

[Dr. Anup Singh.] (Baksha is the word for doctor) is the price of rice going to rise, or will it go down ?" She was not at all concerned when the Communists are going to take over the whole of Korea. She was not at all aware that there were two sides, with ideological differences, fighting for their gains. Her main concern was how it would affect the price of rice. I am sure this is the attitude of the people all over the country. Vast masses of the people in India are not concerned with ideological differences; and I am sure most of them even do not know that ours is a secular State, and what a secular State stands for. All these things are very important. But, for the average man and woman in India, the basic problem is : "What is going to be done about the price of rice, flour, etc. ?" Unless the party in power and the Government take some positive and constructive steps to improve the lot of the average person, what will become of the position of this House ? During the elections, the Congress was returned to power with an overwhelming majority. But in some places I found people saying this. This is the last chance we are giving to the Congress. I recall one occasion when one of the Congress volunteers invited the people from the villages to come and vote for the Congress. Almost everyone faced that party flag and went to the polls and voted for the Congress. They said, "We are going to give the Congress one more chance, and if after 5 years we find that nothing has been done, we will come back to you." I submit that regardless of the criticisms that may be showered on the Congress from the other side—some of them may be legitimate and some of them may be propagandist—we here should work individually and all of us collectively.

SYMPATHY FOR THE VICTIMS OF
RAILWAY ACCIDENT AT BIKANER

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before we take up the further proceedings, I would like, on my own behalf and on behalf of all the Members of the Council, ir-

respective of their differences, to express our deep sympathy with the victims of the railway disaster near Bikaner and I request you, in token of our sympathy, to stand up for a minute.

(All Members then stood up for a minute)

MOTION OF THANKS ON ADDRESS BY
THE PRESIDENT—

[Continued-]

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR

(Nominated) :

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर (नाम-निर्दिष्ट) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं जो थोड़ा बहुत कहना चाहता हूँ वह मैं हिन्दी में कहूँगा और बाद में कुछ अंग्रेजी में कहूँगा। मैं चाहता तो यह हूँ कि हिन्दी में ही बोलूँ लेकिन सभापति महोदय जानते हैं और देख चुके हैं कि जिन जिन लोगों ने यहां हिन्दी में भाषण दिये, जैसे कि लीलाजी ने, राष्ट्रकवि दिनकर जी ने, यहां पर कितनी प्यारी बातें कहीं। लेकिन सुनने वालों में से बहुत से सज्जन गूँ मुँह खोले देख रहे थे मानों कुछ न समझ रहे हों। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है लेकिन यह उनका क्रमूर नहीं है। कई सौ वर्षों की गुलामी की ज़हैनियत ने हमको मजबूर कर रखा है कि हम अपने देश की भाषा, जो भाषा कि मान ली गई है, उसकी तरफ़ आकर्षित न हों। सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके जरिये से अपने मित्रों से, जो यहां पर बैठे हैं, उनसे प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वे जब भी यहां पर १० मिनट, १५ मिनट या जितनी भी देर के लिये बोलें, कम से कम एक मिनट या दो मिनट के लिये ही सही हिन्दी में अवश्य बोलें। इससे मंत्रियों को बोलने की आदत पड़ेगी और राष्ट्रभाषा का भी ज्ञान जल्दी होता जायेगा। एक कहावत इस समय याद आ गई : "क़त्ता क़त्ता मा शबद दरया" यानी कि कतरे कतरे से दरिया बनता है, एक एक बूंद से तालाब भरे जाते हैं।

मुझे जब यहां आने के लिये बुलावा पहुंचा और जब जब मुझे किसी असेम्बली के लिये बुलाया गया तो मैंने हाथ जोड़ कर ना कह दी। अभी मैं जब ३ अप्रैल को कलकत्ते में अपने मित्र श्री देवकी बोस जी के पास ठहरा हुआ था जो कि फ़िल्म प्रोड्यूसर और डाइरेक्टर हैं, उनके वहां मैंने अखबार पढ़ा कि मुझे यहां के लिये नियुक्त किया गया है। मैं उस समय चाय पी रहा था और उन्होंने अखबार मेरे सामने रख दिया। मैंने अखबार में अपना नाम देखा और खामोश हो गया। मैंने उनसे यह कहा कि मैं यह सोच भी नहीं पाया कि मुझे क्यों बुलाया जा रहा है। मैं उस दिन कलकत्तल कांग्रेस में पीस कमेटी की तरफ से गया हुआ था। मैं पीस कमेटी का वाइस प्रेजिडेंट हूँ और मुझे खुद पता नहीं कि उन्होंने भी मुझे क्यों चुना। मैं ऐसी जगहों पर हमेशा इस ख्याल से गया कि मैं वहां जाकर कुछ सीखूंगा। जिस तरह से मां-बाप अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाते और सिखलाते हैं और उनमें से जो कोई नालायक हो उसे और प्यार से पढ़ाया जाता है और लायक बनाया जाता है। मैंने इन चीजों को इस रूप में लिया कि मैं भी वहां जाकर कुछ सीखूंगा और समझूंगा। मैंने उसी दिन इस चीज को अपनी डायरी में लिखा। मैं माननीय राष्ट्रपति के बुलावे को भी इस रूप में लेता हूँ कि मुझे पढ़ाया जायेगा, सिखाया जायेगा और कुदरत भी यही चाहती है कि मैं कुछ सीखूँ। जिस तरह मां बाल-बच्चों के लिये सीखने के लिये सामान तैयार करती है, उसी तरह कुदरत मुझे विद्या पढ़ाती है। सन् १९४५ ई० में जब मैंने "दीवार" ड्रामा पहली बार खेला था तो मैं पूज्य बापू जी से इस बारे में मिला था। उन्होंने मुझ से उसकी कापी मांगी और मैंने उनसे कहा कि मेरे पास यही एक कापी

है और यह भी कल पुलिस के पास चली जायेगी। मैंने उनसे कहा कि आप मुझे आशीर्वाद दीजिये कि मैं अपने आपको इस बुलन्दी में ले जा सकूँ जहां मैं आपके चरण छू पाऊँ और अपने आपको और अपनी कला को देश की सेवा में अर्पण कर सकूँ— ३ अप्रैल सन् १९५२ को भी मैंने इसी बात को अपनी डायरी में दोहराया है। मैं अपने आपको इस योग्य नहीं पाता कि मैं कुछ कर सकूँ मगर मुझे आशीर्वाद दो कि मैं इस योग्य बन पाऊँ। फिर मैंने डायरी में आगे चलकर गुरुदेव टैगोर के वाक्य में यह प्रार्थना की है :

“आमारी जैनोंतां कोरी प्रोचारो आमारी आपोन काज्जे।
तोमारी ईच्छा कोरो हे पूरणो आमारी जीवोनो माझे ॥”

अर्थात् मैं अपने ही काम को बढ़ाने की चिन्ता में न रहूँ; हे प्रभु, बल्कि इस जीवन द्वारा मैं तुम्हारी इच्छा पूर्ण कर पाऊँ। इन प्रयत्नों के साथ मैं यहां पर आया हूँ। यह बात बराबर मेरे दिल में आई कि मैं ऐक्टर हूँ। यहाँ सीखूंगा कि किसी विषय पर क्या बोलना चाहिये। कैसे बोलना चाहिये। मगर यहां जो देखा उससे तो मेरे ख्याल में आया कि अगर इतना समय स्टेज में बोलने के लिये दे दिया जायेगा, तो कोई लोग नहीं सुनेगा। १५ मिनट का समय बड़ी चीज होती है। १५ मिनट में बहुत कुछ हो जाता है। वह कहना, जो कि स्पष्ट है, उसके लिये यहां २ मिनट या २ घंटा ज़ाया करना अच्छा नहीं है। यह टाइम जो हम यहां पर १५ मिनट और २० मिनट का लेते हैं वह नेशन का टाइम है। उसको हमको इस तरह ज़ाया नहीं करना चाहिये। अगर यह बात स्टेज में होती तो लोग उठ कर चले जाते और कहते कि यह ऐक्टर अच्छा नहीं, यह खेल ठीक से

[Shri Prithviraj Kapoor.]

लिखा नहीं गया। इधर यहाँ देखा कि लोग—
कुछ लोग—बोलने के लिये ही बोलते हैं विषय
का, उचित अनुचित का उन्हें ध्यान नहीं।
इस बात से बड़ा दुःख हुआ और कुछ हंसी
आई। इस चीज न मुझे मजबूर किया कि
मैं बोलूँ। मेरे अपने दोस्त कई आये कि
पृथ्वी, तुम कब बोल रहे हो? तो मैंने उन
से कहा कि मैं तो यहाँ सीखने आया हूँ
और एक साल तक सुनूँगा, बोलूँगा नहीं।
यह देख कर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ कि किस
तरह से बहुत से लोगों ने यहाँ पर नाजायज
बातें कीं। अपनी पार्टियों को बढ़ाने की
बातें कीं, प्रोपेगेंडा और दिखाने की गरज से
सकरीरों की और यह परवाह नहीं की कि
हासले मजमून क्या है। मुझे इस पर एक
कहानी याद आ गई।

[For English translation see Appendix 1,
Annexure No. 7.]

It is precious time. We have no business to
waste it. I would certainly not allow anybody
to speak for such a long time on the stage. But
perhaps this is a different affair here and I have
yet to learn so much—so much.

- SHRI K. C. GEORGE ; Will the hon. Member
continue his speech in English? He can speak
very well in English, and we would miss much
of what he said if he spoke in Hindi.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: Well then in
English if it pleases you—about that story—I
was once touring the country with James Grant
Anderson of the English stage. It was in 1932. I
toured with him all over India—Bangalore,
Hyderabad, Poona, Bombay, Calcutta, and so
on. We staged 15 plays in English—some of
Shakespeare. We also staged Indian plays—
"Toy Cart", "Chitra", and so on. Mr.
Anderson told me a story. It was amusing. He
said he was playing in a repertoire with his
sister who was the leading lady of the company.
A little carelessness had crept into his life. One
evening, when they were performing, after the
first scene was over, his

sister came; she had the script in her hand; she
just banged it on the floor and said: "I do not
ask you to learn your lines. At least know
the play that you are performing." You may
not learn the lines, but you must know the play
you are performing. This is the thing for which
I have stood up to speak. This is not a little
thing. This is a very great thing. This mental
slavery we have not been able to cast off, and
that is the bane of our life, and that is the cause
of our trouble. We have heard many speeches.
Many speeches have been made, and many
read—I have seen hon. Members reading
speeches. I had heard that nobody reads
speeches here but I saw some hon. Members
reading their speeches. Perhaps I was mistaken.
But what I felt was this. From the contents
of those speeches it appeared that most of them
were prepared long before the President's
Address was heard. It is very strange. It is
like a deaf man going to a sick person. We had
read in our third and fourth primer about it.
Unfortunately we forget the lessons which we
learn in our childhood. So, the deaf man who
went to the sick man prepared his questions and
anticipating the replies had prepared the
answers also. The deaf man asked a question,
and the sick man replied contrary to his
expectations. But he went on his own way—
with his prepared speech much to the chagrin
of the sick man. That is what I saw yesterday
and today too. I would not have taken your time
and the time of this august Assembly, but it
pains me to say what I have said. I came
here as a "Vidyarthi", as a student, to learn
from the people who are controlling the
destinies of our nation, who say that they
represent the nation. But what shall I tell my
community of actors about the speeches here?
They will feel ashamed, they will be shocked.
Please forgive me. I am just an actor. We have
no head; we go only by our heart and our heart
speaks the truth and records the truth. I
produced the play about partition in 1944 and it
was staged in 1945. That too was based on
what the heart had registered and recorded.
I went to

Chundrigar Sahib.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) :
On a point of order. The hon.
Member is casting aspersions on
the House.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR :
Pardon me. It has a bearing on what we are
doing. I request you, elders and wise people,
not to interrupt me but give me a chance. I am
the Vice-President of the Association with
which my hon. friends who are trying to in-
terrupt me now are very much concerned and I
had the honour and the privilege of seeing
Europe for the first time in my life through the
same Association—so you should rest assured.
I belong to no particular party. I am just an
artist. I would request you, Mr. Chairman, to
ask them not to talk so loudly. It somehow
hurts—it hurts all over.

