satisfy himself that they are accurate before he gives expression to them.

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI: Sir, the instances quoted by the hon. Member are of a particular State. No doubt, in so far as it is germane to the question of the formation

of the linguistic provinces, it may be relevant to that subject but he cannot raise the question relating to the public order which is primarily a subject for the State Government. The Government of India are not primarily responsible for the public order in the State of Hyderabad. Therefore, it would be perfectly a proper subject of the State Government but not of the Central Legislature as such. That is my point, Sir.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : My submission is that it has been done in the State before even the Provincial Assembly came into existence and was done under the direct orders of the administrators sent from here by the Government of India. Therefore, the point that I am pressing is quite germane to the subject. Now, after all these things have been done, still the Government refuses to release 250 detenus. There are 700 prisoners (undertrials) and warrants on 500 persons are still there. We want the Government, if it really wants to start a new era in democratic experiment in the country, to release all these prisoners and take steps to see that what has happened under the police and military, will not recur.

Now the Government seems to think that it has attained complete independence. But what we say is that it is not complete independence. For it is linked with the British Commonwealth. It still continues to be a part of the British Commonwealth and it allows Nepalese to be recruited in the British imperialist army and this army goes to Malaya to suppress our Asian peoples' freedom. The Government claims an independent foreign policy. I am asking : Is it an independent foreign policy to keep British officers to dominate our services ? Is it an independent policy to allow American advisers, in the name of advisers, to parade in all our economic and industrial departments ? Is it independent foreign policy to allow, under the garb of the U.N., officers to spy in Kashmir on our military secrets and other things ? I do not think so. Is it independent foreign policy to send a Medical Mission to Korea to support the Americans

while refusing even to oppose Americans bombing Korean people and letting loose germ warfare.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is up.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I will sit down. Other speakers will take it up.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay):

श्रीमती लीलावती मुशी (बम्बई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा होने के कारण मैं हिन्दी भाषा में बोलने की कोशिश कर रही हूँ और मेरे भाषण के बीच जो कोई त्रुटियाँ हों, वह मैं आशा करती हूँ कि मेरे हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी सदस्यगण उनके लिये मुझे क्षमा करेंगे।

माननीय चमन लाल ने जो प्रस्ताव आज सबेरे पेश किया उसका समर्थन करने के लिये मैं यहाँ खड़ी हुई हूँ। जैसा उन्होंने और बेगम रसूल साहिबा ने कहा कि राष्ट्रपति का भाषण समस्त राष्ट्रीय व अन्तराष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियों पर एक विहंगम दृष्टि डालता है, यह बात सच है और यह भी उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा है कि आज हम एक स्वतंत्र देश की हैसियत से सब महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों पर मिल कर विचार करते हैं और अपना स्वतंत्र निर्णय करते हैं और हमारा देश उन्नति के पथ पर बड़ी तेजी से आगे जा रहा है। हम सचमुच एक स्वतंत्र देश के निवासी हैं और हम अपने भाग्य के विधाता स्वयं बने हैं।

एक बात जो राष्ट्रपति जी ने कही, वह मुझे बड़ी अच्छी लगी। उन्होंने कहा कि आज संसार शान्ति का भूखा है और जो नीतिज्ञ यहाँ शान्ति ला सकेंगे वह एक ऐसे भारी और भयावह बोझ को दूर कर देंगे जो आज संसार के करोड़ों लोगों के मन को व्यथित कर रहा है। यह ठीक है कि सभी को शान्ति चाहिये, मगर दुर्भाग्य से

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

हरएक की शान्ति की व्याख्या अपनी अलग अलग हैं और सब की व्याख्या एक नहीं है। दुनिया में छोटे-बड़े देश दोनों हैं। बड़े देश शान्ति चाहते हैं लेकिन उनकी शान्ति का अर्थ दीन और छोटे देशों पर सवारी करना होता है। छोटे देश भी शान्ति चाहते हैं, अपनी निजी रक्षा के लिये। बलवान देश और ज्यादा बलवान बनने के लिये अपना बल बढ़ाये जाते हैं ताकि कोई उनकी शान्ति भंग न कर सके। इसके खिलाफ जो निर्बल देश हैं वे यह चाहते हैं कि बलवान देश और ज्यादा बलवान न बनें ताकि उन की, उन जैसे निर्बलों को कुचलने की लालसा जाग न उठे। सारे—क्या छोटे क्या बड़े—सभी शान्ति चाहते हैं, मगर हरएक अपनी अपनी व्यवस्था को बढ़ाना चाहता है, चाहे वह साम्यवाद की व्यवस्था हो या पूंजीवाद की व्यवस्था हो। सब शान्ति चाहते हैं, मगर आजकल दुनिया में कार्रवाइयां ऐसी हो रही हैं जिनसे शान्ति के लिये रास्ता साफ नहीं होता है और यह शान्ति ऐसी निर्बल सी मालूम पड़ती है जैसे कोई आदमी मृगतृष्णा के पीछे पीछे दौड़ता है और उसकी तृष्णा बुझती नहीं है, ठीक उसी प्रकार आज सारी मानवता आकुल होकर शान्ति की खोज में दौड़ती है और शान्ति आगे आगे भागती जाती है। राष्ट्र-पति जी ने ठीक ही कहा कि इस जमाने में भी ऐसे देश हैं जो अपने यहां हिन्दियों को अपने से अलग सा रखते हैं और उनको अछूत समझते हैं और अपनी जाति, धर्म और रंग दूसरों से श्रेष्ठ समझकर वे दूसरों पर अधिकार करना चाहते हैं। हमारे कई पड़ोसी देश हैं, जो हमारे मित्र कहलाते हैं लेकिन उनका हिन्दियों की ओर वर्तान्व अमैत्री से भरपूर है।

उन्होंने युनाइटेड नेशन का भी उल्लेख किया। आज तो युनाइटेड नेशन एक

डिवाइडेड नेशन कही जा सकती है, ऐसा मैं मानती हूँ। ऐसा होते हुए भी हम लोग आशा करते हैं कि दुनिया में शान्ति की स्थापना होगी। जाति, कौम और आदमी-आदमी जुदा नहीं समझे जायेंगे और ऊंच-नीच का भी ख्याल नहीं किया जायेगा।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने हमारी अन्न की समस्या के बारे में भी बहुत अच्छा चित्र खींचा है। इस साल हमारे पास काफी अनाज है। खूब चीनी भी है, नमक भी है, जूट भी है और रुई भी है। इतने अमेन्डमेन्ट सुनते हुए भी मैं कहती हूँ कि आज हमारे देश की स्थिति बड़ी अच्छी है और ऐसी अच्छी रीति से सफल हो रही है कि मैं इसके लिये सरकार को बधाई देती हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में हिन्दू कोड बिल के बारे में भी कहा। हम सब स्त्रियों को यह जानकर खुशी होगी कि इसके लिए सरकार एक नया कानून बना रही है और वह नया कानून अलग-अलग विभागों में रखा जायेगा जिससे वह बहुत आसान हो जायेगा। आप लोग जानते हैं कि हमारे बम्बई में सन् १९४६ ई० से मोनोगमी और डाइवोर्स अलग-अलग रीति से पास हुआ है। आज बम्बई के इलाके में एक बहु पत्नि विवाह का निषेध हो गया है। मैं समझती हूँ कि अलग-अलग विभाग लाकर, स्त्रियों को हमारी सरकार बहुत सा फायदा पहुंचा सकती है। इसके लिये मैं सरकार से यह बात कहूंगी कि हम सब इस देश की स्त्रियां हिन्दू कोड बिल को पास कराने के लिये बहुत उत्सुक हैं। जैसे पहिले लेबर सरकार की जीत स्त्रियों के वोट से हुई थी उसी रीति से इस समय कांग्रेस सरकार का अधिकार लाने में, मैं समझती हूँ कि

स्त्रियों का बड़ा हिस्सा है। इसके अधिकार में आने के बाद हम सब देश की स्त्रिया आशा करती हैं कि हमारी सरकार इस हक को दिलाने में संकुचित भावना नहीं दिखलायेगी।

