

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Sir, are we entitled to have copies of these papers that are laid on the Table? We have not been supplied with any copies of these papers that are laid on the Table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They are placed generally in the Library where Members may consult them.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: We want copies. We do not want to go to the Library only to refer to these matters. As a matter of right we are entitled to these papers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are so many things which are laid on the Table. If you make a request for some specified papers in which you are specially interested perhaps they may be supplied. It may not be possible to supply to all the Members copies of all the papers laid on the Table.

MOTION OF THANKS ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT —(Continued)

SHRI M. L. PURI (Punjab): May I have your permission to address the House sitting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI M. L. PURI: Sir, the President's Address strikes a note of realism and of quiet optimism in spite of the very great difficulties, both internal and external, that face the country to-day. It is less than five years since we achieved independence, and during this short period, a foreign policy has been crystallised which is firm and courageous, and which I am glad to find is based on the principles of Mahatma Gandhi which, as the President has been pleased to put it, are the two objectives of peace and non-violence, but peace not of the grave nor non-violence of the timid. There was a persistent clamour at one time that India should take sides in the con-

flict between the two blocs and that a policy of neutrality or isolation would not do. But believing that there was no substitute for righteousness for a nation to follow and that the right ends must be pursued and achieved only through right methods, our leader refused to ally himself with any bloc. After all, the foreign policy of a country has to be judged by the results it achieves, apart from the question of its righteousness or otherwise. Right from China and Japan in the Far East, and along the southern shores of the Mediterranean and throughout Asia, our foreign policy is looked upon with great respect and has earned the goodwill and respect of other nations. Even the leaders of the two blocs are now appreciating our policy. America, on the one hand, and Russia and China, on the other, appreciate the policy which we follow. America at last agreed to give us two million tons of food. She gave this to us at a time when we were in great difficulties, a time of great crisis, when there was lack of food on account of shortage of production, failure of rainfall, floods, and other causes. The President has rightly expressed our feelings of genuine thanks to America. America is again helping us in our community projects. This is so far as America is concerned. Only recently, in the press, we read what Bertrand Russell, the renowned English philosopher, has said about India's foreign policy. He said that if there is one genuine neutral in this world, it is Mr. Nehru. No greater compliment could be paid to a country and its foreign policy. This is the effect of our policy on those whom we are supposed to have offended with our policy of isolation. Let us see where we stand with the other group. The welcome which has been accorded by China to the Good-will Mission which has been sent there speaks volumes in favour of the fund of good fellowship which exists for India in China. You will be glad to observe, Sir, the recent expression of feelings of good-will towards India by the Vice-Premier of China. In *The Hindustan Times*, dated 19th May 1952, there is a small paragraph relating to germ

warfare. The Chinese Vice-Premier, Mr. Kuo Mo-jo has stated here :

It is impossible to find a group of people who would be acceptable to both China and the U. S. A. to investigate into the germ warfare in Korea.

Mr. Kuo Mo-jo, who is also the Chairman of the Chinese Peace Council, said :

China would welcome a commission of scientists, lawyers and journalists whose 'minds are like mirror which reflects what it sees'.

But, he added:

Such a group would be unacceptable to the U.S.A. if it (group) was prepared to speak up impartially.

We believe there are many such people who are on the side of righteousness. Their impartiality must be accepted by the world opinion and not by a mere small group.

He also said :

We will welcome *Indian* scientists to participate in such a group,

There could be no greater compliment to the honesty and integrity of our policy and the respect which it has evoked both in the East and in the West. On the one side, you have Bertrand Russell stating that if there is one genuine neutral, it is India, and on the other side, you have the Vice-Premier of China declaring that they can rely upon the integrity and honesty and impartiality of India in the conflict between the East and the West. This is the direct result of our foreign policy. Mr. Nehru has raised the stature of every Indian in the international field, and the policy of Mr. Nehru has raised our prestige throughout the world. We have every reason to be proud of it.

It was stated by one of the Opposition Members that the foreign policy of India is not the policy of Parliament, nor the policy of the country, nor the policy of the nation, but the policy of one man. I respectfully submit that nothing can be more frivolous

and fantastic than that. It pains me to hear this immediately after the recent general elections. How can such a remark be made after the recent greatest democratic elections in the world? If there is one thing which has contributed to the success of the Congress Party in the elections, it is Mr. Nehru and his policy. The foreign policy of Mr. Nehru was known long before the elections. I do not know what the situation was in other parts of the country, but I know that in the Punjab, both in the rural and urban areas, the foreign policy of this country was actively discussed and canvassed. If there is one thing which is patent, it is this, that the foreign policy of Mr. Nehru has been endorsed by a vast and overwhelming majority of our countrymen. I say with confidence that there is no man in India who enjoys the confidence of his countrymen to the extent to which Mr. Nehru enjoys it. If there is anyone who contradicts this statement, it is merely because he does not know what he is talking about. May I submit, and I say that again with a certain amount of confidence, that there is no leader in any country in the world who enjoys the esteem and respect of his countrymen to an extent to which Mr. Nehru does in this country. I have seen it during the elections. Overnight the personality of Mr. Nehru, the sweetness of his voice—I do not know what magic it possesses—has changed the electorate; and in constituencies where the Congress was not expected to have any chance of success his appearance has had a miraculous effect. In these circumstances, to say that the policy of Mr. Nehru is the policy of an individual and not the policy of the country is, I submit, entirely wrong. If I may be permitted to refer to what one read in one's school days in Emerson's Representative Men, like other well-known leaders of men in history, he represents us to a degree, he represents our innermost feelings and our urges in a manner which no other leader does. He truly represents us and he is our 'Representative man'. His policy is our policy, the policy of the country, the policy of

[Shri M. L. Puri.]

Parliament ; and you will find that this evening the two elected Houses, the House of the People and the Council of States, will endorse that policy by a very large majority.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have a large number of speakers in our midst, and we have to adjourn at 1 o'clock, and we have to give the Government Member an opportunity of stating the Government's case in answer to the Opposition criticisms, and the voting, etc. will take some time. I am afraid that if we have to give a chance to a large number of Members, we have to adhere to a time limit of 10 minutes today, and not 15 minutes.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity you have given me to participate in this debate. At the outset I would take objection to the absence of all other Ministers from this House except the Leader of the House. They cannot get away with the plea that they have been attending in the Lower House and therefore they cannot sit here. There are any number of Ministers, and they can divide themselves and some may sit there and some here, if not all the time, at least for some time. We have enough of them and to spare even for a third House if there is one.

It is unfortunate that Shri Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer yesterday opened his speech straightaway by congratulating the Government on the food policy and on the successful administration of the Food Department. Even the Government Members, the departmental people, the Secretariat people, and the people belonging to the Ministry, do not make that claim, and I really wonder how our friend, a distinguished Member of this House, and a veteran lawyer, could have congratulated the Government on its food policy and administration.

We heard Shri Prithviraj Kapoor with rapt attention yesterday. Not only did we hear him, but we saw him

act also. He was famous hitherto as an actor on the stage and on the screen. He was once my guest in Cocanada, but I do not think he remembers it now. He came there to preside over the anniversary celebration of the Andhra Nataka Kala Parishad. Of course yesterday he took the role of a Mono actor and we had the benefit of seeing him acting without paying anything extra, and we enjoyed it quite well. I do not think he was very serious in his speech. He went on to narrate various stories. I know, he is not a politician ; he is an actor. And as such he was nominated. He praised the Government, and he did not like the speeches made by the Opposition Members. Naturally, as a person loyal to his bosses, to his masters, to the Government, as a nominated Member, he did his work quite loyally. He criticised the Opposition Members, and he told them that they had not read the Address. He is an actor, and I think it is his business to get accustomed to reading things again and again, before he goes on the stage or screen, and he expects hon. Members also to do that. Sir, I have gone through the Address of the President once, twice, thrice. What is there in this ? So many matters are conspicuous by their absence. So, I did not take the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Prithviraj, seriously at all.

I also heard the speech of the hon. Member Shri Reddy of the Socialist Party. He confined himself to the foreign policy of the Government. He said that Pandit Jawaharlal did not know much of external affairs or foreign politics. I beg to differ from him. No doubt, the Congress Government, headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has committed several faults. We know that. But you cannot say that Pandit Jawaharlal is not well versed in foreign politics. You may differ from him on so many matters ; but if he does not know of the foreign affairs of our country, who else does ?

As regards the food policy of the Government, controls have brought in

corruption and black marketeering. The advice of Mahatma Gandhi, whose name and whose principles and ideals the Congress leaders always invoke, has never been taken during his life-time. They were not prepared to de-control. They agreed to a very ineffective kind of partial decontrol, because de-control itself was very ineffective and was being administered in a very bad way. There must be free movement. Ceiling prices may be fixed ; it does not matter. But movement at least between district and district should be free, especially the movement of paddy in the south. I know several officials who were very honest formerly have become corrupt now because of temptation. The income that they get through corruption is very large. Why don't the Government try to allow free movement at least ?

Then, what about our natural resources, particularly in Andhra Desa ? Take the rivers that flow through that part of the country—the Krishna, the Godavari, the Tungabhadra. The water resources were not properly utilised and about 90 per cent. of the water is running to waste. If these resources are properly harnessed and if all the potential natural wealth of our country is properly exploited, I think our country will be a granary in Asia, apart from China, and Asian part of Russia. I hope that hereafter this Government will pay more attention to this aspect so that our country will become self-sufficient and also will be in a position to supply the needs of other countries as well.

We are wasting a lot of money on our Embassies, High Commissions and Legations. It seems we have been spending rupees three crores and odd plus three crores on these. The High Commission in England alone accounts for Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 lakhs annually. There are about 31 countries where we have Embassies etc., and about 55 countries have their Embassies etc., in our country, but in this poor country I do not think they have

been spending so much. There is a big drain on the finances of our country and I would like to know whether there is any possibility of retrenching the staff and reducing other expenditure in this behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one thing. Sir, I have given notice of a motion for Papers. I do not know whether the same has reached you or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It has nothing to do with the speech that you are making on the President's Address. Anyway we are examining it.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Sir, as regards the redistribution of our country on a linguistic basis, I would like to say a few words. Sir, I come from Andhra. The coastal districts and Rayalaseema put together are known as the Andhra part of the Madras State. Then there is the question of Madras City. This movement, regarding the formation of a separate province of Andhra, was founded about the year 1911, that is about four decades ago. Since then this gained a momentum and with the advent of Mahatma Gandhi into the political arena of India in the year 1919-20 we had to suspend that movement merely in the interests of the national fight. The leaders of the Congress and the leaders of this country desired this movement to be suspended and they wished that there should not be any deviation so far as the national fight goes. So, you will thus find, Sir, that we were first Indians and next Andhras. In the Constitution of the Congress, there is a provision for linguistic distribution and the organisation has been functioning as such.

The Congress election manifesto also refers to the linguistic provinces. This means, Andhra, Kerala, Kannada, Maharashtra and so on. When Shri Jawaharlal Nehru came to Coochabed during his election tour, he promised that this matter would be considered. He also said that he was not against the formation of a separate

[Shri P. V. Narayana.]
 Andhra State. In the month of February, Sir, Swami Sitaram, the greatest leader of Andhra, ever produced, came to Delhi to champion the cause of Andhras. With him I and other friends also came here. We interviewed Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri Rajendra Prasad. Pandit Nehru told us that this matter would be taken up and would be considered after the formation of the new Parliament and the new Governments at the Centre and the States. I really wonder why there is no reference to the Linguistic States in the President's Address. Of course I do realise that the process is a long one. We expected a reference, at least an indication to that effect in the Address. This Address, though it appears in the name of the President, must have been drafted by the Cabinet and simply delivered by the President. At the time of the interview, the President was also very sympathetic. Since the Prime Minister assured us that this would be considered, we would like to know what steps have been taken by Government in this regard. Fortunately or unfortunately there are some differences between Andhras and others and in the absence of any differences, the Government would argue that since there are no differences, the question of formation of an Andhra State does not arise at all. Because the differences exist, it is not fair on the part of the Government to say that the differences should first be composed. Therefore, I request them, Sir, to take necessary steps for the formation of a separate Andhra State.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the mover of the Resolution and the sentiments that have been expressed on the floor of this House by various other persons. I am thankful to the President for having mentioned about the conditions of Madras and the hardships and privations that the people have had to undergo in that State. Yet I feel that those who are in the position of advising the

have not presented to him full facts and the full starvation level that is the agony of Madras at present. Mr. Chairman, it is not true to say that only Rayalaseema is in the grip of famine and requires help. Sir, as a matter of fact about eight districts in Tamil Nad are on the verge of starvation as a result of continuous failure of monsoons for six years. I am afraid that the climatic conditions of the State have changed permanently and that better times will never come. The Planning Commission must take into consideration that the climatic conditions of the South have changed considerably and that the South must have its own economic programme. Due to failure of rains there have been no food grains. On the other hand the purchasing power of the people has diminished considerably and as a result there is poverty throughout Tamil Nad and throughout the Madras State. Food grains are available only at high prices. There is no money in the hands of the common people to purchase food grains. If the Government wants that there must be economic stability in the South, then it must not merely concentrate on the river valley projects, but at the same time there must be a large-scale industrialisation in the country which can alone solve the economic ills. As a matter of fact, the Geological Survey Reports of India have mentioned about the hidden wealth of the country in the tracts of Madras State. But the most unfortunate thing is that the Planning Commission has completely omitted any reference to this wealth, as also as to how to exploit the same. It has pointed out that in the district of South Arcot fuel in the nature of lignite is available which can even replace the old fuel, coal. Similarly, in the district of Salem, it has been said by the Geological Report that vast tracts of iron ore are available and they should be also exploited. But nothing has been mentioned by the Planning Commission about the exploitation of these rich mineral resources and it is really a thing about which we should feel sorry. I also desire to bring to the

and request the Government to take immediate measures for utilising these resources.

Secondly, Sir, the Madras State is mainly dependent,—the economic situation, the economic condition of the people in the Madras State are mainly dependent—on two industries, namely, agriculture and textile in general and the handloom industry in particular. Consecutive failure of monsoons for the past six years has driven the sons of the soil to the verge of poverty. The periodical slump in the textile industry and the practically standstill position in the handloom trade has driven the weavers to a plight unknown in the history of this country. Today, the weavers of Madras who comprise nearly about 10 million people, who depend entirely on the handloom industry, are in the streets begging and many of them are prepared to migrate to any part of the country. As a matter of fact, Sir, hon. Members who have come to Delhi must have seen hundreds of Tamilians, especially from the districts of Tamil Nad, who have come here for odd jobs and for even begging. I am told their number is about five to six thousand. Is it for sight-seeing that they have come? Is it for seeing the Parliament buildings that they have come? Or is it for seeing the Presidential palace that they have come here? They have been driven out of their homes due to poverty. I appeal to the hon. Minister concerned and to the Government of the day to see that the handloom problem is tackled immediately.

It is also a pity, Sir, that the handloom industry, which is the second largest industry in the South, has been completely omitted by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has not made any reference to the handloom industry at all. As a result, neither the Government nor the people know whether the handloom industry, the greatest industry of the South and the industry to which Gandhiji gave the greatest prominence, has any future at all. As the Planning Commission has not touched it, I am afraid, Sir, the Government has come to the con-

clusion that the handloom industry has no future. If that is the decision of the Government, I would ask Government to come along and say: "We have no faith in the handloom. We have no faith in the Charkha." Then the people would not be sorry for that, if you provide them with alternative employment and provide them with alternative sources of income. In fact the weavers will be thankful to the Government.

Coming to the home policy of the Government, I am surprised that the hon. Members of the Communist Party and their temporary allies have said that civil liberties do not exist in this country and that there has been suppression of civil liberties by the Congress. Day in and day out, throughout the country, they carry on this propaganda. I ask them: "Is there any country in the world where so much civil liberty, so much freedom is allowed as in India today?" (*Interruptions.*) Sir, my friends may object and say anything. But the fact stands that there is one man in India who believes in the fullest democracy, who believes in the fullest civil liberties of the people and he is nobody else than our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, my hon. friends on the other side say that civil liberties do not exist. I would like to point out two instances that show civil liberties are there and the Government is submitting to rowdyism and communalism in the name of politics, in the name of propaganda, and in the name of democracy. Sir, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, our beloved Prime Minister, is not an ordinary man. He is a man of international stature, who has won esteem all over the world and who comes next only to Gandhiji in this country. Sir, will you ever imagine that in the South the Communists carried an effigy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in a great procession and then burnt the effigy? And the police gave them protection to do it. (*Interruption.*) I am not yielding to the hon. leader from the Opposition.