I have only this request to make to those
wise people who come out with long speeches
condemning the President's Address : for God's
sake, read it. This Address is written in the
spirit of humility, the spirit of India. But they
do not believe in God. They made the
affirmation and did not take the oath. If they do
not believe in God, well they should believe in
me, then. But I would humbly ask them to read
it. If not for God's sake—then for my sake—
read it. If they like, I will read it for them in my
actor's voice. I will stand up and read it. I know
that the microphones were defective, and the
reception was bad, and the President's Address
did not reach properly. Still, the English version
of it did reach us, though the Hindi version did
not because the microphone was not properly
controlled. But copies were supplied. But I feel
that the speeches of my friends were written
and crammed long before the Address was read
or heard. This is the impression I get as an
artist.

Then why don't hon. Members see the spirit
in which the Address was delivered ? It is not
the final thing. It does not say that it is the last
word. In the last paragraph the President says :
4C.S.D.

I have endeavoured to indicate to you
some of the work that will be placed before
this Session of Parliament.

M Some—mark you—some. That means there is
more work for you to do. I do not know—
perhaps there is that ego—the terrible ego that
is causing all the trouble today. " Why not ' I ' ?
Why ' he ' ? and all that." No. This land has
always believed in different things. This land
has never cared for the reward of work done. I
am a richer man after 1947—not economically
and monetarily though. In the theatre I with 91
people—how I manage to keep the theatre
going, you cannot imagine. What hardship I
have to go through and how much I have to
work I alone know. But still I call myself rich
because every morning I see the flag flying.
Whither are we drifting today ? We are turning
this rich country, this rich and beautiful country,
into a country of beggars—just calculators,
cheap calculators: Economics, economics and
economics, day in and day out. Economics. We
have read some books which have come from
abroad. We have studied some theories and
crammed them without understanding them. It
reminds me of a story about my grand-
father. He was a great soul. And of such was our
land made. He had a great love for agriculture.
In my childhood, we heard a great deal of
grafts. We belonged to Peshawar. I still belong
to Peshawar. In Peshawar grew lovely peaches.
My grand-father was very fond of peaches. We
had to settle in Lyallpur in the Punjab, and there
my grand-father brought the seeds of peaches
from Peshawar and planted them. He said to
himself : " I know the land is not that of
Peshawar, the soil is not of that variety, the
atmosphere here is different. The atmosphere is
not there." He said himself " I know the land is
not there, the water is not there, the atmosphere
is not there. I know the result will not be there,
but still let us see whether we can have the
peaches." So he put the seeds there, nursed
them, watered them and then the peaches came
out and they were nothing like ' Bara ' peaches
which are famous in Peshawar. No. On the
contrary, we had something bitter, something
horrible. So my friends, these

[Shri Prithviraj Kapoor.] economic theories are just like those seeds. They might be good, they might be beautiful in their own land. But, if we put those seeds here in this laad, the fruit of those seeds will be just like those peaches. Horrible ! Horrible ! Horrible

I shall refer to one more point only. If we approach this work in the spirit of service we can do something. We are rich people. Let us go out and tell our workers in the fields, in the theatres, in factories, in the coal mines and offices : " Look here, we are rich men, rich people. This land is ours and now let us keep our hands steady and strong on the plough." The plough will go deep. There will be food ; the famine will not be there any more anywhere. But mere theories won't do. Let us work for five years, nay ten years, even more. No land in the world has done anything without putting efforts in the beginning. We can go to Russia and ask them how many years it took them to come to their own. I have got a very great regard for Russia. I am the Vice-President of the Indo-Russia Cultural Association and I have got a very great regard for the people of Russia and of China—I respect their flag—there in their land. But not over my head here. I would rather die than have their flag over my head here.

There was a time when we were speaking in English. Then a time came of revolt and we stopped talking in English, although I was fine at it. I felt it was Churchill's language. It was the language of the imperialists being thrust down my throat and therefore vomited it out. But after 1947 things changed. English language has cast off its imperialistic garbs. Now it is not a Churchill's language. Today it comes to me in its true and natural beauty as a language of Shakespeare. It comes to me as a language of Shelley, Keats and Byron and other poets and philosophers, a language that Ellen Terky spoke and adorned. But, we can brook no interference from others in our affairs. We are not a poor country. We don't want to sell our soul. Today I am an artist. If you give me 20 theatres and give me lot of money to run them,

but if you take away my voice from me and my capacity to understand and portray a character, all is gone. I shall be a bankrupt. Similarly everybody has faith in himself. If we take that away from him, that will be just taking away his soul and we will be making a beggar of him. Let us not do that—no, no, no.

Sir, with these few words, I resume my seat.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, if pious wishes and expressions could solve our problems, if vague generalisations and statistics, full of "buts" and excuses could give us more food, then indeed the Address of the President would be a classic instance of the miraculous fulfilment of all our hopes and expectations. But I submit to you that in this matter-of-fact world, words have no value unless they are translated in our lives in the field of action. Today when we look around us, we find many shortcomings which are sapping the life-blood of our people whom we have come to represent in this august Council and who are crying out with a thousand voices to remedy the grievances whose meagre echo merely we can put before you today being limited by time and circumstances. The hon. the mover of the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address has showered much eulogy in company with his supporters and his party on the policy and the actions of the present Government. Such eulogy would be more appropriate if it fell from the lips of others and more so if it came out of the mouths of their critics. Those critics who are their real - friends and not their carping enemies as the hon. mover of the motion was pleased to dub us, but those critics who are the real friends of the hon. Members on the other side of the House, because they are the people who can show to them their own failings and shortcomings so that we can better serve the ideal of the Government of the people for the people and by the people. This House has heard many criticisms and many suggestions have been put forward to better our policy at home and increase production and the national wealth of this country. I shall only refer

to one, a solitary instance—because I shall not have the time to say in full all that my heart desires to say—of the short-comings from which we are suffering and one of the main remedies to fulfil that shortcoming I will adumbrate this in brief in passing on to the main topic of my amendment.

In connection with the home policy of the Govern-ment we see all around us today want, poverty and indebtedness growing by leaps and bounds and what tangible result has the Government achieved to relieve those untold sufferings of the masses? That problem today has become all the more acute in my part of the country where, as you know, areas with a lower standard of life have been tacked on to other parts of the country accustomed to a much higher scale of existence. This has created new economic problems for the hundreds and thousands of people who were used to a balanced economy under their own specific administrations but who now find that without the relief of an increased standard of living they have to face new taxations, high prices and scarcity conditions prevailing in those adjoining parts whose fates they had to share. To relieve the lot of these people there is no practical programme so far that the Government have produced and in this bankrupt state of their policy I would say to them that they are spurning the remedy which is lying under their very feet. In these areas, as in most other parts of the country, rich mines and mineral resources lie at our disposal. Like a bountiful mother who supplies unstinted milk to all her children without discrimination, Bharat Mata offers this rich source of nourishment to us, her children, without discrimination. Those mines and those mineral resources contain riches which could be exploited by the Government of the people for the good of the people so that our national wealth could be increased and much of our wants met with today and those people who are suffering from high prices and scarcity conditions could benefit by the increased power of the Government to do good in this respect. But is the Government

doing anything about it ? No. It is merely dilly-dallying, as it is the custom of the present Government to dilly-dally with constructive suggestions and constructive policy of any sort. It is merely sitting on the fence as it is accustomed to do and instead of tackling these problems boldly and exploiting our own natural resources for the good of the country and for the good of the people, to what enterprise can it think of extending the policy of nationalisation but merely to petty works and unprofitable ventures like public transport which will lead us nowhere? This is the sort of thing that the Government is doing inside the country, which is a solitary instance.

it) a.m.

I do not wish to take the time of the House unduly and disobey the direction that you have so considerately given to us. Now, I will go on to the main subject of my amendment, namely, the position in question in foreign policy. In 1936-37 this poor servant of the people approached the Indian National Congress through Shri Subhas Chandra Bose for remedying some of the grievances, the persecutions and the high-handed acts of the Indian Political Department of the then British Indian Imperial Government, because of his nationalistic tendencies, because of his nationalistic writings and speeches and because of his alignment with the India League in England in the interest of Indian freedom. At that time I was told that the then Indian States were foreign territory as far as the activities of the nationalist movement of India were concerned and that there could be no redress to the wrongs and the sufferings to which I had been subjected by my foreign persecutors. But since then with the dawn of Indian democracy and the coming into existence of our glorious Republic those States have merged into Greater India and we all glory in that merger because we are confident that in Indian citizenship there is that greatness and that power to do good which no isolationism of any sort can guarantee to us. Yet I in the process of merger, unfortunately,

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo.] it was not the ballot that was used but in many cases it was the bullet which decided the issue. The Government justified their actions by the excuse of the great end which they were going to achieve by these acts and most understanding citizens sympathised with the greatness of the results which were achieved despite these condemnable actions. And yet what a contrast we find when we look at the foreign policy of the Government today? In our very homeland, in the body politic of this great free Republic, like little spots of leprosy or cancer, there are foreign possessions, microscopic points of foreign domination, surrounding our coastline and even in the interior of this vast sub-continent. If it is the fact that the Indian Government is not averse to shedding Indian blood, what is it that holds back its hand in eliminating foreign pockets in our very midst? It is submitting itself to the constant insults and indifference of the Governments of these foreign points in our Republic and around our coast, which are a serious menace to our security. It is my submission that it is a matter of very simple understanding that in the case of a major flare-up, which is not a very unlikely event in the present international situation and the impotence of the United Nations, these foreign pockets in our own homeland are bound to become the centres of the pickpockets of security and safety and as such, unless the present Government undertakes a bold and courageous policy to eliminate these foreign pockets from our midst, we shall be subjected, not to the picking of our pockets only, but to the cutting of our throats as well and we will be at the mercy of fifth columnists from abroad.

It has been stated by the proposer of the Motion of Thanks to the President for the Address that he did not propose to deal with hypothetical statements. As a philosopher I would submit to you that hypotheses and inferences are the only rational bases to any forecast or rational planning of any sort and perhaps this inadvertent statement of the hon. Member contains an admission of the weakness of the present Govern-

ment, which cannot see beyond its nose, because it has no planning, no policy and no foresight of any sort.

In this connection I would draw attention to para. 7 of the President's Address, where he says :

My Government has not sought to interfere with other countries just as it does not invite any interference from others in our own country.

I submit that this connivance and weak policy of our Government towards the foreign pockets in our country are being misconstrued as real weakness and as such are derogatory to the prestige and integrity of our country. As such it can be nothing else but an invitation to foreign interference in this great Republic. Therefore this is a matter which should occupy the front rank in the programme of our Government.

In conclusion, I want to say that there has been a great deal of talk about the non-violent policy of our Government. I would submit that if the blood-baths which have been inaugurated in my part of the country, the misuse of high office and the invectives and threats which have been levelled by responsible personages at opposing candidates in the last general election in my part of the country, in spite of the promise of fair and free elections everywhere, the not very graceful assertions of the other side about the absolute boasts regarding their brute majority yesterday, be instances of this non-violent policy of the Government, I would say to them that their faith is idolatry to a dead ideal and that it has no bearing on our lives. So they have no right to invoke the name of that great saint, who martyred his life for a supreme cause and the great traditions of the saints of this country in a most non-violent manner. In his speech, the proposer of the motion levelled at us a quotation from the Bhagvat Gita, which I level at him equally today, because it was the saying of the righteous minority against the oppressive majority and as such today, the spirit of the dead Mahatma is finding its voice or is coming back to life in the voice of protest embodied in the Opposition.

There is a spirit of regeneration rising against the oppression and the hypocrisy that the opposite benches practise in then; lives and in their policy in Government. With these few words which I will repeat from the Bhagvat Gita, I will end my speech :

यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य ग्लानिर्भवति भारत ।
अभ्युत्थानमधर्मस्य तदात्मानं सृजाम्यहम् ॥
परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम् ।
धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे ॥

['Whenever there is a weakening of the forces that hold society together and there is a rising of disintegrating forces then I create my own Spirit ! For the relief of the good and the destruction of evil-doers I am born (though ever unborn) from age to age.']

AN HON. MEMBER : The Devil quoting Scriptures!

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : Let them read this writing on the wall and improve matters, lest the weapon they wield turn against them in the Nemesis of justice, of truth and of righteousness.

k

m

AN HON. MEMBER : Let us all pray.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA (Uttar Pra desh) : Sir, I rise to participate in this debate only because I want to refer to one definite and specific subject, which is mentioned on pages 5 and 6 of the President's Address. That is a subject which I think overshadows and transcends all others. In fact, if you take any problem, it will definitely be within the orbit of food. Any subject could be discussed under food, but I am not going to widen my scope in the matter.

