

COUNCIL OF STATES

Tuesday, 2.0th May 1952

The Council met at a quarter past eight of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**MOTION OF THANKS ON
ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT —
[Continued]**

MR. CHAIRMAN : The debate on the President's Address will continue.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin) : Sir, I would like to bring to your notice the fact that we have a feeling from yesterday's proceedings that we on this side of the House have not been given sufficient time as we ought to be given. We have got a feeling that Members from the other side belonging to the ruling party have been given sufficient opportunities for discussion, while we have not got sufficient time. I pray that we should be given some more time today to express our view-points than yesterday.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras): As you all know, there is famine in Rayalaseema, and also in different parts of South India. The Madras Government has tried to do its best to tackle the situation so as to help the people. But its resources are not adequate. I have suggested already in the Press that the Central Government should shoulder the burden of their responsibility, an awful responsibility as it is, of rushing foodgrains and fodder and sharing the financial burdens. The Madras Government is spending more than Rs. 5 crores towards this, and has been complaining about its inability to spare any more money. Therefore, I suggest that the Government of India should realize its own responsibility and agree- to feed, at its own cost, the people of this famine-ridden area, those for whom it is not able to provide any work and for whom

4 C S D

the local Government is not able to find free supplies of food grains.

Secondly, for a very long time, this area has been suffering from periodical droughts and famines. We have been crying for more and more irrigation projects so that that area could be protected from the vicissitudes of seasons. But unfortunately the former Government as well as the present Government have not been able to make up their mind to provide these people with necessary irrigation facilities which alone would protect them adequately. It is true that great rivers flow through this area, the Tungabhadra and the Krishna. On the Tungabhadra they have been trying to build one big project, the Tungabhadra project. But it is not able to meet the situation. There is a possibility for having a high level Tungabhadra project also. Nothing has yet been done and the Planning Commission does not propose to include it in its Five Year Plan. Then there is the Krishna River. It is similar to the Tennessee River. It is capable of being harnessed for irrigation purposes to the maximum possible extent, as no other river is capable of, in a similar fashion in the whole of India. There is a possibility of developing the Siddhes-war project which will benefit the Rayalaseema area to the tune of 7 lakhs of acres of land. There is also a possibility of constructing the Nandikonda project, through which you can supply water for 30 lakhs of acres of land, producing easily about 20 lakhs of tons of paddy. That will certainly, besides providing irrigation for Rayalaseema, augment the total supplies of food grains in this country and minimise our need for imports. In addition to that, there is a possibility also for developing the Pulichintala project. All these projects can easily be developed at a cost of about Rs. 170 crores, if only the Government of India were to make up their minds about it. We are told that the Government of India has not got money. Five years ago, the Prime Minister used to tell us that there would be no difficulty with regard to money,

[Prof. G. Ranga.] you only have to think of various feasible and practical projects and we will provide the money. Even today I tell the House that if only they were to evoke the cooperation and the enthusiasm of the local people, it should be possible for them to raise easily half of the expenditure that they have got to incur from the people themselves within the next five or ten years, during which these projects can be developed. But, unfortunately, this Government seems to lack that initiative, that spirit of adventure, and therefore they are advising their own experts not to think of these big projects at all.

Thirdly there is great need today for instituting an Irrigation Commission consisting of officials, experts and also non-officials, to go round the country in the same way in which the previous Irrigation Commission had gone round in the first decade of this century, to gather information as to the possibilities for various irrigation projects in different parts of the country. Whenever any suggestion is made by the local people for the development of any irrigation project, down comes the answer from their own experts referring these people to some enquiries made 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, when it was found that such projects were not at all profitable, and therefore they would not be taken up at all. The science of engineering, especially of irrigation, has made great strides during the last twenty or thirty years, and it is most essential that special attention has to be given to these projects, and their possibilities in the present circumstances, and that can be done best if there was to be an Irrigation Commission.

There is the food problem. I was very glad indeed to hear the speech made by the representative of the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party yesterday, who made a very good speech with sound and practical suggestions, in regard to the manner in which the food controls can be re-organized into regulations, and the way in which the food problem can be tackled. I am very much in agreement with most of

the points he has made. I would like, however, to lay special stress on one or two of them. I have been advocating for a very long time, that the present food control should be replaced by a levy-system of procurement, after a particular minimum exemption limit is given to benefit the small producers, and this, levy should be a progressive one, rising, as it should, as the size of the holdings also goes on increasing. Then the commitments of the Government for feeding these people on rations should be minimised as far as possible and in this connection, we have made a suggestion four years ago in the 25 man-power committee, that was appointed during those days. That has not yet been implemented. Today 140 million people are fed under rations, and there is no reason why all these people should be fed under such a system. If you reduce your commitments in that manner, it would be possible for you to minimise also the total proportion of the produce of the peasants to be compulsorily procured. Then there would be some surpluses left with them. You open a free market for their surpluses, and they will be free to sell it all over the country. If necessary, from province to province, and from district to district, from village to village, the restrictions on free movement can also be abolished. If you do so you will be able to improve your administration also, because today under the stress of these controls, all-pervading controls, there is so much of corruption both in the non-official side and also on the official side. It is as necessary for us to lessen this burden, this responsibility of the Administration, as it is for us to provide more food to our own people.