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.]

Sir, another instance is that Mr. Anandan Nambiar, who has been elected to the House of the People, said that he was going to Delhi to pierce the stomach of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, take out the intestines and garland himself with it. He said this in a public meeting, and I stand by this statement. Sir, could this have been tolerated in a country like Stalin's Russia or China? My appeal to the Government is that they have been too democratic and too lenient to the people who have been traitors. I am not also sorry for the fact that they call us imposters. We cannot expect anything better from those people who joined the Anglo-American Imperialists to suppress the freedom movement of the nation, and to penetrate crimes on India. (*Inter-rap-tion.*) I appeal to you, Sir, to make them use restrained language so that we may also have to use only restrained language.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I was greatly touched by the inspiring words in which the President exhorted us to work and to use our freedom and our newly-won power. It was necessary that at the threshold of our new career we should be reminded of the spirit in which we are expected to work. But as an expression of the policy of the Government I found the President's Address inadequate. Within the short time available to me I can deal only with one matter which is of cardinal importance for the future development of this country, and that is, the economic problem. On all hands this is the most urgent question that we have to tackle, not merely for our future progress but for our safety. And yet what has the President to say on this subject? He has virtually said: "We know the difficulties; we know how essential it is that we should go forward as quickly as possible; but have patience." Practically at the end of every paragraph he has said, "Have *Shanti, Shanti, Shanti*." I do not think, Sir, that we have ever been wanting in that virtue.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar): Not you, but some are.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The only complaint that we can make against the people of this country is that they have too much of this virtue, and I wish that I could do away with some of their '*Shanti*' and make them a little more impatient than they are now. Government will then have to face the realities of the situation with much greater thought and determination than they exhibit at the present time. Even, Sir, if the Members of the other side were asked in private whether they were satisfied with all the practical measures taken to solve our economic difficulties, I am certain that they would frankly confess their disappointment with what has been done so far.

In regard to the food problem, everybody, Sir, feels surprised and frustrated by the stagnation that one sees in practice in all directions. There has been some improvement here and some improvement there—I am not unaware of what the President has said on the subject—but it touches only the fringe of the problem, and the food problem has been dealt with in a highly unsatisfactory manner. Unless, Sir, we can secure the co-operation of the Government, local Governments and the cultivators, and provide adequate central supervision, I do not think that our paper schemes will ever enable us to grow the quantity of food that we need in the immediate future.

Sir, the President has been made to say by Government that our food production has increased by 14 lakhs of tons. No one knows, not even in the Food Department of the Government of India, as to what the actual production has been. Yet, the Government have not hesitated to make the President say in his Address, that the target which the Government had set for themselves has been realised. Even the figures that may be placed before this House by the end of June may show that the plans of Gov-

ernment have succeeded. But, for the present, we must treat the President's Statement as mere propaganda.

Sir, I shall now pass on to two or three other topics which I would like to deal with, before I resume my seat. The existence of an independent judiciary is absolutely essential to the proper working of our Constitution. It is necessary, for this purpose, that nothing should be done by Government that would have the effect of undermining the independence of the Judges. It is therefore a matter of great regret for me to note that a former Judge of the Supreme Court has been appointed as Governor of Orissa. I have nothing to say against the former Judge of the Supreme Court on whom this honour has been conferred. We all admire his ability and integrity. But his appointment as Governor was wrong in principle. We cannot be certain, Sir, that if such an action is taken in the future, it will not have the effect of making the judiciary expect favours from the Government of the time. Sir, such an action is fatal to the maintenance of the independence of our Judges. The Judges have all shown great ability and integrity in their decisions on the difficult problems that have been placed before them from time to time. We are anxious, therefore that the judiciary, which is in a sense the sheet-anchor of our Constitution, should not be weakened by anything that Government does, which creates in them a sense of dependence on Government. (*Interruption*). Sir, I am quite prepared to answer any question that any Member of the Congress Party may want to put to me. If you will allow me a little more time, I shall give my answer to any questions that might be put to me.

Sir, the next point that I should like to deal with is with regard to the Election Commission. The Election Commission should not be treated as if it were a part of the executive machinery of the Government. It should be treated in such a way as not to think that it is a political subsidiary of the executive Government. But what

do we find, Sir? How have the Government acted in filling up the vacancy caused, although temporarily, in the post of the Chief Election Commissioner? The Secretary of the Law Ministry has been appointed to officiate as the Chief Election Commissioner. Could anything show more clearly the position which the Election Commission occupies in the opinion of the Government? The officiating appointment that has been made shows clearly to my mind that the Government thinks that the Election Commission is part of, and indeed subordinate to, the Law Ministry. The Constitution requires that the Election Commission, which has to consult the President or the Prime Minister in regard to decisions on certain matters, should in practice be allowed to exercise the maximum of independence in its decisions. We know, that there has been dissatisfaction with the Election Commission, even in connection with the elections. It was therefore all the more incumbent on the part of the Government to have filled up the vacancy in such a way as to remove all causes of public dissatisfaction, and restore their faith in the independence of the Commission. But I am sorry to say that the Government have shown by every action of theirs that they have no regard for the principles underlying the Constitution.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Sir, if you will allow me, I would like to know from Pandit Kunzru if the practice of appointing a Judge for some other post is obtaining in other democratic countries.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : If you will allow me, Sir, I should like to point out, only this. Lord Reading was sent on a mission to America by the British Government during the First War. But we are not going through a war just now. Even the British Government have not repeated that experiment.

SHRI KRISHNA MOORTHY RAO (Mysore) : Mr. Chairman, the policy of the Government has been attacked mainly on three grounds—

[Shri Krishna Moorthy Rao.] foreign policy, civil liberties, and the food problem. The hon. Members on the Opposition Benches who attacked the Government's policy seem to forget the fact that it took about 150 years for the United States of America to become a world power. It is only after the Second World War, after the attack on Pearl Harbour, that America began to take interest in international affairs. Similarly in Russia, they took 25 years after the 1917 Revolution. It is only after the Second Five Year Plan became successful that they began to take some interest in international affairs. After all, it is only five years since we are free. And what is five years in the history of a nation? Has not the Government done anything to solve these problems? I assert, Sir, that the efforts of the Government have been remarkable. During these four years, they have spent Rs. 50 crores on the Grow More Food schemes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mere waste, waste.

SHRI KRISHNA MOORTHY RAO: Nearly 400,000 acres of land have been brought under the plough afresh. True, natural calamities have occurred, and our efforts have not been successful. We are importing food from outside. Even before the Congress came to power we were importing food, especially rice from Burma. We cannot get rice even for money, for anything, today. Today, food is a world problem. The population of the world is increasing. One of the American experts has calculated that we do not get even 1·2 acres of arable land per head of the world population. Every day we are adding 14,000 people in India to our population. Every year our food demand increases by 50,000 tons. It is this food problem we have to attack, and the Government has done everything possible in its power to attack this food problem.

Sir, one of our friends stated that if there was an Andhra Province, there would not have been famine at all. I wish it were such a magic wand. Why

do you find famine conditions in Saurashtra? Why do you find famine conditions in Rajasthan if that were so? Well, Sir, for the problem of famine we have to look to other causes. It is a geographical question. We hear, we know from history that once flourishing hill-sides are today barren rocks, once fertile irrigated plains are today deserts, once flourishing civilisations are buried under the deserts. The same thing is now occurring in America. There are western dust bowls being created. We talk of big irrigation projects and industries. Well, Sir, Bertrand Russell has stated "Modern Industry is a rape, rape of Nature." Industry is like a spendthrift, and the spendthrift will have to pay the penalty sooner or later. While we are planning for industry, we have to keep this in view and prevent the resultant calamities. These are geographical causes that we have to prevent. Our water-sheds are drying up, our forests are being denuded. The previous Government had no afforestation policy for India. Miles and miles of forests are being cleared to supply raw material for the paper industry. After all, our industries have to thrive upon raw materials that come from nature. There is a balance in nature. We have to protect that balance in nature. We have to protect the top-soil. Well, Sir, I read according to one of the American experts, in Washington the Potomac river is bringing thousands of tons of top-soil to the mouth of the river, and where ocean-going ships were being anchored, today it is the site for the Lincoln Memorial. We have to take a lesson from this history and we have to plan our economy in the light of these things and prevent such occurrences in India.

I come from a district where the rainfall is the heaviest. But I learnt recently from one of the villagers that 20 years ago the rainfall was 110 inches but today it is only 60 inches. An ordinary family required 40 cart loads of fuel, but today six or eight cart-loads of fuel are sufficient to pass off the rainy season. Our rivers are being silted up.

The Thar Desert is encroaching upon fertile lands inch by inch. We have to think a hundred years ahead, and we have to think of the balance of population also. There is a limit to which the country, the earth, the Mother Earth, can bear the population, the weight of the population. After all, we have to get our food from our land. We have to attack this population problem, and I request the Government of India and the Planning Commission to consider these things and take a definite afforestation policy, protection of wild animals, protection of our river bases, prevention of soil erosion and protection of our top-soil. Well, Sir, I learn from one of the books, that a Wisconsin farmer said "I have got 153 acres of land, a farm house and my farm heads, but it is at the cost of 17 years of labour and six inches of top-soil." Our top-soil is going into the sea. This is the problem we have to face. The food problem today is a world problem. Even America cannot supply if we go on multiplying at this rate. There is a limit even for other countries to supply us food. Today they may be able to supply us food, but there is a limit. We have to attack the food problem on all fronts. I request the hon. Members on the other side to help the Government to attack this problem and make it no party cause, but the nation's cause. When we thus attack the food problem, I am sure, Sir, we will solve it in no time.

Well, Sir, there is now the question of civil liberties. Well, if our friends on the Opposite side were in Russia, what would have been their fate, I ask them. We know the policy that Russia adopted. I am not here to criticise their policy. They might have found it good for them, but it is not good for us. Well, what about the mass trials in Russia in the early days? What about the mass shootings in Russia in the early years? Everyone that came against the policy of the then Government was branded as a traitor, and many patriots had to flee the country. Is there any such thing in India? Today my hon.

taken oath to the Constitution and the Communist Party today in India is not a banned party. No progress is possible if there is no peace and tranquillity in the country, if there is no stable Government in the country. But just when the country was facing tremendous problems, just after the Hyderabad Action was over, they started this movement, all in the name of the people's movement. Only yesterday, Sir, Swami Ramanand Tirth has told the other House that 250 Congressmen were murdered, murdered in cold blood. What about the arson and looting? What about the killing of innocent women and children? Is this the way of a patriot? Is this the way to help the Government to stabilise the Government of the country? Our President has said in his message that peace and progress can be established in the country only if we guard our freedom. Is this the way our friends are guarding the freedom, the hard-earned freedom, of our country? Sir, it is this message that we find in the President's Address. I would only quote one passage from that great philosopher-scientist, Bertrand Russell:

Man must lift his eyes and say, 'No, I am not a miserable sinner, I am a being who, by long and arduous road, have discovered how to make intelligence master natural obstacles, how to live in freedom and joy, at peace with myself and therefore with all mankind.'

It is this message that the President has given. Sir, I join my friends in the motion of thanks, and I support it.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR (Bombay) : I had originally thought not to participate in this debate, because I felt that it was right and proper that the new Members of this House who are sitting on the front Opposite Bench ought to be given the fullest chance to express their views on these important matters dealt with in the Speech of the President. But some of my friends said that it would be useful if I said what I felt about the two important matters which undoubtedly loom large before the minds of some Members of the House at any rate and a large majority of the public. The first matter which

[Dr. B. R. Ambedkar.]
 looms large is obviously the matter of food. There can be no doubt that this country has found itself in the grip of one of the biggest problems that it has ever been called upon to face. Sir, as a young boy, I had witnessed famines myself because my father was engaged as some kind of a cashier to pay the wages of many people who were engaged in famine relief work. I was living with him as a young boy and I could see the condition of the famine-stricken people. As a student of economics I had the opportunity of reading those magnificent books by one of the greatest Indian civil servants, namely, Ramesh Chandra Dutt, who had given a complete picture of the periodical famines that had taken place in this country, right from the beginning when the British came to occupy. But, Sir, remembering all this past history, my imagination cannot recall anything that I have seen or anything that I have read in any way comparable to the condition that we see today. I think it would not be an exaggeration to say that there was a time when there were famines but they occurred sometime at an interval of 10, 15 or 20 years. Today we have reached a stage when there is a famine almost every month in this country. This month there is a famine in Bihar, another month there is a famine in Rayalaseema, a third month there is a famine in some other part of the country. I think it would be impossible for any person who reads newspapers to say that any month has passed when there has not been a famine in this country. I was quite interested to listen to the argument which has been urged by some Members of the Congress Party that the Opposition should not be too hard on the Government. The Opposition must remember that when the British left, they left this country as an empty shell, with the resources undeveloped, with the people of this country untrained for economic production. Those arguments, if I may say so with all respect, are without substance. It may probably pass muster in this House or may pass muster with those who are inclined towards the party in this House. But

I should like to tell even my friends who are sitting on the Opposite side that this excuse will not go down for a long time with the people....

AN HON. MEMBER : You were yourself in the Government once.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR : Don't you recollect my past ? I am now a divorcee. What I want to tell my friends on the other side is that this excuse will not serve them for a long time. No hungry man is going to be sympathetic to a critic who is going to tell him "My dear fellow, although I am in power, although I am in authority, although I possess all legal power to set matters right, you must not expect me to do a miracle because I have inherited a past which is very inglorious." If this Government will not produce results within a certain time, long before the people become so frustrated, so disgusted with Government as not to have any Government at all, a time will come when I suppose unless we in Parliament realise our responsibilities and shoulder the task of looking after the welfare and good of the people within a reasonable time, I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind that this Parliament will be treated by the public outside with utter contempt. It would be a thing not wanted at all.

Sir, the situation has been greatly aggravated by the sudden decision the Government has taken with regard to this subsidy. The subsidy is in another way an additional project which the Government has undertaken to relieve the people against the high cost of living. The subsidy, so far as our information goes, has been in operation ...

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): What percentage of the population does the hon. Member want to be subsidised for food ?