I feel that the main problem of India today is that of food. Then there is the life—problem of poverty. All parties are agreed that there should be a solution to these problems. But I think the difficulty is in finding a solution. I admit that the solution is not an easy one ; it is a highly complicated matter which requires a lot of hard work. We are told that we are short of food grains by six million tons or so. I do not know

who computed the deficit and how. Personally, I feel that we have no records, nor any statistics which could give us any clue to this deficit. I once questioned the Food Minister in Parliament. He told me that I should refer to my own calculation—that were made in the old days. I - told him frankly that my calculations were all wrong, they were concoctions, because I knew that nobody could calculate the deficit in this country. You have got to find out how much food each farmer grows, how much he eats, how much he brings to the market. As you will know yourself, there are no records of these. All these things are not known, and it is not possible to arrive at any reliable data with regard to this deficit. The only way in which the deficits are computed today is by finding the difference between the procurement and the requirements of the rationed areas. We have got certain rationed areas. We know what amount of food grains are required to feed those areas. Then we know how much, or how little we have been able to procure, and when we know the difference between these two, which difference has been widened nowadays, we call it the deficit. I submit that is all wrong, as it does not give any true indication of what the real deficit may or may not be. I am one of those who believe that the time has gone past when such rigid control of food grains was necessary, especially the control on free movements. We have a lot of agitation going on these days with regard to food subsidies. What is the food subsidy ? It is an iniquitous thing from the point of view of the public at large. The food subsidies apply to some 20 odd areas only, where the people are given food at subsidised rates in rationed cities. But it does not extend to the rest of the country. Why should those people alone be chosen for this preferential treatment, this favoured treatment? I agree that the prices of food grains must be brought down, that the cost of food must be reduced for the poor people. The food subsidy involves about Rs. 90 crores per annum. This is a huge sum for a country like ours. If we allow the food grains from the

[Dr. J. P. Srivastava.] Punjab to move freely into New Delhi, the prices of food grains will automatically be reduced, and there will be no need for us to give subsidies. Why should we not lift this control on the movement of food grains from the neighbouring area of Punjab ? Punjab has pushed into Delhi a large number of refugees, about 7 lakhs or so. Why should we not let Punjab feed them also? That can be done quite easily by lifting the restrictions on free movement of food grains.

The second remedy is of course to grow more food. We have heard much about the Grow More Food Campaign in the past ; the President's Address also has made a reference to it. But what has been the result achieved so far ? I shall just give a few figures relating to the area under cultivation for different food grains from the year 1949 to 1952.

	1949-50 Acres	1950-51 Acres	1951-52 Acres
Rice .	75,000,000	75,000,000	69,000,000
Wheat .	24,000,000	23,000,000	21,000,000
Jwar .	38,000,000	38,000,000	23,000,000

I find that the area under food grains has been systematically reduced since 1949-50. I wonder if that is the result of the Grow More Food Campaign. The reason for it has been very simple. The cultivator has taken more and more to more remunerative crops like sugarcane. The area under sugarcane has gone up very much indeed as it pays the cultivator to grow more sugarcane. I do not know whether the Grow More Food Campaign, as it is going on today, is likely to give us results in the near future. We have some river valley schemes and irrigation schemes, but God alone knows when they will fructify. I calculated some time ago that if we had 30,000 tube wells more in this country we could immediately produce 4 million tons more of food grains. Tube wells do not take long to be sunk. Thirty thousand (30,000) more tube wells could be got ready in no time if we can get the machinery and equipment. The cost of 30,000 tube wells will be not more than 90

crores of rupees. Look at the cost of the two million tons of food grains which the U.S.A. gave us last year.

SHRMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay) : May I give the information to the hon. Member? This year the estimate is 46,000 tons. The food grown this year is 46,000 tons. That is the estimate for this year. That is much more and probably we are nearer the target given by the Planning Commission. I say this from my knowledge.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA: I have great respect for my hon. friend Mr. Munshi and for what he has been doing in the port folio he has held. He has said that he was the longest lived Food Minister, because his life was two years. That was not a correct statement, if I may say so. I lived for four years in the Food Ministry.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were probably not a Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER : Difficulties are difficulties.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA : Call it by what name you like but within two years he has done a great deal. I give him full marks for what he has done. My point is that we must grow more food. Our shortage may be ten or twelve or fifteen per cent. It is not more than that. In a country like India, where we have 250 million acres of land under cultivation, we should be able to make good the food shortage. I think it is a reflection on our efficiency. The position is that in this country we have about 200 million acres of land where there is no facility of irrigation at all. Forty-eight million is the acreage of irrigated land and if we could provide irrigation for even a portion of these 200 million acres of land, the deficit would soon be met. But it is a question of money. We have got everything that God could give. We have got man-power, we have got plenty of land, and we have got water. We have got mighty rivers and we have water under the ground, and if we could only use these, we should soon be able to meet the deficit;

We are using at the present moment only 6 per cent, of the flow of the rivers. There is water scarcity in the country. We use only 6 per cent. Why could we not use 20 per cent, or 25 per cent, or even more ? We should know how to do it. We should get down to it. That is the main thing.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras): May I know what you had done during your regime ?

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA : That is out of the question. That question does not arise. I do not want to blow my own trumpet.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : There is none to blow.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA: I am making this suggestion in a very humble way.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR(Bombay): On a point of information, I would like to know whether tube wells can be dug in all parts of the country.

DR. J. P. SRIVASTAVA : If you have 30,000 tube wells in places where there is water, that would make the deficit good. Food grains can be transported to all parts of India. I admit there are parts of India which are not suitable for tube wells, especially the Central India tracts and all that area. In U.P. alone we can put down a lakh of tube wells quite easily. There will be no difficulty. But it is the money which is standing in the way. If we spend 90 or 100 crores and put down 30,000 tube wells, our deficit would be made good. I appeal in all humility to the Government that they should work out a scheme to bridge this gap, because on that depends everything else. The country cannot advance unless we have sufficient and enough food. A hungry nation cannot do anything. We can have freedom but we cannot retain it if we have not sufficient food to fill our stomach. That is why I feel once again that we should give serious attention to this problem of food and hunger.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH

(West Bengal) : Sir, at the outset I should like to assure our interesting and hon. friend Shri Prithviraj Kapoor that I have taken the trouble to go through the Speech of the President, the revered Dr. Rajendra Prasad and that I know the name of the play in which we are acting. Unfortunately, for most of us, unlike our friend, play-acting is not our profession, but we are engaged in something much more serious, we are engaged in trying to avert or at least to relieve the tragedy that is impending over our ancient land.

To tell the truth, I, as a new comer to this august House, had been looking forward with great expectation to the Address of our revered President, for whom all of us have the deepest respect. But I have to confess that I was, and possibly most of the Members present here were, disappointed. For rarely have we come across a document more thin and jejune than the one we have before us. One may say that it was not the hand of the President which drafted the Address; the voice was the voice of Jacob but the hand was the hand of Esau. But then the hand that is supposed to have drafted this Address is also a master hand in draftmanship and we all love to read the writings of this hand, and we did not expect such an insipid document from that hand. My hopes were however raised when I learnt that my hon. friend Diwan Chaman Lall would be moving the motion of thanks to the President, and I felt somewhat relieved ; I felt that the dry bones of the Address would be made instinct with life by the sparkle and brilliance which we had learnt to associate with my hon. friend in days long gone by. But, alas, yesterday morning I was again disappointed, for in spite of the elaborate attempts at padding which my hon. friend made for over an hour, the document remains as insipid as ever, with not a spark of life anywhere in its vicinity. However, it is no use crying over spilt milk. The Address is before us, and I have tried to scan through the lines of that Address to discover some sparks of inspiration,

[Principal Devaprasad Ghosh.] but failed to discover any. Possibly the reason lies deeper. Inspiration, to be spread around, requires inspiration within. Possibly the framers of this Address had no inspiration left in themselves which might rouse the enthusiasm of the nation at large.

There has been much discussion, both in the Address as well as in the debate in this great House yesterday and this morning, about foreign policy. It appears that our foreign policy is summed up in one blessed word "neutrality". Neutrality has been exalted as it were to a *mantram*. But, to be frank, I do not think much of this blessed word. In most things that matter in life, whether in the life of the individual or in the life of the nation, neutrality does not play a very large part. There can be no neutrality between right and wrong ; there can be no neutrality between freedom and slavery ; there can be no neutrality between honour and dishonour; when a crisis comes, we have to come to a decision. The decision may be right or wrong, but we have to make up our minds where we stand. Mere neutrality is escapism that leads hardly anywhere.

Another thing strikes me. I am supposed to be a bit of a grammarian. Now, grammar tells us that "neutrality" is derived from the word "neuter", and we all know that "neuter" is a word, which translated into Sanskrit, is "*kliva*" (क्लीव), and "neutrality", correctly translated into Sanskrit, is "*klavya*" (क्लैव्य), and one is not disposed to entertain a very respectful attitude towards "*klavya*", and a neutrality that degenerates into the policy of the neuter gender naturally does not evoke any respect from any quarter. And this reminds me of the stirring call of Shri Krishna to Arjuna in the Bhagwad Gita :

क्लैव्यं मास्म यमः पार्थ नैतत्स्वयुपपद्यते

[*Klavyaṁ ma smagamah Partha, naitatvayyupapadyate*]

That inspiring admonition is applicable I believe to modern India, even

in her wretched condition of today. Neutrality of the neuter gender is not worthy of India or of any patriotic son of India.

It is really difficult to speak with restraint in this connection. I do not know how the hon. Members of this House feel, but I find the most bitter anguish. I come from some distance ; I come from Bengal, about a thousand miles from Delhi, the metropolis of India. And possibly spectators see more of the game than the players engaged in it. My friends will pardon me if I say bitter words. I am speaking more in sorrow than in anger. For how can we be angry with our own men, our best men ? How can we be angry with the elect of the nation ? But our sorrow knows no bounds when we find that, right and left, east and west, north and south, India is getting rebuffs all round, and is herself reacting to the rebuffs in a manner not calculated to elevate the dignity and the prestige of the nation. I would advisedly not like to use strong language ; but people might say that our foreign policy consists in licking the foot that kicks us » and they would not be far wrong. When we turn our eyes around, and our eyes have got a pretty wide sweep—they survey the world though not from China to Peru, as was the fashion in the 18th and the 19th centuries, at least from Korea to Tunisia—but in this wide sweep of our survey we sometimes miss countries nearer home. We miss Pakistan ; we miss Nepal ; we miss Ceylon ; and we miss even Kashmir. What we feel, and what we are mortally grieved at is the spectacle of this great country of India practically ignored, if not positively insulted, by the treatment accorded to her nationals or to nationals of Indian origin. India does not deserve this treatment. India's position, I hope is not so weak as to compel her to put up with these humiliations. I am not given to exaggeration. I shall give you one or two illustrations. About a year ago, there was a great imbroglio over Tibet. The new Government of China invaded Tibet and made short work of its age-old autonomy. For once the Government

of India plucked up courage and sent a note of mild protest to the Mao Government. The Red Mao Government reddened its eyes and told the India Government to mind its own business. We at once collapsed. And we have seen of late the spectacle of a cultural delegation led by the sister of our Prime Minister going to Peking to curry favour with the authorities there. It is said to be just a courtesy visit such as in ordinary circumstances. But there are limits beyond which an honoured and honourable nation cannot go. The Moscow Radio blares out time after time diatribes against the present Indian Government. The Indian Government can only hear the diatribes, grin and bear them. Even little Ceylon has disfranchised, by a stroke of the pen, about two lakh citizens of Indian origin who have made Ceylon their home and have contributed to the economic development of Ceylon. And the Indian Government sends mild protests, and engages in endless correspondence with the Ceylon Government, and ultimately says apologetically that it did not mean this, it did not mean that. I now come to the treatment accorded by Pakistan carved out of territories that but yesterday formed part of India. The last two or three years' history is fully known to you all; and even today a drama is being enacted in Karachi » in the shape of the Passport Conference where the Pakistan Government openly stated that the conference was not of its own seeking that they did not want a conference and that it was the Indian Government's insistence that persuaded them to agree to a conference. And in today's papers it is said that the conference has ended in complete deadlock. What a contemptuous attitude towards India ! Nobody pays any attention to what India demands, what India wants in a most polite manner, in a most courteous manner, in a most civilised manner. Perhaps India's civility and politeness have been undoing her. I am pointing out all these things in the anguish of my soul. When we see these things, we wonder why this contemptuous treatment of India, this unresponsiveness to Indian demands. Has India, free India,

sunk so low that there are none so poor as to do her reverence ? Has really Indian neutrality degenerated into the policy of the neuter gender ? If that is so, the future of India is dark indeed.