Then we have the problem of law and order. For too long a time our Government has been nursing the idea or the luxury that it has got complete control over the whole of this country. I wish to say in all seriousness today that a sedulous attempt is being made by one of the parties in this country to create a rival Government in this country. In certain parts of this country, even

today, in many villages or groups of villages, in parts of districts, in whole districts also, there are two governments, one in the night and one in the day, one which goes about with the authority of the police, legislatures and courts, where if atrocities or excesses are committed by their police, attempts could be made for appointing an enquiry committee, and there is also an other Government.....

AN HON. MEMBER : On a point of order, Sir.....

PROF. G. RANGA : It is not a point of order. I am not going to give way.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will you kindly allow the speaker to go on ?

PROF. G. RANGA : There is the other Government which has no legislature, which has no court, which has no regulated police, whose excesses it is impossible for anybody to enquire into. . Where are we to go and complain and find justice? Instances were given in the other House as well as in this Council where certain excesses were supposed to have been indulged in by the police as well as the military of this Government. How far it is true we would like to know. It is possible for my hon. friend to ask for an Enquiry Committee to be appointed to enquire into this. But how can I possibly ask for the appointment of an Enquiry Committee to go into the excesses committed by the other Government, by the shadow Government, by the night Government, by the secret Government, by the underground Government, that has been going on in this country ? It is not a Government. It is a gonda's rule. It is not a Government but a bandit's rule and this has been so called overt by the people.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Use temperate language, please.

AN HON. MEMBER : Is it a compliment to the present Government that there is no Government going on there ?

PROF. G. RANGA : That is exactly my complaint against this Government. This Government has failed to provide law and order and happiness to a large and increasing number of people in different parts of the country. This Government has failed to assure our people peace of mind. Will they work in the fields ? Will they live in their own homes ? There is no safety for them today. There is no safety today for our houses, even for our agricultural workers, for the poor and for the rich, for the women and men. There were cases where men were done to death, women were done to death and even pregnant women were dealt with badly. That is why I charge this Government that they have failed in their primary duty of not only keeping these people together but also of providing them with the minimum degree of safety.

Sir, some friends have referred to the international policy of this Government, and were finding fault with our Prime Minister for his ignorance. I would like to inform my hon. friends who are so much impressed with the ignorance of our Prime Minister, that long before their leaders had taken to the study of international problems, our Prime Minister, who then was not a Prime Minister at all, had had the opportunity of going abroad, not merely for studies, when he was a boy, but for deeper studies of international problems. As long ago as 1928, he was the first man to write a book on Soviet Russia and the conditions prevailing there.

AN HON. MEMBER : I beg to differ from his views.

PROF. G. RANGA : Nobody can differ from what is said in "Soviet Russia" by Nehru. I would commend that book to my hon. friend who differs from him. My friend has forgotten evidently what the Prime Minister has been doing ever since. I can tell you that even when my hon. friend was a boy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was shaping the foreign policy of the Indian National Congress to

[Prof. G. Ranga.] which I had the honour to belong, and to which so many of these people had the honour to belong, and ever since he has been studying the international problems. I have mentioned this only for this purpose that we have to help each other in constructive criticism. Let us have a salutary degree of respect towards each other in our consideration of the various problems that arise.

I am entirely and wholeheartedly in agreement with the international policy that is being pursued today by the Government of India. Differing as I do in regard to many of our domestic policies, I find it possible to agree with this new doctrine, as it is put by my hon. friend, this very fine conception that has been placed before the world by our President and our Government, and that is freedom and peace. We do not want to acquiesce in the many rotten things that the British, American and various other Governments are trying to allow their Governments to do in the various colonial countries. We have the courage to tell them from time to time, whenever it is necessary, what we think is the best, and we can assure our hon. friend that we have never lagged behind in telling them what we thought of the freedom movements in the colonial countries. If anything goes wrong, India is prepared to stand by the colonial peoples whatever might be the consequences. It has required a lot of courage on the part of India, especially after that embroglio with Kashmir, to stand up for the rights of Indonesia, for the rights of Tunisia, for the rights of Egypt the other day and for Iran also, and in doing so we ran the risk of incurring the displeasure of the great countries on both sides. There were occasions when we could have expected support and sympathy and understanding from the other side. We did not get it. Why, Sir? Because of the courage of our convictions, because of the initiative that we were prepared to take and were taking. Like a man falling between two stools, it looked as if India was going to lose the game. But, fortunately, our Prime Minister had the strength to stick to his guns and stand up in spite

of many misgivings that many of us had felt. I am free to say that I had my own misgivings. Various other people also had their misgivings. I had the opportunity of discussing the matter with him at close quarters. But, in spite of all this, he was able to stand firmly and now, today, he has proved to be in the right and he has proved himself to be a success. My friend was asking, what is the force that India counts for? India counts for as a third force. We cannot very well go into the market and ask various people to come and join us. That is the surest way of frightening them. On the other hand, by saying again and again, as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been saying, that we do not want the leadership of Asia at all, more and more countries have been good enough to befriend us and to come nearer and nearer to us, and that is the best way in which we can possibly develop the freedom front, the peace front. Some years ago—I suppose that that was the first occasion when we were able to have a cut motion on international policy—I mooted the idea, long before other parties had had an opportunity of thinking about it, of India developing as a third force, so that we might be able to help these forlorn peoples. Later on, we found that we could get on much better without officially organising a third force. So I decided it would be better to keep these two big powers apart from each other and make the position as much less combustible as can possibly be made.