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR : Sir, my submission is this that he will not want me to go into the details of the rationing system. I do not want to go into details as to how the population should be classified so that we might be in a position to say that the following classes

shall be subsidised and the following classes shall not be subsidised. That information Government has not placed before us. If the Government places that information before us, I certainly will be able to make such contribution as I can make to that proposal. For the moment I am saying this, that this reversal of the policy of giving subsidy seems to me an absolutely new thing. I find that from 1946-47, when the subsidy made was 22 crores, it has increased in 1951-52 to 36 crores. In the last Budget which the Finance Minister presented to the Provisional Parliament for the purpose of obtaining a vote on account, he had estimated that the subsidy which he might be prepared to give in this year would come to about 25 crores. That was the estimate that he had made. I am sure about it that at the time when he presented the Budget he must have been ready in his mind to commit himself to that magnitude of expenditure. Suddenly thereafter we find this sudden change. Some reasons have been given. One reason is that the subsidy would come to about 55 crores. Some Members have said it would be about 90 crores. I do not know what the correct figure exactly is. But I do want to say that even in the last Provisional Parliament, when the Budget was presented, Government was agreeable to take upon itself the responsibility of a subsidy to the extent of 25 crores. I do not quite understand why the Government has stepped aside from that promise, from that obligation. There are of course.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is up. You can take one or two minutes more.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR : I have something else to say. It will not be possible for me to finish within the one or two minutes that you are very gracious to give me. I will stop here.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH :

خواجہ عنایت اللہ : مسٹر چیدرمین ! سرہ میں اپنے راشتدریتی کے ایڈریس کو سہورت کرنے کے لئے کھڑا ہوا

ہوں - میں چاہتا ہوں کہ آج اپنی ایڈریشن بنچے، تو ایک نئی خبر سنا کر ان کو تعجب میں ڈال دوں۔ انہوں نے اس وقت تک جتلی بھی ایڈریشن اس ایڈریس کی ہے اس سے مجھے یہ صحیح خیال ہوتا ہے کہ انہوں نے اس ایڈریس کو یا تو ہمارے کپور صاحب کے کہنے کے بموجب پڑھا نہیں اور اگر پڑھا ہے تو یقیناً سمجھا نہیں۔ میں اس کی اس لئے بہت خوشی سے سپورٹ کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ ایڈریس ہم کو صحیح معنوں میں کمیونیزم کی طرف لئے جا رہا ہے۔ ہمارے کمیونسٹ درست یہ سمجھ کر کہ یہ ایڈریس کمیونیزم کی طرف لئے جا رہا ہے بہت خوش ہوں گے۔ مگر تھوڑا سا غرق ہے جو میں ان کو بتا دینا چاہتا ہوں۔ اردوہ میں بڑے فخر سے کہوں گا کہ یہ بالکل صحیح ہے کہ یہ ایڈریس کمیونیزم کی طرف لئے جا رہا ہے۔ ذق صرف یہی ہے کہ یہ دیسی کمیونیزم کی طرف لئے جا رہا ہے اور میرے دوست ویدیشی کمیونیزم کا پدچار کر رہے ہیں۔ اس کے علاوہ ایک بات اور بھی ہے اور جس کے لئے میں بہت خوش ہوں کہ یہ کمیونیزم ایسا کمیونیزم ہے جس کے ساتھ ساتھ خدا بھی موجود رہتا ہے اور میرے دوست ایسا کمیونیزم چاہتے ہیں جس کے ساتھ خدا موجود نہ ہو۔ ہندوستان کے لئے ایسے کمیونیزم کی ضرورت ہے جس میں خدا بھی ہو اور جس کے ساتھ دیس بھی لگا ہو۔ ویدیشی پیپروں کو تو ہم نے

[Khwaja Inait Ullah.]

تھیں سو برس تک آزمایا اور آخر میں ہم ناکامیاب ہی رہے۔ ایک رشی ہمارے ہندوستان میں پیدا ہوا اور انہوں نے کہا کہ ہمیں ویدیشی چیزوں کو چھوڑنا پڑے گا۔ وہ ہمارے اخلاق کو گرائی جا رہی ہیں۔ ویدیشی چیزوں کو چھوڑیں۔ ان کی پرواہ نہ کریں اور اپنے دیش کی رہ پڑ جائیں تو سب تھیک ہو جائے گا۔ ہم جانتے ہیں کہ یہ سچ نکلا۔ جب ہم ریڈیش سے دیش کی طرف لوڑتے تو ہمیں غلامی سے آزادی ملی۔ آج ہمارے دوست اسی پرانی لعنت کی طرف دیش کو لے جانا چاہتے ہیں یعنی ویدیشی کمیونیزم لانا چاہتے ہیں۔ آپ پوچھیں گے کہ کمیونیزم یہ کیسے یا کہیں گے کہ اس کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں۔ ہمارے پریسیڈنٹ نے کہا ہے کہ ہم ختم کرنے جا رہے ہیں کمیونیزم کو، پروانشیلیزم کو، پاروٹی (غریبی) کو اور محبت کا پرچار کرنے جا رہے ہیں۔ انہوں نے کہا ہے کمیونیتی پروجیکٹس بنائیں گے۔ ان سب چیزوں کے علاوہ مجھے بتائیں میرے کمیونسٹ دوست اور وہ دوست جن کا کمیونسٹوں کے ساتھ تمپریری الائنس ہو گیا ہے کہ وہ اور کیا چیز چاہتے ہیں۔

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : There is no such thing as *videshi* communism.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : No doubt, there is *videshi* communism.

ہم جانتے ہیں کہ سنہ ۱۹۴۲ء میں ہندوستان جب آزادی کی جنگ لڑ رہا تھا ہندوستان کے سپوت جب سینے پر گولیاں کھا کھا کر گر رہے تھے ہندوستان کی

جیلیں تھیں تھیں تب یہاں ویدیشی کمیونیزم کا پرچار ہوا اور یہ ویدیشی کمیونسٹ ہمارے خلاف رد ورتیں کرتے تھے۔ لوگوں کو پکڑتے تھے اور کہتے تھے کہ انگریزوں کو مت سناؤ کیونکہ انگریزوں کے ساتھ روس لگا ہوا ہے اور اس وقت کہتے تھے کہ پیپلس وار لڑی جا رہی ہے۔

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you kindly address the Chair?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : Alright Sir, I am sorry.

مسٹر چیرمین! میں عرض کر رہا تھا کہ اگر ہمارا ملک ان لوگوں کے پیچھے چلا تو ہمارا پیچھلا تجربہ بتاتا ہے کہ ہماری وہی حالت ہوگی کہ وہ نہ خدا ہی ملا نہ وصال صنم نہ ادھر کے دھینگے نہ ادھر کے۔ ہم انگریزوں کے ساتھ چل کر غلامی کے غار میں گر گئے تھے اور اگر پھر ہم نے دوسرے ملک کے پیچھے چالنے کی کوشش کی تو پھر ہماری وہی حالت ہوگی۔

وقت بہت تھوڑا ہے اور بہت سے دوستوں نے بہت سی چیزیں کہی ہیں ان کو جواب دینے کا وقت نہیں۔ مگر ایک چیز کہے بغیر نہیں رہ سکتا ہوں کہ میرے ایک دوست نے لنگویسٹک پروانشیز (linguistic provinces) پر بہت زور دیا ہے اور اس کی دلیل یہ دی ہے کہ انگریز ہم کو اڑا کر کے حکومت کرنا چاہتے تھے۔ اپنے لائق دست لنگویسٹک پروانشیز (linguistic provinces) کی دیمانڈ (demand) کرتے وقت مجھے تعجب ہوتا ہے۔ کیا کبھی انہوں نے سوچا

کہ ہندوستان میں کئی زبانیں بولی جاتی ہیں - میرا خیال ہے کہ باہر کا ویدیشی لٹریچر پڑھتے پڑھتے دیشی لٹریچر کی طرف انہوں نے کبھی دھیان نہیں دیا - اگر وہ دھیان دیتے تو ان کو معلوم ہوتا کہ ہندوستان میں سینکڑوں زبانیں بولی جاتی ہیں - میں تو یہ کہوں گا کہ ہندی کے اس پار کی زبان میں اور اس پار کی زبان میں کافی فرق ہے - ضلع ضلع کی زبان میں فوق ہے - شہر شہر کی زبان دوسری ہے - شہر میں اور زبان بولی جاتی ہے اور دیہات میں اور زبان بولی جاتی ہے - میں تو یہ کہوں گا کہ اگر یہی لکچریم تک پراونس کی ڈیمانڈ (demand) جاری رہی تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ایک زمانہ آئے گا کہ ہندوستان میں دو سو تین سو پراونسز (provinces) ہو جائیں گے - تو کیا جو پالیسی انگریز ڈیوائیڈ اینڈ رول (divide and rule) کی چلا رہے تھے وہی پالیسی یہاں اب پھر چلا جائے گی؟ ہمیں کہ یہاں ایسا کر دو - یہاں ایسا بدل دو - اس پراونس کو اس طرح بانٹ دو - اتنے پراونس (province) بنا دو کہ سینٹر (Centre) کڑی رہے نہیں - بہتیت بہتیت کی بولی ہو جگہ جگہ کی بولی ہو - کوئی کام مل کر نہ ہو سکے -

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : (In Tamil) Thalaivar avargale, ippozhu-thu pesum Member enna bashayil pesuhirar enru dhayavu seythu sollavum.

(English translation of the above)

[Mr. Chairman, please say in what language the Member who is now speaking is speaking.]

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh) : On a point of order, Sir. My hon. friend over there (Shri H. D. Rajah), probably in order to ridicule the Hindi that is being spoken, said something in a language which is neither Hindi nor English. May I, Sir, draw your attention to a specific provision in the Constitution that the proceedings in this House shall be conducted either in Hindi or in English, and a Member is permitted to use any other language—his mother tongue—if he is not well conversant with Hindi or English. My hon. friend certainly knows English very well, and it is, therefore, not open to him to speak here in any language other than English or Hindi.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I agree.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH :

خواجہ عنایت اللہ : مسٹر

چیئرمین ! سر - میں پوری چیٹنا (کوشش) کروں گا کہ اپنی زبان ہندوستانی میں بولنے کی کوشش کروں - انگریزی میں جانتا ہوں لیکن جہاں تک میں نے انگریزوں کی بہت سی باتیں چھوڑ دی ہیں اور مجھے نفرت ہے اسی طرح مجھے ان کی زبان کو بھی بولنے سے نفرت ہے -

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) : On a point of order, Sir. Since the hon. Member has now admitted that he knows English, he ought now to speak in English.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH :

خواجہ عنایت اللہ : ہاں تو

لوگوں نے راجپرکھہ پر اعتراض کیا ہے - ان کو تو ایک معمولی ریاست کی حیثیت میں بنا دیا ہے - اگر آپ راجپرکھہ پر

[Khwaja Inait Ullah.]

اعتراض کرتے ہیں تو کل گورنر پر کریں گے اور یروں (اشتریتی پر نہیں گے پھر مسٹر چیئرمین اور سپیکر صاحب پر کرنا شروع کر دیں گے -

میرے ایک دوست نے تلنگانہ کی داستان کہی کہ یہ ظلم ہوا - مجھے افسوس ہے کہ انہوں نے تھوڑے کے ایک ہی رخ کو دیکھنے کی کوشش کی - اگر وہ یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ تلنگانہ میں باغیوں پر کیا ظلم ہوا ہے تو اس کے ساتھ یہ بھی دیکھیں کہ تلنگانہ میں دوسرے اطمینان سے بیٹھنے والے آدمیوں، عورتوں، بچوں پر کیا ظلم کیا، تب صحیح نقشہ سامنے آ سکتا ہے -

(For English translation of above, see Appendix I, Annexure No. 8.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin): Mr. Chairman, those of us here whose experience of the Congress administration was arrests, magistrates' courts, jails, underground activities, externments, food shortages, famine, preventive detention and all the other calamities—see before us the regimented Fascist crowd of Congressmen like the Kauravas confronting the Pandavas in olden times on the field of Kurukshetra.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you remember that?

SHRI M. MANJURAN : I do not remember, but my great-grandfather told me that. (*Interrupts m.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Every hon. Member should be heard.

SHRI M. MANJURAN : I will now refer to the President's Speech where he refers to the "Other urges of the human spirit" which have come down to us

through wars and calamities from epic times till today. The history of India, narrated in the Mahabharata, in the Ramayana, has been a history of calamities and wars. I would suggest that when urge of the spirit is brought in, it is in complete opposition to the conception of a secular state. If anything can be set against secularism, it is spiritualism. If it is the ancient spirit of India seen through devastating wars, we need have little of it. I therefore think that there was no necessity for the President to refer in his Address to any spiritual matters.

Again, Sir, the Congress spokesmen, especially the former Premier of Bombay, was appropriating to the Congress Party the whole glory and credit of the freedom movement. I should like to correct him by saying that it was the people who fought and the leaders who spoke. It is easy to say and easy to discredit everyone of the nation when mounted in power. When, Sir, our experience of the Congress administration was so much tyrannical, our passions led us also with a "spirit" of revolt for the redemption of this land. But now we are called fifth-columnists, goondas or any other name that comes in the absurd dictionary of Congressmen. It is a travesty on truth to say that people who reacted to police atrocities were indulging in goondism. This has been going on for a long time. They are still pursuing their atrocious policy of preventive detentions and preventive massacres as in Gorakhpur and Pasmalai. We have found, Sir, that the Congress was pursuing all the time anti-labour policy. They have made certain legislations and they now depend, Sir, on what is called the Industrial Disputes Act by which the State intervenes everywhere. Where labour would like to express free opinion in disapproval of the Government interference and would not accept their dictation, shootings follow. Compulsory adjudication is killing the worker's right of collective bargaining. It has been our experience in the jails that the most tyrannical regime was going on in the days of Congress. I am asking, Sir, whether it is spiritualism when the Congress Government

order their policemen to shoot our comrades. Certainly not. There is no spiritualism when the Congress Government ordered mass attacks, and then speak of the glory of Panditji or Mahatmaji. If they are national assets, they are for the whole nation. They are ours also. Sir, one Member, the former Premier of Bombay, was saying we took oath under the Constitution. That is true. But we want to correct the Constitution. We feel it necessary to point out the faults of the Government so that it can march along the path of progress. We believe that wisdom did not stop with the Congressmen. There is no reason why we should be held responsible for the creations of others. I am one who believes that the Government may be thinking in their pride that they are to be in power for a hundred years more, but I should say that if this state of misery and poverty continues in the land their very existence will be at stake. Sir, time is fleeting. Ideas are changing rapidly. Our greatness is the greatness to understand the cumulative culture of the world and to participate in it.

Sir, we are surprised at the fact that they have not mentioned a single word about the foreign economic relations of this country which should have brought forth our dependence on imperialistic countries. After all, the political superstructure rests on economic foundations. Sir, I find that our policies are the same old British imperialistic policies. Our import and export policy is the same and in continuation of the previous imperialistic policy. There is absolutely no change in these policies for the last so many years. What freedom have we obtained when we are still under American domination, when our Community Project is but a projection of American imperialism on this land? We do not think that this is a land of freedom, but this is a land for Anglo-American enterprises and American domination. We are not prepared to yield to this policy, Sir, and we think that a new economic system has to be founded by our relations with all the powers of the world, by association

with entire universal progress and not simply confined to imperialistic agencies.

It was said that ours is a neutral policy. That is an absurd policy. Ours should be a foreign policy based on certain specific ideology. Ex-tollation of an individual is not an ideology. This has existed from times immemorial. Now we require a radical change as praise and encomium showered on individuals are no panacea for the evils of the nation.

Mr. Kher, the Congress Member, wanted from us constructive criticisms. But I am asking, where is the time for constructive criticisms? We could give him, a lot, but the greatest construction we can make in this land is the destruction of the fascist Congress.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is all. Time is over.

SHRI M. MANJURAN : Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ABID ALI (Bombay) : Sir, at the outset, with your permission, I would refer to a remark made by a Member here with regard to Muslims. I can appreciate, Sir, the mentality of those who are brought up in the Muslim League traditions but five years should be more than enough to change their minds and it is time that everyone in this country should be pure, simple and genuinely full-fledged citizen of the country.

Sir, what my friend from the Opposite Bench has just spoken regarding civil liberties is quite correct. Civil liberty of course is very good and should be everywhere. But if I go out or even here slap anyone or run away with somebody's property, certainly, Sir, there should be police to arrest me and a magistrate to send me to jail. The friend opposite was just asking what the Congress has done and what was its programme and its doings. It is to the credit of the Congress and the democratic principles in which it believes that so many persons of the Communist Party are sitting in this House. Sir, most of us do not like the idea

[Shri Abid Ali.]

that those who are responsible for killing people, arranging derailments of the trains, burning trams and buses, burning crops in the fields and food grain godowns, should have the status of good citizens. They act on the dictation of a foreign power. I wish, Sir, that the time should come soon when this mania of democracy should change. Yes, these Members have been elected by electorate but, Sir, the mysterious tactics they adopted are not known to many. Shri Jawaharlalji may be feeling that these friends may change their tactics for the good of the country, but I am sure that Shri Jawaharlalji will be disappointed because these friends will never become free from Moscow domination. They were tried in 1942 but failed. They say that the Congress Government is following U. S. A. and the United Kingdom. But, Sir, it is a fact that we have never followed them. On the contrary the Communist Party became the friend of Hitler. They followed the dictation of Hitler when Russia and Germany were friends during the early stages of war for their own imperialistic aims. When the Russians left Germans and joined the Anglo-American bloc, the Communist Party here called it a 'People's War' and were doing everything possible to sabotage the national movement. Some of my friends have already described their doings which are also very widely known. Their *zulam* in Telangana and other places is also not a secret.