I need not dilate upon the foreign policy of India any further, as it has been discussed in great detail by my friends from both sides of the House. The real difficulty is this. You all know that Shakespeare in his tragedy of Hamlet has depicted the Prince of Denmark as an otherwise excellent young man but quite lacking in decision ; his attitude in life seems to be summed up in his soliloquy "To be or not to be, that is the question." Similar to Shakespeare's tragedy seems to be the tragedy of India, whose leader's policy seems to be just a variant of the Ham-letic soliloquy—"To do or not to do, that is the question." A crisis comes ; nothing is decided ; in the meantime time passes, for time and tide wait for no man ; but action falters or at the best becomes ineffective. References have been made in this House about the little foreign pockets in India which my hon. friend sitting by me (Mr. Bhanj Deo) called " dens of pick-pockets "— belonging to certain foreign powers for centuries and now a sort of anachronistic survival. Now Portugal says, for instance, that little Goa is part and parcel of the State of Portugal despite what geography teaches and maps reveal. The head of our Government is not decided what to do or not to do about it all, and in the meantime the time passes. That is the supreme anguish that overwhelms us. We all wish and hope that our Foreign Minister, who is also our Prime Minister, should make up his mind and stand up for India's prestige, India's honour, at home and abroad. He is a very intelligent man with a firm grasp of international affairs and we all expect him to rise to the height of the occasion.

The Home policy of the Government I shall not dilate upon as so many speakers in this House have already described it. Only I shall say something about the food policy, and particularly about the" food situation in

[Principal Devaprasad Ghosh.] Bengal, regarding which an amendment has been moved by me. The situation is very difficult in the Sundarbans area. Over five lakhs of people have been affected by the food shortage which borders not on scarcity but borders upon famine conditions in an area which you will please note, is known as a surplus area in West Bengal. Two years ago, in September 1950, there were floods, as a result of which many dykes were broken, and much of the area was flooded with saline water destroying the crops. That was disaster number one. Secondly, for the last two monsoon periods, there has been failure of rains there. As a result of this, the position there is most critical. The people there are just eking out a bare existence, living on roots and leaves of vegetables and grass. What causes deep anguish is the fact that many Congress members in West Bengal have called this picture an exaggerated one ; they have characterised it in *pucca* bureaucratic style—as over-dramatization ; and scientists in Government pay have not been wanting who have discovered unsuspected vita-minous virtues in grass and roots of vegetables. That is the pity of it all.

I would like to refer to only one point more and finish. Mr. Chairman, whatever be the other problems before the country of a temporary nature, the main problem that confronts us is that of the unity and integrity of our motherland. There was one passage in the Address of the President which struck me as going to the core of the matter. The passage is this :

We have to build up the unity of India, the unity of a free people working for the realization of the high destiny that awaits them.

I want to stress this point—let us ensure the unity of all India,- let us all strive for this unity despite our party factions and differences. Let us all join each other and work unceasingly for the restoration of the unity and the integrity of India, without which I am afraid none of the nation's problems whether of food or finance or industrial regeneration or refugees are capable of satisfactory solution. Let

us therefore concentrate all our energies on this primary problem and try to realise the noble vision of the patriotic sons of our land from Surendra Nath Banerjee to Subhas Chandra Bose who lived and fought and died for this glorious ideal of reunited India. And God willing we shall very soon see Mother India emerge once again in the triumph of her might and the resplendence of her majesty ; and we shall have the privilege of adoring her once again in the words of the immortal Bankim Chandra as :

बाहुबल धारिणीम् ,
नमामि तारिणीम् ,
रिपु-दल वारिणीम् ,
मातरम् ,
वन्दे मातरम् ।

[Bahubal dharinim,
Namami tarinim,
Ripud'il varinim,
Matararn, Vande
Mataram.]

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, in commending the Address for the respectful consideration and support of this House, I should like to say a few words especially in regard to two of the points that were referred to in the Address, namely, our foreign relations and secondly, the food problem in India at present which is by far the most important and vital problem in which we are all interested. So far as our foreign relations are concerned, I should think that by far it is the most satisfactory record of the Government. You may level any criticism against this aspect of the home policy of the Government, you may level any criticism against that aspect of the home policy, but I think any person who gives due consideration to the grave problems that are confronting the world today must come to the conclusion that by far the best solution is the policy that has been adopted by our Government in regard to foreign relations.

Now there is no war. I do not understand what exactly is meant by saying 'You are neutral or not neutral'.

The question of neutrality as a fact I can arise only if and when a war breaks out. Before that we can think of alliances with this power or with that power, but there can be no question of neutrality. In order to circumvent certain Articles of the United Nations Charter, various kinds of regional alliances have been formed in Europe. Now, what is the sort of regional alliance or compact which you expect us to enter into? Let us analyse the situation. A leading Socialist spokesman said we cannot have anything to do with China because the Government of China does not appeal to us; we cannot have anything to do with Russia because there is something communistic about it. Then which is the Power or the third bloc with which you have to enter into an alliance? Let us calmly consider the situation. Now we are not in a position to say that we will contribute so much of our Army, so much of our Navy, so much of our Air Force in consideration of your doing this or not doing this. You may enter into any alliance with any bloc; but that alliance must be reciprocal. Therefore, what is the compact we are to enter into? Are we to enter into a compact with Arabia, with Persia or with Egypt, if you exclude China, if you exclude Russia, if you exclude Indonesia which is under obligation to the United States? What is the kind of third bloc which you enter into and what is the kind of contribution which each member of the third bloc is to give? Is Pakistan to be a member? We have got already our domestic troubles with Pakistan. Is Pakistan prepared? Is Iran prepared? Is Iraq prepared or is Egypt prepared with all their internal troubles to enter into an offensive or defensive alliance with India, that being the *quid pro quo* between people who enter into a regional compact? We have our troubles in Kashmir. We have a quasi-domestic trouble with Pakistan. When I call it 'quasi-domestic', that does not mean that we want to get back Pakistan or any such thing. We are anxious to maintain very

cordial and excellent relations with Pakistan, as if Pakistan was a part of India. And yet troubles there are. We have been confronted with troubles with Pakistan. That is the position today.

Now the record of our Army, our Air Force and our Navy has been great. With our limited resources, they have won glory for India in many a theatre of war. But with all that it is hardly sufficient for our internal defence and for our troubles in Kashmir or for maintaining our land frontier. Under those circumstances, what is the sort of alliance from a practical point of view which is proposed, never mind the ethics of it? That is the point I would ask Members to remember in dealing with the question of compacts. We can only throw our weight in the cause of peace inspired by the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi which are by no means an unimportant factor in the counsels of the world today. Two years ago every American paper, every American journal, cheered at the policy of our Prime Minister. Even English papers were thinking that our Prime Minister was trying to make a big man of himself. What he is trying to do is that he is throwing his weight, moral weight, on the side of peace and order and harmony in the world. There is still some force in the region of ideas and in the region of idealism. Interested foreign newspapers and periodicals who have been critical of our foreign policy have begun to realise the wisdom of the foreign policy of our Government. It is a wrong assumption that in regard to questions affecting our foreign relations we are led by America or Great Britain. You have only to peruse the proceedings of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Assembly and if you have the patience to go through them, there have been quite a number of occasions on which India differed from the conclusions arrived at both by Great Britain and by America and there were several occasions on which she supported J Russia. If necessary, a record may

[Shri Alladi Krishnaswami.] be prepared of the various occasions on which India voted with one party or with the other. il a.m.

I am reminded of a conversation I had with a friend. Some of the Members who took part in the debate also spoke as though we have about three hundred divisions at our command, thousands of the most modern type of fighters and bombers and a huge navy to guard our coastline. Only the disposition of the forces is what is needed. It is not as if that is our position. They would urge our withdrawal from the United Nations because the United Nations Organisation is under the control of one power bloc and in the Security Council the voice of another great power alone counts. One of the Members suggested, as a counterpoise to the two power blocs, that a third bloc consisting of many Asian nations should be formed. As I have already pointed out, they seem to imagine that the Asian nations are well-armed, well-equipped with modern weapons. At the same time, it was suggested that we should break away from China because the Chinese Government and the conditions there are not what we desire them to be. If we eliminate from the Asian bloc Russia on the ground that it belongs to the Communist bloc, China as being an ally of Russia or that its Government is not what we desire it to be, the Philippines on the ground that they are closely linked with America, Australia as being a part of the British Commonwealth and her policy being linked with the United States and the United Kingdom, Indonesia which has just won its freedom on the ground that it has allied with the Western Powers or is depending upon America—I was wondering what this third bloc would and should consist of! The only countries that I can think of are India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq and Egypt if we treat it as a part of Asia also. We all know our relations with Pakistan very well. That has formed the subject of numerous questions, debates and resolutions

in Parliament. Iran, Egypt and Tunisia are up to their eyes with their own domestic problems to be ever concerned with the formation of an Asian bloc. I wish the House were enlightened on the question as to whom this third bloc should consist of, what is its extent and what are the respective contributions of the different members of the third bloc. We were not enlightened on that aspect of the question by the hon. Member who spoke in favour of the formation of the third bloc.

Then the question of the foreign pockets in India was mentioned and it was stated that they were creating difficulties in regard to customs etc. But what are we to do? The foreign pockets are not the making of the present National Government of India. They have been a heritage of the past and we are trying to do what we can by way of diplomatic pressure and an appeal to the sense of fairness of the nations concerned. We will have to enter into entanglements with the Portuguese and the French, not to mention other complications, if we were to cross the frontier and try to bring freedom to these people. Is that the idea of the hon. Member? Therefore, merely harping on foreign pockets does not carry conviction to anybody. I am not a member of the Government but I can say that both the Opposition and the Party in power agree on that point. I would ask, how many legions are you going to march into the foreign pockets to ensure their freedom? Or are you going to assist any rebellion there? If so, what are the steps that you are going to take? Or are you going to try peaceful means? There are only two methods of solution. One is war and the other peaceful adjustment of dispute.

Then the problem of Ceylon was mentioned. I agree that our people in Ceylon who are the nationals of Ceylon are entitled to political treatment at least on the same level as the citizens of the U.S.A. Assume for a moment that the Ceylon Government is unreasonable. What are we to do? We have to appeal to the

enlightened conscience of the world, to the good sense of the Ceylonese and the friendly relations that existed between Ceylon and India for ages past. We can, if necessary, resort to other kinds of pressure upon Ceylon but at the same time we have to see that we do not interfere with their domestic affairs. Supposing another nation interfered with our domestic problems, how much will we resent it? These are problems which have to be delicately, skilfully and cleverly managed in a statesmanlike manner. Those who are critical about our attitude towards Ceylon have not offered any other solution. Having been trained in the profession of law I try to see what exactly is the resultant of an argument. Every argument or contention must lead to some result: otherwise the argument has no force....

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH:
Better stop the export of rice to Ceylon.

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI :
If you stop the export of rice, then there is the question of the necessary commodities which we have to get from Ceylon. There is always that disadvantage.

AN HON. MEMBER : Have trade relations only with such countries where our national honour is not at stake.

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI : I dare say that my hon. friend is well equipped in all these matters. I am trying- to have my say. That is always the disadvantage of having a number of points discussed in the course of a debate like this. If an argument is defective it carries its own condemnation. My hon. friend can suggest effective ways and means when the time comes, such as the Budget debate, or the debate on foreign relations or trade relations. He can then deal with our relations with Ceylon, with China and every other blessed foreign country.

One word in regard to our being a member of the Commonwealth and our relations with Great Britain. Our being a member of the Common-

wealth has never stood in the way of pursuing an independent line of action in the counsels of the U.N. nor on our functioning as a Republic. On the other hand, we are in a position to count upon expert skill and assistance in any matter in which we do require such an assistance. It is not suggested that a modern Navy or a modern Air Force can be built up without some kind of assistance from countries that are far advanced in these matters.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the hon. gentleman reading a quotation or a speech ?

