

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Do I take it, Sir, that you do not reconsider your decision?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, no.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** In that case, would you permit me to make a statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** No statement.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** If in a matter like this which has so deeply agitated us, your ruling is that Parliament cannot give a little of its time to a discussion of this matter, and if this kind of rigid law of the Medes and the Persians is going to be followed in Parliament, then, I am afraid, we cannot remain in this House...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** We abstain from today's proceedings.

**Mr. Speaker:** He can act as he likes. *(Interruptions.)*

---

**BARSI LIGHT RAILWAY COMPANY  
(TRANSFERRED LIABILITIES) BILL**

**The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to impose upon the Barsi Light Railway Company, Limited, an obligation to make certain payments to the Central Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to impose upon the Barsi Light Railway Company, Limited, an obligation to make certain payments to the Central Government."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Alagesan:** I introduce the Bill.

**MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE  
PRESIDENT**

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, we will take up the debate on the President's address.

Before I call upon Shri Govind Hari Deshpande to move his Motion of thanks to the President, I would announce that under Rule 21, I fix that the time limit for speeches shall be ordinarily 15 minutes and not more, with the exception of Leaders of various Groups, and the hon. Prime Minister for whom 30 minutes or more will be allowed if necessary to reply to the debate on behalf of the Government.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakha-patnam):** May I draw your attention to a point, Sir? I thought it was agreed in your Chamber yesterday that the debate will be for three days, and not for two days?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes; it will be for three days and not for two days. The third day will be Monday; on Friday we have Private Members' Business.

**Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik-Central):** Sir, I rise with great pleasure to move the Motion of Thanks in the following terms: I beg to move:

"That the Members of the House of the People 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 15th February, 1954."

This opportunity, I do think, is a great honour to the constituency which I represent. Yesterday, while preparing myself for this debate, I tried to go through certain speeches delivered on such occasions in the British House of Commons, and I came across one very funny incident. It was in the year 1837 that Queen Victoria had delivered her address and when the motion of thanks was being discussed in the House of Commons, it was all right with the mover, but when the turn of the

---

\*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

seconder came, who represented a rural constituency, he got up, uttered two words in a very low voice which were never heard, then for twenty minutes he was standing on his legs without uttering a single word and then sat down. I am coming from a rural area, but I have no fear that I may meet with the same fate. I was very much interested to find that the entire House treated that member from the rural area with great sympathy and tolerance. Though I have said that I will not meet with that fate, nor my Secunder, I do expect that sympathy and tolerance during my speech from every section of the House.

Coming to the Address of the President, which was delivered on the 15th, I listened to the Address with great care and attention, and for the purposes of this debate, I read it once more with great care. The Address, though short, is very significant and full of meaning. In it we find that a very realistic picture regarding the national and international situation has been presented. In the Address we also come across the reference made to the success that we have achieved during the last year in solving some of our national problems and also a reference to our failings and defects. We also find a reference to the broad outlines of principles and policies on which we are, in the near future, to embark for the realisation of our objectives.

I would, in the beginning, like to refer to that part of the Address wherein our national problems have been considered. In the beginning a reference has been made to the formation of the Andhra State. Everybody knows that during the last year it was one of the greatest events—this formation of the new State of Andhra. In this very House we discussed for a number of days the formation of Andhra, and with the sympathy of everyone in the country, I am sure the new State will make good progress in the near future. At the same time a reference has been made to the re-organisation of States. Even in the last year's Address the President was pleased to refer to this

matter. This is a question which was agitating the public mind for several years. Many people were anxious that the re-organisation of the States should be undertaken as early as possible, and there were many who were of the view that the matter was rather delayed, but to the great satisfaction of the entire country, a commission has been appointed and now it is for those who are interested in the vital problem of the re-organisation of States to take advantage of this opportunity. If with a spirit of co-operation people would try for the solution of this problem then I am sure it will be solved, and solved very soon to the satisfaction of most people, if not to the satisfaction of all.

Then there is a reference to the Five Year Plan. It has been said that half the time of the Five Year Plan has passed. Though we have not achieved success in every individual item, considerable success in certain items has been achieved. Just this morning we were discussing the food situation, which is now very satisfactory. In the Five Year Plan much stress is laid on the self-sufficiency in food. This was one of the vital problems that faced us immediately after the achievement of freedom. The way in which this problem has been solved shows that we have recovered excellently from the ravages of World War II and Partition. We were faced with a very difficult situation with this deficit of food, and nobody thought that we would be able to overcome it so soon. It has been done. So far as the Five Year Plan is concerned, great stress was laid on an all-round improvement of Agriculture and during the last two and a half years attempts have been made throughout India, and we are reaping the fruits of it in having a rosy food situation, which is a happy thing. A reference is also made to the Community Projects. Only a few days ago I had an extensive tour in the community project area of my own district. It is a part of the district wherein we had very good response during the 1930 movement. I was glad to witness the same spirit and enthusiasm

amongst the masses in carrying out the development work in this Project area. I went from village to village and I found out that there was a great awakening and a keen sense of realism. Everybody was eager to develop the area; everybody was eager to improve his land; everybody was eager to improve the conditions of the village that he lived in. I found that in many villages people had come forward to dig their own well, to prepare their own road, to build their own school building and to construct a building for a library of their village. This was all done by voluntary labour and there was very little expectation of Government help, for people have realised that so far as the development of our country is concerned, our chief method should be to put in our own efforts. Voluntary labour is coming forward not only in the community project areas, but also throughout the district in fact everywhere in the country. Throughout my constituency during the last six weeks that I was there, I have found that so far as the local schemes are concerned, there is a very good response and people are organising themselves very enthusiastically for voluntary labour for improving the lot of their surroundings. So far as the National Extension Scheme and local schemes are concerned, it is really very heartening to see that good progress is being made and that the progress is being maintained.

There has been some reference to the improvement in our economic situation also. We find that we have made good progress in production. We were faced equally with a difficult situation so far as cloth was concerned. There was a deficit of food and there was also shortage of cloth. I do remember the scenes that we had to witness in several cities where people had to stand in queues for hours together for two yards of very ordinary cloth, but now the situation is quite changed. We have produced much cloth and we are in a position to export cloth. During the British period we were required to import cloth, but now we are in a position to export cloth. After Partition we were faced

with the question of raw material, namely, cotton. We had cotton mills, but cotton remained in Sind. Even that problem has been solved. We had placed before us a target for more production of cotton, and not only has that target been achieved, but it has been achieved in a shorter period to the satisfaction of all people in the country.

From this Survey, Sir, you will find that everybody should be convinced that we are **making good progress** in the realisation of the objectives of the Five Year Plan.