It is said that the food question should be a non-party policy. First of all, Sir, there is no party worth the name in this country except the Congress, and, Sir, even for making it a non-party question with whom should the Congress sit and discuss—Communists, Socialists or Independents?

AN HON. MEMBER : There is nobody else according to your own admission.

SHRI ABID ALI : Individuals ? Sir. None of them is earnest to ameliorate the condition of the masses. If they wanted the nation to progress,

they would not have burnt the crops in fields and the food grain godowns. They do this mischief deliberately and no party is immune from it. They want that the masses of this country should become poorer and the nation should be in chaotic condition. They hope that in such a situation they may get a chance to capture power. Earlier they realise it the better for themselves that the masses have now understood them and their tactics and the more they do all such things the more unpopular they will become.

Sir, for everything that happens on earth the Congress and the Congress leaders are blamed. There is no rain—the Congress Government is there to blame. Somewhere there is too much heat—look here, the Congress *Raj* is there. If there is flood, the critics say that you have got Congress Government and therefore there is flood ! And if the mountains move—Jawaharlal is your leader and he is the Prime Minister of India, therefore there will be floods in Assam and mountains will move. If genuinely these friends want the country to progress, they should also join the constructive programme and help the nation. But they do not want it. They do not mean it ; therefore they will not do it. The Congress Government is trying its best. One can be reasonable with a reasonably-minded person, but none can convince those who are determined to create chaos and trouble for the nation. Judged from the point of view whether any other party or group of persons could do better than what the Congress Government has done, the verdict will be in favour of the Congress.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Give them a chance.

SHRI ABID ALI : Sir, I feel that every reasonably-minded person will give his verdict in favour of the Congress that it is making sincere attempts to relieve the nation of its miseries. Of course, Sir, peaceful transfer of power has its own curses and that has been according to my feeling, one of the

main reasons why the Congress Government could not progress as much as it would have been otherwise possible for it.

I was referring to the Communist Party. It was their own *Pravda* paper which has said that out of the Socialist Army one-third is in Russia and two-third is spread all over the world.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : Some of them are in India also.

SHRI ABID ALI : Of course they are. I feel that the French and Italian Communist Party people have been more honest. They have openly declared that if there is a war and Russia invades France and Italy, they will join with the Russian Army. At least because of this declaration our Government should beware ; they should take serious note of it and should place the representatives of the Communist Party at the proper level. The concessions which are given to them should be checked again and Government should decide appropriately so that the country and the democracy to which we are pledged are properly safeguarded and honoured.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat embarrassed in addressing this House not having participated thus far in this three-day debate here, although I have sought to acquaint myself from reports with what was said here. I do not propose to say anything about the multitude of matters that have been referred to because I find that in this debate on the President's Address almost everything under the sun has been brought in. I am not objecting to that from any legal or constitutional point of view, but purely from the practical point of view as we get lost in a maze of detail instead of concentrating perhaps on two or three or four or five important issues. There appears to be, if I may say so, a certain misunderstanding as to what the President's Address is supposed to be. Well, first of all, the President's Address

represents the viewpoint of Government. That is obvious. But, apart from that, the Address is not the kind of long dissertation on every subject with which Government has to deal. It is confined to a few very broad matters, general matters ; other matters come up before this House or the other House in detail on various occasions, whether it is a general debate on the Budget, which I take it they will have here—I am not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : . . . or specific matters as they come up, which can be discussed fully and thoroughly. Our Constitution is drawn from various countries and our own country ; but to some extent this system of Government is based upon the British Constitution with which we are most accustomed. Now, in America, the President from time to time addresses Congress and deals with a variety of topics because he is in fact, not only in theory, the supreme executive of the nation. In England the King of England is placed in a very different position and his Address to Parliament is usually a brief, concise document dealing with foreign affairs generally and with a few domestic topics which are likely to be included in legislation. Now, we are not following any particular model, but more or less it is the latter model that has been adopted here, so far as I understand it, for the President's Address. I wish to say this, because I should like hon. Members to realize what the scope of the President's Address is, and not to criticise it from the point of view of not including so many other topics or not going into details or not making any dramatic pronouncements and the like. If any dramatic pronouncements are made, they are made at the right time and at the right place. Take the case of our whole economic policy, which is of the first importance to us. It has been considered in a larger context by the Planning Commission. I have no doubt that the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Planning Commission's Report will come up before this House and also the other House for full consideration, and we can discuss these matters then, and discuss them in any way. But to bring in all those matters in a discussion on the President's Address rather overshadows the few important things that that Address intends to bring out. The President's Address is meant for the people of this country, of course. It is also meant for the people of other countries. Therefore, inevitably a good part of it deals with our foreign outlook, our relations with foreign powers and the like. There is nothing new about it. But it is important that these things should be emphasized, repeated, and clarified from time to time, because there is a great deal of confusion in people's minds here, as in other countries, in regard to this changing world, so that foreign policy almost always occupies the first place in the President's Address. It also deals with certain important domestic matters.

Sir, I wish to say just a few words about that foreign policy only. My hon. friend the Leader of the House will no doubt deal with all other matters that have arisen in the course of the debate. This foreign policy of ours may be considered from a variety of points of view. It is not, if I may say so, my policy which I have imposed on others. It is the policy not even of a group, it is the inevitable development which had to take place in view of our past history. I venture to say that although the Government might vary subsequently, although it might think otherwise on other topics, however, I am almost sure that basically that foreign policy would be continued by any Government. It is all right for hon. Members in the Opposition Benches to criticize it, as they are perfectly entitled and justified to do, because their main function is to oppose, whether reasonably or unreasonably.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU :

But the fact remains, that considered objectively and dispassionately, I say, any Government which does not forget its responsibilities completely—which does not forget that they are governing this country, and have therefore to keep the good of this country in view and not that of other countries for the time being—would follow eventually and basically that policy which we have endeavoured to follow. As I said, that policy springs up naturally from our struggle for freedom. If you go back and look up the numerous expressions of our foreign outlook long before we became a Government, the numerous resolutions or speeches which we had passed and made, you will find how that policy fits in or is in tune or rather how our subsequent policies fit in there. Sir, I do not want to say anything to the effect that we must adhere to what we said long ago regardless of changing circumstances. Much has happened in recent years which is completely new, which nobody could have envisaged previously. Nevertheless there are certain basic approaches which have flowed from the past. If I may go a step further, I may say, from even earlier than that, the whole outlook of the past of India fits in, and is in tune with our policy, or I may say, our present policy is in tune with that outlook. And that is an important thing, because then the policy we pursue becomes something infinitely more than the policy of an individual or a party, it becomes in a real sense, a national policy having its roots in the way of thinking of the people. Now, as I said, it might vary while dealing with some minor details. But that is the basic approach. That policy may be examined from a number of points of view, as to whether it is having any effect on the events, whether it is raising India's position either morally or in any other way in the eyes of other people and other nations, whether it is leading—to whatever small extent it may be, but nevertheless leading—in the right direction or not. These are the various tests that are applied to

it. I think that by any test you will find that it has succeeded in some measure. I do not claim any dramatic success for it, because it is difficult to be dramatic in a world which is torn by these dissensions, and where any dramatic act may perhaps sometimes, instead of succeeding, bring about more confusion. One has to be cautious; and one may be occasionally inclined to take risks. And in that matter, it is quite possible that opinions may vary, that in this direction one should go a little more positively; and I am prepared to consider the criticism that in a particular thing one should have gone a little farther, or a little less or not quite so far. That is a question of degree, which has to be judged by the particular circumstances prevailing at that particular moment. It cannot be judged here.

My first point is that the basic policy that we have pursued is the natural policy that any Government which has kept the ideals, not of any party but of the people of India, in view, had to pursue.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : It is a matter of opinion, Sir.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Naturally. I am not any religious teacher coming out here, as some of the Opposition leaders apparently imagine themselves to be. I give my opinion, but what is more, I think I can say with a large measure of assurance that however much the people of India may differ in regard to many other matters, yet on this particular matter 99·9 per cent. of the people are with us.

Now, what are the other policies ? They are largely policies of shouting in condemnation. Examine the speeches of the Opposition here as also in the other House. What do they amount to except to shouting and condemnation ? Is it a constructive approach ? It is extraordinary to see how words which were presumed to have a good deal of meaning in the English language or in any other language are used and bandied about and twisted in their meaning ; peace,

one of the finest words, and the ideal I hope we all aim at, is used in terms of war and with the intention of war. It seems an extraordinary state of affairs to be arrived at.

You go to the United Nations ; that great body is meant to preserve peace and collective security ; I still think that without it, the world will be much the poorer, and will have to face greater dangers. Unfortunately, as the President has pointed out in his Address, recent developments in the United Nations have not been very fortunate. It may not be very definite, but they gradually seem to move away from their ancient moorings, and that was something that was not intended. And the speeches that are delivered there with passion, and with, if you like, logic or lack of logic, this is not so material—the point is the manner in which they are delivered, almost amounts to a competition in mutual vilification. That is what apparently our present-day policy has gradually drifted to. That is the temper of it. Now, do you expect to solve any great problems of peace or war or any other problem when you approach them with that temper ? Now, I do not wish to criticise people of great countries, because all of us, wherever we may live, in the matter of foreign policy, or any policy rather, live in glass houses, and I do not presume to say that what we have done is free from blame or free from criticism. Therefore it does not become us to criticise others as far as possible, nor will it do any good, because it merely irritates others and you get into an atmosphere which is still more difficult for finding a solution. Therefore, we try to avoid this business of vilification even though we disagree thoroughly with some step that other countries take. Of course, if it is possible while avoiding criticising others, we may express our opinion. We have done so privately with the countries concerned and not shouted it out from the house-tops. Now, here again, some people seem to imagine that foreign policy has to be shouted out in the market place, and countries which we do not like or which have

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

done something against our wishes should be cursed openly and publicly. Now, that is not the way, if I may venture to say so, to conduct any policy,—I would even include domestic policy, but certainly not foreign policy. We are, I hope, a mature nation, and we have to behave as a mature nation, as free men, with restraint, with responsibility, not saying things in the passion of excitement which creates difficulties. And when you come to the foreign field, and more specially during a critical stage, words said, casually said, words said in anger, have repercussions. And they make the solution of any question terribly difficult. So, even though we have strong feelings about matters and we express them, we do not shout about it. And then people may think that, because we do not shout in the market place, we are passive. That is not so. I think that our opinion, our voice, firmly expressed, but calmly and dispassionately, has perhaps a far greater influence than if given in a loud and vituperative way.

Now, I suppose we must accept some basic approaches. I am not going into the relative merits of various ideologies and the like. One basic approach is that we in India must fashion our own destiny, according to our wishes, no doubt influenced by other people, other countries, but we choose our own. We stick to our roots and we take what is good from other ideals. I have no objection to taking any such idea, wherever it may come from. But then we must fashion our destiny, and nobody else should interfere with it against our wishes. There is far too great a tendency in the world today to interfere with other countries. Indeed, I ventured to say on another occasion that there are not too many countries left in the world which are not interfered with, and which can be called, well, fully independent, carrying on their own policies. Most countries, under stress of circumstances have somehow become subject to this type of interference and they are unable to carry out their full

policies. Now, I think I can say with some assurance that whether we have acted rightly or whether we have not, we have not acted on any occasion under pressure from any country. We have tried, of course, to keep in step, to keep in friendly relations with other countries, to put our point of view to them and to listen to their viewpoint and to consider it carefully and to accept it in so far as we can accept it ; if not, we go our way and they go theirs. We do not start quarrelling, and we try to avoid it. The result has been that although in the modern world the test is supposed to be the possession of great military might, and ultimately the Atomic Bomb and the like, we who do not possess that military strength or the economic strength of great countries and therefore from many normal present-day standards might not be considered important,—nevertheless, our voice has some weight because of the way we do things, because it is realised by people that our voice represents our own opinion and nobody else's opinion, and because it is realised that we are likely to stick to that opinion unless we are converted or convinced to the contrary, and that the last thing that is likely to happen is that we will be coerced into a contrary opinion. That is not going to happen. It was thought by some countries that the type of pressure which used to be exercised in the past might perhaps be exercised, if not in a big way, in a small way, on our country also. They soon found out that that could not be done and, in fact, it had the opposite effect on us. And so, a certain consideration, a certain respect for our viewpoint is being given which has enabled us to play a somewhat more important part in world affairs than otherwise. And I am sure such hon. Members as have had occasion to go abroad can test this.

Now, if I may refer to certain more or less recent happenings, many things have happened in the last two, three, four years, many things have taken place since the last War ended, which has made confusion worse confounded, but probably the one thing which has

led to more serious consequences than any other has been the denial of recognition of something that was obvious, of a fact that was patent and obvious, and that is, the fact of the recognition of the People's Government of China. It is not a question of any country or any people liking or disliking anything. It is a question of recognising the fact of a great country functioning as a united country, as an independent country. Not to recognise it by the United Nations meant that the United Nations was becoming to that extent unreal, because it had refused to recognise reality. It meant that the United Nations, to that extent, had become rather exclusive. It was losing its more or less universal character that its founders wished to give it. That was a very unfortunate happening and from that many evils have flowed. I do not know how reality can be restored to our international politics till we recognise such basic facts.

We are living all the time in a state of high tension and we do not know what tomorrow's developments might be. On the whole, perhaps, it might be said that there is somewhat lesser tension in the world than there used to be a year or two ago, a somewhat lesser fear of war and smoother relations than there were previously and that is a good thing. I have no doubt whatever that in every country there is a positive dislike and horror of war. Nobody wants war. I doubt very much if any Government really wants war. There may be groups here and there or individuals who, in their short-sightedness or an excess of passion, think that war might solve problems. But, leaving these people out, generally speaking, I do not think there is any Government, and certainly there are no people, who want war. And yet, curiously enough, things happen in such a way that a certain drift towards war continues. It may be slower or faster. There are, as this House must know, very serious problems in Europe. There are serious problems of a resurgent nationalism in Western Asia and in Northern Africa. But perhaps the most serious problem at

present relates to the Far East of Asia, to Korea and all that is connected with it in the present context. For the last eleven or twelve months truce negotiations have gone on there and they have not succeeded yet, and the whole thing seems to hang now on a single issue, so far as I can understand. I am not going to discuss that issue but it does seem a tragedy, as the President has pointed out, that the future of peace or war, the future not only of the Far East but of the world at large, depends upon that single issue of exchange of prisoners. I earnestly hope that that issue will be resolved. Not that I think that by the coming of the truce in the Far East, all the grave problems of the Far East would be resolved. But, anyhow, one big step will have been taken and I have no doubt that that step, when it occurs, will be received by a tremendous feeling of relief all over the world by the common people. So, when we have to deal with these delicate problems, are we merely to shout and express our disapproval of this or that and thereby perhaps give occasional pleasure to one party and occasional displeasure to another but not help at all in the process of healing or bringing about peace? So we function a little quietly, without trying to lose our tempers, quietly approaching the various parties opposed to each other, approaching them in a friendly way, trying to put in a friendly way suggestions so as to help in bridging the gap, leaving it of course to them to decide. We perform a service. It may not ultimately be successful. I do not know. But we perform them a service today which no other country in the world can perform in that measure. Therefore, we do that in all humility because it is not our desire to play just a dramatic part in these world affairs. It would be perhaps easy though it would be fruitless and certainly not helpful to anybody and since we play that part quietly, in a friendly way, refraining from criticism of others, we are heard in a friendly way and our advice, which may or may not be accepted, is listened to with respect and considered. That

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

itself is a great gain when passions are roused. Therefore, I venture to say that by and large the policy that we have pursued is not only the natural and inevitable policy which any Government which represents India can pursue; it has had a certain element of healing in it. It is not a policy which can be applauded from the house-tops by impassioned multitudes because we have sought to make it a calm and dispassionate policy. There is too much passion about foreign affairs in this world. But it has, I believe, done some good and I hope it will in future also do some good.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : We shall be grateful if the Prime Minister would kindly let us know about the report that I referred to on China that has been submitted by Mr. G. P. Huthee Singh. The House and the people outside also would be very grateful for this.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : A discussion took place in this House regarding membership of the Commonwealth. We would like to hear the views of the Prime Minister on India being a member of the Commonwealth which is really the British Empire.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I did not hear the first question.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Some report is supposed to have been submitted to Government by Mr. Huthee Singh on conditions in China. That is the first question. The second question is regarding our status in the British Commonwealth.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I do not exactly know what that reference to a report is. We get almost weekly and daily reports on various aspects of the question, not a complete report of one particular visit. A large number of reports we have received and I believe we also received a brief report from Mr. Huthee Singh.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I thought it was a very significant and a very useful report for the people.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : We receive reports of all kinds so that we may look at the picture from various points of view, and that is one of the reports we received. It was not an official report. I would be perfectly justified in saying that we have not received any report officially. But we received private reports and all types of information come to us.