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI :
There are only a few advanced countries which are in a position to sell us modern equipment

MR. CHAIRMAN : The point raised is that speeches are not expected to be read. All that I say is that Shri Alladi can certainly speak.

SHRI ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI: I am only reading out of my notes. Now I come to the food problem. There are only two aspects to the food problem. One is the present need. You have to get food if there is scarcity and there is a huge population to be fed. You have to ask foreign countries for food grains. A starving man cannot afford to wait and that is what leads to complications. Some hon. Members will not have anything from the U.S.A. They warn that the 2 million tons offered by U.S.A. should be rejected, which means greater starvation for the people of the country. You cannot get the necessary food grains except at a price from other countries of the world.

In regard to the future production, you will have to concentrate your attention on river valley projects, and what may be called small channel irrigation, tank irrigation projects, etc. That is an outlay which can only be met by increased taxation or by conserving your resources in particular respects or by taking any other special steps. I quite realize that there are great difficulties created if

[Shri Alladi Krishnaswami.] we stop the subsidies to the States. That, however, might require further re-examination. I would request Government to stop black-marketing first, before dealing with any other offences. The unsocial offences must be treated on the same level here as in Russia; whether I accept the Russian creed in other respects or not, I certainly accept this part of the Russian economy, namely that unsocial offences are to be treated as grave danger to the public, even more so than any other similar offence. That is all I wanted to say in this matter. There should be a concerted action on the part of all people. I wish that the food problem is treated not as a party problem at all; all parties may put their heads together and see that the situation is brought under control. Just as in times of war, people forget all party alliances in a country like England where great criticism is always made. I wish in tackling this food problem, here in India also, we should forget all party alliances. All parties, all sections should make a concerted effort to find what exactly are the means for the purpose of solving the food situation in the country, which is grave. Unless the Government is able to save the food situation in the next ten years, I see very great dangers. I wish that the Government gives first priority to the food problem, and relegates all other problems to a secondary state.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, the first part of my amendment is with regard to the food situation. The Members of this House as also the public of our country know that several parts of the country are stricken with famine, though there are people who would not in that connection like to use the word 'famine'. If such scarcity of food and scarcity of water do not constitute famine, I do not know then what famine means. The President's Address dealt with the several things which have been done by Government in tackling the problem.

It was a good idea on the part of the Government to have put the army in the service of the people in that area. They have been doing many things on the spur of the moment, and I should say that they have done a lot which otherwise would not have been done. But the Address does not say what amount of relief has been given to the people, so far, even by the army, and whether the people have got out of their difficulty. If they have not, I ask, what further steps are the Government going to take in this connection. There is no reference to that in the Address. There are, however still difficulties; in spite of the many wells that have been deepened and new wells that have been sunk by the army and the civilian agencies of the Government, the water scarcity is still there. In the Madras State, there are several places where the poor people have to wait for hours together to get a pot of water from some lorry that brings water to them. They have to wait for several hours during day as well as night, leaving their other work, with the result they lose the means of their livelihood. That is the position existing in several parts of the country still. What is it that the Government proposes to do in this connection? The Address says that the Government happens to have a large stock of food grains in its possession, much larger than it used to have in the past. We have no information as to whether any good portion of these large stocks of food grains are proposed to be rushed to the areas that are stricken with famine. What are the immediate steps which they propose to take to give substantial relief to the people? We are not told. We are not also told as to how the Government proposes to eliminate the contingency of the people in several parts of the country falling victims to this disease of plague and famine which is striking our country every now and then at the slightest provocation, whether at the instance of nature or human agency. The State Government, at

the instance of the Central Government, might have done many things • which would have avoided these calamities in spite of the inclemency of nature. Many State Governments are inclined to blame nature for what has befallen our people in the country. They say that there have been no rains for the last five years. In the first year they said there was no rain. In the next year, they ought to have foreseen and provided for such a contingency. Repeatedly they were told that they should be prepared for the failure of rains; but what has been done? For instance, there was a reference by one of our friends about the sinking of wells, which is after all an ordinary matter. The Government allotted several crores of rupees for the sinking of wells. Even on the first day, when the proposal came on the floor of one of the Houses of the Legislature in our State, it was put to them that they must do these things according to some plan. That plan was that a survey should be made of the water facilities available in various parts of the State. That survey could bring in many other things also, not only water for irrigation, but water for drinking purposes as well; it may unearth many minerals whose existence was unknown to the people or the Survey Department hitherto. We told them that the most simple way of using this money for the best benefit of the people was to have made such a survey and then the people should be asked to dig wells in such places where it would have been ascertained that there were veins of water. The Government should have given subsidies only for those wells which are being dug according to this plan. It is a simple matter which is easily understandable. But the Government did not take up this plan, did not even give any thought to it, but instead have been haphazardly spending crores of rupees. With what result? The result they were not able to divulge, and they would not divulge even today in spite of the many questions put to them on the floor of the House. The President's Address says that as a result of the

measures that were taken throughout the country 14 lakhs of tons of rice have been produced, more than usual. But that is qualified by another statement that this cannot be taken strictly or literally as being 14 lakhs, because drought and famine, scarcity of water, failure of rains have affected the production. What is the net result then? We would like to know how they were able to discriminate between the results of the drought and the results of their Grow More Food Campaign. The question has been put to them in the State several times, as to what is the result of the expenditure they have incurred so far, which runs to several crores. In several parts of the country there are tanks which have been in existence from times immemorial. People in the olden times also had some engineering idea as well as the people today. They had brought into existence systems and chains of tanks. Many of them have now fallen into disuse. They have been out of repairs. Perhaps it was thought that it was not fashionable to resort to these tanks. No attention was paid to them. What are the Government going to do in all these matters? There is particular need for all this in Rayalaseema, North Arcot district, Chinglepet, Coimbatore district and various other parts of the country. We want to have a clear impression whether the people can draw any consolation from the Government.

The next point also is one connected with the food situation in the country. It was put to the Government that for anything which a man is asked to do, he must have sufficient inducement. More than 80 per cent, of the population of our country is engaged in producing food and other agricultural produce. If you ask them in a particular year to make a sacrifice in the interests of the people as a whole, they will do it. But if you ask them year in and year out to make sacrifices, they cannot do that. It is not human nature to do so. It is, is physically impossible for these people to go on making these sacrifices. We find that production is falling. People think it is not paying

[Janab M. Muhammad Ismail Sahib.] enough to grow food grains. Therefore, they are growing such commodities as cotton, sugarcane, ground-nut, tobacco and other articles. "These are really paying them rather than to grow food grains. What does it mean? It means that it is not paying to grow food grains. So, we must make it worth while for them to grow these food grains. The price must be more economic than it is today. Then there will be increase of production in the country. That is the only and scientific way in which you can deal with inflation. If you have got sufficient food grains to meet the demands of the country, prices will settle down by themselves. When the produce is sufficient to meet the demand, when the public knows it, the prices will settle down by themselves and that will be a lasting solution of the problem of inflation. In fairness to the producers I say that there ought to be a better price. The other day I came across some statistics which says that the wholesale price index figure for the country in November 1951 was 436. That was the price index for all commodities. For the same month of the same year the retail price index for food grains was only 160 or 170, if I remember aright. From this we can understand the disparity in the prices of food grains and other commodities; and it is not fair to ask the peasants to make such sacrifices. The prices must be made uniform throughout the country. We should not say that the cost of cultivation in one part of the country is one thing and the cost in another part is another thing. That is not fair. It is not fair and just to treat labour who are all entitled to the same level of wages, in one way—as if they are a depressed class—in one part of the country and in another way in another part. If a price is fixed for rice, it must be uniform for the whole country. If a price is fixed for wheat, it must be uniform throughout the country. If there is any disparity in the wages, that disparity must be eliminated. People in the whole of the country

, must get the same level of wages. Now that is not the case. Madras was facing an emergency about a year or 18 months ago. All of a sudden she had recourse to buying a quantity of rice from U.P. They bought 40,000 tons from the U.P. When the bill came from the U.P. it was found that there was a difference in price and it worked to Rs. 108 lakhs when compared to the price which the Madras Government was paying for the rice which it was procuring in its own State. 108 lakhs of rupees for 40,000 tons of rice! At this rate, if you take the produce of rice in Madras to be even so low as 40 lakhs per annum, it works out to 100 crores of rupees. That means the agriculturists in one part of the country are without the 100 crores which is actually due to them. That amount of money is less in circulation amongst them. What kind of economic position and standard of living those people would have can be understood from this one instance. Therefore I say that such disparity should not exist. There should be a proper and more economical and uniform level of prices for these food grains.

Coming to the question of industrial development, we are told time and again that it is the policy of the Government of India as well as that of the State Governments to encourage cottage industries, to decentralise industries, and to encourage cottage industries. It is a good idea. But what has Government been doing in that connection to see that that policy is put into execution? There is one outstanding instance where this policy has not been working properly and to the benefit of the people, and that instance is regarding the handloom industry. The handloom industry is a cottage industry that has existed in the country from time immemorial. Historians cannot trace its origin, and millions of families are eking out a livelihood from this industry. Now, when you have already got this industry established over centuries and thousands of years,

I do not understand what the Government is doing in pursuance of that policy of encouraging cottage industries if they do not encourage this industry. This industry has been caught in crisis after crisis, in calamity after calamity. It could not get sufficient quantities of yarn at one time, and it was crying itself hoarse for the supply of yarn. And now, before they get a sufficient quantity of yarn, they cannot find a market for the product which is manufactured even out of the insufficient quantity of yarn. Cannot the Government do anything in the matter? The members of the public as well as the handloom people, the weavers, would like to know how the policy of helping this industry is being implemented. The problem now is to find a market for their manufactures. Some of the markets which they had previously are lost to them. In these circumstances, the Government has to come to their rescue. If they are not able to secure the services of any reliable co-operative society in the matter, the Government should themselves go to the extent of forming a corporation for this purpose, and that corporation should be charged with the task of buying the manufactured products of the handloom industry. Government being in a position of vantage, it can arrange with other countries for the selling of these articles to them and purchasing of other articles and materials from them; and even if there is a loss in the transaction, the risk is worth taking. When crores are being spent on such schemes as firka development schemes for the improvement of the rural population—schemes and experiments which are new, which are not yet proved to be good, and which have not yet begun to yield results—surely a risk can be taken for the benefit of millions of people who are engaged in the handloom industry.

There are a number of other industries, like cocoanut growing, pepper growing, leather tanning and manufacturing, and so on. In these matters Government can really take a 4CS.D.

helpful hand. Whether they have any idea of doing so, we cannot know from the Address.

Then there are the mineral resources of the country. The Geological Survey of India has not yet surveyed the whole country for minerals, so much so there are untapped and unexploited resources in our country worth thousands of crores of rupees. Although this was put to the Government, no action was taken, and by a mere accident in Madras they have discovered certain deposits of lignite, apart from other minerals like mica and iron ore. In one place alone they estimate there are 200 crores of tons of these lignite deposits; it may be worth anything like 4,000 crores of rupees. If these resources are exploited and other deposits are worked, it will really revolutionise the economic condition of the people. But we are told that they cannot exploit these resources because there are difficulties. There may be difficulties, but it is for the Government to overcome them.

SHRI B. G. KHER (Bombay) : Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in support of the motion to convey the thanks of this House for the Address which the President has delivered here. I have listened to the debate, particularly to the speeches made by Members opposite, with considerable attention. I must confess to a sense of disappointment. Many of them were barren of any constructive, useful suggestions, and the rest were party propaganda. As I said yesterday, the occasion of the Speech of the President is to enable the Opposition to put forward their own constructive proposals and alternative policies, and to point out the superiority of those proposals and policies to the policy that has been set out by the Government in the President's Speech. From that point of view, I do not think we can be very pleased with what the Opposition has been pleased to say.

That does not amount to saying that there was no literary merit in it. There was an hon. Member

[Shri B. G. Kher.] who quoted from the Bhagwat Gita. He said that for the protection of the good—which presumably means his party—and for the destruction of the *dushkritas*, the wicked—which presumably means the Congress—Bhagwan often and often—in the person of Members who are elected to this House—comes down and obliges their Party:

**परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च द्यूकृतां ।
धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे ॥**

[*Paritranaya sadhunam vinasaya cha dushk-ritatn,*

Dharma-samsthapanarthaya sambhavami yuge yuge.]