एक दूसरी बात राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में साम्प्रदायिकता की दीवार, प्रान्तीयता की दीवार, जातिभेद की दीवार को खत्म कर देने की कही। अगर उसको खत्म करने की बात है तो वह एक भाषा है जो इस चीज को जल्दी से खत्म कर सकती है। हमारी सरकार ने एक भाषा के लिये क्या किया? राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में इस के बारे में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया। हमारे विधान में यह दिया गया है कि हिन्दी १५ साल के बाद राष्ट्रभाषा पूरे तौर से बन जायेगी। पन्द्रह में से तीन साल तो खत्म हो गये हैं मगर हिन्दी की प्रगति के लिये इन तीन सालों में हमारी सरकार ने क्या काम किया है? यह प्रश्न मैं समझती हूँ कि इस सभा में बहुत से लोगों के मन में होगा। हाँ, एक समिति बनाई गई है और आज जो रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने रखी गई है उससे मालूम होता है कि हिन्दी के विकास के लिये सिर्फ तीन लाख रुपया खर्च किया जाने वाला है। अगर इतने बड़े सवाल में इतनी धीरे प्रगति होगी तो मुझे डर है कि हम १५ साल के भीतर भी हिन्दी को अपनी राष्ट्रभाषा बना नहीं सकेंगे। राष्ट्रभाषा का सवाल एक बड़ा सवाल है और इसको इस तरह से नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये। पुराने जमाने में संस्कृत से ही हमारी एकता रही है। जब अंग्रेज यहाँ पर थे तो उनके हथियारों और अंग्रेजी भाषा से हमारी एकता रही। अब तो अंग्रेज चले गये हैं और अंग्रेजी भाषा भी जाने लगी है इसलिये देश को एकता में रखने के लिये कोई न कोई चीज ऐसी होना चाहिये जो देश

को एकता के सूत्र में बांध सके। मैं समझती हूँ कि हिन्दी ही एक ऐसी भाषा है जो इस कार्य को पूरा कर सकती है। अगर हम ने हिन्दी भाषा को अच्छी तरह से नहीं अपनाया तो हमारे देश के टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो जायेंगे।

लिंग्विस्टिक प्राविन्स के बारे में अभी हमारे एक भाई ने कहा कि यह जरूर होना चाहिये। इससे पहिले ही हमें सारे देश की एकता को सरल और ठीक बनाना होगा। अगर हम देश का विभाजन भाषा के आधार पर करेंगे तो इससे हमको बहुत नुकसान होगा। एक भाषा के अभाव से हमारे यहाँ सारे देश में सांस्कृतिक सामंजस्य नहीं होगा और इससे देश की एकता बड़े खतरे में पड़ जायेगी।

एक दूसरा एतराज भी है। वह यह है कि जो संस्थाएँ हिन्दी के विकास के लिए काम कर रही हैं उनको मान्यता क्यों नहीं दी जा रही है। जो संस्था अच्छा काम कर रही है उसको अलग रखने की कोशिश क्यों की जाती है और इस तरह की खीचातानी में क्यों पड़ा जा रहा है। जिन संस्थाओं ने कई सालों से हिन्दी के बारे में कोशिश की है और जो अब भी करती जा रही हैं उनको सरकार को मान्यता देनी चाहिये, ऐसी मेरी प्रार्थना है। इसके लिये मैं सोचती हूँ कि हिन्दी की उन्नति के लिये हम सब लोगों को हर प्रकार के प्रयत्न करने चाहिये। इस क्षेत्र में सबकी सहायता लेनी चाहिये। दोनों हाउसों की एक कमेटी बनाई जाय जिससे कि हमें हिन्दी भाषा को आगे बढ़ाने के प्रोग्राम में सहायता मिले।

मेरा कर्त्तव्य है कि मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण का अनुमोदन करूँ और मैं यह आशा करती हूँ कि इस में जो बातें उचित हैं उनको मान लिया जायेगा। हमारी बहिन बेगम एजाज रसूल ने जो बातें कही हैं मैं भी उनकी

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
 ततो से सहमत हूँ कि फूड मूवमेंट में जो
 रैसट्रिक्शन रखे गये हैं वह दूर कर दिये
 जायें ।

इन शब्दों के साथ श्री दीवान चमनलाल
 जी ने जो प्रस्ताव राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण
 के लिये रखा है मैं उससे सहमति प्रगट
 करती हूँ ।

[For English translation, see Appen-
 dix I, Annexure No. 4.]

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, before
 I proceed with the discussion, I would
 like you to permit me to mention that
 you have allowed me to move a very
 big and comprehensive amendment,
 and I expect that you would be more
 liberal, so far as this amendment is
 concerned. Of course I leave it to you,
 Sir.

Before I came to Delhi, I expected
 and had heard that the Presidential
 Address is to be a statement of policy
 by the Government. I heard with all
 attention to the President when he was
 addressing us the other day. And then
 I went home and read through the
 Address. Again, here, today I heard
 with all attention to the mover, and I
 hoped that he would be able to inject
 some substance into this. But I find,
 Sir, that this surpasses the other vague
 document that was inflicted on this
 country six months ago—the Congress
 manifesto. I thought that this would
 be an important and clear statement of
 policy, as it ought to be. But I find
 there is nothing in it except one re-
 actionary statement of policy, namely,
re: the Preventive Detention Act. Apart
 from that, I do not see anything which
 the Government has to offer to this
 country, which it says it rules today for
 the prosperity of this country.

Going through this document, I find
 that apart from even an attitude, the
 Government is being forced from side
 to side. It is trying to serve conflicting
 interests not only at home but also out-
 side the country at one and the same
 time. I think that this is an impossibi-
 lity which no individual body or even

a Government would be able to
 achieve.

For the edification of the Govern-
 ment, may I re-tell a story which my
 mother told me when I was six years
 old ? There was a middle-aged man
 who was partly grey. As he did not
 have any children, he married again.
 The first wife was afraid that people
 would think she had married a young
 man, as he still had some black hair.
 So she started plucking off the black
 hair. The young second wife naturally
 thought that her friends would jeer at
 her and say that her husband was an
 old man because of the grey hair. So
 she started plucking off the grey hair.
 You can imagine the state of that
 person's head after this. That is what
 exactly this Government is trying to do.
 Government may call it *laissez faire*.
 It may call it neutrality. But it is
 really not even an attitude, because they
 will never be able to please everybody.
 So far as the foreign policy is concerned,
 we had a very charming and eloquent
 argument from the mover of this motion.
 He tried to tell the House that we have
 a policy. I tried to follow him, I tried
 to seek information from him. But
 I believe the brief given to the hon.
 Member who moved this motion was
 much too big even for himself, because
 I find that he was not able to put before
 the House any indication of a definite
 statement of policy so far as foreign
 affairs are concerned. I should like
 to submit, Sir, that on no occasion,
 have I found the Government or the
 Foreign Minister leave any impression
 on our international scene on behalf of
 this country. I find that we have been
 acting alternately as the hand-maiden
 of one bloc or the other. You will find,
 Sir, that we take an attitude one day in
 a certain situation in the world. Afraid
 that some one will criticize us that we
 have joined this bloc, immediately,
 we go over to the other bloc. That is
 the policy of neutrality which we have
 been following. Every time you find
 us siding with one bloc or the other.
 Even in this document which is cleverly
 drafted—I did not expect so much of
 cleverness from a draftsman, who, I
 think, must be getting a little old—
 even here I find there is something

about Korea, and it is mentioned that peace should come there, meaning thereby that something dreadful is happening there. Taken in the light of the attitude that this Government had taken on the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, people would criticize and say—already some of our hon. Members have drawn our attention to the fact that we have been supporting the American bloc, or whatever it might be called, in Korea. So, in paragraph 8 we find a mention about Korea.

In paragraph 10 we find a mention about China. It is said : "We have sent a cultural and friendship delegation to China". This is how we have been going on. I should like to put before you, Sir, that the need in the world today is for the development of a third force, a force which would be able to act independently of the two blocs. Today you find that the nations of the world are divided into two distinct entities, or if I may so term them, the Brahmin nations and the Pariah nations. Four nations of the world who contain only one-third of humanity in their countries, are dictating to the others, and are making the other 70 nations of the world their puppets and victims in this disgraceful scene of world politics. It was up to India to have taken the lead of the 70 nations, to have seen that we develop a third force which would not have allowed these blocs in their attempts to divide the world into two spheres of influence constantly at cold war with each other. We thought we made a very good start in 1947, when we had an Asian Relations Conference. Our Minister for Foreign Affairs took a leading part and initiated that conference. But I should like to know what happened to his experiment ; nothing has happened, it did not go farther than some pictures, cinematographs and some publicity of that sort.

So at least now, we should make an attempt to come forward and say that we will develop a third force which would see that these two blocs are kept in their proper places and do not make this world a place of bloody conflicts.

I tried to find out from the speech of the mover where we have acted as a force. As I said, we acted as a negative force. Our Government is pursuing a policy of reaction and not action. They never act. They react to a situation. They wait for a situation to arise and then try to meet it. I have not found one instance where this Government, either in the foreign or in the domestic field acting in anticipation of a situation—acting against a situation that may arise. It has always tried to act to meet the situation after it has arisen.