Then there is a reference that in several essential commodities we have got increased production. This cannot be denied. In spite of this increased production, I must admit, we have not been able to solve the question of unemployment, but efforts are being made to ease the situation so far as this question is concerned.

The main thing to which I would like to refer is that the President was pleased to say, and say very plainly, that so far as cottage industries were concerned, we have not been able to make good progress. As a matter of fact, very little progress has been made. If in this country we have to solve the question of unemployment, then we must take, and take very seriously, to the development of cottage industries. That alone will solve this problem of unemployment. We want to increase production, but we want to take to such means for increasing our production as would be man-absorbing and not man-saving as have been resorted to by the Western countries. That alone will solve our problem and for this, Sir, we have to reconsider our position. We must find out why it is that we are not able to develop properly or reorganise our cottage industries. If we reorganise our cottage industries, if we take to the spirit of Swadeshi, I have no doubt, we will solve the problem of unemployment to a great extent.

Then, Sir, a reference has been made to certain additional projects which have been included in the Five

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

Year Plan. I am glad to note that in these five projects there is a reference to Koyna: the Koyna power project has now been inserted in the Five Year Plan. There was a great demand from Maharashtra to include this project in the Five Year Plan. A couple of years ago, there was a conference at Helavak, presided over by my colleague from the district, Mr. Hirey, the present Revenue Minister of the Bombay State. He had presided over it and there was a unanimous demand, supported by practically the entire people from Maharashtra that this project should be included in the Five Year Plan. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government of India and the Government of Bombay for having seen to it that this project in the Maharashtra is included in the Five Year Plan.

The President's Address makes reference to the improvement of our transport and communications. Our increased production leads to the question of better transport facilities. The agricultural production is on the increase, but, Sir, if there is no betterment of our transport facilities, this increased production in agriculture will not benefit the agriculturist. In my part of the country even now this situation prevails. The production there is on the increase, but the agriculturists are suffering on account of inadequate facilities of railway transport. I was glad to find from the President's Address that the Railways are thinking of opening even new lines very soon. It has also been said that so far as locomotives and rolling-stock are concerned, the manufacture of these is going on very satisfactorily, and we have made good progress in this respect during the last few years. Any nation can be proud of this achievement.

Then, there is a reference to the housing conditions. We can very well remember the scenes that we were required to witness immediately after Partition. Thousands and tens of thousands of our brethren came to this country from Pakistan. It was a very serious question as to how to

house them, but the day has come when the question has practically been solved, or it can at least be said that we are near the solution of the question. Seventy-two crores of rupees have been spent during the last few years in constructing houses for the refugees and in this very City we are witnessing an Exhibition where we can see the models of cheap and decent houses. If people take benefit of that Exhibition, I am sure housing co-operative societies will spring up throughout the country which will construct cheap and decent houses. This will go a long way in solving this national problem.

Then, Sir, there is a reference to the issue of Ordinances. This point has been thoroughly discussed only yesterday and I do not wish to take up the time of the House in that respect. There is a reference to that great tragedy at the Kumbh Mela, but I shall deal with it after I say a few words regarding reference in the Address to the international situation. There is a reference to the work that was done, and done very efficiently, by our army officers and our army men who were deputed to Korea on a special mission. Sir, anybody will have a word of appreciation for the way in which they discharged their duties. We are having very friendly relations with some of our neighbours, and some of the problems on which there were certain differences are being solved, or are on the way to solution. We are having talks with the Chinese Government; we are having talks with the Ceylon Government and the problems are just nearing solution. So far as Pakistan is concerned, during the last year there were meetings between the leaders of the two nations and a hopeful atmosphere had been created. But now there are certain other developments. There is that pact between America and Pakistan and on that pact this country has declared its views very plainly to the world. Every right thinking man does appreciate the policy enunciated by the Leader of the House and the leader of the country in regard to this subject. Not only that, I have

no doubt that even citizens of Pakistan will realise the wisdom of the policy that is being followed by this country in this respect.

Then lastly I come to that great tragedy at Kumbh Mela. I am very sorry that references have been made to this in a somewhat irresponsible manner. A Committee of Enquiry has been appointed by the Uttar Pradesh Government and very responsible people are in charge of the enquiry. It was a tragic occurrence no doubt. Before the occurrence of that sad event, everybody that I met was appreciating the arrangements that were made by the Uttar Pradesh Government regarding this Mela. Many people from my State had gone over there and returned, and they talked very highly about the sanitary and other arrangements that had been made for this Mela. Sir, after this enquiry we will know, or at least will have a fair idea as to what happened and how that tragedy took place. No doubt, it was a very sorry incident, but I am very sorry to say that there is a tendency among some of our countrymen—they are very few of course,—to exploit every calamity in the country for their sectional ends. I am sure, Sir, that in the attitude of the public the sense of responsibility is on the increase and nobody will fall a prey to this sort of propaganda. Even those who are indulging in that sort of propaganda and try to take undue advantage of this national calamity will realise very soon that it is not going to benefit them in any way. I am very sorry for the incident, but I do not approve of this tendency amongst some of our countrymen to exploit every national calamity for their sectional ends.

The President's Address refers to the policies that we intend to follow in national and international affairs. We are already realising the beneficial effects of that policy. If we continue with determination to follow that policy, I have no doubt that very soon we will achieve our objective. Sir, I have done. I once more very sincerely offer my thanks to the President.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Members of the House of the People 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 15th February, 1954."

Before we proceed further with the debate, I might just state to the House that the Leaders of various Opposition Groups have had consultations amongst themselves and have agreed upon certain amendments which they would like to debate, instead of putting all the amendments which will have the effect of confusing the whole debate. I think the procedure that they have adopted is better in that the attention of the House can be invited pointedly to certain points. It is not, therefore, proposed to take all the amendments, in lump as it were, as moved.

I do not know as to what the desire of the Congress Party is. Are they going to move any amendments?

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Mr. Speaker:** I take it that their amendments are not going to be moved.