Lastly, I am not at all satisfied with this Address—not only with this Address but the manner in which this Government has conducted itself during the last five years in regard to internal matters. There are the controls which have brought corruption. There have been so many scandals in the various Departments. Very little attention has been paid. Even when some of these things were brought to the notice of the Prime Minister in other places as well as in Parliament, he was powerless to tackle them. There were Ministers in whose Departments open scandals had taken place because of their incompetence, and yet those

Ministers continue to be Ministers in the Government. Then you have got the National Planning Commission. What it proposes to do is very little more than what has been done during the last five years. And even now there is the danger of the Finance Minister putting a stopper on so many of their schemes which were already decided upon, because he has brought " about this economic slump by artificial means. I wish to warn the Government that unless they are serious when they say that they are watching the situation very keenly, we are likely to be faced with a terrible economic slump which it would be impossible for the Government to tackle. I therefore trust that the Government will be able to conduct themselves much more effectively and efficiently, much more spiritedly, much more dynamically, on the home front and provide our people the peace that they ask for, the safety that they demand to live peacefully and freely as free citizens, as happy citizens in their homes.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Sir, before you call upon the next speaker, I wish to move a motion for papers.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The procedure is to give notice of the motion, which will be examined.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : We have this morning read of a gruesome tragedy that has taken place, and our hearts must go out to the victims of that unfortunate disaster. If this House cannot express its sympathy towards those victims, there is no purpose for us to exist. Therefore, in all humility I request you to give us a chance to express our sympathy towards those sufferers.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It will be examined.

PROF. DINKAR (Bihar) :

प्रो० दिनकर (बिहार) : श्रीमान्, कालाहल और असन्तोष की जो लपटें इस सभा में पहुंची हैं, उनके पीछे मैं प्रत्येक सदस्य के हृदय की इस आकुलता को पाता हूँ कि देश के नव-निर्माण का कार्य तेजी से आगे बढ़े।

मगर जैसा कि कल प्रस्तावक महोदय ने कहा था, सदियों की गुलामी ने हमारे जीवन का रस सोख लिया है और आजादी के बाद जो चीज हमारे हाथ में आई है वह हिन्दुस्तान का कंकाल मात्र है। इस कंकाल में लहू और मांस भर कर उसमें जवानी की रूह फूंकने की जिम्मेदारी भाग्य ने जिनके लिये सुरक्षित रखी थी, वे हमी लोग हैं और हमारी वर्तमान पीढ़ी और हमारे बाद की पीढ़ी को इस बड़े काम में अभी वर्षों तक संलग्न रहना पड़ेगा। समस्यायें अनेक हैं और प्रत्येक समस्या ऐसी ही है जिस का निदान और समाधान रातों-रात हो जाना चाहिये। मगर एक पूरे मुल्क की किस्मत को आनन-फ़ानन में पलट देना असम्भव बात है। जो परिस्थिति हमारे देश में अभी मौजूद है, उसमें हमारा एक ही कर्तव्य हो सकता है और वह यह है कि जो योजनायें हमारे सामने रखी जायें, उनसे हम सहयोग करें, उन पर हम अमल करें और परिस्थिति के अनुसार जो भी अच्छे नतीजे हासिल किये जा सकते हों, उन्हें हम हासिल करें। अगर हमारी सरकार या हमारी पीढ़ी यह अहंकार करे कि वह नव-निर्माण की सारी समस्याओं का हल निकाल सकेगी, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका ऐसा अहंकार व्यर्थ होगा। बहुत से काम हैं जिन्हें हमारे पहले के पुरखों ने किया, बहुत से काम हैं जिन्हें हमारी पीढ़ी पूरा करेगी और बहुत से काम ऐसे होंगे जिन्हें हमारी आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी को पूरा करना होगा। श्रीमान्, मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार की आलोचना चाहे जितनी भी हो, लेकिन आगे का इतिहास-कार जब इस युग की घटना को दर्ज करेगा तब यह तो वह अवश्य लिखेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद जो लोग उसके नव-निर्माण के काम में लगे थे, उनके सामने

[Prof. Dinkar.]

बड़ी-बड़ी मुसीबतें आई थीं मगर वे तगड़े और ताकतवर लोग थे। उन्होंने प्रतिकूल परिस्थितियों पर काबू रखा और देश को बिगड़ने नहीं दिया, देश के लोगों को डूबने नहीं दिया और उसकी नई आजादी को कमजोर होने नहीं दिया। मगर मेरा ख्याल है कि आगे का इतिहासकार यह नहीं लिखेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के बाद जो लोग उसके काम को चलाने के जिम्मेवार हुए थे वे आलसी थे, निकम्मे थे या उनकी नीयत खाम थी।