Our foreign policy was criticised, and there was an hon. Member who also brought in the Bhagwat Gita to show that "neutrality was absolutely futile". He said "N mw T*T: <TI*f Kioto-yam masmagamah Paritita. The Bhagwat Gita also contains some other verses. It says also : "sr^-frsr^TR^ S^iHW fe^fer" The ignorant one with no faith and full of doubts perishes.

Hon. Members do not care to read the Speech or to understand the momentous times, the critical times, through which our country is passing, when those who are in charge of the affairs of the State are trying to pull up the country after its recent attainment of independence. Those who are ignorant of what is being done, have not participated in the achieving of our independence, and have little faith,— their faith is not either in their own action or in what we are doing, but in imitating what other people do —about such people the Rhaowat Gita says: **विनो जज्ञश्चात्रदधानश्च संशयः।** The ignorant one with no faith and full of doubts perishes.

So far as the enunciation of the policy of this Government is concerned, I would take the liberty to say that the President's Speech contains a very lucid and clear state-

ment of such policy, both so far as international affairs are concerned as also so far as domestic issues of very great importance are concerned.

The attainment of independence by India and the manner of her attaining it have a great significance and are bound to influence not only India but also other countries in the world. Already other smaller exploited countries are looking to India for help, they are turning towards India for guidance with hope and expectation. We are attaining an importance in international relations since we became a free country which already compels the attention, and will, I am certain, soon compel the respect, of the big powers of the world. The mover of this Resolution has dealt with the question of foreign policy at great length and in a very able manner and also my neighbour and friend, Sir Alladi Krishnaswami, has dealt with the objections that were raised about it in a very effective manner. I am asking what are the constructive suggestions that the Opposition has made? I say so far as our foreign policy is concerned very little criticism is possible. I quite realize as my friend opposite said that there are still in our midst, the pocket of Goa and the pocket of Pondicherry. I do agree that there are these pockets. We shall certainly remove them in due time but things cannot be done overnight. After all Rome was not built in a day. I think the Opposition Members have yet to learn so many things before they can come into power—and remove those pockets. If they are aspiring for coming into power now—I do not see any chance of their coming into power now, or at all especially when they are in such a microscopic minority—I advise them that immediate war should not be the foreign policy that should be adopted. I will not, therefore, take the time of this House about matters of foreign policy and international affairs. There are more urgent, more important and more vital things which claim the attention of the House, The President's Speech has

told us these things of vital importance. Yes, it is all right for critics to talk about political slogans regarding policies and advocate them. But the people know that there are far more important things which also affect the foreign policy in their turn and the President has referred to them in his Speech. What is of vital importance for us? It is to labour for the rapid economic advancement of our people. That is one. And, secondly, to endeavour to realise the noble ideals of equality and social and economic justice which have been laid down in our Constitution. If I heard him rightly, there was a gentleman in this House who said that this our Constitution—I can quote his very words—was framed by pretenders. Whether it is parliamentary language or not, I do not know. What right has he to say that, when it is well-known that the Congress was the only party which was struggling hard and agitating for freedom? It is the Congress that underwent all sorts of troubles and hardships while struggling for the country's freedom. They had to face the difficulties

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : You made profits. You are the profiteers.

SHRI B. G. KHER : I do not yield to the hon. Member. So he cannot interrupt me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will have an opportunity of answering that when your turn comes. But it is not right to interrupt other speakers when they are speaking.

SHRI B. G. KHER : When we framed that Constitution after three years' labour, when it was framed by people who were representatives of the vast masses and millions of our countrymen, and when the gentleman who talked about it himself took the oath of allegiance to that Constitution and solemnly affirmed his support to it, it is surprising that he should attack the framers of the Constitution

in this fashion at this stage as pretenders. I say that that Constitution represents the essence of what is good for this country. Of course it may not be so according to the ideals of some hon. Members. But, even if it requires a change, there are methods of changing that Constitution and the hon. Members will have to be taught that it is those methods that will have to be followed and not those which they in season and out of season advocate in the country. That is the first remark that I wish to make about the Constitution. I should say it is a very noble Constitution. It puts before the people a very good ideal. Of course those who do not wish to see the good of the people, the proper evolution of the liberty and happiness of the people by peaceful means, would not like that Constitution and would like to subvert it by means which are so well-known and which end only in the seizure of power by a particular group and not in secular democracy based on the popular franchise which this Constitution embodies. I cannot understand the remarks that the hon. Member made about "pretenders" framing this Constitution. He will soon learn that that Constitution was made by the true representatives of the people and that it will be a beacon light to other people who are struggling for independence.

I attach greater importance to equality and social and economic justice. I do not minimise the importance of the rapid economic advancement of our people. But there is a psychological factor in these matters and unless we are able to rouse the enthusiasm of the people—make them realise that they have achieved true independence, that the Government is entirely in their power, to compel them to do what they want in order to prosper, and what is for their benefit,—then alone will they put forward their best endeavours. It is the enthusiasm of the common man that we want to rouse. The hon. Member says : "take the land of A and give it to B

[Shri B. G. Kher.]

without paying anything to him and then the enthusiasm will be roused." The Father of our Nation, the architect of the freedom of this country and those who struggled for that liberty under his banner, knew better ways, and I hope, more efficient ways. We have somehow therefore to evolve a social order in which the status and not only the income of what is usually called the common man is raised. Yes, I do agree that now there is great social inequality. I have been a lawyer for the greater part of my life. Advocates were paid as fees ten guineas or twelve guineas twenty years ago and worked for the whole day. Now, mediocre people earn three times that fee, in half the time. I am sure my noble friend Sir Alladi Krishnaswami who belongs to the same profession will agree with me so far as my facts go. He smiles and agrees. The so-called educated people who think that they have received education from the British and are the benefactors of the country have yet to learn the lesson that the common man particularly after the attainment of *Swaraj* will not tolerate this kind of inequality of income and ostentatious expenditure of wealth. When your neighbour starves, when people have no food to eat, how can they tolerate anybody's making money, so easily and in such a large measure? Disparity of incomes—that is the disease of the country and the sooner we realize it and try to bring in social justice, in evaluation of labour the better it is. That was very much alive to the minds of the Members who framed this Constitution. We need not look to other countries who may have achieved their freedom in a different manner. After all every country has its own history, its own traditions, its own past, its own culture, its own spirit and even those who profess and raise slogans of other countries are bound by this Constitution. The President in his speech and another speaker from Bihar has referred to these things of the spirit and I do not propose to deal with them on this occasion but

come to more mundane matters. But you cannot ignore what is more important, this psychological factor of making the common man feel that the Constitution not only provides for social justice but social equality and also economic prosperity; unless we soon evolve a social order that brings these things into reality we will find ourselves in difficulties.

The Father of the Indian Nation had evolved a programme of such work; people do not like the name he gave it—he used to call it the 'Constructive Programme'. I think it is a very good name and I think it is a great programme suited to the needs of human nature, particularly to Indian nature. And he also named his ideal in a wonderful way. He was patriotic, he was nationalist, but at the same time he was *human* and a citizen of the world; and so he called his ideal *Sarvodaya* and he gave the people not only slogans but gave them elaborate details of working them out, as elaborate as 40 years of devoted service to the country could enable him to do. He gave them a plan. It is very difficult to implement, and as I said I do not propose to say more about this now because the time at my disposal is very short, but I will refer to only one or two matters which have been discussed in the President's Speech.

People complain of shortage of food—yes, of course we want food—and a brilliant suggestion was made that if Ceylon does not do this or that, 'stop importing rice from Ceylon'. Yes, and make the price of rice go up and then our friends will say the prices are going up!

PRINCIPAL D E V A P R A S A D
GHOSH : Stop export of rice to Ceylon.

SHRI B. G. KHER : Very well, "export" of rice to Ceylon. What I want to tell hon. Members is this.....
{*Interruption*}. I am sitting with the permission of the Chair and that is why I am not yielding to the hon. Member.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin) : The time will come.....

SHRI B. G. KHER : What I want to suggest is, don't be impatient ; we have got to grow food, we have to feed the people. We are now helpless and that is why we are importing it. Don't we know that we pay for it, we pay through the nose—something like 250 million rupees or so. You have to pay for it and so you have to grow more food. Therefore, if they take the trouble to read the Address they will see that provision is made for growing more food in what is referred to in the President's Speech as the proposal to start "Community Projects". That is a big scheme. My friend just referred to cottage industries and price of cloth. He made a very good speech, which would have been more relevant on the floor of the Madras Legislature but, in this House, which is concerned with more important, countrywide matters of policy, well, I think the question of price of cloth in this district or that has no per-12 Noon, tinence. So, in order to provide for the general prosperity of the whole country, in as short a time as possible, Government has thought out a scheme. Hon. Members can criticise it. No one will quarrel with that, and the Chairman has particularly said we can make constructive suggestions. That is what I want to say about the proposals that have been put before the House, in order to ameliorate the condition of our people. The purpose of a Community Project is, as it has been laid down by the Government in their own Press Note—the central object of the Community Project is to secure the fullest development of the material and human resources of an area. Minerals—yes, grow more food—yes, more employment—yes, try and see that an attempt is made to achieve these in as short a time as possible; we are to have certain pilot plans, to have these projects, rural and urban projects, which will serve as pilots in the establishment for the men, women and children covered by the project area, of the right to live and to live a better life. Food being

the principal item must receive primary emphasis in the initial stages of the programme. It is obvious that this programme cannot succeed without the closest co-operation of both, the people and the Government machinery, because it comprises the improvement not only of agriculture and Grow More Food but of communications, health, removal of unemployment, housing, social welfare and also of cultural activities. And what is, therefore, of essence, what is of the greatest importance is that not only the Government officers—and certainly not only the professional men who are busy now only with their own fat incomes—but all of us put together who have the good of this country at heart, must in record time convince the people of the land—the masses—that things have changed. Somebody said this was the last chance; yes, it is the last chance—but all is not yet lost; you can convince the people, and begin with yourself, that *Swaraj* has come, things are changing and, the rich are now thinking of helping the poor. Don't start with the pessimism which says that men must quarrel like the wolf and the sheep. There are better ways of constructing a society. It is, therefore, necessary that in these projects the psychological aspect should not be lost sight of. Though a substantial increase of agricultural production is the immediate target, it will be necessary to provide for the agricultural producer an incentive in the form of other increased amenities of life which are at present available only for urban citizens. There will be a drive for all-round development so as to ensure a richer and fuller life for the citizens of rural India with agriculture as the pivot. Our country's economy being what it is and production of food and more food being the pressing necessity, an effort must be made, as my friend said in another connection, on a war footing as quickly as possible and by all concerned. We must start helping these Community Projects so that more than the immediate benefits it will bring, it will bring to the hearts of the millions of these people the conviction that things

[Shri B. G. Kher.] have now changed, that there are people who care for them, that their happiness and prosperity are engaging the attention not only of the Members of this House but of every educated and earnest man who is capable of doing anything because of the education that he has received and because of the unselfish nature which I hope he does possess as an Indian.

We therefore must now realise that although we have enough material resources and enough man-power to tackle this pressing problem, we have not yet the will and not yet the skill to achieve these things. We tried to do these things in Bombay with the co-operation of the people. We had about 40 centres which were put in charge of non-officials. They were asked to make their budgets and they were asked to yoke for service all the people who were willing and were able-bodied and anxious to help in the amelioration of 30 to 40 villages. It has shown excellent results. Hundreds of school buildings have been built and the cost to the Government was nominal. If the Government have put in Rs. 5,000 the people have put in labour which costs Rs. 50,000, because it is their own children who are to study in those schools. Hundreds of schools have already been built. Hundreds of miles of roads have been built, and many disputes have been settled out of court. It is this kind of constructive work that is needed and will be needed if, as our hon. friend has said, we are running against time. That is what is needed to convince these people that those who were erstwhile the partners of their exploiters are now changing their colour have now cast off their love of ease and comfort and become the servants of the whole nation. That is of the essence of the Community Project Scheme.