The only question now is as regards the amendments to be moved by members of the Opposition Benches. I would like to state the amendments that they have agreed upon are.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh** (Shahabad South): The Motion should be seconded first and then the amendments will be moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am clearing the ground first: I am not calling upon the movers of the amendments to move them. I am just stating to the House the agreed amendments. They may be moved at the appropriate time. I have tried to classify them according to the subject to which they relate and not according to their serial numbers. Military aid to Pakistan—Nos. 1, 17, 37, 43, 56, 63 and 65. Some of them are overlapping even with regard to other subjects.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Nine also falls in the same category.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am coming to that. Hon. Members may raise their points after I have finished. Their classification may be a little different from mine. Re-organisation of our defence affairs No. 9; Re-organisation of administrative machinery—No. 14, unemployment—Nos. 48, 64, 65, condition of peasantry and working class—Nos. 23 and 65 (*Interruption*). Kurr:bh Mela—Nos. 37, 63, 65. Hindu Law—No. 43, Backward Classes—Nos. 10 and 54; the Five Year Plan—No. 62, the Korean Repatriation Commission—No. 63, economic conditions in the country—No. 63 and civil liberties—No. 65. It contains so many parts. These are the amendments. With regard to amendment No. 40, I am afraid it may not be in order because a Commission has already been appointed and the terms of reference are already out now.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo** (Kalahandi-Bolangir): What about all the other aspects. Sir? Even after the Commission has been appointed there is nothing which could prevent the Government to enlarge the terms of reference or clarify certain terms of reference. Coming to the other aspect, it is to ensure the conditions for the successful working of the Commission.

**Mr. Speaker:** I may suggest to the hon. Member, instead of technically insisting upon the amendment he can speak on that subject; but the amendment, as it is, will not, I am afraid, be in order.

There is another amendment by Shri Nand Lal Sharma—No. 49. What he wants is already provided for in the Constitution and to some extent it goes against the provisions of the Constitution also. It is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution. I believe the Constitution provides that the President may appoint a Commission after a certain number of years. His amendment does not quite fit in with those provisions. I should be inclined to rule it out of order; however, he can make his own suggestions in his

speech. The amendment will not come in formally as an amendment but the subject matter can be discussed.

This will be the position in regard to amendments. After I call upon the Seconder, Members will be called upon to move the amendments standing in their names and then a discussion will follow. That is how we shall proceed

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence** (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I just want to know—You were good enough to say that certain amendments had been selected. You read out the numbers—about twenty-five of them. Have all these twenty-five been selected?

**Mr. Speaker:** The total number is sixty-five and the selected amendments are seventeen and two are disallowed. So, fifteen out of the sixty-five will be before the House. I believe that will help a better debate on the subject.

श्री बी० बी० त्रिपाठी (ज़िला उन्नाव व ज़िला रायबरेली—पश्चिम व ज़िला हरदोई—दक्षिणपूर्व): अध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के सम्बन्ध में जो प्रस्ताव हमारे मित्र श्री देशपांडे जी ने हमारे सामने पेश किया है मैं उसका हृदय से अनुमोदन करता हूँ। यह मेरा सौभाग्य है, यह मेरे लिये गौरव की बात है कि मुझे यह मौका मिला कि मैं ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव का अनुमोदन करूँ। साथ ही साथ मुझे एक बात से और भी प्रोत्साहन मिला है। जो कथा अभी प्रस्तावक महोदय ने हमारे सामने इंग्लैंड की सुनायी है उससे मुझे इस बात का उत्साह तो अत्यधिक हो गया है कि यदि मैं इस विषय के सम्बन्ध में पूरी बातें आपके सामने नहीं भी रख सकूँगा तब भी किसी तरह से मेरा निरादर नहीं होगा। इस घटना से मुझे विशेष रूप से प्रोत्साहन प्राप्त हुआ है।

यह हमारे लिये, तमाम सदस्यों के लिये, बड़े सन्तोष और प्रसन्नता की बात है कि

एक वर्ष के बाद हमको फिर यह मौक मिला कि हम अपने राष्ट्रपति के मुख से तमाम पिछली घटनाओं का सारांश सुन सके, और हम उनके द्वारा एक नया सन्देश पा सके। गत वर्ष भी उन्होंने एक ऐसा ही सन्देश हमारे सामने दिया था। इस वर्ष उन्होंने जो सन्देश दिया है उस सन्देश के अभिभाषण में उन्होंने तमाम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र की घटनाओं को जो गत वर्ष में घटित हुई हैं हमारे सामने रखा है। उन्होंने तमाम उन घटनाओं को भी, जो राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में घटित हुई हैं, हमारे सामने रखी है। वे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अथवा राष्ट्रीय समस्याएँ क्या हैं, गत वर्ष किस तरह से उनके हल करने का प्रयत्न किया गया और कहां तक वे हल हो सकीं— इसका भी संकेत उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में किया है। इनके प्रतिरिक्त, उन्होंने एक नया सन्देश, जो वास्तविकता में हमारे राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी का सन्देश है, हमें देने की कृपा की है।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में उन्होंने कई महत्वपूर्ण बातें हमारे सामने रखी हैं और उन पर पर्याप्त प्रकाश डाला है। उनके अभिभाषण में यह स्पष्ट कर दिया गया है कि हमारा देश पिछले वर्षों में किस प्रकार अपने समीपस्थ देशों से मैत्री के सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने में समर्थ हुआ है। हमारे पास ही ब्रह्म देश है, लंका का देश है। इन दोनों देशों से किस तरह से हमारे मैत्री के सम्बन्ध स्थापित हुए हैं इसका जिक्र उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में किया है और साथ ही साथ तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में जो सन्धि बर्चा चल रही है वह भी उन्होंने बतलाई है। यह एक बड़ी प्रसन्नता की बात है। इस पर हम लोग अपने को बधाई दे सकते हैं कि जितने हमारे पड़ोसी हैं उनके साथ हमारा मंत्री का सम्बन्ध है

और हमारे और उनके बीच में सद्भावना भी पर्याप्त मात्रा में है। यही नहीं बल्कि, एशिया के अन्य देशों से भी हमारा सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छा है। पिछले यू० एन० ओ० की जो बैठकें हुईं उनसे भी पता चलता है कि भारत वर्ष की ओर एशिया के तमाम राष्ट्र (एक दो को छोड़ कर) हमदर्दी और सहानुभूति रखते हैं। हां, यह बात जरूर है कि कुछ ऐसी घटनाएँ इस बीच में हुई हैं जिनके कारण कुछ गलतफहमियां, (जैसा कि अभिभाषण में कहा गया है), पैदा हो गई हैं।