श्रीमान्, राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में भारत के आध्यात्मिक स्वरूप, उसकी आध्यात्मिक परम्परा के विषय में जो संकेत हैं, उसे मैं बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण मानता हूँ और आज के संघर्ष में तो उसका महत्व और भी अधिक बढ़ जाता है, जब कि सारे संसार के सामने यह समस्या खड़ी हो गई है कि समाज की रचना किस प्रकार से की जाय, जिसमें मनुष्य की आत्मा और मनुष्य का शरीर, दोनों सुखी हो सकें। प्रश्न यह है कि जिस पीढ़ी पर नई रचना का काम पड़ा है वह जब अपने बाद की पीढ़ी के हाथ में उस देश को सौंपेगी जिस देश को उसने आजाद किया है तो वह हिन्दुस्तान बुद्ध और अशोक का हिन्दुस्तान होगा, गांधी और जवाहरलाल का हिन्दुस्तान होगा, या ऐसे लोगों का हिन्दुस्तान होगा जिन्हें बुद्ध, अशोक, गांधी और जवाहर की परम्परा पसन्द नहीं है। एक और बात है जो राष्ट्रपति के भाषण से बहुत मुख्य रूप से प्रकट होती है और वह यह है कि जिस भारतवर्ष को हम बना रहे हैं, अथवा जिसे यह पीढ़ी छोड़ जाने वाली है, वह भारतवर्ष तब से एक होगा, या मन से भी।

श्रीमान्, जिन लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद करवाया, उन्होंने बड़े बड़े सपने

देखे थे और उन में से जो पुरखे हमारे बीच मौजूद हैं, उनकी यह तमन्ना है कि ये सपने उनके समय में ही साकार हो जायें। ये सपने एक ऐसे देश के सपने हैं जिसने अपनी आजादी को हासिल करने के सिलसिले में अपना ही खून बहाया है, अपने विरोधियों का नहीं। ये सपने एक ऐसे देश के सपने हैं जो आजाद मुल्कों की महफिल में एक बिल्कुल नये रास्ते से आया है और जिसने युद्ध से जले हुए संसार को यह ढाढस बंधाया है कि शान्ति और अहिंसा का मार्ग केवल कल्पना ही नहीं है, वह अमल में भी लाया जा सकता है। श्रीमान्, लोग हंसते थे कि संसार का कोई भी देश शान्ति और अहिंसा से स्वाधीनता नहीं पा सका है और वे समझते थे कि गांधी का सत्य और अहिंसा का प्रयोग गलत साबित होगा क्योंकि इतिहास हमेशा अपने को दुहराया करता है। मगर हमने हिन्दुस्तान में देखा कि इतिहास अपने को दुहराता नहीं है। इतिहास इस लिये इतिहास है कि उसमें रोज नई नई बातें लिखी जाती हैं। एक नवीनता का सद्गुण हमें भारतवर्ष में मिल चुका है। अगर हम विद्वानसपूर्वक बढ़ते रहे और ईश्वर को यह मंजूर हुआ तो शान्ति और अहिंसा के द्वारा ही हम उस दुनिया का दरवाजा भी खोल देंगे जहाँ पहुँचने को हिन्दुस्तान भी कम बेचैन नहीं है। सारे कोलाहल और असंतोष के बीच हमें इस सत्य को परख लेना चाहिये कि इस देश में गांधी जी का आविर्भाव कोई आकस्मिक घटना नहीं थी और न यही निरर्थक बात है कि भारतवर्ष एक ऐसे समय पर स्वाधीन हुआ है जब सारा संसार मनुष्य की किस्मत के विषय में चिन्तित हो रहा है। मैं राष्ट्रपति के प्रति बड़ी ही श्रद्धा अर्पित करता हूँ कि वे राज्य-मंच से देश को यह याद दिलाते जा रहे हैं कि भारतवर्ष अपनी आत्मा के स्वरूप को न भूले, क्यों कि इसी स्वरूप के कारण संसार में आज

उसकी महत्ता है और इसी स्वरूप के कारण संसार उससे एक महान् संदेश की अपेक्षा रखता है ।

राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में से जो दूसरी बात निकलती है और जिसे मैं समझता हूँ कि कम से कम उन लोगों को बार बार बोलने की जरूरत है जो देश के सांस्कृतिक कार्य में लगे हुए हैं, वह यह है कि हमारे मुक्त की दृढ़ता, एकता अभी दृढ़ नहीं हुई है । भारतवर्ष यदि अपने आध्यात्मिक स्वरूप को छोड़ता है तो संसार को उसके अस्तित्व से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा । लेकिन अगर एकता टूटती है तो हमारी सारी आर्थिक और सामाजिक योजनाएँ बेकार हो जायेंगी । एकता के खिलाफ उठने वाली आवाज़ जब हमारे कानों में पड़ती है तब हमें दुःख होता है । हम एक होकर लड़े थे; हम एक होकर बढ़े थे । मगर आज जब कि देशी रजवाड़ों की मणियाँ भारत के कंठहार का दाना बन चुकी हैं और काश्मीर से लेकर कन्याकुमारी तक तथा कामरूप से लेकर कच्छ तक के लोग एक साथ बैठ कर विचार-विनिमय करने लगे हैं तब हमारे हृदयों में शंकाएँ सर उठा रही हैं और प्रान्तीयता, साम्प्रदायिकता तथा जातिभेद के सांप अपना फण जोड़ने की तैयारी करने लगे हैं ।

श्रीमन्, हमारी एकता का आधार हमारा संविधान है, हमारी एकता का आधार हमारा भूगोल है, हमारी एकता का आधार हमारा इतिहास भी है । लेकिन, इस सबके ऊपर जो संस्कृति का स्तर है उस पर अभी हमें कुछ और करीब आना है । संस्कृति अपना संदेश साहित्य के माध्यम से देती है, भाषा के माध्यम से देती है । मगर दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हमारे यहां अभी ऐसे कितने ही भूभाग हैं जो एक-दूसरे को इसलिए नहीं जान सकते कि उनके