About the other matter, namely, our being in the Commonwealth, I am rather glad that the hon. Member has drawn my attention to it, because I confess to not being able to understand at all the criticism that is sometimes made about our association with the Commonwealth. The House will remember that this association is of a most peculiar type; that is to say, it is so tenuous, it is so little binding in its character—in fact it is not binding at all. It is a willing association of two countries or more to consult each other. That is all that it is. And, naturally, they consult each other in a friendly way. I think that our association with this Commonwealth, just as our association with the United Nations, has been good. Because we are in the United Nations it does not mean that we agree with the policies of every member of the United Nations. Because we are in the Commonwealth, it does not mean that we agree with the policies of the different members of the Commonwealth. We pursue our policies without the slightest interference from them. I can assure this House that there has not been a single attempt by members of the Commonwealth to interfere in the least degree with anybody.

Hon. Members will ask : “What is happening in South Africa ? What is happening in Ceylon ?” I do not know where the Commonwealth comes in so far as Ceylon is concerned. It has nothing to do with it. Our attitude to Ceylon is governed by the basic fact that even if Ceylon does wrong, we propose to treat Ceylon as a younger brother. It does not matter whether we are in the Commonwealth or outside; we shall continue to do so, because we consider Ceylon too close

to us, too closely allied to us in culture and other things for us to get very angry with her. For, we are quite convinced that ultimately she will accept our viewpoint and act accordingly. Now, if we treat Ceylon in anger because she is not doing what we think she should do, because she is doing something wrong, what is the result? We do not do the slightest good to those people there of Indian origin who are at present being invidiously treated; in fact we do them a great deal of harm. And what is more, we sow the seeds of distrust and anger as between Ceylon and India. Now, we have to look to the future; we have to look to a future of cordial and good relations between Ceylon and India. This must come some time or other; and if we now, in a hurry or because we are angry, do something which leads to our sowing those seeds of passion and prejudice and anger in Ceylon, what will be the result? We have a duty to perform for the future generations of India and Ceylon. Therefore, we express ourselves firmly about present issues, and we try to deal with Ceylon in a manner conformable with justice, and at the same time we continue addressing them in a friendly way. But it has nothing to do with the Commonwealth.

Take the question of South Africa. That, again, has nothing to do with our being in the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, to put it in diplomatic language, we have no diplomatic relations with South Africa. We have no direct relations with each other. We have no diplomatic representative there, and they have none here. It is totally immaterial that South Africa happens to be in the Commonwealth and we too happen to be in the Commonwealth, though in a different way and not in the same way as South Africa. In fact, if I may say so, these questions that arise in South Africa arise not only in South Africa but in other parts of Africa as well, and they are very important, and the next ten years or fifteen years are likely to see very big happenings in Africa. If the situation is dealt with with some wisdom, it will be well for Africa and for the world;

if not, it will be bad not only for Africa but for the whole world. It requires the most tactful handling of these problems in Africa, not just getting angry. I am not talking of South Africa at the moment; I am talking of the whole of the African continent. The Africans, quite rightly, are becoming politically conscious; they have ambitions which are very justifiable; they do not want to be sat upon; they want to grow in their own way. And so, it has been our policy in Africa, which we have repeated to all our representatives there and to all the Indians living there, that on no account do we want any Indian to have any kind of a vested interest against Africans there, that they are there to co-operate with the Africans, to help the Africans to progress. In so far as they can do that they are welcome there; if not, they have no place there. We try to look ahead a little.

This trouble about people of Indian origin in South Africa has nothing to do with our being in the Commonwealth. Our being out of it will not help a solution of that problem; it will probably hinder it to some extent. I just do not understand this reference to the Commonwealth on the part of hon. Members, except that it is a kind of sentimental urge from past history. I do not understand this talk of our being inside or outside the Commonwealth. We are a Sovereign Republic. In the whole of our Constitution there is no reference to the Commonwealth or to any other foreign country. But it is open to us always, as to any independent country, to have a treaty of alliance or agreement with any other country. If we have a treaty of alliance with any other country, that means some give-and-take: you give some promises, and you get some promises, apart from just promises of goodwill and friendship. In other words, alliances, apart from those rather simple treaties of friendship, mean binding yourself to something. Now, our association with the Commonwealth is not a treaty or alliance of that kind; it does not bind us to anything, and it does not bind others to anything either. It of course binds us—if you call that a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

binding factor—to meet each other occasionally and discuss matters, to confer with each other, and then go our way. And I think it is a good thing to consult each other, to meet each other as often as possible, and we do meet sometimes Asian countries, and sometimes African countries; we meet together and discuss and formulate our proposals regardless of what any other country might do about it. I should like to know how and in what measure our freedom of policy and our freedom of action have been influenced by our membership and by our association with the Commonwealth. I should like to point out the many good things that have flowed from our membership of the Commonwealth, and many helpful things, and even in regard to the larger question of world peace, I think our being with the Commonwealth has been very helpful, and we have exercised such influence as we have in a more widespread way, in a somewhat more effective way than we might have otherwise done.

So, I do not see the slightest reason for us to dissociate ourselves from the Commonwealth. We are completely free to do what we like and function as we like and at the same time have the opportunity of influencing others in the right direction.

AN HON. MEMBER : May I ask, Sir.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. This is not a debate on foreign affairs. This is a debate on the President's Address. If hon. Members wish to have a debate on foreign affairs, other occasions will arise.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA (Bihar) : Mr. Chairman, I received the President's Address with mixed feelings. At the outset I wish to say that we at least on this side of the House do not suffer from the disability of thinking one way and speaking another way. I belong to the Socialist Party. I am proud of being a member of that Party. I want to tell you, in the first instance, that the claim of the Congress Party that they solely represent the people of the country is not justified. Only about 50

per cent. of the people who were enrolled as voters went to the polling booths, and out of that only 43 per cent. voted for the Congress. So, taking the total number of the voters, only 25 per cent. voted for the Congress in this country.

AN HON. MEMBER : How many voted for you ?

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA : That is a different point. What I say is that you are in that position through a vote of 25 per cent. How you are there—that is a different story; I do not want to dwell upon that at this stage. And as regards the claim that it is the Congressmen alone who brought freedom to the country, I do not agree to that proposition either, because we the Socialists were just a part of the Congress all through the battle for freedom. Perhaps we did much more in 1942, which was the last stage of the battle for freedom.

I will now take up the President's Address. I have said that I received it with mixed feelings. Regarding our foreign policy, I say at once that I entirely agree with the present foreign policy of India. I do not for a moment believe that it is in unsafe hands or untrained hands. It is unfortunate that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is here. I did not like to say this to his face, but unfortunately he is here, and I have to say it to his face. Mahatma Gandhi said that Jawaharlal was the keeper of his conscience so far as foreign affairs were concerned; and I can assure you that he is the keeper of our conscience too so far as foreign affairs are concerned.

There was some confusion in my mind. But I thank him that he has cleared this confusion by the speech that he has just made regarding our position in South Africa and Ceylon and I am only glad that he is doing and the Government is doing all that is possible to ease the situation.

Sir, it was said by my friend Mr. Reddy who also belongs to my Party and comes from Mysore that a third bloc should be created. But is he not aware that the third bloc is

automatically being created? You find that there are people and there are countries rallying round to India's view that no country should interfere with another country's affairs. A third bloc and a very powerful bloc is being created under the leadership of India. I think it is already being created and if the present policy continues, this third bloc will be in a position to prevent war for which the two blocs are already making preparations.

Then, Sir, with regard to the home policy, I thoroughly disagree with Pandit Jawaharlal's Government. We expected a very much different treatment to the masses in regard to the uplift of the down-trodden as also social freedom. I remember, Sir, it was some time before Mahatma Gandhi's death, in Delhi in a prayer meeting he said that it is true that India's political independence has been won but its social and cultural independence has still to be won and he said that he will devote the rest of his life to that purpose. Sir, I am very doubtful if there is anybody here, even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, to pursue that unfulfilled task of the great Mahatma. Sir, we have seen all these years that the poor people are getting poorer, the rich people are getting richer.

The hon. Member from Bombay (Mr. Kher) said that they are trying to evolve a society free from economic exploitation and that was the claim made by the mover of the Resolution. But, are we doing that or are we merely talking about it? In the Address it has been said that we have reached our target so far as sugar, textile and jute and some other things are concerned. But what has been done for the masses of India as a whole, the common man, the middle class man? These people have not profited. These things have on the contrary increased the incomes of the capitalists. If we had the reins of Government in our hands, we would have said that the profits made as a result of increased production should go to the real producer of those articles. What happens now is that the millionaires are getting the whole profits. We desire

the profits should go more to the real producers and workers rather than to capitalists. My grouse is that the whole economic system is so bad that the rich is getting richer and the poor poorer.

You wanted constructive suggestions from this side. I am giving, Sir, a very constructive suggestion which my Party has also given. You regulate the economic situation in such a way that no man in this country will have more than a thousand rupees as income for himself and that a poor man will not have to get less than one hundred rupees per month. That is a very simple proposition, which my Party has always placed before you and which you have not accepted.

I shall refer to one more thing and finish, and that is about the food situation. I will again refer to Mahatma Gandhi. He clearly said that it is a shameful matter for a country to get food grains from any foreign country and live upon them. I am not in favour of a subsidy business. This must be discontinued. But my point is that you should take special efforts to increase the production. What is happening now? Look at the conditions. We have grown food grains to the extent of 46 million tons but many States are not taking their quota. What does it prove? It proves that they are not in need of that grain. If you have reached a target of 46 million tons within a period of five years, that is not bad. So, distribution should also take place on right lines. I would like the Government to take bigger projects of irrigation directly or in conjunction with the State Governments and thus go ahead.

DR. S. K. BHUYAN (Assam) : Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to associate myself with the offering of thanks to the President for his Address on the 16th May. The President's Address is a historic document embracing the whole sphere of the administrative activities of the Government over this vast continent. The document is a historic one also for the reason that it comes from the first

[Dr. S. K. Bhuyan.]

President of Independent India, elected after the coming into force of the Constitution. This Address was given to the two Houses of Parliament constituted under the new Constitution.

The President's Address can be divided into three parts. First of all, it deals with the ideology of India; secondly with foreign policy; and thirdly it deals with domestic affairs. As far as the ideals of India are concerned, I am glad that the President has made very significant remarks on the ideals which have dominated India for ages—the ideals of amity and friendship and non-violence through which Bapuji brought independence to India.

This, in fact, is the message which India has given to the world and which India has to give to the world in future. I am sure the President's Address contains an invitation to the whole country to formulate active and regular systematic measures for the inculcation of this ideal into the hearts of our children from their very childhood. This ideal has been with us from time immemorial. We have adopted the "Ashoka Chakra" as the symbol of India and it is my earnest prayer that its full significance should be brought home to every school boy and girl. It can be very easily done by explaining it in a piece to be inserted in text books for boys and girls between the ages of 8 and 15 or 16.

The President has also alluded to periods of greatness and of tragedy in the long history of India's past. The root causes of such greatness and such tragedy should be examined by our historians and writers so that they may serve as a source of inspiration and of warning. It will be seen that greatness was always the offshoot of our moral strength; and tragedy the outcome of our spiritual degradation.

I come next to the foreign policy of India. I am glad, and it has been repeated several times in the House, that whatever be the domestic policy of our Government, there is no difference of opinion as regards the foreign policy. The foreign policy of India is attuned

to Indian ideology and our cultural heritage. Our policy is based on friendship with all countries in the world.

India, acting in a spirit of love and peace towards all nations, will assuage the evil intentions of our prospective aggressors, for who would like to strike at a person or a nation who does not bear any ill-will to others? We know the story of the infuriated elephant let loose against a sage for the latter's destruction. As the elephant ran towards the sage it was overpowered by the glow of kindness and love radiating from the unperturbed countenance of the holy sage; and instead of attacking him the elephant lay prostrate before the sage in an attitude of adoration and reverence. The name of the sage, as we all know, was Lord Buddha, and that of the elephant was Nalagiri. India's foreign policy is bound to create round her an atmosphere of good-will and love; and every one will shrink from raising a finger against our land as we do not bear any malice or ill will towards any other country. It can also be predicted that India's foreign policy will gain ground gradually in the same way as Mahatma's gospel of non-violence has stirred the imagination of many a race struggling for self-determination.

It may be that by carrying out this policy we will incur the displeasure of one country or the other. But I am quite sure that in course of time this foreign policy of ours which has been designated by the mover of the Resolution, Diwan Chaman Lall, as the "Nehru doctrine" would in future guide the political destinies not only of this country but of other countries also. I only wish that this Nehru doctrine should be brought into effect in all directions so that there may be peace and happiness in all parts of the world.

SARDAR D. S. PHERUMAN (Punjab):

सरदार डी० एस० फेरुमान (पंजाब): मिस्टर चेयरमैन, मैं चूँकि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी में अपने ह्यालात नहीं रख सकता, इस बास्ते हिन्दुस्तानी में बोलता हूँ।

दीवान चमनलाल जी ने 'थैंक्स' का 'मोशन' पेश किया है। मैं उसको 'सपोर्ट' करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यहां बहुत से लैक्चर हुए हैं, बहुत सी 'स्पीचे' हुई हैं। 'फारेन पालिसी' के लिये मैं सिर्फ इतना अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी 'फारेन पालिसी' दुनिया में सूरज की तरह रोशन है, जिसको स्टालिन की ताकत झुका नहीं सकी, जिसको ट्रमैन यानी अमेरिका की बौलत खरीद नहीं सकी, जिसको चांचिल की सियासत जीत नहीं सकी। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे लीडर पंडित जवाहरलाल जी की जो 'फारेन पालिसी' है, जिसको हिन्दुस्तान ने कई दफा 'सपोर्ट' किया है और अपनाया है और कहा है कि यह ठीक है, वह हिमालय की तरह अटल है। आज उसकी तरफ तमाम दुनिया के लोग देखते हैं और उसको 'एप्रेसियेट' (appreciate) करते हैं। और मैं जानता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों ने वफा की, हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों ने ऐसी बात नहीं की जैसी कि एक दफा जयचन्द ने हिन्दुस्तान में की या कई और लोगों ने की, तो यह चमकता हुआ सूरज तमाम दुनिया को रोशनी देगा और तमाम दुनिया इसी जगह से रोशनी लेगी।

इसके आगे मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, अपने अंदरूनी मामलात के मुतालिक। प्रेसीडेंट ने अपने ऐड्रेस में साफ कहा है कि एक काम हमने खत्म किया और वह काम था पोलिटि कल आजादी का। महात्मा गांधी की 'लीडरशिप' में उसको पूरा किया और अब दूसरे को पूरा करने के लिये हमें आगे निकलना चाहिये। उन्होंने कहा है कि 'रेवोल्युशनरी' के लिये कोई 'रैस्ट' नहीं है। उन्होंने साफ कहा है कि जो दूसरी बातें नहीं हुई हैं उनको पूरा करने के लिये हर एक से 'कोऑपरेशन' मिलना चाहिये और उन्होंने हर एक से, चाहे वह

किसी पार्टी में हो, 'कोऑपरेशन' की ख्वाहिश, की है। इस वास्ते मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यहां जो 'स्पीचे' होती हैं वह सिर्फ इस वास्ते नहीं होनी चाहियें कि 'प्रोपेगेंडा' (propaganda) हो। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि करोड़ों लोग गांवों में पड़े हुए हैं, मैं भी गांव का रहने वाला हूँ, एक किसान का लड़का हूँ, किसानों में काम करता रहता हूँ। यह इस वास्ते नहीं कहता क्योंकि किसी और 'ऑर्गनाइजेशन' की तरफ से आ रहा हूँ बल्कि मैं किसान के घर पैदा हुआ हूँ, किसान का काम करता हूँ। इस वास्ते मैं उसको अच्छी तरह समझता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनकी बेहतरी के लिये, गांवों की बेहतरी के लिये हमें आगे निकलना चाहिये और गवर्नमेंट को 'सपोर्ट' देनी चाहिये ताकि जो काम अधूरा है और जो इकरार हमने आजादी के समय किये थे उनको पूरा कर सकें। मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत सारा काम बाकी है। हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के बाद 'एकनामिक' आजादी बाकी है, 'इक्वालिटी' (equality) बाकी है, लेकिन वह तभी पूरी हो सकती है जब कि हम सब 'कोऑपरेशन' दें।

मेरे दोस्त मुझे माफ करेंगे। मैं यह उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि 'फारेन पालिसी' पर वह बहस करते हैं जिनकी अपनी कोई पालिसी नहीं है। कहां से बनकर उनकी पालिसी आती है, कौन उनको डाइरेक्ट करता है? इस वास्ते बहस उनको करनी चाहिये, जिनकी अपनी पालिसी है। कांग्रेस की अपनी पालिसी है, वह लोगों को पालिसी देती है। इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि हम सब को इस पर जुट जाना चाहिये कि जो काम बाकी रह गया है और लोगों के साथ जो इकरार किये हैं, वे पूरे हों और

[Sardar D. S. Pheruman.]