Now, regarding the U. N. O., the President has rightly said that it has become ineffective so far as Tunisia is concerned. Not only Tunisia, but we know several other examples where the U. N. O. has become ineffective. The make-up of the United Nations Organisation has to be changed. In the executive of the U. N. O., the Security Council, you find just these five powers, in whom 85 per cent. of the power is concentrated. The continents of Asia, Africa, South Africa and South East Asia enjoy only 15 per cent. of the power. We represent 2/3rds of humanity and yet we find that this 1/3rd, which is divided into two distinct blocs—much of the time warring, all the time in direct conflict with each other—is leading us. The world politics are dictated according to their interests.

It should have been possible to see to this when the United Nations Charter was drafted. Probably we should have tried to move an amendment afterwards to see that every nation had an equal vote in this august Assembly. If you understand the make-up of the United Nations you will find that the U.K., America, France, Russia and whichever China gets in ultimately—these five nations have all the power against the combined strength of all the other nations which are really not interested in this conflict between these two blocs. Regarding Tunisia, if I may be permitted, I will read out from a letter from Mr. Taieb Slim, who is one of the leaders of the Tunisian

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

Destour Party. He has written a letter to Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia which was received only two days ago. He writes in the course of this letter :

In all this struggle, whether inside Tunisia or abroad, we have been conscious of the great support brought to our cause by the Government and the people of India, and particularly by you and your party. The great campaign waged by you throughout the country has brought an inspiration and encouragement to our people behind the bars of concentration camps, etc.

Further, towards the end of the letter' he says :

We need material assistance. You also impress on your Government to see that a Commission of Enquiry is sent down to Tunisia to find out the real things that are happening there and see whether world opinion is brought towards the sympathy of Tunisia.

In Tunisia, as also elsewhere, in the whole of Africa, the same thing is happening. If we do not take intelligent stock of the situation in the African continent, you will find that just as in Indo-China, all other forces except these two conflicting forces would be exterminated from Africa. You see one side alone and I the other side. Each bloc sees only its own side. It is just disgraceful. You find massacres going on in Madagascar, Algeria, Tunis, Gold Coast, etc. I shall not stop with that. There are other cases also.

Now, I would like the Government to give me a reply on this question. What was the report submitted about China some months ago to the Government ? It tells us about mass executions and waves of trials throughout the country. Why is it that the Government has not placed that report before the people of this country ? What is it that they are hiding ? Are we not entitled to know the real situation in China ? Are we going to be prevented from knowing what is going on in that country ? If in China there is milk and honey flowing, we want to know the truth about it, whichever that country may be. I would ask the Government to lay on the Table the report submitted by Shri G. P. Hathee Singh after his visit to China. We have a right to know about it.

You find that ordinary human rights are being abused, and yet, the United Nations, which has the power of superintendence, has nothing to say about it, because, if you ask one bloc, they will probably say the other bloc is doing the same thing. I should like to tell you that only the United Nations can keep these two blocs in check and for that it is necessary for a third force to exist in the world. In our country we may say it is neutrality. It is not neutrality. As I have already said, it is a ball game the ball going from this side to that and then coming back. There should be a sort of equity and justice between the two sides.

As some hon. Members ought to know, in all countries the foreign policy is bi-partisan, so that a continuity of policy is maintained whatever Government comes in. In this country we find that not even the party in power is allowed to contribute towards the foreign policy. That policy—that attitude, if I may say so—it would be euphemism to call it a policy—that attitude is of one single individual, an individual who thinks he is omniscient, but if I may say so, a very ill-informed person on foreign affairs—it may come as a shock. He should not mind it. I may be guilty of the greatest blasphemy, but I find that our foreign Minister.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : No reflections on individuals, please.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Our worthy Foreign Minister does not appreciate criticism. It is not the policy of this country. It is not the policy of even the ruling Party.

AN HON. MEMBER : He represents the country.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : This is a wonder. If hon. Members know anything of foreign affairs, they should examine the situation. In other countries the foreign policy of a country is the foreign policy of all parties put together. It is not the policy of any one single party, much less the policy of a single individual.

AN HON. MEMBER : There is no other party.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Oh, yes : that exactly is my complaint against the powers that be. They tell us in this House that there is no other party. And no wonder it has got into their heads that they are the people who are born in heaven and who are meant to rule throughout their lives, and probably pass it on to their children. (*Interruption*). It should, as I said, be the policy of the country.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) : On a point of clarification. Is it not a fact that the Socialist Party Conventions, in Bangalore and Madras fully endorsed the foreign policy of Nehru ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Nonsense. Most of the hon. Members are ill-informed about our foreign policy, and I shall go on.

Regarding foreign possessions, hon. Members will remember that our Foreign Minister called them "pimples" on the face of India. Probably the Foreign Minister does not know that pimples are very annoying, and very difficult to get rid of, as most of the hon. Members will certainly agree. Since 1947 very high-power centres of vested interests have been created in these foreign possessions. If you take a plebiscite today in any of these foreign possessions, you will find they will vote against you, because they have seen to the creation of high-power centres of vested interests. If you are prepared with determination to see that these pockets, which rightly belong to us—it is our soil and no one has any business to be there—if you go about it with determination, there will be no difficulty whatever for you. (*Interruption*). Please allow me to proceed.

Sir, two or three years ago the people of these pockets put up a very good fight and they very nearly succeeded in expelling foreign influence from some parts. What did the Government do ? What did the party in power do ? Did they give timely assistance ? No. Such situation will arise again, and it is the duty of the Government to see that assistance is given to the people who

are trying their best to see that foreign influence is finally exterminated from a part of our own soil.

As regards the food policy, I do not know whether I will be given enough time, but I may just say this. It came as a shock to me to hear the phraseology used in the President's Address with regard to food subsidies. The Address says :

The contraction of the food subsidy has contributed in some measure to those high prices, and has caused some distress and discontent in rationed areas.

Sir, the Government and the party in power are so far removed from the people that they do not understand how much suffering has been caused in this country because of the withdrawal of food subsidies. If they want figures, I will give them. An ordinary middle class family earning Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 has got to pay another Rs. 12 to Rs. 15 for its food. And I have proof to show that in rationed areas, ordinarily in the fourth week, people did not draw their rations. After the increase in food prices, I am saying definitely, with a certain amount of conviction and a sense of responsibility, that they will not be able to buy their third week's rations. And here is the statement by Government that the contraction of the food subsidy has caused a certain amount of distress and discontent in rationed areas. It shows how ill-informed they are, or they are purposefully ignorant of conditions. Is it only in rationed areas ? Do they not know that in the rural areas about 50 to 60 per cent. of the people buy their food grains ? Do they know that there are wage earners in the rural areas who do not grow their own food ? Do they also know that the tenant who cultivates land for the landlord, after giving away the grain and also the interest to the zamindar-cum-shahukar, finds that he has hardly six months' provision of grain and that he has to buy in the normal market, which is the black market, and which is very nearly the official market today ? And you make a statement like that—that it has caused "some" distress to only "rationed" areas !

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

I have only one constructive suggestion to make. I am always accused of being a destructively critical person. "destructive criticism", "constructive suggestion"—these are slogans which we have to learn. Let me make a constructive suggestion. I am not going to propose taxation, that a burden should be placed on shoulders that can bear them. I am not even going to propose that the proportion of direct to indirect taxes, which ought to have been increasing but instead is decreasing—should be changed. I do not make any such suggestion. So far as the State of Mysore is concerned, regardless of party affiliations, I am prepared to find you the money—a minimum of Rs. 1 crore. I hope my hon. friends from Mysore belonging to other parties will all support me in assisting the people of Mysore. Sir, up to the year 1949 the income-tax in Mysore was ridiculously low compared to what it was outside. But even this little tax was not paid by the people—and we know that to day scores of people there are worth a crore of rupees. Allow us to assist you to see that this money, which really belongs to the State coffers, is collected. It is yours for the taking. Come and take it. That is my constructive suggestion. One crore of rupees is there, and you can give it to Mysore State, you can do the same in any other State, and the suffering of the people of Mysore would be greatly mitigated. I should be interested to know the reply of the Government to this constructive criticism.

3.48 p.m.