बीच भाषा-भेद के परदे झूल रहे हैं । इन परदों को हटाने के लिये कोई संयोजित कार्य करना होगा । सरकार यह आसानी से कह सकती है कि यह व्यावहारिक बात नहीं है । यह ऐसी बात है जिसका इन्तजाम जनता को स्वयं करना चाहिये । मगर, हमारी विशेष परिस्थिति के कारण, मेरा ख्याल है कि सरकार को इस दिशा में किसी संयोजित कार्यक्रम की ओर कदम बढ़ाना चाहिये । यह काम कैसे होगा, यह योजना की बात है । संभव है, अगर सरकार इस पर विचार करे तो उसे यूनियटी और कलचर की एक नई मिनिसट्री की जरूरत महसूस हो । संभव है, शिक्षा विभाग सांस्कृतिक कार्यक्रम के बहाने इसे आगे बढ़ाये । यह भी हो सकता है कि संस्कृति-संगम जैसी कोई और सरकारी संस्था सरकार की निगरानी में इस काम को शुरू करे । मगर मेरा निवेदन यह है कि यह कार्यक्रम ऐसा है जिस पर ध्यान अवश्य देना चाहिये और सरकार को कुछ न कुछ ऐसा काम शुरू करना चाहिये जिससे देश की सभी भाषाओं को विश्वास हो कि संघ-शासन की नीति सभी भाषाओं को प्रोत्साहन और बल देना है ।

संस्कृति आदान-प्रदान में बढ़ती है । जो प्रान्त अथवा देश केवल देना ही जानता है, लेना कुछ भी नहीं; उसका दिवाला निकल जायेगा । जब हम किसी भाषा में किसी आर्ट को सुविकसित देखते हैं तब हमें तुरन्त यह ख्याल आ जाता है कि अवश्य यह आर्ट किसी अन्य भाषा में जन्म ले चुका होगा, तभी यह चमत्कार इस भाषा में प्रकट हुआ है । मगर दुःख की बात है कि हमारे लोग अपने पड़ोस की भाषा में पुस्तक नहीं पढ़ते । सच पूछिये तो हमारे बौद्धिक पड़ोसी अभी भी पश्चिमी संसार के लोग हैं । यह ठीक है कि हम भी उनके बौद्धिक पड़ोसी हो गये हैं । मगर भिन्नता यह है कि वे हमें

[Prof. Dinkar.]

अनुवाद में पढ़ते हैं और हम उन्हें आरिज-नक रूप में। इसीलिये उनके व्यक्तित्व पर उतना असर नहीं पड़ता है जितना हमारे व्यक्तित्व पर।

श्रीमन्, संस्कृति की सीमा का निर्धारण नहीं किया जा सकता; मगर यहाँ इतिहास को लेकर एक बान का कर्क पड़ता है। जो लोग एक इतिहास के भागीदार हैं, सबसे पहले बौद्धिक पड़ोसी भी परस्पर उन्हीं को होना चाहिये। भारतवर्ष के सभी प्रान्त, सभी राज्य एक इतिहास के आधीन हैं, इसलिये स्वाभाविक बान यह है कि भारत के सभी प्रान्त बौद्धिक दृष्टि में आपस में एक हों। संभव है, सभी प्रान्त एक ही दिशा में सोच रहे हों; संभव है, सभी भाषाओं में एक ही संस्कार की धारा चल रही हो। मगर हमें वह बल प्राप्त नहीं है जो बल केवल उन लोगों को प्राप्त होता है जो यह जानने हैं कि वे सब के सब एक ही दिशा में चल रहे हैं, एक ही लक्ष्य को प्राप्त करने में लगे हुए हैं। अगर हमें अपने देश के मन को एक ही दिशा में चलाना है तो हमें यह मीका निकालना चाहिये, जिससे एक प्रान्त दूसरे प्रान्त के केवल तन ही नहीं मन को भी पहचान सकें।

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is time.

PROF. DINKAR: I am finishing in just one minute, Sir.

श्रीमन्, यूनिवर्सिटियों का भी उपयोग इस दिशा में किया जा सकता है। मेरा ख्याल है कि यूनिवर्सिटियों को प्रान्तीय राज्यों के अधीन नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये। राज्य सरकारें उनकी जो भी सहायता करें, मगर यूनिवर्सिटियाँ भारत सरकार के अधीन रखी जानी चाहियें। देश की सभी यूनिवर्सिटियों का लक्ष्य एक होना चाहिये। उनके सामने एक आदर्श होना चाहिये। इस समय देश

में जो भाषा की समस्या चल रही है उस मुलकाने में यूनिवर्सिटियाँ बहुत बड़ा योग दे सकती हैं। सभी यूनिवर्सिटियों में सभी भाषाओं की परीक्षाओं का समावेश किया जाना चाहिये, जिसका परिणाम यह होगा कि हर भाषा में दूसरी भाषाओं के अनेक विद्वान तैयार हो जायेंगे। इससे हम प्रत्येक राज्य में, देश के प्रत्येक भूभाग में एकता की लहर दौड़ा देंगे और उस स्वप्न को पूरा कर सकेंगे, जिसे हमारे महापुरुषों ने देखा है।

[For English translation, see Appendix I, Annexure No. 6]