उनको करने के लिये हम सब को मिलकर काम करना चाहिये।

हिन्दुस्तान में कैसे कैसे लोग बसते हैं। जिसको हम पिताजी कहते हैं, बापूजी कहते हैं, जिसकी पूजा तमाम दुनिया करती है, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे लोग भी हैं जिन्होंने उन पर भी गोली चलाई। जिसने इतना परोपकार किया, दुनिया में एक नई चीज लाया, बगैर ब्लडशेड (bloodshed) के आज़ादी दिलाई, उसको भी मारने वाले लोग हिन्दुस्तान में बसते हैं। इस वास्ते मैं तो यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो काम रह गये हैं, आइये, उस काम के लिये 'कोअोपरेशन' दीजिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि हम अभी कुछ नहीं कर सके, किसानों के लिये, मजदूरों के लिये, लेकिन इसकी जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट पर नहीं है, पंडित जी पर नहीं है, जिम्मेदारी हम पर है। जिन्होंने 'पीपुल्स वार' का नारा दिया, जिन्होंने तोड़-फोड़ की, लाइनें उखाड़ी, कई बेगुनाहों का खून कर दिया, वे कहते हैं कि हम जनता में अमन के दावेदार हैं, पब्लिक के लिये हैं। वह कम से कम इतनी मेहरबानी करें कि अपना 'कोअोपरेशन' दें, साथ दें, ताकि जो इकट्ठा हमने लोगों के साथ किये हैं वह पूरे कर सके। वह तभी पूरे किये जा सकते हैं जब हम अपने लीडर के साथ हों और जब हम उनके साथ खड़े होंगे तभी उनको पूरा करेंगे।

(For English translation, see Appendix I, Annexure 9.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : In view of the very inelastic nature of time, I shall ask one Member from this side of the House, Mr. Kidwai, on behalf of the Government to say a few words and then I shall call one Member from the Opposition.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, the Government is having too much time. The Prime Minister took about three-quarters of an hour, and the Leader of the House also will be taking another hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All the same, I feel we have had a very satisfactory and full discussion. More than thirty Members have participated in the discussion. I shall ask one Member from the Opposition, and then Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar will wind up the debate on the President's Address on behalf of the Government.

THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI RAFI AHMAD KIDWAI) : Sir, I am sorry I was not present in the House, when the debate on the President's Address took place. It was but natural that many of the speakers devoted their attention to the food situation in the country. There was criticism about the withdrawal of subsidy. That has been dealt with in the discussion on the increase in food prices. I hope hon. Members would have read or will read the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister delivered yesterday in the House of the People. That gives a full explanation as to why the subsidy was withdrawn. There has been another criticism about the failure of the Grow More Food Campaign, the failure of the Government to rapidly provide irrigation facilities by attempting to build up minor irrigation channels, digging wells, etc. With most of that criticism it has been my misfortune to agree; as hon. Members are aware, I have only recently taken charge of the Food portfolio. It is difficult for me to acquaint myself with all these schemes. There are schemes in the Department that were proposed, I think, some twenty years ago. There are also schemes which have been suggested only recently. I shall have to look into them and then I shall try to see if I can expedite the process. It is wrong to say that the Central Government has not done anything in the different scarcity areas. As friends coming from Madras must know, in Rayalaseema our army has undertaken

to give relief to the local people in respect of water and other things. Relief works have been started all over the country in all the scarcity areas. I am told there was some criticism as to why Rayalaseema and other places have not been declared a famine area. It is for the State Government to determine whether they should declare it a famine area or not, but whatever facilities could have been made available under the Famine Act have been made available to the scarcity area. I think we have given some relief at least, though we have not been able to give all the possible relief. As I have said, Sir, I am new to the Department, but I am trying to find out a way by which the rise in food prices in Delhi city, and also in the country side, where, till the 1st April of this year, food subsidies were given, could be stopped, and prices may be reduced. I am tackling firstly the problem in Delhi city, and I think Delhi people will get some relief as early as possible. I am going to other places and I shall have the opportunity of looking into the difficulties in those places also. But at this stage it is not possible for me to announce any final decision on the floor of this House, because we have to consult the State Governments also. Apart from consulting the State Governments, we have to look at our own resources also. I assure the House that I will look into all the suggestions that have been made for effecting improvement in the food situation and in the Grow More Food Campaign. I am prepared to discuss, I am eager to discuss, with all the Members who are taking interest in the Grow More Food Campaign. My mind is open. I will accept every suggestion that can solve the present difficulties. As I have said, Sir, it is not possible for me to announce any settled policy because it will take some time, but, as I have said, I agree with much of the criticism that has been levelled in this House and in the House of the People and I am trying not only to meet the criticism, but also to take advantage of the advice that Members are prepared to offer, and even non-Members because I am contacting all those people who are in a position to give competent advice, and

I shall sit with them and discuss with them and will try to improve the position.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Chairman, I wish the hon. the Prime Minister was here, as I would touch upon his subject, namely, the Commonwealth of Nations.

The hon. Prime Minister has expressed the desire that we should point out to him how India's continuance within the Commonwealth of Nations is hindering India's progress and independence. But, before I come to that, I would touch on some of the features in the Presidential Address which to my mind is a miserable testament of measureless political bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, as I was listening to the Presidential Address in the Hall in this one time imperial city, I recalled to my mind the Resolution of the Ramgarh Session of the Congress which was presided over by the present incumbent of the Presidential Chair, namely, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. And that Resolution declared the national pledge and reiterated the independence pledge of the people. It said : " Indian Freedom cannot exist within the orbit of Imperialism and Dominion or any other status within the imperialist structure, is wholly inapplicable to India, is not in keeping with the dignity of a great nation and would bind India in many ways to the British policies and economic structure." Now, those who have forsworn their pledges, forgotten their past and walked upon their traditions might forget these sacred national pledges for the fulfilment of which many have died. I will ask the Prime Minister, if I may, if the present Commonwealth of Nations, which is after all nothing but the British Empire, has altered the fundamental economic and political relations—fundamental economic relations, I say, because the British built in this country through their years of colonial plunder and loot, a regime, an economic structure. That structure, Mr. Chairman, continues today. For instance, in India today, five to six hundred crores of British capital remain invested—money that was invested by the Lord Clives, by that unspeakable

[Shri B. Gupta.]

gang of imperialist plunderers. That capital is invested in tea, in coal mines, in engineering, in various other industries, in shipping, to the utter detriment and ruination of our country.

AN HON. MEMBER : Insurance also.

SHRI B. GUPTA : And, Mr. Chairman, as you will have known, every year no less than Rs. 100 crores is drained out of our country on account of this British investment. In Bengal, there are managing agencies, Andrew Yule and others, which control between four to five hundred companies, and carry on their plunder unchecked. There are shipping companies who control our coastal shipping to some extent, but almost wholly control our overseas shipping. India's share in international trade, Mr. Chairman, is 3%, but her share in shipping accounts far less than 3%. If this is not exploitation, what else is exploitation? We know that every year 15 to 16 crores of rupees have been taken away by the foreign shipping companies, particularly the British, on account of shipping, and we are told by Mr. M. A. Master, Member of the Shipping Advisory Committee, that in this year the figure will come up to Rs. 40 crores. We know the insurance companies which deal with foreign insurance are again taking away our money. If this is not exploitation, what else is? If this is not imperialist structure unaltered, what else is?

The Prime Minister has told us about the Republican status. Does India being a Republic do away with imperialism and imperialist structure? It is nothing new as, Mr. Chairman, you might know. Barriedale Keith was a very able imperialist jurist. He foresaw that the time might come when the British Empire would have to accommodate a Republic within its structure. That is why he wrote in one of his letters to *The London Times* which I would like to read out here. He wrote : "If no place can be found in the British Commonwealth for a Republic, the enduring character of the Commonwealth may well be doubted." And today Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru says

that an accommodation has been found for our Royal Republic within the Commonwealth of Nations. It is, therefore, very relevant, Mr. Chairman, that we raise our voice against this continuance in the Commonwealth. We want to get out of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth, after all, is nothing but a change of nomenclature, as Mr. Attlee, the then Prime Minister, referring to the Agreement of April 1949, told the House of Commons on May 2nd in that year. We know that he said : "We leave the name to be used as the people desire." It is there in the *Hansard* if the Prime Minister would be good enough to look up that book. We know the Commonwealth is imperialism unvanquished. Within the Commonwealth we are told there exists equality of status and we find in Britain the national income is 2,577 per head whereas in our poor country, the national income, according to the latest estimates, remains at 227, that is to say, the equality is such that England has a national income to the extent 12 times that of India. That is the Commonwealth of Nations. And if we look into the trade relations, we find that Britain is controlling our trade. Britain is robbing different materials out of our country. The composition and structure of the trade remains essentially colonial, and if the Americans and the British control 40% of India's foreign trade, why does India's trade with the Soviet Union, China and other countries account for less than one per cent? If that is called international relations, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what to say in condemnation.

Look at the sterling balances. During a short period of time as we know, Rs. 30 crores have been spent by this Government for paying pensions to the British officials who retired from this country. It is an insult to Bhagat Singh, and Chandra Sekhar Azad who was killed in Allahabad. It is an insult to our countless martyrs that the assassins of British imperialism should have been paid pensions. The tale is as sorry as it is painful. We want to break away from this Commonwealth. That is our declaration; that is our national aim. We will redeem this

pledge. Let this Parliament declare and the whole country declare this, so that mankind will say that this Parliament has not become a useless Mountbatten show, but has come forward to uphold the traditions of our national movement.

I have not the time to touch on the food situation. The Congress has made famine a permanent feature, wasted 88 crores of rupees in farcical Grow More Food Campaign, bought American food grains at exorbitantly high prices.

I want to say a few words now about civil liberties. I do not wish to tell anything to those sanctimonious hypocrites who talk about non-violence but practise violence. But I would like to tell the Government that more than 2,000 people have been killed in Telengana alone, one thousand villages have been ravished and they have put more than 50,000 people all over India in detention camps and prisons. 500 people are in prison in Hyderabad out of whom 250 are in detention. That is the record of the gentlemen who preach non-violence and indulge in violence. That beats Hitler, Tamerlane, and Chengiz Khan. I appeal to you, Sir, to listen to the voice of the people of the country. I would tell Mr. Kher that it will not take 200 years, but it will be within two years, if you give us the full democratic rights, when you will have come to this side of the House and we will have gone to the other side.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, when I was not here I understand a note of deviation was struck by a member of our Party. I should like to give an explanation because my name also was raised. I have a right to make the explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Why were you not here ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : My name was raised. I have a right of giving an explanation. According to Parliamentary procedure, a right is given to a person whose name is raised.

5 C.S.D.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is it you want to say ?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : So far as the Party's policy is concerned, when deviation occurs, it is that which is expressed by the Leader or the Deputy Leader. So far as this is concerned.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is a matter of internal arrangement.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : Mr. Chairman, as I was listening to the last but one speaker, I rubbed my eyes and wondered whether after all we had been so wicked as he tried to paint us to be. But I thought for a while and came to the conclusion that perhaps he was carried off his feet with his own words—I would not call it eloquence. He tried to paint us with all sorts and kinds of wicked acts. But I do not propose to deal with everything that he referred to, or for that matter with everything that has been referred to in this House in the course of these debates. But I should at once like to join issue with him as regards his exposition of the place of India in the Commonwealth of Nations. After spending a lot of rhetoric upon that matter he appealed to the House, or he stated it as the position of the Party which he represents, that we should take the earliest opportunity to get rid of the Commonwealth by walking out of it. I thought all reasonable-minded persons in this House would have been satisfied with the exposition that the Prime Minister gave about our place in the Commonwealth of Nations. Perhaps my hon. friends on the opposite side are still obsessed with the notion of a British Commonwealth of Nations. At present there is no such British Commonwealth. It is simply a Commonwealth of Nations. Every nation which is included in that Commonwealth is a sovereign entity. India is a Democratic Sovereign Republic, and it is as an independent State that she has allowed herself to continue in this Commonwealth. The Prime Minister referred to certain aspects of the connection of India with this Commonwealth of Nations; He

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.]

described it quite frankly as a consultative association of independent nations. He compared it to the United Nations. He compared it also to independent nations who enter into treaties or alliances. Let me draw one distinction which he omitted to mention to this House and that, I hope, will carry conviction to my friends on the opposite side as to the true nature of the so-called Commonwealth tie. That tie is of a most tenuous character, as has already been said by the Prime Minister. I would deal first with the relationship in the United Nations. They are all independent nations who are gathered in that body, but they subscribe to a charter. There are certain rules of procedure for consultation and discussion, which the members of the United Nations are supposed to follow. There are, in very extreme cases, the possibilities of certain sanctions being applied for the purpose of enforcing such decisions or resolutions as the United Nations come to.

In the Commonwealth of Nations of which India is a member today, there is no charter. All consultation is free, and all association is free, and there can be no sanctions at all—under no circumstances. Take, for instance, also the relationship that subsists between one independent nation and another in the nature of treaties or alliances. Treaties are documents in which each nation surrenders perhaps a bit of its theoretical sovereignty, and so long as that treaty lasts each nation is supposed to be bound by the terms of that treaty. There is no treaty or alliance or any similar document between India and the rest of the Commonwealth of Nations. Do you call this a perpetuation of what you call British imperialism? Where is Britain as a dominant factor in this relationship? Where is the question of our subordinating our independence to Britain in anything that we do in connection with these Commonwealth relations? We can break away at any moment we choose.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Then why not do it ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI: Because

it is not to our interest to break away from it.

Now, my hon. friend who spoke on the opposite side referred to the crores of rupees which have been invested in India by Britishers and to the crores worth of material which is exported from the country. Well, this is a very old story. It is in our power to stop further British investment if in the interests of the country we were required to do so. But we have not put a ban on such investment. For a time we were discussing the conditions on which foreign capital should be allowed to flow to India. After a great deal of discussion and thinking we came to the conclusion that if foreign capital does come to India and can be used for the purpose of the development of India, so long as there are no political strings attached to that flow of capital, it is all to the interest of India to get that capital over here.

I will read some portions of the speech of the Leader of the Communist Group here. He asked :

Is it independent foreign policy to keep British officers to dominate our services ?