DR. RAGHU VIRA (Madhya Pradesh):

डा० रघुवीर (मध्य प्रदेश) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सभा में राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का अनुमोदन करते हुए मुझे आज बड़ा हर्ष है। यह बात सच है कि, राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में क्रान्तिकारी बातें नहीं आईं। जिस बात की आशा हमारे नौ-जवान करते थे, वे बातें इसमें नहीं आईं। किन्तु देश के शासन के लिये जो नित्य शाश्वत

नियम हैं, अहिंसा और सत्य, जिन के आधार पर महात्मा गांधी ने हमारे नये राष्ट्र की नींव डाली, उन नियमों का इस में अच्छी प्रकार से प्रतिपादन किया गया है। इन के आधार पर हमारी पर-राष्ट्र नीति का निर्माण हुआ है। किन्तु कांग्रेस से बाहर के जो सज्जन यहां बैठे हैं, उन्हें ही नहीं, कांग्रेस वालों को भी यह कठिनाई पड़ती है कि विदेशों के साथ हम क्या नीति रखें। यह कठिनाई हमारे दूसरे पक्ष के मित्रों की ही नहीं, यह कठिनाई हम लोगों को भी है, हमें इसको इकट्ठा मिलकर समझना है। जो कुछ आज हमारे दूसरे पक्ष के मित्रों ने कहा, मैंने उनको ध्यानपूर्वक सुना। मैं उन व्यक्तियों में से नहीं हूँ कि यह बात विपक्ष की ओर से कही गई है, इसलिये उसका खंडन करना आवश्यक है। ऐसी बात नहीं है। जो बातें कही गई हैं उनके प्रतिपादन में तथ्य हैं। किन्तु राष्ट्रपति जी को जो हम अपनी वृत्तवत्ता प्रगट करने के लिये यहां प्रस्ताव रख रहे हैं, उस वृत्तवत्ता प्रस्ताव को पास करने में कठिनाई क्यों होनी चाहिये? मैं मानता हूँ कि भाषा के आधार पर प्रांतों का बनाना हमारे लिये आवश्यक है, क्योंकि जब हमें अपने देश की भाषा को, अपनी शिक्षा और अपने शासन का माध्यम बनाना है, उसके लिये भाषा के आधार पर प्रांतों का बनाना अति आवश्यक है। किन्तु प्रश्न समय का है। प्रांतों का बनाना सिद्धान्तरूप से मान लिया गया है और इसका सरकार ने भी स्वीकार कर लिया है, केवल समय की देरी है।

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : You said you wanted time. How many years do you want ?

DR. RAGHU VIRA :

डा० रघुवीर : मैं कुछ नहीं बता सकता। यह प्रश्न शासन के लिये है और संसद भी शासन

की कठिनाई का है। यह प्रश्न उन प्रान्तों के रहने वाले व्यक्तियों का है। यदि एक ही बात को एक प्रान्त के सब लोग मान लेते हैं तो कोई कठिनाई मार्ग में कहीं पर नहीं आती। किन्तु कठिनाई इस बात की है कि जनता क्या चाहती है। एक ही प्रान्त में इस प्रकार के लोग विद्यमान हैं जो कि विभाजन को पसन्द नहीं करते। यदि हम गांधी जी के प्रतिपादित अहिंसा और सत्य के मार्ग को नहीं अपनाते, जिसके द्वारा हमने इस देश को स्वतन्त्र किया, तो यह शासन के लिये अच्छी नीति नहीं होगी। हमारे शासन को जनता की इच्छा को मानना होगा। वह उसके ऊपर कोई वस्तु बलात्कार नहीं लादता। हमारा शासन यत्न कर रहा है कि जनता को वह सब सुविधायें दे और कोई नई समस्या खड़ी न की जाय। जो समस्या हल की जाय वह सदा के लिये की जाय और प्रेमपूर्वक हल की जाय। अब यह नीति की बात है कि हम सत्य और अहिंसा और समझौते के आधार पर अपनी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति और अपनी शासन की नीति को बनाते हैं अथवा हम इसके विपरीत आधार पर अपनी नीति को खड़ा करते हैं।

मेरे मित्र ने भोजन की समस्या को कुछ बातें कही। इस सम्बन्ध में, मैं यह सोचता हूँ और हम यहां देखते हैं कि थोड़ा सा समझने में भेद है। शासन भी वही बात चाहता है जो हमारे विपक्ष के सज्जन। क्या वे यह कह सकेंगे कि शासन की यह मन्शा है कि लोग भूख मरें? क्या वे यह कह सकेंगे कि शासन की यह मन्शा है कि लोगों को भोजन न मिले, समय पर न मिले, पर्याप्त न मिले? शासन अपनी ओर से पूरा प्रयत्न कर रहा है कि इस देश में कोई भी भूख से न मरे। मेरे मित्र ने

जो कुछ भी सम्भावना से सुझाव दिये हैं मुझे आशा है कि हमारे शासन-प्रधिकारी इन पर विचार करेंगे, ध्यान देंगे और कोई न कोई उपाय निकालेंगे जिससे कि हमारी अन्न की समस्या पूर्ण होगी और यह देश पहिले के समान सन्तुष्टिशीली बन जायेगा।

मैं यहां अपने पक्ष वालों के लिये या शासन के लिये स्तोत्र पढ़ने के लिये खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूँ। मैं भी जानता हूँ कि जनता जितनी शासन से आशा करती है उतनी उसकी आशा शासन पूरी नहीं कर रहा है। किन्तु जिस स्थिति पर इस समय शासन है यदि उस शासन के आप या मैं भी अधिकारी होते तो हम भी जनता की सब आशाओं को पूरा न कर सकते।

अपने देश की नीति और स्थिति के बारे में जितना ज्ञान और अनुभव मुझे यहां पर रहने से नहीं हुआ उतना मुझे विदेशों में जाने से प्रतीति और अनुभव हुआ है। मैंने विदेशों में कोई भी ऐसा शासन अधिकारी और विदेश मंत्री नहीं देखा जिसने हमारे देश की स्थिति और उसकी नीति के बारे में मुझे बधाई न दी हो। इंग्लैंड के बड़े बड़े व्यक्तियों ने भी इस देश की प्रशंसा की है। मैं यहां पर किसी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। वे लोग उत्तरदायी व्यक्ति हैं जो पहिले भारतवर्ष में रह चुके हैं, जिनका पहिले कभी भी कांग्रेस से किसी प्रकार का सहयोग न था। उन लोगों ने स्पष्ट रूप से यह प्रगट किया कि जिस रीति से पंडित नेहरू और सरदार पटेल ने शासन का कार्यभार उठाया, वे इसके लिये बर्बाद के पात्र हैं। इन लोगों ने राज्य को सम्भाला और देश की स्थिति को सम्भाला। देश में इतना रक्तपात होते हुए भी उनकी आंखें नहीं बंदने दिया। देश में युद्ध के बादल मंडलाते रहे किन्तु उनकी आंखें नहीं बंदने

[Dr. Raghu Vira.]

दिया, उनकी रोक दिया। इन सब बातों के लिये वे हमारे देश के शासकों को बधाई देते हैं। यदि हम भारतवर्ष के शासन की संसार के किसी अन्य शासन से तुलना करते हैं, जैसा कि इण्डोचाइना से तुलना, बर्मा से तुलना, फ्रांस से तुलना, हालैंड से तुलना और जर्मनी से तुलना। तो मैंने इन देशों का दो वर्षों से भ्रमण किया है और अच्छी प्रकार से अनुभव प्राप्त किया है। मैंने वहां शरणार्थियों की दशा भी देखी। अपने यहां के शरणार्थियों की दशा भी देखी। मैं भी शरणार्थी बन कर आया हूं। मैं भी उन मन्दभाग्य भाइयों में से एक हूं। मैं जानता हूं कि किसी ने अपने पिता को खोया, किसी ने माता को, किसी ने बहिन को, किसी ने भाई को, किसी ने लड़के-लड़की को, किसी ने पत्नी को, यहां तक कि बहुतों ने अपने परिवार का संहार होते अपनी आंखों से देखा। यह सब कुछ हम लोगों ने देखा और सहा। जब मैं बर्लिन में गया तो देखा कि आज भी प्रति दिन १५०, २०० व्यक्ति रात के समय, पुलिस की गोलियों से बचकर और कई प्रकार के कष्टों को झेल कर पश्चिमी बर्लिन में आ रहे हैं। उनकी दशा हमारे पंजाबी और बंगाली भाइयों से कोई अधिक भिन्न नहीं है। उनको न खाने को मिलता है और न पहनने को। उनकी अवस्था निःसंतान दयनीय है, दीनहीन है। यदि सहायता के लिये अमेरिका नहीं आता तो उनकी दशा असह्य होती। हमने शरणार्थियों की स्थिति का सम्भालने के लिये किसी देश से सहायता नहीं मांगी। न हमारी सहायता के लिये इंगलैंड वाले आये, न अमेरिका वाले आये, न रूस वाले आये और न चीन वाले आये। उस समय जिस रक्तपात का हम ने सामना किया और जिस प्रकार से हमने शरणार्थियों