यह सभी जानते हैं कि अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान का प्रस्तावित समझौता एक ऐसी घटना है जिससे कुछ गलतफहमी पैदा होने का अन्देशा हो गया है, यद्यपि मैं उस पर इतना महत्व नहीं देता जितना कुछ और लोग देते हैं। कुछ लोग तो उस से भयभीत, सशंकित और कभी कभी आतंकित भी हो जाते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा देश इतना मजबूत है और हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में ऐसे न्याय संगत रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं कि हमारे लिये भयभीत होने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। फिर भी हमारे कुछ मित्र भयभीत और कभी कभी आतंकित भी हो जाते हैं। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि यह एक ऐसी घटना है कि जिससे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में, विशेषतः—भारतवर्ष में खलबली पैदा हो गयी है यह खलबली इसलिये नहीं है कि हम इस से भयभीत या आतंकित हैं, बल्कि इसलिये है कि सम्भव है कि इस से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जटिलताएं पैदा हो जायें और उनके कारण संसार में कोई महायुद्ध हो जाय। यही नहीं, बल्कि सब से बड़ा कारण जिस से कि हम लोगों के हृदय में

[श्री वी० डी० त्रिपाठी]

चिन्ता पैदा हो गयी है यह है कि पाकिस्तान इस तरह विदेशी सम्पत्ति को और विदेशी शास्त्रास्त्र और सामरिक सामान को अपने यहां मंगवा कर अपनी स्वतन्त्रता को नष्ट करने जा रहा है। हम पाकिस्तान की स्वतन्त्रता की उतनी ही कद्र करते हैं, हमारे हृदयों में, हमारे दिलों में, उसका उतना ही मूल्य है जितना कि अपने देश की स्वतन्त्रता का है, क्योंकि उस के लिये हम और पाकिस्तान के निवासी दोनों ही मिल कर लड़े हैं, खास कर हम लड़े हैं। यद्यपि भारतवर्ष और पाकिस्तान अब राजनीतिक दृष्टि से अलग अलग देश हैं, लेकिन इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि से भारत और पाकिस्तान एक देश हैं। पुराने जमाने में भी हमारे देश में राजनीतिक दृष्टि से अलग अलग अनेक राज्यें थीं परन्तु सम्पूर्ण भारतवर्ष एक ही देश माना जाता था। अतः सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि से हम दोनों,—हिन्दुस्तान व पाकिस्तान, एक देश हैं यद्यपि आज वह दो राजनीतिक भागों में विभक्त है। ऐसी दशा में जब कि हमारे देश का एक हिस्सा, एक चौथाई भाग, इस तरह से गुलामी की ओर अग्रसर होने जा रहा है और इस प्रकार हमारी सीमा पर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जटिलता पैदा होने जा रही है तो इस से हमें शंका प्यूर होती है। हमें यह चिन्ता नहीं है कि इस से हमारे लिये कोई खतरा है, या हमारे लिये कोई भय की बात है। बल्कि हम इस लिये चिन्तित हैं कि हम ने जिस स्वतन्त्रता को इतनी तपस्या कर के प्राप्त किया है उस स्वतन्त्रता का चौथाई भाग बहुत जल्द समाप्त हो जायगा अगर पाकिस्तान अपनी इसी नीति चलने का हठ जारी रखता है। इसी कारण हमें चिन्ता है। हम इस वास्ते भयभीत नहीं हैं कि यदि उन के यहां अधिक फौजें हो जायेंगी, या उनके

यहां अधिक सामरिक शास्त्रास्त्र या सामरिक सामग्री हो जायगी, तो उस से हमें किसी तरह के खतरे का सामना करना पड़ेगा। इसलिये हमारी यह हार्दिक इच्छा है कि जो गलत-फहमी पैदा हो गयी है, उसे पाकिस्तान दूर कर दे ताकि हम दोनों की मैत्री के मार्ग में कोई बाधा न पड़े।

हमारे विपक्षी दलों के सदस्य अक्सर इस से भयभीत हैं और बार बार इस पर जोर देते हैं कि हमारे देश में सामरिक तैयारियां होनी चाहियें, उन्हें आतंकित होने की या अपने अन्दर भय लाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। हां, यह चिन्ता का विषय जरूर है और इस चिन्ता को दूर करने का हमें प्रयत्न अवश्य करना चाहिये। हमें आशा है कि पाकिस्तान और अमेरिका दोनों इस बात को सोचेंगे और ऐसा करने से अपने को रोकेंगे।

हमने इस बीच में, एक वर्ष के अन्दर, जैसा कि अभिभाषण में भी कहा गया है, अपने राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी के सन्देश को अपने सामने रख कर, विश्व भर में मैत्री फैलाने का प्रयत्न किया है। संसार भर ने देखा कि हमारी फौजें कोरिया गईं, लेकिन लड़ने के लिये नहीं। यह इतिहास में एक नयी बात थी कि फौजें किसी दूसरे देश में जाय, लेकिन लड़ाई के लिए नहीं, बल्कि शान्ति की स्थापना के लिये और शान्ति को जारी रखने के लिये जाय। हमारे इतिहास ने हमें हमेशा यही सन्देश दिया है। हमारे लम्बे इतिहास में आज तक एक भी घटना नहीं है कि हमारी फौजें दूसरे देशों को विजित करने के लिये गयी हों। हमारे लोग बराबर बाहर जाते रहे और सहस्त्रों वर्षों से अनेक देशों के साथ हमारा सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध रहा है। हमारे अनेक सांस्कृतिक

मिशन भी समय-समय पर बाहर जाते रहे और इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि हमारी संस्कृति के उदय और विकास की छाप एशिया के अनेक देशों पर रही। लेकिन कभी ऐसा नहीं हुआ कि हमारी फौजें किसी को मारने के लिये या किसी पर आक्रमण करने के लिये बाहर गई हों। उसी परम्परा को हमने अब भी कायम रखा जब कि हमारी फौजें कोरिया में शान्ति के लिये गई, युद्ध के लिये नहीं। हमारा यह निश्चय है कि हम इस परम्परा को जारी रखेंगे और किसी की गुटबन्दी में शरीक न हो कर युद्ध को रोकने का भरसक प्रयत्न करेंगे।

कुछ लोग अक्सर इस मामले में धनांक कह डालते हैं कि जिस तरह पाकिस्तान अमेरिका के साथ जाने को तैयार है उसी तरह भारतवर्ष को भी चाहिये कि वह दूसरे गुट के साथ अपना सम्बन्ध स्थापित कर ले। लेकिन यह हमारी नीति के बिल्कुल विरुद्ध होगा। हम किसी गुट में शामिल नहीं होना चाहते,— न एक गुट में और न दूसरे गुट में। हम तो यह चाहते हैं कि संसार में एक ऐसा वातावरण पैदा हो कि युद्ध बन्द हो जाय और हम एक ऐसी मिसाल सब के सामने रखें जिस से कि लोग सबक ले कर युद्ध की ओर अग्रसर न हों; बल्कि जिस प्रकार इस शताब्दी के प्रारम्भ में दो महा-युद्ध हो चुके हैं उसकी पुनरावृत्ति न हो। इस लिये, जैसा कि अभिभाषण के अन्त में इशारा किया गया है, हमारी नीति तटस्थता और शान्ति की नीति है। लेकिन हम यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहते हैं कि हमारी तटस्थ नीति निष्क्रिय नीति नहीं है, बल्कि हमारी तटस्थ नीति सक्रिय नीति है। हमारी तटस्थता तथा शान्ति की नीति सजीव नीति है, न कि निर्जीव और निष्क्रिय। हमारी तटस्थता का यह अर्थ नहीं है कि जब दो देशों में युद्ध का तनाव हो तो हम खामोश हो कर बैठे रहें।