SHRI S. BANERJEE (West Bengal) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the President's Address. The Address is remarkable more for its omissions than for its commissions. It has omitted to mention the Kashmir problem which presently is perhaps causing headache to the present Government of India, the problem of the refugees which still remains to be solved, and the most glaring omission of all is that it has omitted reference to the Soviet Union's and China's offer of food on generous terms which was refused by the Government presumably to satisfy America which the present Government of India cannot perhaps afford to offend. If I rise to speak on the President's Address, I do so, not with a view to bury Caesar nor to praise him, but to render unto him what is his and if in the matter of doing so he is buried, I confess I cannot help it. It must be admitted on all hands that the President's Address contains some very pious platitudes and some noble sentiments couched in noble language but that leads us nowhere. The same darkness, the same helplessness, the same hopelessness still envelops the people of this country, while, on the other hand, the same anxiety, the same earnestness, the same solicitude to benefit the exploiters of the Indian, people is betrayed from line to line of the President's Address. Diwan Chaman Lall, the mover of the Resolution of Thanks, has waxed eloquent over the achievements of the Goghress

Government. But what do we really find ? Five years of Congress rule— I was going to say misrule—has produced a state of affairs which beggars description. The people are sans food, sans clothing, sans shelter, sans education, sans medicine, sans civil liberties, in short sans everything that goes to make a man's life worth living. What the British could not do during about 200 years of their rule, the Congress has been able to do. It has out-heroded Herod during the last five years. What has this been due to ? How are we to explain this remarkable phenomenon ? I will pause here for a moment and take you back to the immediate past to consider the situation of the country just on the eve of the transfer of power, mis-called freedom and independence.

The Second World War terminated in 1945 both in Europe and Asia. The end of the War in Asia brought in its wake a revolutionary situation, due more to the exploits of the I.N.A. under the supreme leadership of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose being brought to light before the people at the trial of the I.N.A. heroes in the Red Fort of Delhi than to any other factor, which frightened both the British stewardship and the Congress leadership. The British, knowing full well that their days were numbered, made a virtue of necessity by deciding to transfer power ; the Congress leadership, on the other hand, weary of further struggle, afraid that it might be dislodged from its position by the growing forces of revolution, lured by the prospect of power, betrayed the revolution, surrendered to the British machination and sacrificed the interests of the people at the altar of the Mountbatten plan of vivisection of India and continuance of exploitation by the British, aided and abetted by their Indian comrades.

The Constitution of India framed by a fake representative so-called Constituent Assembly which set the seal of approval to this plan is, therefore, a monument of that betrayal. The seed of treachery which was then sown could not but grow into a tree bearing

the fruits of want and unemployment, famine and pestilence, squalor and misery. May I ask in this connection your leave to demand of the framers of that Constitution : What right had they to say "We the people" ? Who gave them this authority to speak the language "We the people" ? It would have been more correct in conformity with the motto of the Government of India *Satyameva Jayate* if they had said in the Constitution "We the pretenders". The Constitution that has been framed by these pretenders stands in the way of all progress. The President has asked us not only to maintain and protect that freedom but also asked us to enlarge it at all costs and to endeavour to realise the noble ideals of economic and social justice which have been laid down in the Constitution. But how to do it ? That is the question of all questions and the President is silent about it. You in your message to the Hindustan Times, Parliament Supplement, hit the nail right on the head when you were pleased to observe : "The Constitution defines our objective in a clear way. But the clauses in the Constitution do not confer real freedom on the citizens of the country."

The creation of linguistic provinces— here again the Constitution stands in the way. I refer to clause 3 of the Constitution. Planning to bring about a measure of happiness to the people and lessening the burdens on their shoulders—here again the Constitution stands in our way. Let the Prime Minister of India, the main architect of the present Constitution, speak about it. He said on the 10th of October, while speaking on the Planning Commission on the floor of the Provisional Parliament in clear terms like this : "One of the factors was the Constitution itself which precluded any vital change in the existing conditions. Similarly they had also to proceed on the existing economic and social structure of the country as also its present conditions. The Planning Commission or the Government could not change these limitations because those conditions were there in reality",—a confession which.

[Shri S. Banerjee.] has come from no less a person than the Prime Minister himself. The maintenance and furtherance of civil liberties—no, that is not to be. The Constitution provides for the curtailment and the Constitution provides for preventive detention. And State necessity has always been invoked on behalf of the Government. State necessity is a dangerous word. It covers everything under the sun to suit the whims and caprices of the Government in reality. What is a State necessity ? I cannot resist the temptation of quoting Sheridan—what he said in his speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings. He said in his speech :

That imperial tyrant, State necessity is yet a dangerous despot, bold in its demeanour, rapid its decisions, terrible its grasp— it tries to skulk behind the skirts of justice— it tries to steal a pitiful justification from whispered accusations and fabricated rumours —tear off the mask and you see the coarse, vulgar avarice, you see peculation lurking undir the gaudy disguise and adding to the guilt of libelling the public honour to its own private fraud. 9 a. m.

The continued association of India with the Commonwealth of Nations is galling to India's self-respect, precisely when one of its members, I mean the Union of South Africa, is pursuing an aggressive policy of racialism, precisely when England is pursuing a policy of ruthless, barbarous, inhuman oppression of the freedom movement of the people in Malaya and elsewhere. What is the Commonwealth of Nations ? It is the old British Empire that has only changed its name but not its spots. The history of the British Empire is still the history of wickedness which has served to corrupt and brutalise mankind. The sooner we do away with it the better it is for all concerned.