Let me tell the House that there is not a single British officer in this country today, either in the Army or in the Civil Services, who has the power to dominate either the formulation or the implementation of our policies. There are a few British officers in our employ. We employ them. They have got to carry out the policy that we lay down, and we use them as we use anybody who is employed for the purpose of carrying out our policies. Then, the hon. Member went on to ask :

Is it independent policy to allow American advisers in the name of advisers to parade in all our economic and industrial departments ?

What is this parade that is being referred to? America has come forward with an offer of help. We examined that offer, and we found that it would be to our advantage to accept that offer. We wanted the know-how—the kind of people who would be able to advise us as regards how this help could be most beneficially utilised in this country. We got a certain number of men from

America for the purpose of helping us to do it. If we do not want them, we can ask them to clear out tomorrow. They are not themselves interested in coming out with all their men and money. If you want them, take them ; if not, send them out.

Then, there is another question asked :

Is it independent foreign policy to allow under the garb of the U.N.O. officers to spy in Kashmir on our military secrets and other things ?

What is the foundation for this insinuation ? Who are the foreigners 'who are in Kashmir today ? They are observers sent by the United Nations for the purpose of seeing that the two parties on either side of the cease-fire line do not encroach upon the sphere of each other, that peace is maintained, that there is no encroachment on the borders, and that the terms of the arrangement under which the cease-fire was established are not broken. It is possible an hon. Member or two may have heard that a particular observer, a stray observer or two of the United Nations, did go about the streets of Srinagar, perhaps trying to contact people in social functions and so forth, and that this gave the impression that they were there spying upon our military secrets. Why cast an aspersion on the observers who come from a free all-world body like the United Nations ? We agreed to their coming as part of the arrangement under which the cease-fire was established. That is not departing from our position as an independent country.

Then, the Leader of the Communist Group finally asked :

Is it independent foreign policy to send a medical mission to Korea to support the Americans while refusing even . . .

The sentence was lost in some interruption. Now, Sir, we sent a medical mission to Korea. For what purpose ? We are a member of the United Nations. There was fighting going on in Korea and help was asked for from every member of the United Nations. We said we were not prepared to send an

armed force there. But when an appeal for humanitarian help, such as that we should send a medical mission, was made, we sent a medical mission. It was for the purpose of helping Americans; it was for the purpose of helping, more particularly, the inhabitants of Korea. They may have been South Koreans; they may have been North Koreans; but our medical mission helped all those who required that sort of help. We sent that mission as an independent country, as a member of the United Nations. Is that any deduction from our position as an independent country ? I am afraid, Sir, ideas about our independence are confused in the minds of my hon. friends.

As regards general foreign policy I do not propose to say anything, because the Prime Minister has put it in the clearest possible manner and I do not think there can be any reasonably-minded person in this House who could take exception to that statement of foreign policy which has been followed in the past and which, I think, in the interests of the world as a whole and not merely of India, will endure for all time.

Sir, with regard to the food problem, we heard a statement from my hon. colleague the Food and Agriculture Minister. You will find it is a most difficult problem. It has many facets. It is not so easy of solution as many people think it is. There is no doubt about the fact that there is a certain amount of suffering prevalent in certain parts of the country which deserves to be tackled and rectified as soon as possible. The Government are every-day giving their attention to the proper solution of this problem and they would only ask that in the efforts they are making for a proper solution they will have the assistance and advice of all hon. Members, whether they belong to this side or to the Opposition side, because there is no problem more vital than this food problem.

I would like at this stage to refer to something that was said about the Constitution. Some hon. Members I think who are responsible for making the Consti-

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.]

ution, have been described as pretenders. As pretenders of what? Pretenders in the capacity of being representatives of their country or only pretenders for seeking the best interest of the country? What exactly does the word "pretenders" mean in that context, I have not been able to follow. But as one who had something to do with the making of this Constitution, let me say that in the history of Constitution-making to which I have given a great deal of attention, I cannot think of any Constitution in the world which is so comprehensive, which embodies so many right principles and which also attempts to create the machinery that is necessary for our implementing the highest ideals of our country. Those ideals are stated in the Preamble of the Constitution. It has been implemented in the various parts of this Constitution. I do not say that it is a perfect document. Perhaps it could have been a little shorter than what it is. But there is no doubt about the fact that it has extorted, if I may use that word, the appreciation of those who have given thought to the making and implementation of Constitutions in the world. That is a great compliment. We may no doubt be able to improve it by adding and subtracting a few things here and there. But the basic structure is, if I may be pardoned for saying so, one of the best that has been constructed in the course of history in that field.

Then, Sir, I shall pass on to certain things which were mentioned in the course of the debate. My hon. friend Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee referred to Kashmir. We are very grateful to him for the historical analysis that he gave of this problem. He reached the conclusion that we have arrived at a stage when it must become necessary seriously to consider whether we should not give up this idea of taking a plebiscite and attempt to solve this problem by other means. He is a student of history. While I would welcome to be released from the shackles which events of the last four years have imposed upon us and to adopt his suggestion, we cannot forget the fact that we are under certain

commitments which if we are to maintain our reputation in the international sphere, we cannot get away from. I wish in this connection to state one or two things about this unfortunate State. About the end of October of the year 1947 Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India. The Governor General of the time accepted that accession, and, on the advice of the Government then in power which was also headed by the present Prime Minister, voluntarily added that while this document, the Instrument of Accession, was legally complete, he would give the people of Kashmir an opportunity for ratifying it when conditions quietened down and they were in a position to take a free vote on so important a matter. That was an arrangement between the Government of India and the people of Kashmir. That was not an arrangement between India and Pakistan, for, at that time Pakistan had absolutely no *locus standi* in Kashmir. Things developed rapidly after that and a certain amount of fight took place. There was invasion first by the tribesmen. There was invasion later by Pakistan. The first invasion was with the backing of Pakistan and the second invasion was directly by Pakistan. Finally it came to a cease-fire. We took it to the United Nations in the meantime and tried our hardest to ask the Security Council to pull up Pakistan which had absolutely no *locus standi* in Kashmir. In the United Nations this problem was however allowed to drag on. It dragged on for many months. Finally a cease-fire came on.

The negotiations are still going on. It would not be right for us to say at this stage that we walk out of the Security Council so far as this matter is concerned. As a matter of fact, the procedure by which we are bound in the United Nations does not permit of our doing so. It is not right that we should now say "We walk out; we will try to settle it by other ways." What does settlement "by other ways" mean? Can we come to grips with the problem directly with Pakistan and say we can settle it without the intervention of the United Nations? If that is not possible—and I may say it

is not so easy to accomplish as you see from the negotiations that are going on in respect of the introduction of a passport system—so minor a matter as that—if that is not possible, what other alternative we can think of? You all know what that alternative is, but we want to settle this problem with Pakistan in a peaceful way. I for one do not despair of our doing it in a peaceful way.

So much as regards Kashmir and its relations with us and our relations with the United Nations. There are some minor problems in respect of Kashmir which have agitated people in this country quite recently. These are problems connected with the internal relations, if I may so describe them, between Kashmir and India. Under the Constitution of India, Kashmir is a constituent State of the Union. It has been tied up with India permanently and that tie cannot be cut except by an amendment of the Indian Constitution. But what is the nature of that tie? It is not the same tie as exists between the Union and the rest of what was known as the old Indian States. Kashmir is tied up with us, broadly speaking, only in respect of three subjects: Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications, that is to say, the subjects which were elaborated into the items that were entered in the original Instrument of Accession. With regard to other subjects, our Constitution provides that with the consent of the Kashmir Government more subjects could be added to this list. But even if we got the consent of that Government to it, that kind of additional accession would have to be ratified by their Constituent Assembly when it came to be convened. It has been convened and it is now in session. So I want hon. Members to realise that the present constitutional position is that any such accession, in addition to these three broad subjects, can only be with the consent of the people of Kashmir, as expressed in their Constituent Assembly. Not all of us remember this basic fact when we criticise the position as regards Kashmir. Now, I wish to stress this fact because, I am afraid, latterly expositions of this position by

people who have not understood it correctly have given the impression that it is possible for the Government of India to impose accession in respect of every subject on Kashmir and that its failure to do so is a failure in their duty to the country. Nothing of the kind. We recognise the principle as a democratic axiom that we cannot impose a Constitution on one of the units of the Union unless the people of that unit State are willing to consent to such imposition. So we have got to carry the people of Kashmir with us and the people of Kashmir have to carry us with them before further accession takes place. I may mention for your information that already talks are in progress on this subject because the Constituent Assembly is meeting and will have to take decisions before they frame a Constitution for their own State. The talks regarding financial integration have made considerable progress and talks in regard to other subjects will be launched very soon between the representatives of the Government of India and the Government of Kashmir.

Somebody said things about linguistic provinces, though I believe the subject is not one referred to in the Presidential Address. But, as the matter has been mentioned, I should like simply to say a word or two about it. It was suggested that there should be constituted an Andhra Province. I thought the leader of the Communist group preferred a 'Vishala' Andhra Province to a mere Andhra Province. He claimed to be a representative of 'Vishala' Andhra. That means that it includes not merely the Andhra districts as we know them in the Madras State; it includes Rayalaseema and it includes the Telugu districts of the Hyderabad State. Well, the suggestion was that we were afraid of this because, if these areas were constituted into an Andhra Province, there could be no Congress Government in these areas. Well, I do not know if the Congress is so weak or powerless that it cannot win a majority in these areas. But this suggestion reveals to my mind the objective of those who are pressing for the immediate constitution of a 'Vishala' Andhra,

[Shri N. Gopalaswami.]

and that is this. Let me say frankly, these gentlemen feel that in one portion of this area, namely, in Telengana, they are overwhelmingly strong and they think that if the other two areas are added to it, they will be equally strong in those areas.

Therefore, their objective is to combine all these together for the purpose of having the opportunity of establishing a Communist State within the Indian Union. That obviously is their intention. I am not, for the moment, giving a decision as to whether, when an Andhra Province is constituted, it should be a Vishala Andhra Province or an Andhra Province as we used to conceive it in the Madras State when this matter was being discussed for years. That is a different thing altogether. But, really, the Congress Government either at the Centre or in the other States cannot be afraid of this penetration of the Communist doctrine in areas which it has not yet reached. I believe the results of the recent elections are sufficient proof that the Congress can give battle to the Communist Party and come out with a majority which cannot certainly be pooh-poohed even by the Communists. Therefore, we are not afraid of this thing at all. If a Vishala Andhra State has not come into existence so far, it is not due to that reason. I believe the Congress Government and the Congress leaders have made it perfectly clear that they are all in favour, when the time is ripe, to constitute provinces on a linguistic basis. Sir, the time has to come; the conditions have got to get established. There must be agreement amongst the people of the different sections of the area that is attempted to be constituted into a province. I am afraid that, in spite of all that has been eloquently said from the other side, there is not in the Vishala Andhra area as now conceived the same amount of unanimity about what areas should come into an Andhra Province and how it should be constituted, which it is necessary to have if we are to take steps under Article 3 of the Constitution for the establishment of an Andhra State. I would ask my friends who are present

to clear it if they can and to educate public opinion in their favour. I know they will do so. But there is the Congress Party also which can educate public opinion in its own way. Let both parties have the chance of getting public opinion in favour of the view each party holds. Let us see what maximum agreement there is going to be and then we can take up the question of taking action under the Constitution for this purpose.

This naturally leads me to deal with certain things that have been said about the Telengana area in the name of civil liberties. It has been suggested that the Government and the military have crushed civil liberties in that area; that thousands of people have been detained, thousands have been injured, perhaps some killed, and so on. The question has been asked: "Is it a democratic process of which the Congress can feel proud?" Well, I am afraid that is a very garbled account of what happened in Telengana. As everybody knows, at the end of the police action in Hyderabad, the Razakars were liquidated, their mischiefs were put an end to, but the Communists, their allies previously, were left free to carry on with their own activities. The result was that they made such progress in these activities that they even dreamt the dream of establishing a Communist State as the first unit of communism in this country. As has been already mentioned to you by my friend, Mr. Ranga, this shadow government attempted to run an administration of their own during the night, and naturally no human being in the area was safe either as regards person or property. I would only mention one or two facts. The methods adopted by Communists in this Telengana area were those of threats, intimidation and violence. They moved about in organised gangs, *dalams* as they are called, and went about intimidating villagers; committed murders, extorted from the village folk the funds they required for their own warfare as they conceive it to be. They murdered in all about 1,026 persons including 250 Congress workers and sympathizers as was mentioned in the other House yesterday.

PROF. G. RANGA : Kisan workers also.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : That number included also a number of 'patels' and 'karnams', accountants etc. ; they were all murdered in cold blood. There are stories about residents from houses being dragged out, tied to trees and either shot at or cut to pieces. There were a number of cases instituted. Some people were arrested; other people went and took refuge in the jungles and from time to time they sallied forth to commit further murders, dacoities and looting. They destroyed crops ripe for harvest; they destroyed other village property. The total value of the loss has been estimated at several crores of rupees. Here, the Government of India dealt with this matter in a firm way but in as tolerant a manner as possible; they first tried to tackle the problem with the help of the local police ; that was not found sufficient, and you know what it is to deal with guerilla warfare with men who come from the jungle, as they do in Malaya today. Enormous forces with the most modern equipment have been employed in Malaya for the purpose of tackling some three to four thousand guerillas hiding in the jungle. In the Telengana area, therefore, when we found that the police of the State could not tackle the problem, we had to draft police from other States also. We had also to give marching orders to the army for help in this affair. We did this sort of work for a period of eighteen months and the results are seen in the exhibits on the other side today.

SHRI B. GUPTA : On a point of order, Sir. Are we having a debate on the police report on these matters, or are we having a debate on the Presidential Address ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Some of the incidents that happened in the Telengana area were referred to by Mr. Sundarayya in his speech earlier. The hon. the Leader of the House is referring to them in his reply on behalf of the Government. You will have an opportunity to vote either with the Government or against the Government, when the situation arises.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Sir, after 18 months things quietened down. These violent acts diminished in number, almost vanished from certain parts of this area. I do not know if I can claim the whole credit for it for the Army and the Police. Perhaps, the then impending elections had their influence on the change that occurred in the policy of these jungle-men. Well, the result is that quite a number of them who were underground or were in detention were allowed to go free because we are persons wedded to democratic processes. We want everybody to have the opportunity of contesting the elections and fighting us constitutionally if they could do so. So we said to these gentlemen : "Have this freedom, come and fight the elections." They have gained a number of seats. They are to be found in the Council of States here, in the House of the People and in the Legislative Assembly of Hyderabad.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) : How did that happen ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : That happened because of the conscious act of the Government of the day. That is, I think, a fact which it is well worth remembering. I might give one instance of the manner in which Government tackled these problems in spite of the provocation they had. We have a gentleman, who I find has not yet been sworn in in this House, who was in detention. He applied to the High Court of Hyderabad. He put in a *Habeas Corpus* application to the High Court of Hyderabad, and that High Court, after listening to him and his counsel, dismissed that application. They said it was not a fit case to pass an order of release. Within one week of that order of the High Court, the Hyderabad Government all the same released him. We said we shall be glad to welcome a Communist. His name is being called everyday. I may assure him that nobody can stop him from coming here.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : He may be in the jungle again.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : That is the way the Government deals with this matter.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : I do not rise to interrupt, Sir, but I would like some information. The hon. Member says that crops were burnt by the Communists. I would like to know whether it was the policy of the Communist Party or the act of individuals.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is not for him to say.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I do not know what their policy has been in respect of the burning of crops, but such burning has taken place in more places than one. We have to infer these were measures which they considered necessary to adopt in carrying on their campaign of intimidation and injury to the population of the area.