यह हमारी नीति नहीं है। बल्कि हमारी नीति यह है कि जिसकी गलती हो उससे स्पष्ट कहें, लड़ कर नहीं, बल्कि समझा कर ताकि यथा सम्भव किसी प्रकार का युद्ध न होने पावे। हम खामोश या निष्क्रिय हो कर नहीं बैठेंगे। इसलिये हमारी न्यूट्रैलिटी वैश्व नहीं है, बल्कि ऐक्टिव है और हमारा शान्तिवाद सक्रिय है, न कि निष्क्रिय। हमारी यह नीति स्पष्ट हो जानी चाहिये और सभी लोगों को इसे अच्छी तरह समझ लेना चाहिये। इसी की ओर हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण के अन्त में संकेत किया है जिसके लिये हम उन के बड़े आभारी हैं।

अब जहां तक राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र का सम्बन्ध है, उस में जो कुछ कार्य एक वर्ष के अन्दर हुए हैं, जो जो समस्याएं हमारे सामने आई हैं और जिस प्रकार उनके हल करने का प्रयत्न किया गया है, इसका भी उल्लेख राष्ट्रपति जी ने बड़ी ही विशद रीति से अपने अभिभाषण में किया है।

सब से बड़ी समस्या हमारे सामने 'खाद्य समस्या' थी।

4 P. M.

हम यह देखते हैं कि उस समस्या को बहुत हद तक हल कर सकने में हम समर्थ हुए हैं और यह आशा की जाती है कि यदि हम इसी तरह से अपनी नीति पर चलते रहे तो इस समस्या को हम सबैव के लिए हल करने में समर्थ होंगे। यह कोई साधारण समस्या नहीं थी। खाद्य समस्या एक बड़ी समस्या थी और इधर पिछले पांच-छः वर्षों से यह कठिन मालूम हो रहा था कि इस समस्या का हल किस तरह से किया जायगा। लेकिन अब हम उस अवस्था पर पहुंच गये हैं जब हम यह कह सकते हैं कि उक्त समस्या करीब करीब हल होने के समीप है और हम उसे जल्दी ही हल कर सकेंगे।

[ श्री वी० डी० त्रिपाठी ]

पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी कुछ बातें ऐसी हैं जिनमें हमें बहुत सफलता मिली है ; लेकिन यह भी सही है कि कुछ महें ऐसी भी हैं जिन में उतनी सफलता नहीं मिल पायी जितनी मिलनी चाहिये थी, और उस ओर हमारे राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने खास तौर पर हमारा ध्यान दिलाया है । विशेषतः उन्होंने हमारे घरेलू उद्योग-धंधों की ओर इशारा करते हुए हमें बतलाया है कि उस दिशा में हम आगे प्रगति नहीं कर सके हैं । इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि यह बड़ी आवश्यक चीज़ है । देश की आर्थिक अवस्था को सुधारने के लिये यह नितान्त आवश्यक है कि हम अपने घरेलू धंधों को आगे बढ़ायें और जब तक हम यह चीज़ नहीं कर पाते तब तक हमारे देश की आम जनता का आर्थिक स्तर ऊंचा नहीं हो सकता । हमें चाहिये कि हम अपनी पूरी शक्ति लगा कर घरेलू धंधों के विकास करने का प्रयत्न करें । हमें पूरी आशा है कि उनके इस कथन के बाद केन्द्रीय तथा राज्य-सरकारें इस ओर विशेष ध्यान देंगी ।

इसके अलावा, बेकारी की समस्या, नदी-घाटी योजना, हवाई यातायात, रेल-व्यवस्था और डाक-तार, इत्यादि की ओर भी उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में संकेत किया है और उस सम्बन्ध में हम ने गत वर्ष में जो उन्नति की है, उसकी तरफ भी उन्होंने इशारा किया है । इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि यदि हम आलोचनात्मक दृष्टि से देखें तो प्रत्येक बात में हमको कुछ-न-कुछ त्रुटि, कोई-न-कोई दोष दिखाई पड़ेगा । लेकिन हमें व्यापक बुद्धि से इन बातों पर दृष्टि डालना चाहिये । सवाल यह है कि जो हमारी सीमाएं हैं, जो हमारी मजबूरियां हैं, उनके होते हुए क्या हम इस से और अधिक कर सकते थे या नहीं कर सकते थे और अगर हम इन

मजबूरियों और इन सीमाओं को अपने सामने रख कर देखें तो हम इसी नतीजे पर पहुंचेंगे कि जो उन्नति गत वर्ष इन तमाम बातों में हुई है, वह सराहनीय है और उससे अधिक उन्नति होना साधारणतः सम्भव नहीं था । इसलिये जो कुछ उन्नति पिछले वर्ष राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हुई है, उससे हमें प्रोत्साहन मिलता है और हम आशा करते हैं कि हम आगे चल कर उस प्रगति को और आगे बढ़ा सकेंगे और पंचवर्षीय योजना को पूरी तौर पर सफल बना सकेंगे ।

उक्त बातों के अतिरिक्त, एक बात की ओर मैं खास तौर से आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसके सम्बन्ध में सरकार की बड़ी आलोचना हुई है । मुझे दुःख है कि उसी आधार पर हमारे कुछ विपक्षी दलों के सदस्य राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के समय संसद् की सम्मिलित बैठक में शरीक नहीं हुए । वह है कुंभ मेला-सम्बन्धी दुर्घटना । मुझे इस बात से बड़ा दुःख हुआ । मेरा तो ऐसा विचार है कि राष्ट्रपति समस्त राष्ट्र का प्रतीक होता है और उनके अभिभाषण में जान बूझ कर न शरीक होना एक तरह से राष्ट्र का अपमान करना है । लेकिन वह तो छोड़ दीजिये, जिस कारण से वह उसमें शरीक नहीं हुए, उस कारण पर भी हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये और वह है कुंभ मेले की दुर्घटना । उस दुर्घटना से राष्ट्रपति का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था, वह राज्य सरकार का मामला था । राज्य सरकार के मुख्य मंत्री ने स्पष्ट कहा है कि जिस समय वहां पर चायपार्टी हुई उस समय तक हमको उस दुर्घटना की सूचना नहीं थी । ऐसी सूरत में राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में शरीक न होना उचित नहीं था और विशेषकर उस समय जब कि राज्य सरकार ने उसके सम्बन्ध में एक जांच कमेटी भी नियुक्त कर दी है जो उस दुर्घटना की जांच करेगी और यदि उस