Much has been said about foreign policy and much confusion has been created thereby. I like to deal with fundamentals. What is, fundamentally, a foreign policy ? A foreign policy is simply the projection of the policy at home. If the policy at home is to perpetuate the existing order of things,

the Government of India cannot ally themselves with those abroad who have also the same end in view, namely the perpetuation of the existing order and it has, willy nilly, to ally itself with those forms, viz., those represented by Anglo-America. It cannot do otherwise. There may be exceptions— there have been certainly occasions when it has raised its voice against J, America—but those exceptions only prove the rule.

Reference has been made to a third bloc. The third bloc is a myth, mirage and an unreality. Those who prefer to pursue that course are pursuing the mirage. Therefore the only foreign policy that India ought to follow is not to do anything nor to say anything which would weaken the forces of progress of the present day world and in the same manner not to utter any single word nor to pursue a course which would directly or indirectly go to strengthen the Anglo-American citadel of reaction, the greatest curse to, and the greatest enemy of, humanity at the present moment.

AN HON. MEMBER : To help Russia ?

SHRI S. BANERJEE: Food has been certainly one of the greatest problems that faces India. What has the President's Address done ? It has complicated matters. It has sought to teach State Governments a lesson by withdrawing subsidies. It has sought to balance immediate with future advantages. It is also anxious that no distress should be caused. Can we by any stretch of imagination reconcile these points of view ? If you are keen to remove the present distress, you have to forget for the time being something about the future. If you have to redress the grievances relating to food you have to pay some subsidies to the Provincial Governments here and now. You cannot shirk this responsibility. If again you mean to solve the food problem for all time to come you have to settle the land problem ; you have to give the land to the tillers of the soil without any payment and thus create in them an enthusiasm which will lead them to produce more

and more, so that the country will be flooded with abundance of food and the prices of foodstuffs will come down in no time.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : Will the hon. Member tell us who the tiller is ?

SHRI S. BANERJEE : Am I to understand that the hon. Member does not know who the tiller is ? At any rate he does not come under that category.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Is the *zemindar* a tiller ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Mr. Banerjee might proceed.

SHRI S. BANERJEE : Sir, I have no time and I shall try to finish after a few more words.

It has certainly, I suppose, become clear to all the Members that the Constitution stands in the way of the progress of the people and if we really want the good of the people, the Constitution has got to be changed, and the sooner the better. I would ask the Government in power to look to it. I would ask the Prime Minister to bear in mind what he said on the floor of the Provisional Parliament on the 10th October last. If he considers that the present Constitution stands in the way of the progress of the country, he should change it. He can change it if he wills. He has changed the Constitution once and made it worse and he can do it again this time for the better, for the benefit of the people at large. Let him do it—the country will be beholden to him. Mr. Chairman; I have done.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Sir, I rise to associate myself with the motion that has been moved by my distinguished colleague and friend, Diwan Chaman Lall. I belong to a very small group of those Indians who have lived abroad for a number of years. I am sure most of you here were active participants in the freedom movement, which finally culminated in this

great Republic. But, although we were physically isolated from you here, we also shared in your joys and sorrows and sufferings and ultimate triumph.

The other day, when I was listening to the Address of the President, I was really overwhelmed with a sense of joy and gratitude, regardless of the contents of the Address itself. Those of us who had the good fortune or misfortune to have been abroad felt the humiliation of the political bondage of the country in a sense perhaps more than people here did. I can recall my days in California, when I was operating a small farm in which some Mexicans were employed. One of them was irritated at my attitude but I cannot recall the details. I overheard him talking to the rest of the Mexicans in his own language, which I managed to speak and understand. He said : "What does that fellow think after all ? Who is he ? He comes from India, a country which does not have its own flag !" He was very proud of the fact that he came from Mexico, a free country.

On the occasion when the Indian flag was hoisted in Washington for the first time, I recall distinctly that some of the old Bengal revolutionaries who had lived in America for a number of years, one after another went down on their knees and kissed the feet of the first Ambassador from India. It was certainly an expression of gratitude and joy.

As for the contents of the Address, a great deal has been said on both sides of the House. I am sure there are many people on this side who are far more competent to deal with the contents of the Address than I am. So far as the domestic problems are concerned, I feel that the overwhelming or dominant problem of India today is the abolition of poverty and destitution. I do not believe there is anyone here in the official circles who can say that everything possible has been done. I am sure the Congress Party, like any other party or Government, must have been guilty of its share of sins of

[Dr. Anup Singh.] 'commission and omission. But I would ask the critics to bear in mind the magnitude of the problems that this new young Republic had to face. Once we keep that perspective in view, all criticism can be fruitfully utilised and all resources mobilised to help the people of India. We are a free people. I think the problem today is to find out in the happy phrase of Prof. Laski : "Where do we go from here ? What are we going to do ?" I think the President has indicated the path. I am sure you will all agree that the Presidential Address is not supposed to be a comprehensive treatise on foreign policy or domestic problems but merely an indication of the problems that confront this Republic and is also an indication of the way in which they should be tackled.