A suggestion that has been made from the other side is rather interesting to relate. The Hyderabad Government have said that in regard to the persons who are still underground, or have not been traced, against whom charges and warrants are pending and so forth, they would be willing to drop all prosecutions if the Party gives evidence of a surrender of arms. That this Party or the members of this Party who are still at large have got large quantities of arms and ammunitions in their possession goes without saying. Nobody can contradict it. I would first mention a fact. Even during the last three or four months we have captured a number of individuals belonging to this Party with arms in their possession. The police have carried out raids on ammunition and arms dumps in the area, and captured a number of rifles and ammunition and so forth. Apart from this, the Party itself has stated—and this is what I want the House to note—that if Government declares a general amnesty to all Communists, whatever their crimes might have been, and if Government declares further that they will take no action against those persons who are underground, they would surrender a large number of unlawful arms which are now

in their possession. These jungle-men, as I call them, have large quantities of arms in their possession. They cannot be in legal possession, because, as you know, arms require licences. Now they say : “ Well, you first release us, give us a general amnesty ; then we will surrender arms.” What the Government said was : “ You first surrender them—it does not matter how you surrender them—surrender them in any way you like ; then we will release you.” They say they must keep these arms, these unlicensed arms, and continue to be offenders.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Is Government prepared to release ? Government has so far said it will only consider it.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I do not wish to continue this matter further. What I want hon. Members to recognise is that in Telengana we had a menace to civilised Government, and no Government worth the name could refrain from taking strong action for the purpose of putting down this menace. Their recent change of tactics—I advisedly use the expression “ change of tactics ” because I know that not a single member of the Communist Party, not in any case the leader of the Communist Party, taking the two Houses together, has said that the Party has abjured violence from its creed—they have certainly said that they do not propose to use violence for the present as a matter of policy ; that is all they have gone up to. Now, what I say is that in dealing with a Party of that description, we have got to be careful that we do not allow them to develop in such a way or put things in such a condition that members of that Party relapse into their creed in supersession of what they call their policy today.

So they have got to be watched, and while we will go all out to allow the utmost freedom possible for following constitutional methods—they can come here or go and talk to the electorate and turn us out of power ; you can take charge—but so long as you continue a creed and whenever you try to translate that creed into practice, we have

to treat you as an enemy of civilised Government. We have to deal with you as every civilised Government must deal with you.

Sir, a word regarding a small matter which was mentioned by my hon. friend Mr. Ranga. He is enormously interested in increasing food production. He feels that one way of doing it will be to enlarge and expand the irrigation facilities available today. I sympathise with him in feeling that there is a lot of water which can be used for irrigation, both in the Godavari and the Krishna, which runs to waste. It is necessary that large projects of this kind should receive early attention. A great deal has been done for schemes of this kind in the North, but, he said, it has pained him that similar attention was not being devoted to the South and he finally recommended the appointment of an Irrigation Commission such as the one which I believe we had last in 1925, which reported on all irrigation projects in the country. Now, this is a matter which requires careful consideration. In the present set-up we had a Planning Commission which was put almost in direct charge of all river valley projects everywhere. I have a notion that they have already taken up examination of projects relating to the Krishna and the Godavari. I believe they are discussing this matter with engineers, and it is possible they can arrive at conclusions which perhaps may be quicker than the appointment of an Irrigation Commission. But I am not ruling out this idea. Unfortunately, I have not here the Minister in charge who can give a more authoritative pronouncement on that subject. I will certainly ask him to examine this point.

There were two points which were mentioned by my hon. friend, Pandit Kunzru, to which I shall refer, and then close. First he referred to the appointment of an ex-Judge of the Supreme Court to the Governorship of Orissa, and secondly he referred to the appointment of the Secretary of the Law Ministry of the Government of India as the Election Commissioner. He seemed to equate the position of the Election Commissioner with that of a Judge

of a High Court or the Supreme Court. Having done that, he thought it was not quite proper or in consonance with correct principles that a Judge should be put in the position of expecting favours of this kind from the Government which appoints him. Well, Sir, that is ancient orthodox opinion. But I am a man who has been brought up in the practicalities of administration. A Judge of a High Court is appointed not by the President but really by the Government. The Governor of a State is also appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister. The case of an appointment like that of the Election Commissioner is on the same footing. Now, I would refer hon. Members to the numerous cases of ex-Judges of High Courts who are being appointed to all sorts of judicial and quasi-judicial jobs all over the country. Why is that being done? The fact that after retirement a Judge is appointed to a judicial job is not different from his appointment to a non-judicial job for the simple reason that the appointing authority in both cases is the Government. If the principle is that no Judge of a High Court should be appointed after his term to an office in the gift of Government, logic would require that he should not expect to be appointed either to a judicial or to a non-judicial job. I mention this as a practical consideration. There is any amount of talent in the country, available for responsible tasks of this description, in retired Judges of High Courts and the Supreme Court. I do not see why we should waste all that talent merely on the basis of adherence to a theoretical principle whose virtue people like me are not always in a position to understand. I know in the old days this was one of the cries against the appointment of judicial officers to executive posts. The Governorship of a State is as high and independent in position as a Judge even from the narrow standpoint of his being a man of strict impartiality. It may be, for instance, that quite a number of party men are appointed to Governorships. But when a party man becomes a Governor he is not supposed to carry his party affiliations with him. He has to be a Governor for all parties. With regard

[SHRI N. Gopalaswami.]
to the appointment of the Law Secretary to the position of an Election Commissioner let us not forget the fact that the Election Commissioner who has proceeded on leave was himself only Chief Secretary of a State Government before he was appointed Election Commissioner. The Law Secretary to the Government of India is or ought to be one of the most independent Indian officials you have or you ought to have in the set-up of the Government of India, because he acts as a legal adviser on all important matters. He is not and should not be swayed by any consideration other than the merits of a particular case, and I do not know what really there is in this which is so obnoxious as to deserve condemnation at the hands of even the hon. Member Pandit Kunzru.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : On a point of information. Can the Government give any information about the official connections of the Indian Communist Party with other countries abroad ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I may have that information, but I would rather not disclose that information here.

SHRI M. L. PURI : Who supplies them arms ? Do they get them from abroad ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : These are all questions. Hon. Members can put them as questions.

The debate is now concluded. The main motion with the amendments is before the House. There are no amendments moved from the Government side ; there are nearly 30 amendments moved from the Opposition side. I would ask them to show their co-operative spirit by withdrawing all the amendments. If they want to express their dissent from Government policy they can do so when the main motion is put to the vote.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : We want to cooperate with you, and will ask for a vote on amendments Nos. 1 and 26. The other amendments will be withdrawn. Amendment No. 1 relates to

the food problem, and No. 26 to preventive detention.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : We want to show a spirit of co-operation. We will ask for a vote on one or two of the amendments.

*Amendment No. 2 (by Shri S. Dwivedy) was, by leave, withdrawn.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Sir, you have put us in an embarrassing position. You have asked us to vote only on the main motion. We would like to support the main motion ; we would like to vote only on the amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is why it has been suggested that the House would vote only on amendments Nos. 1 and 26—the first relates to food, and the second to preventive detention, and that they should withdraw all the others.

*Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 (by Shri H.D. Rajah) were, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 5 (by Shri C. G. K. Reddy) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 6 (by Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 7 (by Shri S. Mahanty) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 8 (by Prof. G. Ranga) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 9 (by Shri S. Banerjee) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendments Nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13 (by Shri E. K. Imbichibava) were, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendments Nos. 14, 15, 16 and 17 (by Shri P. Sundarayya) were, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendments Nos. 18 and 19 (by Shri B. V. Kakkilaya) were, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 20 (by Shri B. Gupta) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*For texts of all amendments, *vide* columns 96 to 102 of the Council of States Debates for the 19th May 1952.

*Amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23 and 24 (by Shri M. Manjuran) were, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 25 (by Shri B. Rath) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 27 (by Janab M. Muhammad Ismail Saheb) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendment No. 28 (by Principal Devaprasad Ghosh) was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendments Nos. 29 and 30 (by Shri E. K. Imbichibava) were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Amendment No. 1. The question is :

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

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

The House divided :

12.30 p.m.

AYES—35

Abdul Razak, Shri.
Angelina Tiga, Shrimati.
Arman Ali, Munshi.
Banerjee, Shri S.
Bhanj Deo, Shri P. C.
Deshmukh, Shri N. B.
Dhage, Shri V. K.
Dhillon, Shri G. S.
Dube, Shri B. N.
George, Shri K. C.
Ghose, Shri B. C.
Ghosh, Principal Devaprasad.
Gupta, Shri B.
Guruswami, Shri S.
Imbichibava, Shri E. K.
Ismail Saheb, Janab M. Muhammad.
Kakkilaya, Shri B. V.
Kamalaswamy, Shri T. V.
Kishen Chand, Shri.
Kunzru, Shri H. N.
Mahanty, Shri S.

Manjuran, Shri M.
Mazumdar, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri C. G.
Naidu, Shri Rajagopal.
Narasimham, Shri K. L.
Narayana, Shri P. V.
Ranawat, Shri M. S.
Ranga, Prof. G.
Rath, Shri B.
Raut, Shri R. B.
Reddy, Shri C. G. K.
Sinha, Shri M. P. N.
Sundarayya, Shri P.
Suryanarayana, Shri K.

NOES—142

Abdul Shakoor, Molana.
Abid Ali, Shri.
Agarwal, Shri B. P.
Agrawal, Shri A. N.
Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ahmad Hussain, Kazi.
Ahmed, Shri Gulsher.
Aizaz Rasul, Begam.
Akhtar Hussain, Shri.
Alva, Shrimati Violet.
Amolakh Chand, Shri.
Anant Ram, Pandit.
Anup Singh, Dr.
Barlingay, Dr. W. S.
Beedi, Shri I. B.
Bhatt, Shri N.
Bhuyan, Dr. S. K.
Bisht, Shri J. S.
Biswasroy, Shri R.
Borooah, Shri L.
Budh Singh, Sardar.
Chaman Lall, Diwan.
Chandravati Lakhnapal, Shrimati.
Chauhan, Shri N. S.
Das, Shri Jagannath.
Dave, Shri S. P.
Deogirikar, Shri T. R.
Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
Dharam Das, Shri.
Dinkar, Prof. R. S.
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Doshi, Shri L. H.
Dube, Shri B. R.
Dube, Dr. R. P.
Dube, Pandit S.
Dutt, Dr. N.

Faruqi, Moulana M.
 Gopal, Shri V. G.
 Gopaldaswami, Shri N.
 Gupta, Shri R. C.
 Gupte, Shri B. M.
 Hans Raj, Shri.
 Hathi, Shri J. L.
 Hegde, Shri K. S.
 Hemrom, Shri S. M.
 Hensman, Shrimati Mona.
 Inait Ullah, Khwaja.
 Italia, Shri D. D.
 Jafar Imam, Shri.
 Jain, Shri S. P.
 Jalali, Aga S. M.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
 Kapoor, Shri J. R.
 Kapoor, Shri Prithviraj.
 Karayalar, Shri S. C.
 Kaushal, Shri J. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri P. M.
 Khan, Shri Samiullah.
 Kher, Shri B. G.
 Kishori Ram, Shri.
 Krishnaswami, Shri Alladi.
 Kumarappa, Shri J. M.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal Bahadur, Shri.
 Lilavati Munshi, Shrimati.
 Madhavan Nair, Shri K. P.
 Mahtha, Shri S. N.
 Maithilisharan Gupta, Shri.
 Majumdar, Shri S. C.
 Malkani, Prof. N. R.
 Mann, Lt. Col. J. S.
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
 Mazhar Imam, Syed.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Dr. P. C.
 Mohta, Shri G. B.
 Mookerji, Dr. Radha Kumud.
 Mujumdar, Shri M. R.
 Mukerjee, Shri B. K.
 Murari Lal, Dr.
 Nag, Dr. Kalidas.
 Nagoke, Jathedar U. S.
 Narayan, Shri D.
 Narayanappa, Shri K.
 Nausher Ali, Syed.
 Nihal Singh, Shri.
 Obaidullah, Shri.
 Onkar Nath, Shri.

Pande, Shri T.
 Parikh, Shri C. P.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pheruman, Sardar D. S.
 Pillai, Shri C. N.
 Prasad, Shri Bheron.
 Puri, Shri M. L.
 Pushpalata Das, Shrimati.
 Pustake, Shri T. D.
 Raghubir Sinh, Dr.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Rao, Shri Venkat.
 Rao, Shri Bhaskara.
 Rao, Shri Krishna Moorthy.
 Rao, Shri Rama.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri Channa.
 Reddy, Shri Govinda.
 Roufique, Shri M.
 Saksena, Shri H. P.
 Sambhu Prasad, Shri.
 Sarwate, Shri V. S.
 Savitry Nigam, Shrimati.
 Seeta Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati.
 Shah, Shri B. M.
 Sharda Bhargava, Shrimati.
 Sharma, Shri B. B.
 Shoila Bala Das, Shrimati.
 Shrimali, Dr. K. L.
 Singh, Shri B. P.
 Singh, Shri Kameshwara.
 Singh, Shri Kartar.
 Singh, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sitaramayya, Shri Pattabhu.
 Sobhani, Shri O.
 Srivastava, Dr. J. P.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri.
 Surendra Ram, Shri V. M.
 Tamta, Shri R. P.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
 Thacker, Shri P. B.
 Thakur Das, Shri.
 Thanhkira, Shri R.
 Thimmabovi, Shri L. H.
 Vaidya, Shri K. D.
 Valiulla, Shri M.
 Variava, Dr. D. H.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Venkataraman, Shri S.

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The next amendment is No. 26.

The question is :

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN : Now we are having the main motion which I am putting before the House. The motion is :

That the Members of the Council of States assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 16th May 1952.

The motion was adopted.

RAILWAY ACCIDENT NEAR BIKANER

MR. CHAIRMAN : With reference to the Motion for Papers of Mr. H. D. Rajah, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri will now make a statement.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI LAL BAHADUR) : Sir, Government are deeply shocked to learn the serious accident which took place on the night of 18th May and our sympathies naturally go to the bereaved and the injured. Relief measures were taken immediately and an enquiry into the accident will start to-morrow. We have received a report from the high officers of the Railway which I will read out :

On 18th May 1952, at about 23 hrs. there was a head-on collision between 24 Dn. mix. train from Merta Road to Bikaner and 221 Up goods train from Bikaner to Merta Road, between Bikaner and Palana stations of the Northern Railway. The site of accident is about 7 miles away from Bikaner. Deaths 45 : 36 or 35 at site and the rest on the way when they were being taken to the hospital. This includes one fireman of goods train. Injuries : at present there are 50 in the hospital.

5 C. S. D.

The first report from the site of accident issued by the guard of 24 Dn. through a spare guard reached Bikaner at about half an hour after midnight on the 19th. Relief train with two senior doctors from Bikaner hospital, full medical equipment, water for drinking, generating set for lighting and empty coaching stock for patients left Bikaner at 2.00 hrs. and reached the site at about 2.30 hrs. This relief train was also accompanied by some railway officers of the Bikaner Division and civil and police officers.

Before the arrival of the relief train, railway staff assisted by other passengers, removed some injured persons from the wreckage and the remainder were taken out by special staff on the relief train with the aid of electric light from the generating plant on the relief train. At the same time, necessary medical aid was rendered to all injured at the site.

All injured were removed to Bikaner hospital where full medical attention including transfusion of blood plasma etc., and setting of fractures in plaster, was given to all injured up to the mid-day of 19th. Full comforts for treatment including beds for all in the hospital, were ensured. Fifteen were discharged after medical treatment in the hospital by the mid-day of the 19th, and 52 were still in the hospital. Now, there are 50.

Three passenger bogies, all third class, next to the engine of passenger train were completely telescoped, and the fourth I, II, Inter and III composite bogie mounted the telescoped bogie in front and fell on one side. Both the locomotives were badly damaged. The damage to track was negligible. It appears to be a case of wrong line clear having been given to one of the two trains. The system of working on the Section is by paper line clear ticket.

Enquiry by the Government Inspector of Railways, Bombay, has been fixed for the 22nd instant at Bikaner. The General Manager, the Chief Operating Superintendent and the Chief Medical Officer, Northern Railway flew from Delhi at 9.30 hours on the 19th for Bikaner on their way to the site of the accident. They also went round the Bikaner hospital to see the condition of the injured.

The line was blocked by the wreckage. I might mention that the two engines were so badly inter-locked that it was difficult to separate them. As a result, the subsequent trains from Bikaner and to Bikaner were cancelled. According to information available now, through communication was restored at 11.30 a.m. on the 20th. That is all the information I have, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER : All this has been published in the press. Can't you give us any additional information ?