दुर्घटना के लिये किसी को जिम्मेदार पावेगी तो निश्चय ही वह इस बात की सिफारिश करेगी कि उसको दंड दिया जाय। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि वह दुर्घटना बड़ी ही दुःखद थी और अगर किसी की गलती से वह घटी हो, तो उसको अवश्य ही दंड मिलना चाहिये और साथ ही साथ यह भी व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिये कि आयन्दा ऐसी दुर्घटना न हो। लेकिन सदस्यगण राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में शरीक न हों और पार्लियामेंट से उठ कर चले जायें और इस प्रकार एक दुःखद दुर्घटना से राजनैतिक लाभ उठाने का प्रयत्न करें, यह मुझे सर्वथा अनुचित मालूम होता है। इस प्रकार राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में सम्मिलित न होना और ऐसे राष्ट्रपति के विरुद्ध, जो सहृदयता की साक्षात् मूर्ति हैं, 'हृदयहीनता' का आरोप लगाना सर्वथा अनुचित है और उनके साथ अन्याय करना है, और मैं समझता हूँ कि जिन लोगों ने ऐसा किया उन्होंने उचित नहीं किया।

अब मैं अन्त में उन संशोधनों के सम्बन्ध में एक-दो शब्द कहकर समाप्त करूँगा जिनकी सूचना विपक्षी दलों के सदस्यों ने दी है।

**Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea):** Amendments have not been moved.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They have been tabled.

**श्री बी० डी० त्रिगौरी :** उन संशोधनों से और गत-वर्ष राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर जो वादविवाद हुआ था उससे मालूम होता है कि विपक्षी दल के सदस्य राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण की निन्दात्मक आलोचना करने में संकोच नहीं करते। मैं समझता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण की निन्दात्मक आलोचना करना उचित नहीं है, लेकिन इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि आलोचना न हो। आलोचना का तो हमेशा स्वागत किया जाना

चाहिये। आलोचना से कभी कभी अपनी गलती मालूम हो जाती है और उसके कारण अगर हमारे प्रबन्ध में कोई त्रुटि होती है, तो उसकी तरफ भी हमारा ध्यान जाता है। इसलिये आलोचना का तो हमेशा स्वागत करना चाहिये लेकिन मैं विपक्षी दलों के सदस्यों से यह अवश्य कहूँगा कि वह आलोचना निन्दात्मक अथवा निषेधात्मक न होनी चाहिये बल्कि संकेतात्मक अथवा रचनात्मक होनी चाहिये।

अन्त में मैं राष्ट्रपति जी को इस बात के लिए पुनः धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने हम लोगों को एक मौका दिया कि हम गत वर्ष के कार्यों का पूरा व्यौरा उनके मूँह से सुन सकें और उनके सन्देश के प्रकाश में समस्त घटना-चक्र की वास्तविक अनुभूति कर सकें। मैं इस सिलसिले में यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो सन्देश हम को दिया है, वह सन्देश महात्मा गान्धी का सन्देश है, और हम आशा करते हैं कि हम राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी के सन्देश को, जो हमें राष्ट्रपति जी के द्वारा मिला है, अपने राष्ट्रीय जीवन का आधार बना कर आगे बढ़ सकेंगे और अपने देश के स्तर को ऊँचा कर सकेंगे।

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** We should move our amendments.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** As and when an hon. Member is called upon to speak, he will move his amendment and speak. I am calling upon Acharya Kripalani.

**Acharya Kripalani:** But I have no amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That does not matter.

**Shri S. S. More:** The usual practice has been that all the amendments are first formally moved without any speech and then all amendments become open for discussion. That has been the procedure up till now. Is there any reason for making a departure on the present occasion?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The reason is that all these benches on my left are empty.

**Shri S. S. More:** But we are here.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not want to close the amendments today and re-open them tomorrow again. All those amendments which have been read out by the Speaker, subject to other additions, may be treated as the amendments before the House and hon. Members may proceed with them. As every hon. Member gets up, if he has tabled an amendment, I will allow him to move it. Let me follow this procedure, to avoid some amendments being moved now and once again others coming in tomorrow or the day after and moving theirs.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I thought the Speaker announced the new procedure in order to restrict the discussion to selected subjects. Even if an amendment is moved, it is not necessarily pressed to a division. Moving of the amendments is necessary to begin with, so that the selected subjects could be discussed. That was the intention of the Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Such of the hon. Members as are present here may indicate the amendments which they want to move.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):** I should like to move amendment No. 37.

**Shri S. S. More:** I am moving my amendment No. 23, but along with that I want to seek some clarification from the Chair. My amendment No. 20 as printed here in the list of amendments seems to have undergone a substantial modification. The original amendment that I had submitted seems to have undergone a substantial modification and I would like to know, under what rule that amendment has been substantially modified.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will look into that.

**Shri S. S. More:** For your information I will say that in my original amendment I had said:

"but regret that the Government has grievously failed to appreciate

the danger to the security and independence of India by the successful attempt of American....."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will not allow that portion to be read out. The Speaker has got the right to delete any particular portion, in any amendment, resolution or question, which according to him is not proper, the language is not proper or is offensive, or makes aspersions and so on. Now, in that capacity the Speaker has modified the amendment. The Rule number is 307. It says:

"If in the opinion of the Speaker any notice contains words, phrases or expressions which are argumentative, unparliamentary, ironical, irrelevant, verbose or otherwise inappropriate, he may in his discretion amend such notice before it is circulated."

**Shri S. S. More:** May I make a submission Sir? As far as this particular amendment to the Address is concerned, we are governed by Chapter V of the Rules of Procedure. There is a special rule for this. I am referring you to Rule 16. When a special procedure has been laid down for any particular aspect, it cannot be superseded by any rule as far as that procedure is concerned. Rule 16 says:

"Amendments may be moved to such Motion of Thanks in such form as may be considered appropriate by the Speaker."