The need today is for the adoption of what is far more important than many bags of rice for our people, it is the evolution of a national system of all-round education, which will be free, from pre-basic, basic, adult and

f social education. That education is not only during elections ; that education is not to be done merely in schools, but in every part of the State, in farms, factories from wherever the people gather in festivities and occasions of public celebrations. The people who profess to be the servants and saviours of their country should give this message of hope to the down-trodden and depressed people of India, and try to enlighten them that after all if they labour for their country they will enjoy the whole fruit of it and it is their own children who are going to be more prosperous. We have to revolutionize the system of our education. Here again, the architect of our freedom has given us the basic system of education, namely, education through activity, useful activity, which increases the wealth of the people. Unless we emphasize these two aspects, I say that the criticism of our programmes and policies which are framed by people who have given an earnest of their desire to raise this country and free it from centuries of bondage, any criticism which will lead people into the further bondage of other countries, is not good. I am very grateful to the President for the very fine Address that he has been able to deliver us.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There was a question raised about question-hour here. Next Tuesday and Wednesday, you will be allowed to have questions raised here. You must give notice of them today or tomorrow. If you are able to put your questions today or tomorrow they may be answered on Tuesday or Wednesday next week. The first half-hour will be devoted to the questions.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment moved by my leader Mr. Sundarayya.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, SHRI M. L. PURI, in the Chair.]

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: I do not want to make here the eloquent type of speech made by Members teaching us high ideals. But I would only like to

place before you certain bare facts, and ask you to judge them for yourself.

Coming to the Presidential Address, I have to say that it is very disappointing to find no change in the policies of that Government which is responsible for the famines, which is responsible for the industrial crisis in this country, and for the unemployment. The Address is a clear warning as to the impending attack on the standard of living of the people. In short, it refuses to take into consideration the realities of our country.

While coming to the realities, I will mention first the unity of our country. An argument was advanced here that we must all strive for the unity of our country, as we are all for unity. That unity does not mean the denial of the legitimate right of the people to have linguistic provinces ; that unity does not mean the imposition of something which is not good for the people. My leader, Mr. Sundarayya, has placed before you already the case for an Andhra State in a very effective manner, and also the case for the dissolution of the Hyderabad State. Attempts are being made by converting the Osmania University into a Hindi University against the wishes of the local people. If the interests of the local people are not taken into consideration, and instead Hindi is to be imposed on them against their wishes, do you call it unity of the country ? If you do that, the people will revolt against you, and that revolt will be in a proper and justifiable manner. I would only like to place before this House, that we should stop imposing this kind of tyranny on an unwilling people. Again in the name of unity, you deny the legitimate right of the people to use their natural resources for their benefit. I ask you, in the name of social justice, equality, fairness, non-violence, is it right on your part to deny the people their natural right of using their natural resources of the country to their benefit? Here is an Address referring to the famine in Rayalaseema. That famine would not be there if the Andhra State had been formed a year ago. That famine would not be there if our

projects have been developed, if electricity is developed in our State, if the river valley schemes are developed for the needs of the people. I ask you to read again the President's Address, and understand the implications involved in that Speech. It is mentioned : " We have therefore to put an end to all the tendencies that weaken the unity and raise the barriers between us, the barriers of communalism, provincialism and casteism." While communism and casteism should be avoided, does it mean that it is an indication that you should deny the legitimate right of the Andhras to have their Andhra State ? If that is so, I have to say that the Andhra people will not rest content unless they achieve their legitimate rights.

Coming to the question of food, here it is mentioned : "For the first time in recent history we have got the largest stocks of food grains, and built up a substantial reserve which will help in the future needs." I have to say here that you missed the point and you are talking about large stocks of food grains in reserve. You refuse to see the deteriorating condition of the people, because the purchasing power is going down. The people are not able to purchase the minimum rations they are given. You have removed the subsidies for even the rations that you supply to the people. The people are not able to pay. In Madras, it is no exaggeration to say, that people refuse to buy wheat. Even in Delhi and other places, I have got figures to prove that people are not able to buy even the rations allowed to them. What is the reason ? The reason is that the purchasing power has gone down heavily. The people are famished and they are not able to pay. I read in the Press a few days ago that some of the industrialists in the country approached the Commerce Minister and asked for some protection. In that connection, they stated : "The people are refusing to buy our consumer goods." What is the reason ? The people do not have the means with which they can buy these consumer goods, because of your policies, of increased famine, of increased starvation. Your policies have lowered down the

[Shri K. L. Narasimham]. standard of living. You talk about social justice, fairness, tolerance, but at the same time you are non-violent—killing the people. If the Government had the slightest sense of duty towards the people, they must take into consideration this problem of famine. Sixty lakhs of people are dying in Rayalaseema, and what are you doing? Digging wells. If you have any slightest sense of duty towards the people, you must take into consideration this problem. In Rayalaseema we have 60 lakhs of people to be fed. You double the minor and major irrigation projects there and then you will be able to save the country from famine. But you refuse to do it. You place the whole thing in the hands of a contractor. Even the money you allot, you place in the hands of the contractors. You see the result. People are leaving their homes with families and children and Rayalaseema is threatened with famine. You have to develop the major and minor irrigation projects together.

Then you talk of the price level going down and helping the textile industry. You are not going to look into the problem of employment there. So many mills are being closed and thousands of people are being thrown out of employment. Millions of the peasantry, who are looking more to cash crops, what will happen to them if prices are manipulated by the Government? You always help the finance capital. You help the monopolist. You now come with a statement in which you mention only about the textile industry. We must protect our national industries against foreign imperialists. If you go to Bihar, you will see how the lac industry is being closed and a Britisher taking it away. You go to Madhya Bharat or Rajasthan; thousands of textile workers are unemployed. In Bengal, the textile machinery manufacture mills are being closed. Coming to Andhra, the aluminium industry, the handloom industry, all these are closing down. You only talk of the interests of the textile industry. When the!

I hon. Member from the Madras State I has talked about the leather industry, your hon. Member on the Treasury I Benches has said that this has to be put in the Provincial Assembly. Here is a Resolution from the Tamil Nadu Handloom Workers Federation which says :

(») Twenty thousand carpet weavers have no work. Yarn is not available to them. Government must take responsibility for giving them yarn and selling their goods. This will save one lakh looms.

(it) When there are 10,000 looms for manufacture of good silks the import from America and Japan have killed this branch. This import must be stopped.

Coming to the tanning industry, we see a Britisher buying the goods and exporting—in fact closing our cottage industry, the tanning industry. I need not go into the details of this case, as the time at my disposal is very short.

I now come to another question, the labour policy that the Government would like to follow. It is announced here that social justice will be done. I need not go into the past history of how you have dealt with the labour problem, how you have denied the legitimate rights of labour, how you have killed the workers and the working classes, how you closed down even the trade unions by declaring them unlawful. I need give you only the latest instance at Gorakhpur. On the 25th April, the workers were shot down by the police. What was their demand? They only demanded that their service must be taken into account and they must be exempted from certain examinations and their transfer must be stopped. Here we see an arrogant officer under the Republic of India, stating that it is necessary for the security of the country to restrain them; that officer insults the leaders; that officer sends them out of his office; there is a peaceful demonstration and the General Manager of the Railway brings in the police and in the name of non-violence they kill the workers; in the name of nonviolence they demolish them. That is not social justice. What are you do-

ing ? Are you giving social justice or are you giving justice only to some people and that justice to the British and American financier and capitalist only ? You are denying even the legitimate request of cases being referred to tribunals. When the railway colliery labourers want their case to be referred to a tribunal, that is denied to them. When the Railwaymen's Federation asked their case to be referred to arbitration, that is denied to them.

In QW come to the last point and that is the Preventive Detention Act. That is a policy of crushing the legitimate movements of the people by a police *raj*. I have been a victim of that detention. I shall not go into the details of that. There are rules called Railway Services (Safeguarding of National Security) Rules under which in the name of national security railway employees can be discharged from service if the head of the Department thinks that he is connected with subversive activities. He is denied even the opportunity of defence. Is this social justice ? It indicates only a policy of crushing the people's movements and denying them their legitimate rights.

SHRI B. GUPTA : Sir, a time limit was imposed yesterday in the interests of the debate. The leader of our Group, which is supposed to be the main Opposition Group, was given only 15 minutes. The Congress gentleman is not restricted to any time limit. I understand they are not accustomed to economy. I would like to prevail upon the leader of the Congress Party to restrain their speakers who have been accustomed not only to speak but also to shooting people in jail, so that we can get some time to express our opinion.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. L. PURI) : Order, order. This is a most unfair remark. I have got a record of the time which has been taken by the various speakers and I find that on an average 15 minutes have been taken. When a Member is in the course of an argument, it is only fair that the Chair-4CSD

man should let him finish his argument. I find from the record that the time taken was 15 minutes, and 17 minutes, by most speakers and in some cases 23 minutes. The last speaker from the Opposition took more than 15 minutes.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): Sir, I rise to add my humble voice to the chorus of general applause which has greeted the Address of the President to the first Parliament of Republican India. On the present occasion, I only wish to say that more public attention should be given to two very important domestic issues along with the international issues that have been referred to in the President's Address. The first of these issues is the Kashmir issue. I have been reading recently the entire literature bearing upon this very important issue, and my conclusion is that a plebiscite cannot be claimed either by Pakistan or by U.N.O. as a matter of right. The accession of Kashmir to India was a complete legal process by itself, and it was not subject to any conditions or reservations. On this point, I wish to place before you what the Government of India's own White Paper has stated. People are sometimes forgetful of such documents, and that is my excuse for placing these before this House :

The State of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India on October 26, 1947. The form of the instrument of accession executed by the Ruler of the State is the same as that of the instruments executed by the Rulers of other acceding States.

Legally and constitutionally, therefore, the position of this State is the same as that of the other acceding States. The document proceeds:

The Government of India no doubt stand committed to the position that the accession of this State is subject to confirmation by the people of the State. This, however, does not detract from the legal fact of accession.

Therefore, I submit that the Government of India, by way of a generous gesture, offered to consult the will of the people on this most important issue. But politics knows of no generosity. The response of Pakistan to this generous gesture made on behalf of the Indian Government has not been very satisfactory. Therefore, it is

[DR. Radha Kumud Mookerjee.] time to think whether what is called the will of the people may be ascertained by other means than through a plebiscite to be held under foreign or international auspices. I should say that it is a domestic affair to be settled between the two parties concerned, namely, India and Kashmir.

Now, this suggestion as regards the will of the people really came from Lord Mountbatten, who expressed his idea in this form:

To ascertain the will of the people by.... — mark you—

by referendum, plebiscite, election or even, if these methods were impracticable, by representative public meetings.

Therefore, so far as the Government of India is concerned, it will suffice for the purposes of its commitment if we ascertain the will of the people in our own way, according to our own methods.

Fortunately, on the present occasion, much of that old history has changed, and now the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has been formed, and we can certainly accept the verdict of that Constituent Assembly as representing the voice of the people of Kashmir. Therefore, at the present moment I think it is very useful to give a warning to the parties concerned that so far as India is concerned, we cannot talk of a plebiscite.

My next point is that, in a sense, plebiscite was already taken at the time when Kashmir was subjected to foreign invasion. In fact I should like hon. Members to remember that the accession of Kashmir to India was forced upon India. It was not of India's seeking. It is on official record and, to the eternal credit of the supreme statesmanship of the late Sardar Patel of revered memory, it has been stated that the States Ministry under Sardar Patel's direction went out of its way to take no action which could be interpreted as forcing Kashmir's hands and to give assurances that accession to Pakistan would not be taken amiss by India. Therefore, Sardar Patel gave Kashmir a free hand. Therefore, it cannot be pleaded that the accession of Kashmir to India was really what

India was seeking. On the contrary, it was forced upon India by war, by the invasion of Kashmir by Pakistan. That invasion began about the 24th of October 1947, when it was left to our Prime Minister to break the news with a broken heart that tribesmen were being taken in military transport up the Rawalpindi road, and these 5,000 tribesmen had already attacked and captured Muzzafarpur and Domel on the way and were very near Srinagar, according to the report then sent by General Lockhart. After this, the Government of India thought that they could not at all interfere with the domestic politics of Kashmir unless there was some ground for such intervention. And that ground was furnished by the then legally constituted Government of Kashmir by acceding to India. As a result of that accession, of course, India went to the help of Kashmir.

Now, the point that I raise is this, that the very fact that the Kashmiris thought of the Azad troops—the so-called army of liberation—as simple invaders, the very fact that the Kashmiris did not at once fraternise with the so-called army of liberation, shows which way the wind blew at that time. The people of Kashmir were prepared to fight to the last man against this invasion of their hearths and homes, and at that moment it was left to Mahatma Gandhi to send this message. The Mahatma said :

He would not shed a tear if the little Union force was wiped out like the Spartans bravely defending Thermopylae, nor did he mind Sheikh Abdullah and his Moslem, Hindu and Sikh comrades dying at their posts in the defence of Kashmir. That would be a glorious example to the rest of India ; such a defence would affect the whole sub-continent, and everyone would forget that Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs were ever enemies.