की समस्या को सुलझाया उसके लिये हमें अपने आपको बधाई देनी चाहिये।

श्रीमान्, मुझे एक दो बातें विशेष रूप से कहनी हैं। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जो ने सून रूप से, बीज रूप से अपना भाषण दिया है वह भाष्य रूप में नहीं। उनके भाषण में सर्वसम-दृष्टि, कल्याण और हितबुद्धि है। उन्होंने भाषण विश्व में शान्ति की स्थापना की मंगल कामना के रूप में रक्खा है। मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि भारत संसार की उन्नति और संसार में शान्ति बनाये रखने में क्या कर रहा है। इंडोनीशिया की स्वतन्त्रता में भारत ने जो कंधा लगाया उसको मैं स्वयं डा० सुकर्ण के शब्दों में रखना चाहता था। किन्तु मुझे यहां उन के उद्घरण देने का अधिकार नहीं जब तक वह प्रकाशित रूप में न हो। मैं बर्मा के प्रेजिडेंट और प्राइम मिनिस्टर से मिला और उनके विचार अपने देश के बारे में जाने। वहां पर मुझे दिखाई पड़ा कि वे लोग हमारी ओर देखते हैं। और प्रतिदिन की घटनाओं पर जो हमारे शासन की प्रतिक्रियाएं हैं उसकी प्रतीक्षा करते हैं। इण्डोचाइना, अरब राष्ट्र, यहूदी और टूनीशिया वाले हमारी नीति को अपना पथप्रदर्शक मानते हैं। मुझे उच्च शासन के एक ऊंचे अधिकारी ने कहा कि यदि भारत समय पर इण्डोनीशिया की सहायता न करता तो आज हालैंड संसार में पददलित जाति न बनता। यदि भारत इण्डोनीशिया की सहायता नहीं करता तो आज वह एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र नहीं बन सकता। हमारे एक छोटे से वक्तव्य ने हमारे देश को संसार में उच्च स्थान तथा मान्यता दी है।

मैं दूसरे पक्षों की बातों का खंडन नहीं कर रहा हू। जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा

हैं मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारे शासन ने जितनी शीघ्रता से काम करना चाहिये था उतनी शीघ्रता से नहीं किया। किन्तु मैं यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जितना शासन का खंडन किया जा रहा है वह अतिशयोक्ति है।

एक बात भाषा के सम्बन्ध में। क्योंकि मैं भाषा का विद्यार्थी हूँ। हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी बन गई है किन्तु इसका यह अर्थ नहीं कि दूसरी भाषायें हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा नहीं। तमिल साहित्य मेरा साहित्य है, मेरे देश का साहित्य है। मलयालम हमारे देश का साहित्य है। हिन्दी वालों का परम धर्म है कि दूसरे साहित्यों को भी अपना साहित्य माने और उनको समझें। हमारे शिक्षा विभाग का परम कर्त्तव्य है कि बंगला में निविष्ट साहित्य, इसी प्रकार गुजराती में, मराठी में जो साहित्य है उसका ज्ञान और भारत की १३ भाषाएँ जो हमारे संविधान में रखी गयी हैं, उनका भी हमें ज्ञान कराये। अंग्रेजी जो इजरायली लोगों से यहां आयी है क्या हम उसके द्वारा अपनी भाषाओं को सरझे ? यह बात राष्ट्रप्रेमियों को सोचनी चाहिये। राष्ट्रप्रेम चाहता है कि हिन्दी में सब साहित्य मिले। एक भारतीय भाषा का साहित्य दूसरी भारतीय भाषा में नहीं मिलता। बंगाली साहित्य हिन्दी में नहीं। तेलुगू साहित्य भी हिन्दी में नहीं। इसी प्रकार से दूसरे प्रान्तों की भाषा का साहित्य भी हिन्दी में नहीं। हिन्दी को हमने राष्ट्रभाषा माना है किन्तु उसके लिये हमने क्या किया ? “ हिन्दी सर्वांग प्रथमा ” है। हिन्दी के साथ साथ दूसरी भाषाओं का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये और दूसरे साहित्य को भी पढ़ना चाहिये। जब तक हम उनकी प्रगति में योग नहीं देंगे और उनको नहीं समझेंगे तब तक हमारा उनके लिये वास्तविक प्रेम नहीं होगा।

मैं यत्किंचित अपनी सेना के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे देश के इतिहास में पिछले एक सट्ठस वर्षों से चला आया है कि दो चार सट्ठस लुटेरों ने आकर आक्रमण किया और पेशावर से लेकर पाटलीपुत्र तक उन लोगों ने ४-६ महीनों के अन्दर ही सब कुछ पददलित कर डाला। भारतवर्ष की सैनिक शक्ति दुर्बल है। भारतवर्ष में इतनी क्षमता नहीं कि वह किसी विदेशी आततायी का सामना कर सके। जिस प्रकार चीनियों ने निःशस्त्र ही वर्षों तक जापानियों का सामना किया और हार नहीं मानी, बिना विमान और दम के वर्षों तक लड़ते रहे। इस प्रकार की मन-शक्ति जनता में आनी चाहिये। शासन का परम कर्त्तव्य है कि वह इस देश के एक एक बच्चे को, एक एक स्त्री को सैनिक शिक्षा दे। जब तक इस देश के बच्चों को सैनिक शिक्षा नहीं दी जायगी तब तक वह अपने पाओं पर खड़ा नहीं हो सकता।

अन्त में मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का अनुमोदन करता हूँ और मुझे आशा है कि आप सब उसको पास करेंगे। तथा इसके पक्ष, और विपक्ष में जो कुछ बातें कही गयी हैं उनसे हम सब लोगों को विचार तथा विवेक ग्रहण करना चाहिये।

[For English translation, see Appendix I, Annexure No. 5.]

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to the discussion about the amendments to the Motion of Thanks, I would suggest that in true democratic spirit, if a simple wording is brought before this House, instead of this grandiloquent, gubernatorial companionistic way of thanking the President for having addressed this House which he was pleased to do, we could have had the simple democratic matter-of-fact wording, namely, “Resolved that this House adopts the President's Speech”, it would have

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

been better. That is the real and truly democratic way. I do not mean any disrespect to the office of the President. But he is part of us, he is one of us, he is paid by the Indian taxpayer for doing his job, that is, the President's job. You are paid, we are all paid, we all live in a democratic country elected truly with a democratic spirit by hundreds of millions of our people who have got the one supreme bliss conferred by this great Constitution, namely, once in five years, they can go to the booth and cast their vote in favour of somebody. That is the basis of this democratic Constitution we are having today. However, having in our possession this motion, I would like to say that the preference to the motion as it is, is not in keeping with the democratic spirit, of the 20th century and especially of our time. What is it that this motion refers to? It is about the contents of the President's speech. Let us see how far the policy of the Government for this session is revealed by the speech. Absolutely, as my friend Mr. B. G. Kher from Bombay read out the speech of the King and the interpretation put on it, it contained a big zero. And not only that, having given to the country a big zero, the hon. Minister for Defence has hedged our right to speak even on the motion, supported ably by the jurist of Madras, Dr. Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer. These are the sentiments expressed in a 20th century House of this nature. It is not like a House of Lords, but it is a House duly elected by the representatives of the great Legislative Assemblies of States.

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI: The hon. Member's remark is a reflection on the Chair.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : I am not meeting any disrespect to any one. I am at liberty to speak with the fullest freedom that is commanded by me in this House and I shall express in no unequivocal terms as to what I feel about the way in which things are being done, the way in which the liberty and freedom of this House are being threatened and curtailed, the way in which we are being treated like school-boys from the

Secretary onwards to the Leader of the House on the Government side. Therefore, I have come here to voice the opinion of the dumb millions of this country and to say that we shall have the liberty, we shall have the freedom, we shall have the constitutional method of ventilating our feelings in this House without being taught what we should say and what we should not say. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I thank you once again for upholding the privilege and the freedom of this House. I am not speaking with my imagination stretched to the four corners of the earth.

Now I shall get into the details of this Address.