So my submission is that as far as this particular rule is concerned, it is the form which matters.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** One other point. So far as this amendment No. 20 is concerned, it is not one of the amendments that has been selected. The Speaker already announced in the House that out of the various amendments that have been tabled, some particular amendments have been selected, and this does not happen to be one of those amendments. Therefore, all the arguments now put forward by the hon. Member are more academic than of any particular use. I am not considering any amendment which has

not been selected. This is not one of the amendments that have been selected.

**Shri S. S. More:** I am not raising any academic point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. What is the good of it?

**Shri S. S. More:** That does not mean that the other amendments are struck out.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will defer judgment on this till tomorrow. I will consider this matter regarding the question as to whether the Speaker has the right to strike off any amendment or not. This rule under Chapter V relates only to the amendment to be tabled and not to the expression.

**Shri S. S. More:** Sir, before you give your ruling,.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have given my ruling. I have heard everything and there is absolutely no substance in this. Further, as regards disallowing amendment No. 20 and selecting a particular amendment, I defer my judgment till tomorrow.

**Shri S. S. More:** Our rights and privileges are the same as in the House of Commons. My submission is that a particular article of the Constitution cannot be modified or restricted by the Rules laid down by the Speaker. Therefore, I take my stand on that particular article and contend that if I get the same rights and privileges as Members of the House of Commons, I belong to the opposition and I have every right to use the expressions used in my original amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is entitled to raise a point of order. I may answer the point. So far as the rule is concerned, the hon. Member now proceeds to another objection that the rule itself is *ultra vires* of the Constitution. I am not willing to agree that this rule is *ultra vires*. It is *intra vires*. The rules have been so framed as to give power to the Speaker to modify or delete ironical expressions, whatever might be the practice in the House of Commons. Therefore, I am

not going to agree that the rule is *ultra vires*. It is under that rule that the Speaker has modified the amendment. Regarding the question as to whether it is open to the Speaker to select only a few amendments, I will reserve my judgment.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Mr. More gave No. 23 himself. It has nothing to do with the selection of amendments announced by the Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not going to allow any more discussion and take the time of the House. I am here to safeguard the rights of all Members. So far as this matter of whether the Speaker has got the right to select amendments or not is concerned, I reserve my judgment till tomorrow and, if I agree, then this amendment may be moved tomorrow.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** May I draw your attention, Sir to this very simple point? Amendments Nos. 20 and 23 are in the name of Mr. More. He has given his preference towards 23. It is on that basis that the Speaker announced it today, whereas the point now relates to amendment No. 20. Your ruling, therefore, is not necessary on this issue.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not know if he has already given his preference to No. 23 over 20.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I had conveyed the entire list to the Speaker on behalf of the Opposition. It is by consent.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let us proceed with the amendments to be moved.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I beg to move: That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"but regret—

(1) that an attitude of complacency still persists in spite of the imminent danger to the peace of India and Asia in view of Pakistan's Military Pact with the United States of America and there is no indication of any constructive attempt towards the militarisation of the nation and the building up of

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

adequate armaments—industries and the creation of a united front; and

(2) that there is no explanation whatsoever of the collapse of the administrative machinery and organisation which resulted in the colossal loss of human lives at the Kumbh Mela and the regrettable lapse in failing to cancel the Party at Allahabad on the very day of the tragedy."

**Shri S. S. More:** I beg to move:

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

"but regret the failure of Government to realise the miserable economic condition of the peasantry, the growing hardships and exploitation of the workers and the pauperisation of the middle classes and its consequent failure to take prompt and effective steps for the betterment of the condition of these classes."

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the total mobilisation of the nation was not taken in hand in the face of the threat to our security by the Pakistan-U.S.A. military aid pact, through the formation of all-party governments at the Centre and in the States; and"

**Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack):** I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"but regret that the Address does not indicate any steps that should be taken by Government to rouse public enthusiasm, even after a lapse of two years in the various sections of the Five Year Plan, and especially in the Community Projects."

**Shri U. C. Patnalk (Ghumsur):** I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in spite of the urgent need for reorientation of overall national policies in various spheres, consequent upon Pak-U.S. relations, the Address—

(a) gives no indication of any effective plan for strengthening the defence machinery through trained nation-wide Potential Reserves (without corresponding increase in defence expenditure or dependence upon foreign aid) by adopting modern methods of man-power mobilisation;

(b) does not envisage measures for defence against modern weapons of warfare like aerial attacks, long-range bombardment, panic, infiltration, sabotage and other fifth column activities;

(c) discloses no proposals for acceleration of production in Ordnance Factories and other military installations, so as to make us independent of foreign countries in respect of vital warlike stores;

(d) makes no practical proposals for utilising the stores in the Depots, reducing avoidable expenditure on the M.E.S. and minimising purchases from outside, with a view to effect savings for necessary reorganisation and other requirements; and

(e) contemplates no change in the out-moded approach of the administrative machinery in order to organize to the full, our vast human and material resources by integrating defence with socio-economic planning."

**Shri Gidwani (Thana):** I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in view of the likely developments owing to the U.S.A. Military aid to Pakistan, that no steps have been taken to bring all political parties together

and take them into confidence in regard to measures to be adopted to meet the developments."

**Shri J. R. Mehta** (Jodhpur): I beg to move:

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

"and that while they should have much wished that it should have been possible for him in his Address to give this House, and through this House to the country at large, a more positive and dynamic lead in the matter of combating the growing menace of country-wide unemployment, as well as the serious threat to our security involved in the 'unfortunate developments' taking place on our borders to which he has referred in the Address, they would like to take this opportunity of assuring him that this House, as representing the entire nation, solemnly pledges its solid support to the Government in all measures that may be found necessary to avert or meet this threat."

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address is highly disappointing to the whole body of unemployed as it does not give adequate assurance of employment."

**Dr. Jaisoorya** (Medak): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"but regret that no mention was made in the Address of the rapidly falling efficiency in public administration and the urgent need for reorganising and reconstructing the administrative machinery which will reach the people, know and understand their needs and gain their confidence."

701 P.S.D.

**Shri Pocker Saheb** (Malappuram): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"and express their grave concern over the policy of Pakistan in the proposed agreement for military aid with the United States of America, which necessarily causes anxiety to India and to other neighbouring countries as it is likely to jeopardise the safety and security of India and other neighbouring countries in South Asia and will seriously affect the cordiality of relationship which it is necessary to maintain in the common interests of both the countries and are of the view that such steps as may be deemed necessary should be taken to safeguard the interests of India."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I hope these are all within the list that was submitted to the hon. Speaker.