I would like to say a few words about the foreign policy of India. A number of statements have been made. Several assertions have been made, which I believe will not bear careful scrutiny. It has been said, for instance, that India has no foreign policy. It is simply a series of zigzags. We find ourselves in one bloc today and in another bloc the next day. It has also been said that India has never taken the initiative, it has never envisaged some of the great problems that have confronted the international world. It has also been suggested that because the U.N. has not lived up to its expectations we should clear out of the U.N. Suggestions have also been made to the effect that India should organise or lead a third bloc. With all due respect to the critics of India's foreign policy I believe that ours has been a positive policy. It has been a dynamic policy. • When one says it is a policy of peace, it is not like a pious platitude. But I think that is the need and the urge of the people all over the world today; it is one of the paramount issues. I think it can be truthfully said that every move that India has made so far from the very beginning has very materially and largely contributed to the stabilisation of peace all over the country. I will take the case of Korea as a very specific illu-

stration of the nature of India's foreign policy. I had the very great privilege of representing India at the United Nations Commission on Korea. I am sure all of us here know India's stand too. But, for the benefit of those who have forgotten or who may have deliberately ignored what India sought to do, may I mention just two or three things ? When the war broke out, India supported the first two resolutions of the Security Council which characterized the North Koreans as the aggressors. Now, if India sought to please one group or the other, she could certainly have abstained. Having studied the report of the Commission and also the report of their representative, the Government of India came to the conclusion that under the circumstances, whatever might have happened in the past, whatever provocations might have been made on either side, the North Koreans were definitely the aggressors. I submit that that stand was a positive stand. Later on, when the question of crossing the 38th parallel came up, India envisaged the possibility of that conflict spreading into other areas, and in a very carefully but very strongly worded statement, India made it very clear that if the United Nations forces were to cross the 38th parallel, and if that decision were to be left to the discretion of General MacArthur, the chances are that the Chinese would come in. It is no sense of shame to tell so, but it so happened that subsequent events have vindicated India's policy. The crossing of the 38th parallel was an immediate provocation and I think that was very largely responsible for the fact that the Chinese volunteers or the Chinese people, as they prefer to call them, came in. It was certainly not a negative policy. It was not calculated, to please one group or the other. As I said, when I look back on what has happened, I feel that India's policy has been to study every single problem with which she was confronted, and the United Nations were confronted, on its own merits, and then come to a decision.

-

India also took the initiative in calling the Asiatic people and urging the North and the South to come to terms. India '

has reiterated that belief to the participants of both parties ever since that time. I am giving this problem of Korea as an illustration. Many other instances could be cited to show that India's policy has not been negative, or wishy-washy, and it has not been designed to please anyone. Certainly India, like any other country, must look to her own interest, and her policy cannot be anything; she has to keep in mind the interests of her own people first and foremost. I do not believe that the people who characterized it as a negative policy were very serious about it. I would suggest that they make a careful study, dispassionately and objectively, of India's foreign policy, and then come to a judgment. I am inclined to believe that some of them will perhaps be inclined to revise their opinions.

When it is said that India has never taken the initiative, may I cite just one or two instances, which are very glaring, from the recent past? Take the case of China. It was India who took the initiative of rushing to recognise the new Government of the people of China. India felt, and rightly so, that by every criterion the new Government of China has earned the right of recognition. It was a simple fact which unfortunately many of the countries have failed to see and still continue to ignore. I am reminded in this particular case, of the observation that Justice Onnes once made, when he said the recognition of the obvious is often far more difficult than the elucidation of the obscure. I think, in this case, the fact that a new China has come into being was a simple and patent fact which many of the people still ignore. That is an illustration of the positive and dynamic stand that India took.

The same thing can be said about Tunisia also and also about many other countries. I submit that in view of the two or three isolated examples, that I have tried to put forward, it will be seen that India's policy cannot fairly be characterized as negative, and it is not designed to please this group or the other. As a matter of fact, all of us know that our

policy has been subjected to very severe criticism by both sides, not only criticism but sometimes abuse and denunciation. I recall the time, when I was in New York a couple of years ago associated with, the Indian delegation, that the very same people, including some of the most outstanding liberals in America, had gone overboard and they were denouncing India and calling our Prime Minister all kinds of names. I am very happy to see that a change has come over them. I have been receiving a number of letters from some of my old associates in America which testify to the fact that after a sober recollection and thought, most of the people who had become critical of India have now changed their attitude. I submit that whatever stand we took, we took it on the merits of the issue. It is quite possible that we might have been wrong. Surely no country and no leader is infallible. But India's stand was certainly not designed to please any group. It is not very easy, when there are two giants in the struggle, to take a stand which may be acceptable to both parties. But on more than one occasion, India has taken the right stand.

As I said in the beginning, the problem of poverty is our paramount issue on the domestic side. We who have been sent here by the people and the respective legislatures sometimes have a tendency to indulge in what might be called 'ideological differences'. I recall when the North Korean armies were within three or four miles from the city of Seoul, I and my colleagues were frantically busy packing up to vacate. I told my Korean servant, who understood English fairly well: "Soni, the North Koreans with their guns and tanks are going to take Seoul within less than three or four hojLirs." Unperturbed and with nonchalance, she kept on with her cooking; I told her again "Does it not frighten you? This very city may be devastated, you may-be no more, and your mother may be gone; how do you feel about it?" With the utmost calmness, she said—and I remember the same very distinctly—she looked at me and said: "Singh Baksha-

[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 गूं गूं 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।