We have had in this Address the issue of famine which is referred to in a short paragraph. The President has stated in his Address about the famine in Rayalaseema. I may at once point out, Sir, that this famine, which we have the misfortune to experience in Madras, is not confined to Rayalaseema alone. The famine in the Madras State is all-pervading. You will see, Sir, that the people are dying in hundreds, are famished for want of water. When I saw the Ganges flowing here in North India, in its full glory, giving succour and relief to the draught-affected areas, my heart was singing within myself. I am looking forward to the day when that water facility will be provided to my countrymen by a Government whose record of service socially is absolutely so low for the last seven years. If that water facility is given to my countrymen, this famine will never rear its ugly head. The fundamental need of humanity is water, and that is not available to many of us. That is a fundamental problem to which any civilized Government must pay its attention and what we find here is that a grand sum of Rs. 94 lakhs is being given by the Government of India to the Government of Madras, while taking away Rs. 2 crores of securities for a loan is being given to them against that Rs. 2 crores of securities. But, when famine conditions were in Bihar, what happened? Every heart palpitated in agony in Government

circles, and people threw money in helter-skelter in crores of rupees to the service of the famished people of Bihar. I demand, Sir, that this Government should take note of the conditions in the South, and ungrudgingly throw Rs. 5 crores there to alleviate the distress of humanity. Then you will find that communism does not rear its ugly head. What is it that has been responsible for the growth of communism in India? The Congress Fascism on the one side, the Fascism of the party which is controlling every aspect of economic life which has brought in controls in one form or the other, has created its own monster of black-market on the other side. In the officialdom, you cannot get anything done unless you grease the palm of a wretched official. You cannot get anything under the system of controls, unless some lower strata of society in the officialdom is greased in some form or the other. Controls breed corruption, corruption breeds black market, and black market breeds profit on one side and misery on the other. Between Congress Fascism on one side and Communist dictatorship on the other, is there no salvation for humanity in this country, can there be any growth of democracy in this country? That is the point on which every civilised administrator must focus his attention.

Sir, now let us take the question of foreign policy. So many people were shedding crocodile tears for the Tunisian tangle. What is the Tunisian tangle when French Imperialism is next door to us? We have a small pocket of France near Madras. That pocket is able to disrupt the economy of our country, by importing goods and sending them through smugglers into our State. Brandy, for instance, we have got prohibition in our State. How many bottles of brandy you want? Come to Pondicherry, you can drink to your heart and be happy. Now take the case of the pin, the shaving stick, the shaving blade. While it is sold at As. 12 in the market, you get the Pondicherry imported and smuggled stuff for As. 6. That is because the Customs people are cheated by the smugglers of this small pocket of France. Why

are you going to Tunisia, going round the world? Look at your own home. Solve your own problems first, and then talk about Tunisia. What is this foreign policy forgetting the menace at home and trying to save others?

SHRI B. G. KHER : Why should the hon. Member face a particular member and talk? The hon. Member is supposed to address the Chair.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : I am talking to the Government, not Mr. B. G. Kher. Coming to our own country, we find, that after crores of rupees have been spent, we have got a tangled and confused version of the Kashmir situation. People make hue and cry when thinking of Kashmir. We went to the U. N. O. as the complainant against Pakistan's aggression against our country. The U.N.O. would not have required even two minutes to declare as to who is the aggressor; they never did anything of that sort. They were not concerned with that. But what was their concern? They circumlocuted the entire process and are not declaring Pakistan as the aggressor. They said that there should be a cease-fire. After the cease-fire, there was ceasing of all activity. Five years have passed and still this Kashmir problem is hanging fire. When this Kashmir problem was taken up, there was an accusation, a limited accusation, saying that the money of the tax-payers is going to Kashmir in crores of rupees, to save the turmoil in Kashmir. But what is the result? We have got a doubtful ally on one side and the United Nations Organisation on the other side, with its Graham coming over to India and Pakistan some fifteen times not being able to do anything. Our Government is committed to a plebiscite in which case we know what will be the result. Is it not better to say, Sir, that the Indian Exchequer's money is properly spent without anybody being unfortunate enough to say that we are dealing with a matter where we have not yet come to a definite solution?

In that way, every foreign policy attached to the Government is fraught

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

with vacillation, Machiavelism and indecision. It is not based on the reality of the situation. I wanted to talk about Goa. But I leave it to Mr. B. G. Kher who is a better authority and knows all about the troubles created by Goa. I talked about Pondicherry, which is the embodiment of French Imperialism, so far as I am concerned. I talked about the misery of our people, for whose relief a grand sum of Rs. 94 lakhs is given by this Government, when 5 crores of rupees or more are needed to prevent people from falling on the road side for want of water and food. The famine is not confined to Rayalaseema alone, it is there in Chingleput, the district of Coimbatore and other areas of Madras State.

Sir, I would like to impress upon this Government that they must look upon all provinces with absolute impartiality and decency.

With these few words, I would again remind the House that the motion of thanks that is to be passed must not be a simple matter of fact alone, but should take note of the realities of the situation.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, the occasion of a debate on a resolution of thanks to the President of the Republic for an Address announcing the policy of the party in power must always be a joyous occasion for those who sit on this side of the House. It is doubly joyous to me for the valuable reason that it contains an announcement of the impending appointment of a Press Commission. I have been connected with the freedom movement. I have sweated and slaked for 34 years in this profession. Today I feel I am seeing the gates of Eden gleam. I find at last an era of emancipation. Sir, on behalf of the Federation of Indian Working Journalists, I offer my most sincere and my most profound thanks to the President of the Republic.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who is full of the milk of human kindness, has been a great friend of the working journalists. He knows perfectly well that some of

us working journalists work with conviction and conscience and suffer for it. He knows that that is the case not only today but it will be so also tomorrow. Sir, we are perfectly happy that a Commission is coming, we expect that the terms of reference will be comprehensive, that the personnel will be satisfactory, that the work of the Commission will be speedily done, and that its conclusions and recommendations will be radical and far-reaching. Sir, a Commission of a similar character is sitting in South Africa.

I have seen it stated in a capitalist owned newspaper that the Press Commission that reported in England did much work, but only a rat came out of the mountain. The Press of England is like the House of Commons and many of these British institutions, which grow in a miraculous manner but are a product of the will of the people. But in India, our Press has been a by-product of our politics, with many angularities and singularities. All these must be rectified. We have got to create a welfare State. It will be extremely good, therefore, that the Press Commission should function well and function effectively. I understand that the Commission will be endowed with judicial powers and will be enabled to call for evidence, to call for documents, and for so many things that are wanted to make the inquiry exhaustive and realistic. I am very happy to hear about it.

Sir, I find that the paragraph which mentions the Press Commission says something about legislation that will be placed before the House on the Press Laws Enquiry Committee. I am rather unhappy about it. I attacked it in my paper last year when the Constitution amendments were being discussed, restricting the freedom of expression as it existed originally. I had also the opportunity of being connected with the formative stages of the Press Act which Mr. Rajagopalachari was good enough to put on the Statute Book. Fortunately for us, we succeeded in restricting the mischief of the Press Act. I do not like the Press Enquiry

Committee's Report, if only for the reason that two of our senior journalists, Mr. Srinivasan and Mr. Brelvi, disagreed with every major recommendation of that Committee. With what face are Government prepared to proceed now with that Committee's report? I should like to know all about it. We should like to be told in advance not only something about the terms of reference of the proposed Commission, but also something about the nature of the Press Enquiry legislation. Our co-operation will be very helpful, because we know where the shoe pinches.

Sir, our Federation in Calcutta, after passing a resolution on the question of the Press Commission, passed another which reads as follows :

Pending a comprehensive inquiry by a commission as suggested in another resolution of this session, the Federation urges Parliament to order a separate inquiry forthwith into the conditions of working journalists in all their manifold aspects, with a view to improving them consistently with the directive principles of the Constitution and the rights of workers in a modern welfare State.

The resolution proceeds :

The Federation is of the opinion that all the labour welfare laws in force and such laws as may be made hereafter should be immediately made applicable to all working journalists alike, without distinction of class, grade and the nature of the work done. The Enquiry Committee should submit its report within six months from the date of its appointment.

Sir, we request the Government to take immediate action on this resolution. I will tell you why. Yesterday morning a news item from Allahabad appeared which makes us very sad. It says in effect that most of the sub-editors in a leading paper there are being given the choice :

Either you resign, all of you, with the chance of some of you being re-employed or we will dismiss all of you.

That is the choice which is being given to them. This is happening all over the country. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been saying that he would not allow the working classes to be thrown out of employment. I beg of him to remember this case. Many working journalists are being thrown out.

Sir, much has been said about the foreign policy and I should like to say a few words on this subject. It is said that we on the Congress benches know nothing about foreign policy, and probably that we do not take much interest in foreign politics. That is the privilege of the Socialist Party or the Third Force, it is presumed. I can assure him that we know enough of foreign politics and we can even hold classes. I would advise him to read what Bertrand Russell has said recently. He said that Jawaharlal Nehru is the only genuine neutral in the world.