This shows that the whole of Kashmir was united in resisting the invasion of the foreigners and there was no kind of fraternization with the enemy which could have put an end to this Kashmir episode at once. My point is that even at that time the whole of Kashmir was united against the foreign invaders.

My next point is that now, when the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir is

sitting and is ready with its verdict on the question of accession, we should tell the authorities concerned that a plebiscite cannot be claimed as a matter of right and that the U. N. O. should not force upon India its Plebiscite Administrator. There is no legal foundation for such a claim.

The other domestic issue that I should like to raise is the growing refugee and rehabilitation problem. It is a matter of controversy and has been the subject of adequate Government attention. But in this connection I should like to urge only one point, namely, that the Ministry concerned should not attend merely to the needs of the economic rehabilitation of the refugees, because the question of the cultural rehabilitation of these displaced refugees is not less important. We have to consider that lakhs of Bengalis are being forced to immigrate from East Bengal, and when the question arises of settling them, you should so settle them that they will be able to preserve their cultural and linguistic integrity. Please be careful that you do not create new minority problems of a very complicated description. After all, these displaced persons can claim the fundamental right that their children should be taught in and through the medium of their mother tongue. This is the only point to which I wished to draw the attention of the Minister concerned. I think that there are many other matters which I do not like to raise on the present occasion and I just submit in all humility these new points of view that have struck me after my careful reading of the entire literature on the subject.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY

(Mysore) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Motion that is before the House and to oppose all the amendments that have been put forward. I have watched with interest the debate that has been going on the whole of yesterday and this morning. I have with special interest listened to the speeches made by the Opposition Benches, and I was interested in seeing what valuable contributions they make towards the debate. I expected the

Opposition Benches to view the President's gracious Address in the proper perspective. I expected them to feel that their opposition is to the Government only in its shortcomings and I expected them to come forward with constructive suggestions. But what do I find? I find that they were viewing the Address, not with any serious attention, not in the light in which it is to be viewed, not as responsible people who have come here taking the mandate of the electorate to represent the country, to represent the people here. They have not taken that attitude which responsible politicians, statesmen and Members of the Parliament should take. I say that is a very regrettable attitude. I expected them to take the proper perspective of the Address and make a right estimate of the work of the Government. Neither has been done. What has been done is to level against the Government either exaggerated or unfounded facts, reckless allegations and aspersions against both the Party and the Leader of the Government Party and even the Constitution. Against the Party yesterday a Member was pleased to say that we are camp followers. He meant it as an aspersion, but I take it as a fact. We are no doubt camp followers. But ours is not a Party where everybody is a leader and nobody to follow. Ours is a Party where we have a leader. I take pride in that. We are the camp, followers of one who has been acknowledged by the whole world as the greatest of statesmen, who had dedicated his life for the service of the Mother-land and for the service" of humanity. We follow one who has throughout his life led a life of self-denial. There is no shame in our being camp followers and we have this leader and only one leader. We are proud to acknowledge that he is our leader. About the Party we have been called names. I beg to respectfully submit that if there is any Party in this country which has a right to be in charge of the Administration, it is the Congress Party and Congress Party alone. It is a Party which has come not by mere propaganda. It is a Party which has shed its blood, as one Member who spoke in Hindi said,

[Shri Govinda Reddy.] to free the country. It is a Party which even today is bearing the mark of martyrdom on its face. We owe it to the Opposition that we who have served the country and fought for freedom, we cannot go in the streets without being called names. Well, this is not a natural thing but a thing which lawless forces clothed under the name of political parties are engendering in the country. We have had speeches from the Opposition Benches emphasising civil rights, emphasising social justice and at least two Members of the Communist Party, the leader and his supporter, have given instances of oppression by Government, of imprisonments and beatings and so on and so forth. I do not know the truth about the statements. But when people find themselves murdered in cold blood,' Congressmen, officers, rich men, poor men, even unwary passengers going along have their ears lopped off or noses cut or limbs chopped off. While the leader of the Communist group was spinning here instance after instance of oppression, he had not a word of condemnation of acts of perpetration of the members of his Party. If this is the thing I want to know whether the Government can tolerate such lawless subversive forces and such atrocities. It is the duty of any Government—and no Government is worth its salt if it allows these things to take place. I want to know from the leader of the Communist Party and his supporters whether they would allow such atrocities to be perpetrated if their Party were in power.

In this country—as Shri B. G. Kher was pointing out—there is no dearth for anything. There is only one thing that is at fault and that is the irresponsible and unresponsive attitude of those who differ from the ruling Party.

Well, let me now come to the food situation. I find they have made the most of the scarcity of food that is prevailing and the famine that is prevailing in certain parts of the country. I would simply ask the Opposition as to what would be the responsi-

ble attitude of statesmen, of politicians of leaders of political parties in such a situation? Would we be relieving the distress if we go on belittling the Government and underestimating the work of the Government and bringing that Government into contempt? We expect responsible politicians to co-operate with the Government in relieving the distress.

Well, the Communist Party has been responsible, as we all know, for the peasantry being weaned away from their fields where they have to toil and labour, for the crops being looted and we have even the Socialists to stage demonstrations against the Government. They want to carry on Satyagraha against the Government for raising prices of food. I would like them to think as responsible men whether that is the attitude that is called for. Well, that is not the attitude. Yesterday the Socialist Deputy Leader narrated the story of two women plucking out the hair off their husband's head. Well, there are two women here who are plucking the hair of the Government; one wife is the Socialist and the other wife is the Communist. And for everything that the Government does, maybe a good thing, they are plucking the hair. For everything that the Government is doing they want to cast aspersions; they want to throw stones. For those people who wish to aspire to get into power, is that the attitude to take? What is the contribution, definite contribution, I ask, they have made, their parties have made, to relieve the distress, to relieve the scarcity of food and even to place before the electorate, before the people, a proper appreciation? There is a wrong impression among many Members about the scarcity of food. Well, this is not the making of the Government. This is not a situation which is peculiar to India. As the Food Expert of the U. N. O., Mr. Santa Cruz, has said, there is food scarcity all over the world. When the population is rising every year by 13 per cent, in some countries, by 17 per cent, in some other countries, food production is not keeping pace with this rise, but has registered an

increase of only 1 per cent. That is the condition of the whole world and India with a ruined agricultural economy which was the gift of the British rule for several years, India with a ruined industrial economy, with no industrial economy for the matter of that, had to feed not only her own population but had to feed many refugees and outsiders also. In this difficult situation it would be contributing to the Government assistance if every party member behaves with responsibility and gives solid constructive suggestions. Well, as Shri B. G. Kher has been saying

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. L. PURI) : Your time is up.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Just a minute or two, Sir.

No nation can thrive unless it is prepared to toil. In the words of Bernard Shaw—I would quote it :

A nation as a whole must make its bread and eat it as it goes along. A nation which stopped working would be dead within a fortnight even if every man, woman and child in it had enough land and millions of money in the savings bank.

Well, if all parties in this House contribute and come to the assistance of the Government, then the food distress will no longer be there ; we can be relieved of it. The shortage that we are feeling today is one-tenth of the production. For every ten maunds produced if we produce instead eleven maunds we need not depend upon foreign countries for our supply of food grains. We can produce enough and that one maund in ten maunds can be produced very easily, if, instead of bringing the Government into contempt, instead of belittling the honest efforts the Government is making, everybody helps the Government.

One word more and that is with regard to linguistic provinces. Of course, foreign policy has been referred to by many Members. With regard to the formation of linguistic provinces, our friends on the Opposition side

^«OT-*

have waxed very eloquent. One Member—I believe it was the leader of the Communist Party—said that this Government had violated all pledges given in this regard. Well, no responsible politician can make such a statement. People who say that linguistic provinces are easy to be formed, people who say that linguistic provinces have no problems, no difficulties attendant with them, people who say that Government can form linguistic provinces without any difficulties to face, are people who talk through their hats. As soon as we agree and form linguistic provinces we will have a new caste in India. Regional minorities will be created. Every linguistic province will be a problem for the Centre to tackle. In this country with so many different castes, so many different creeds, so "many different religions.....,

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : That is in the election manifesto.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY..... there should be unity which can be developed only through the creation of a sense of oneness and not by means of either language, or caste or creed to create differences.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) : Now we know where the Congress stands.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : Well, I come from a Part B State—from Mysore.

AN HON. MEMBER : He has already taken 20 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. L. PURI) : No, exactly 17 minutes.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : I would like through you, Sir, to convey the thanks of Mysore State and Part B States to the Prime Minister for having so graciously taken a representative on the Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about others from Mysore ?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa) : Sir, I am glad that Shri B. G. Kher referred to social and economic equality. I had been listening to the remarks of Members of the Congress Party telling us about the prestige of this Government outside our own country. Probably they have nothing to offer as regards the prestige of this Government in our own country which has moved away from the people. I do not want to dilate upon this point further, but I want to say about this economic and social equality, about the Constitution about which so much has been spoken. I am constrained to say in the matter of even honouring this Constitution which has a very limited scope, the present Government has violated its Directive Principles of State policy. In that connection I want to cite one instance for your consideration. We say 'social and economic equality'. Social and economic equality cannot be achieved by concentration of money, concentration of land in the hands of a few. Our Directive Principle in Article 39(c) of the Constitution lays down very clearly :

that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.

But what have we done? We have abolished the zamindari, they say. But the present Government have deliberately left untouched thousands of acres of land in the hands of ex-princes, ex-rulers and zamindars. By giving compensation, they have again created conditions of concentration of wealth. Again, while this is the case, can the common man, the man in the field and the factory expect social and economic justice from the hands of such a Government ? It is no wonder therefore if the labouring classes, the agriculturists do not feel enthusiastic enough. They feel there is no security. The agriculturist does not possess the land he is tilling, nor does he enjoy the entire produce of his lands. Therefore, it is mere playing to the gallery, it is mere eye-wash to say that the present Government is determined to meet out social and economic justice to the people. For the last five years, we have seen the record of its achieve-

ments. Specially, let us take the land problem. We have seen famine conditions increased, we are having scarcity everywhere. We are hearing of death from Starvation. The announcement of self-sufficiency is an eye-wash. The Grow More Food Campaign is merely a wasteful expenditure. Where are we heading ? There is no indication whatever that this Government is going to do anything radical in future. The draft of the first Five Year Plan has been published. There is a Chapter on Agricultural Reorganization. In this Chapter, what this Government is going to do in the coming five years to meet this very urgent and immediate problem of land has been clearly stated. On page 99, while discussing the ceiling on existing holdings, it says :

the distribution of the land among the various classes of claimants—small owners, tenants and landless labourers—will present numerous practical problems involving basic social conflicts.

Mark the words : ' basic social conflicts '. This Government is afraid of conflicts ; so they are going to give nothing to the agricultural labourer, who has no right whatsoever on his own land. Conflicts you have to face, if you want to give social and economic justice, not with a view to increasing them, but with a view to resolving them in the best interests of the country. The present Government is sitting tight over it. Escapism is not going to solve any matter. That is what is happening today. The Government may wait, but the people-cannot. This Government is incapable of giving any social and economic justice to the people of this country. So the people must move, and I am glad therefore that Acharya Vinoba Bhave has realised the importance of this, and is going about the country on his mission of redistribution of land. Whatever may be its ultimate outcome, the problem of redistribution of land has been focussed upon the eyes of the people of this country. And the land problem is assuming the urgency for which the Socialist Party has been agitating since the last four-years. Therefore the people are on the move. Either the Government willi

have to come down and tackle this very burning problem, or else they will have no place in this country, to rule so despotically as they are doing today.

The land question is only one aspect of the whole problem. I would like to offer one suggestion here. Let the Government fix a ceiling of 30 acres for a peasant family. This will not hurt many people, this will hit only 10 per cent, of the population at the most. By this simple act, it is possible to bring about a psychological owing in the countryside ; the peasant will come to his own, and it will encourage initiative and independence of spirit, with a desire for collective well-being so very essential for the future of our society.

Is this not a constructive suggestion which the Government should implement forthwith ? I want a categorical recognition of this by Government. I do not want to dilate further on this simple question of land redistribution. Let the Government declare on the floor of this House their policy regarding land redistribution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. L. PURI) : I adjourn the House till 8.15 A.M. on Wednesday, the 21st May 1952.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Wednesday, the 21st May 1952.