AN HON. MEMBER : Let us decide it.

SHRI RAMA RAO : There is nothing to decide, and the electorate of India has already decided it by throwing you out. Where is the Third Force? Where is Doctor Lohia? Sir, it has been said that our foreign policy is a personal policy.

AN HON. MEMBER : Will the hon. Member please say what his views are with regard to our membership of the Commonwealth?

SHRI RAMA RAO : After all, you and I are not greater than Mahatma Gandhi. And what was Mahatma Gandhi saying all the time? He said that Jawaharlal Nehru was his conscience-keeper so far as foreign policy was concerned. That is my answer to the critic. If you think that the foreign policy of a country is laid down by all the parties, that is applicable only to a country like England, with tremendous vested interests and dependencies to exploit. But in the case of a country like ours, with its geographical limitations and with its traditions, a country like ours has the right to shape its foreign policy in its own way. You will be out of court if you say that everybody has a right to shape that policy. Here you have a voice, here you have a vote ; challenge that policy if you can. Why do you say that the policy is being laid down by a single individual? The party accepts that policy. That party has been elected by an overwhelming majority in this country.

[Shri Rama Rao.]

Sir, I have been challenged to speak about the views of foreign countries. I was touring with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in America. I also covered more than half of Europe. I have had no English training like some of my friends here with all kinds of affiliations. I am a man educated in my own country. You can level the charge of foreign education against Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru ; you cannot level that charge against me. Wherever I went, I made continuous and searching inquiries, and I was told by my late friend Dhirubhai Desai among others : "Rama Rao, take it from me ; this Commonwealth business is all right. Nothing happens. Every one of us functions as he pleases. We may send a carbon copy of some resolution, some decision, to the Australian Foreign Office, or to the New Zealand Foreign Office. But nothing really happens." And yet my friends have been saying that India has suddenly walked into the other camp. It is almost a blasphemous allegation.

When I was in the United States, I found tremendous hostility to the Prime Minister of India. His speeches were not well received ; there was constant criticism. Why does the United States now welcome our co operation ? Why are we getting so much aid ? Because America has realised, out of the fulness of her wisdom, that the old policy will not succeed—the old policy of bullying and intimidation and corruption and bribery. America has realised that democratic India, the India of Jawaharlal, the India of Gandhi, must be morally touched. General Eisenhower said only the other day that he did not think that tanks and guns and aeroplanes would be effective ; it was the spiritual strength of mankind that would be decisive.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE : Is that the moral aid which we are getting ?

SHRI RAMA RAO : If my friend undertakes to provide all the guns and the ammunition wanted in this country, we shall go to war tomorrow and conquer the world.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE : The moral support that the hon. Member refers to is got through the financial aid that is given by America.

SHRI RAMA RAO : Sir, it is an extraordinary dialectic. I shall answer it. (*Interruption*).

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL : On a point of order, Sir. Is it not the custom that an hon. Member cannot get up to interrupt unless he is given way by the speaker, and if the speaker is still standing, is it not incorrect for any hon. Member to utilise his voice and position to interrupt him ?

SHRI RAMA RAO : Sir, take the history of the last four years. What has happened ? The charge against our Foreign Minister is that he talks too much, that he talks too soon, that he talks too freely for a Foreign Minister ; and yet somebody from that side has been saying that we are too late. I cannot understand this argument. Leadership requires that it should be honest in a democracy. In Gandhian India, you must be frank, you must come out straight. We spoke first on Korea. We expressed our views to the Americans. What happened when they crossed the 38th Parallel ? What happened in San Francisco ? What happened about the Pacific Pact ? We made it very clear that we were against it. They are still devising some methods for it. The Americans have on their side New Zealand and Australia, which between themselves do not have half the population of my district. What are they going to do with the Pacific Pact ? Take South-East Asia. What is happening there ? The French want to retain all the air control in Indo-China. Over Tunisia also the same thing is apparent. We have made it very clear that unless it is the desire of the United States and the Western Powers to destroy the United Nations, they must wake up betimes. The crack of today will become the crash of tomorrow. It is not correct to charge, of all the people in the world, the Foreign Minister of India with lack of courage.

Before I was interrupted, Sir, I was speaking about the Commonwealth. Sir, nothing is happening in that Commonwealth. It is a beautiful little club. You do not pay any subscription. (*Interruption*). If there is any money, we are taking it.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : Is there prohibition in that beautiful little club?

SHRI RAMA RAO : There is no prohibition. Tomorrow you can send a letter to Churchill saying : "My dear Churchill, I am not dining at your club ; I have many engagements." (*Interruption*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Will the hon. Member proceed?

SHRI RAMA RAO : Take the Middle East. We have made our attitude very clear as regards Egypt. The fact is that America is putting pressure on Britain over the question of Egypt ; America is putting pressure on France over the question of Tunisia. There was Anglo-American opposition to India over Nepal, and yet we triumphed, and today we are on the best of terms with Nepal. Take the question of disarmament. We have made proposals, and if they are not accepted, it is not our fault. We were then working under the distinguished leadership of Shri B. N. Rau.

Then, take the U.N.O. Ask any journalist who has been in the U. N. O., and he will tell you that the Indian delegation has earned a reputation second to that of none for its work for peace, for its services to the cause of internationalism. And yet you want that we should get out of the U. N. O. There is the monumental failure of Geneva. We do hope that we shall succeed this time with U. N. O. After all, it is something not ourselves that makes for righteousness. It may, be that the Parliament of Man has arrived, but the Federation of the World is yet to come. It may be that our hopes have been duped. It may be that we have not succeeded in the measure we had expected. But we strive, and it is not for us to yield.

Sir, the question of foreign possessions in India has been raised, and this "pimple" business has been brought forward. Well, I am not an expert in aesthetics, and I shall not discuss that subject. I would rather tell you a little story. Hitler was asked early in 1934: "Why don't you invade Austria? The people are German-speaking ; they are your own people. The Tory Party in England is not going to unsheathe its sword for the sake of a little country like Austria." Hitler's reply was blunt. I must not repeat it in a House of gentlemen—certainly not in a House where there are ladies. I would paraphrase the reply mildly by saying : "Why should I do any harm to the girl I am going to marry next week?" You will get these possessions. They are in your lap. But you will have to wait. If you think of satyagraha, for heaven's sake, go there and organise it. (*An hon. Member : We have.*). Then, hats off to you.

Sir, I would quote one beautiful sentence from a leading article in *The Statesman* which sums up the Address of the President so far as foreign topics are concerned :

It was a notable survey of the troubled world scene with, running through it, the thought of a larger freedom of the human spirit.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Is it permissible to read out a foreign journal's opinion?

SHRI RAMA RAO : It is not foreign. It is *The Statesman* of Calcutta, published also in Delhi.

May I quote from some other paper which has no Congress affiliations? It says :

But India's insistence on peace through mediation in preference to exclusive reliance on collective security is now better appreciated. India, young in independence, has always supported peoples still fighting the battle for independence. Her recent reminder to the United Nations, that the Charter enjoins the member-States to help the people in every country to choose their own form of Government, will be appreciated not only in Tunisia. Her gesture will be welcomed by all who do not want the United Nations to go the way of the League of Nations.

[Shri Rama Rao.]

Sir, I can go on answering the various points raised by the Opposition but have another purpose to serve on this occasion. The policy of the United States has undergone a new orientation. We are happy about it. Without selling our soul and without surrendering a single principle of ours, we are willing to offer our co-operation if only the United States policy is more intelligently framed and more carefully worked out. For instance, the United States must get out of Korea. It has no business to remain there. She must come to terms with Red China. Mao is as much in possession of China as Jawaharlal Nehru is in possession of India—pack up, cross the Pacific and go home. The U. S. is not going to stay in Korea. The United States may like to crush Russia. She may do something to bring about her defeat. But Russia is not a country, Russia is an idea. The people of the world look to Russia rightly or wrongly—rightly rather than wrongly—as a country where a great Socialist experiment has been going on. Russia may be a Welfare State on one side, it may be a police State on the other. Nevertheless, it is our duty to see that a great State like this survives, and that no harm is done to her.

Sir, it is the duty of India to play her part in the world's politics. We shall certainly make progress gradually. The electorate of India has thoroughly endorsed the foreign policy, just as it has endorsed the various other policies of the Congress. For the next five years it has given this party authority to rule this country. But the Congress has yet its policies to frame, it has yet programmes to put forward. I have no doubt that the five years ahead will be glorious years for this country. We shall solve the internal problems. We shall see that peace prevails in the world around. We would sing :

Ring out the thousand wars of old.
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : Mr. Chairman, we have listened today to many excellent expositions of our foreign

policy although they [have been at great variance with one another. But I would like to divert the attention of the House to a consideration of some domestic problem, namely, the food problem. For, however much we want to be a powerful nation and a force in the world, if conditions internally remain what they are, if famine, starvation and death stalk the country, we shall never command the respect of the world, nor become a great nation. It was in this context, I think, rather wise on the part of the mover of the motion that he confined his attention mostly to foreign policy in the very excellent speech that he made. For, conditions being what they are in the country today, he would have agreed that milk and honey is not flowing here. We have been swearing by Gandhiji. Gandhiji did not dabble so much in foreign politics. He was concerned with the Bhangi colony. He went to the villages. He was concerned with the happiness of the people. How much progress we have been able to attain during the last four and a half years? But, before I go to the problem of food, I want to mention just one word about one topic about which there has been a studied absence of any reference in the President's Address, namely, our relations with Pakistan, because that is a problem in which, coming from West Bengal, we are very much interested. There are many matters on which we should like to know what the Government's point of view is and what the Government policy is; matters such as evacuee property, Kashmir, border raids, payment by Pakistan of her obligations towards India and, last but not least, the introduction of the passport system. It appears to me, Sir, that the introduction of the passport system is a clear violation of the Delhi Agreement. For, one of the fundamental principles underlying that Agreement was that there should be freedom of movement between the two Bengals and the introduction of the passport system will severely restrict that freedom. What has the Government of India done about it? Or is it that we must acquiesce in everything that Pakistan may choose to do, however unjust that may be?

Now, I want to deal only with one topic, and that is, food, because I consider that to be very important. The President's Speech gave expression to a very noble sentiment. He said that freedom by itself is not enough. It must also bring a measure of happiness to our people and a lessening of the burdens they suffer from. If, Sir, we cannot give our people food, not sufficient nor even optimum quantity but just enough to keep them out of starvation and death, can we say that we are assuring them any measure of happiness? And if, further, food subsidies are taken away under these conditions, can we say that we are lessening the burdens that they are suffering from? Therefore, to people without food or with food offered at prices beyond their reach these noble words of the President must come as a sheer mockery as they do to many people in our part of the country where they are suffering from famine as also in other areas of India.

The greatest difficulty in discussing the food situation is statistics. It is well-known that the same official figures have yielded a surplus to Mr. Sidhwa and a deficit to the Food Minister. I do not intend to enter into those questions, but I may say that our food production had been increasing at least up to 1950. In the Report on Currency and Finance published by the Reserve Bank of India for 1950-51 our internal production was shown as a little over 44 million tons for 1948 and 1949 compared to about 42 million tons in 1947, while in 1950 it was a little over 45½ million tons. I understand that production has gone down in 1951 but it is a moot point as to how far that was affected by an understandable anxiety on the part of the State Governments to report shortages and press for larger allocations. But, whatever that may be, we had larger production up to about 1950, but has the acuteness of the food problem abated one iota? Certainly not. The explanation for that is also well-known. The Government say that although there is an increase in production, yet, for various reasons, there is no proportionate increase in

marketable surplus. If that be so, I believe, Sir, that the assumption made by the Planning Commission that an increase in food production by 7·2 millions by 1956 will solve the problem for us, by that year will also go wrong.

Sir, in this context a word should be said about the Grow More Food schemes on which much acrimonious controversy has raged. In spite of the contention of the Government that these schemes have proved successful—and I believe there is mentioned in the President's Speech that there has been an increase of something like 14 lakh tons as a result of the Grow More Food schemes—yet it is interesting that the Planning Commission says in so many words that the results of the Grow More Food schemes have not been appreciable, that these schemes will have to be re-orientated, that they must be made more intensive rather than be so widely spread out as is the case now. But there is little doubt that a lot of the money that has been spent on such schemes has been more or less wasted.

One word, Sir, also on natural calamities. It used to be said that there is a cycle in agricultural production, that if you take a period of five years, one year would be surplus, one would be deficit and the other years would be more or less normal. But it appears ever since independence natural calamities have been persistently pursuing our Government. If nature and elemental forces are bent upon discrediting the Congress Government, how long could we frail mortals bolster it up?

Sir, an overall examination of the food situation leaves one very much depressed about the future. Internal production is not enough. We have to import a lot of food grains. The Planning Commission estimates that we shall have to import about 3 million tons a year over the next five years. Latterly we have been importing something of the order of 5 million tons, costing us over 200 crores of rupees. Then food subsidies which are essential and must be given cost us something

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

between 15 and 20 crores of rupees. Now all these mean a severe strain on our finances and also on our foreign exchange. And if there should be a deficit in our balance of payments position, Government will turn round and say that with a view to bridge it, we must restrict imports, say of industrial raw materials or of machinery, which will then have a very adverse effect on the future industrial development of the country. Relief, Sir, might be had for some time through gifts and loans, but how long could we depend on gifts and loans? And even if we did, could we then survive as a nation of an independent status and shall we not gradually become servile and subservient to the donor? In spite of what one hon. Member here said that there has been a change in the outlook of the U. S. A., there is no denying the fact that the U. S. A. wants us to go along with them and this is one of the thin ends of the wedge that they are resorting to.

Sir, I shall not have the time today to elaborate my proposals on the food problem, and I am therefore merely stating them. Our immediate and short period problem is concerned with our obligations for the rationing population. So far as the non-rationed population, nearly 70 per cent. of our people, is concerned, we have left them virtually to their fate asking them to fend for themselves as best as they can. For the balance of the 30 per cent. of the rationed population, we have an elaborate and vexatious system of controls which, while it has corrupted and perverted large sections of our public life and also created in certain areas artificial scarcities, has not as yet been able to procure the food grains necessary to meet the commitments for our rationed population. And the Centre has always to make good any deficit that is not a very satisfactory position. I feel, Sir, that it would be good for the Centre to reduce its rationing liabilities, to reduce its rationing obligations and take upon itself the whole burden of feeding only the important urban areas and that also from imports. The

rationing obligation might be reduced from the present figure of something like 125 million people to something like 50 or 60 million people. Let the Government thereafter build up a reserve stock, say of 1 million tons, also from imports. And then let the Government remove food controls in the other areas. I should like to emphasise, Sir, that what I have been suggesting is not immediate de-control or complete de-control but only a gradual de-control and that also only after the Government have built up a reserve stock. Because a reserve stock is essential, for, whenever there may be a scarcity, unless the knowledge is there that food can be rushed to that place, there will always be a more than proportionate increase in prices. Therefore, Sir, it is necessary that we should have that reserve stock. I believe, Sir, the outgoing Food Minister had also been thinking along some such lines and in spite of the observations of the Planning Commission on the question of de-control, I believe there is very much good sense in these suggestions, and particularly because that will remove a lot of corruption from our public life.

I have, Sir, no time to elaborate on a long-term solution of the problem. Of course, abolition of intermediary interests in land is essential. It is really surprising that the Congress Government, pledged to that, have not yet given effect to it all over the country. But everybody knows that mere abolition of the intermediary interests will not solve the food problem; other measures will have to be taken simultaneously to increase the production of food. And I would offer another suggestion, namely, to guarantee to the agriculturist a minimum price not for a year, but over a period of years, say, for three or four years. That has been done in Great Britain with spectacular results and it is really somewhat surprising that under the new plan, Great Britain has been able to reduce her dependence on food imports from two-thirds to one-third of her total requirements. It is really a very excellent achievement.

Sir, I do not propose to dilate on this occasion on the food problem any further, because it is already five, and I would merely end by saying that the food situation in the country is so critical that we can afford to neglect or tinker with it only at a very grave risk to the internal peace and stability of this great country.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Sir, before we adjourn today, I wish to submit a suggestion for your consideration. There is a general feeling, on this side of the House in any case, that the timing of the daily sessions might be changed. The suggestion is that we might meet at about 8.15 and sit till 1 p.m. and that will give us 4 hours and 45 minutes—the same period of time that we now sit here both morning and evening. I do not know if the same timing has been decided

on by the other House, but I have been told that the matter is under their consideration. That would mean that we sit only in the morning and close for the day at 1 o'clock. If the House is agreeable to this modification and if you also are agreeable, Sir, you might decide whether you should bring it into force from tomorrow or from day after tomorrow.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : It is agreeable.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It seems to be agreed that we meet here at 8.15 from tomorrow and sit till 1 o'clock.

I adjourn the House till tomorrow at 8.15. a. m.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Tuesday, the 20th May 1952.