Amendments moved:

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

"but regret—

(1) that an attitude of complacency still persists in spite of the imminent danger to the peace of India and Asia in view of Pakistan's Military Pact with the United States of America and there is no indication of any constructive attempt towards the militarisation of the nation and the building up of adequate armaments industries and the creation of a united front; and

(2) that there is no explanation whatsoever of the collapse of the administrative machinery and organisation which resulted in the colossal loss of human lives at the Kumbh Mela and the regrettable lapse in failing to cancel the Party at Allahabad on the very day of the tragedy."

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

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

“but regret the failure of Government to realise the miserable economic condition of the peasantry, the growing hardships and exploitation of the workers and the pauperisation of the middle classes and its consequent failure to take prompt and effective steps for the betterment of the condition of these classes.”

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

“but regret that the total mobilisation of the nation was not taken in hand in the face of the threat to our security by the Pakistan-U.S.A. military aid pact, through the formation of all-party governments at the Centre and in the States; and”

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

“but regret that the Address does not indicate any steps that should be taken by Government to rouse public enthusiasm, even after a lapse of two years in the various sections of the Five Year Plan, and especially in the Community Projects.”

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

“but regret that in spite of the urgent need for reorientation of overall national policies in various spheres, consequent upon Pak-U.S. relations, the Address—

(a) gives no indication of any effective plan for strengthening the defence machinery through trained nation-wide Potential Reserves (without corresponding increase in defence expenditure or dependence upon foreign aid) by adopting modern methods of man-power mobilisation;

(b) does not envisage measures for defence against modern

weapons of warfare like aerial attacks, long-range bombardment, panic, infiltration, sabotage and other fifth column activities;

(c) discloses no proposals for acceleration of production in Ordnance Factories and other military installations, so as to make us independent of foreign countries in respect of vital warlike stores;

(d) makes no practical proposals for utilising the stores in the Depots, reducing avoidable expenditure on the M.E.S. and minimising purchases from outside, with a view to effect savings for necessary reorganisation and other requirements; and

(e) contemplates no change in the out-moded approach of the administrative machinery in order to organize to the full, our vast human and material resources by integrating defence with socio-economic planning.”

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

“but regret that in view of the likely developments owing to the U.S.A. Military aid to Pakistan, that no steps have been taken to bring all political parties together and take them into confidence in regard to measures to be adopted to meet the developments.”

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

“and that while they should have much wished that it should have been possible for him in his Address to give this House, and through this House to the country at large, a more positive and dynamic lead in the matter of combating the growing menace of country-wide unemployment, as well as the serious threat to our security involved in the ‘unfortunate developments’ taking place on our borders to which he has referred in the Address, they would like to take this opportunity of assur-

ing him that this House, as representing the entire nation, solemnly pledges its solid support to the Government in all measures that may be found necessary to avert or meet this threat."

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

"but regret that the Address is highly disappointing to the whole body of unemployed as it does not give adequate assurance of employment."

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

"but regret that no mention was made in the Address of the rapidly falling efficiency in public administration and the urgent need for reorganising and reconstructing the administrative machinery which will reach the people, know and understand their needs and gain their confidence."

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

"and express their grave concern over the policy of Pakistan in the proposed agreement for military aid with the United States of America, which necessarily causes anxiety to India and to other neighbouring countries as it is likely to jeopardise the safety and security of India and other neighbouring countries in South Asia and will seriously affect the cordiality of relationship which it is necessary to maintain in the common interests of both the countries and are of the view that such steps as may be deemed necessary should be taken to safeguard the interests of India."

**Acharya Kripalani:** We have listened with respectful attention to the speech of the President. I am, however, sorry that these speeches of the President have become progressively formal and inspire no hope or confidence in the people. I shall confine my remarks mainly to the topic

which is uppermost in the mind of our people.

The President made a reference to the recent unprecedented tragic happenings in Allahabad on the Kumbh Mela day. We have expressed in this House our deep sorrow for the victims of this tragedy, whether alive or dead. But this is not enough. If we are to avoid such occurrences in the future, it is necessary that we should see that we are ourselves immune from blame. If we are not immune from blame, we must find out wherein we have erred.

When I speak about this tragedy from my seat in the Opposition benches, I am conscious that the authorities and a few Congressmen will say, and they have already said so, that we of the Opposition are making political capital out of a national calamity. How is this unworthy charge to be answered? When on some tragic occasions, millions of our people feel very strongly, who in this House is to give expression to their wounded feelings? I feel that it is the duty of every representative of the people here to do so irrespective of party affiliations. However, when the Members of the majority party consider that their duty is finished when they have lent support to whatever the Government does, right or wrong, when they refuse to give expression to the genuine feelings of the people for fear of annoying their bosses, when even revered leaders, who were not afraid of British imperialism, close their mouth on such occasions, it must be the duty of somebody to voice the feelings of the public. Therefore, we have to discharge this painful duty. But, it was always not so in the Congress. Congressmen never considered their organisation or the doings of their leaders as infallible. Of course, there was always Gandhi, who performed the task of a vigilant censor of whatever we did. There were also groups and individuals in the Congress who freely criticised the Congress policies even when some of our opponents took advantage of such criticism.

[Acharya Kripalani]

Even in this House, before the elections, there were Congressmen who criticised Government policies braving threats of disciplinary action. But, all this has now changed. I have, therefore, to perform a painful duty under the shadow of an unworthy suspicion that I am seeking to make political capital out of a national tragedy. So far as it is possible, I shall confine the discussion to general terms and avoid personalities and party politics.

I want to discuss the change in our fundamental attitude to the formal part of our religion comprising of ritual, ceremonial observance of certain holidays and even superstitions. This is not the first occasion that there has been a Kumbh Mela during our life time. We have lived through a few of them. What was our attitude towards these melas? Some of us went there to perform Seva Samiti and Red Cross service. I remember that Gandhi once visited the Kumbh Mela at Hardwar to do this kind of work. He and his companions never thought that a dip in the Ganges or sprinkling of the water of the river, however sacred, on their heads, would wash away their sins and make them holy. We considered such ideas against reason and against the scientific spirit on which we prided ourselves. In those days we even resisted the demand of our orthodox households. If our women wanted to go to these fairs, they must have other guides than ourselves. Even when we wanted to have an idea of such a large concourse of humanity, we did so from a safe distance. We did not consider the procession of hundreds of stark naked *nagas* as very exhilarating. We felt ashamed of it. We were rather apprehensive that foreigners taking photographs of *naga* processions would give a distorted idea of our religion and of our nation to foreign countries. We did not fancy these confused processions on foot, on horseback, on camels and on elephants. We also utterly disliked the rivalries of these *sadhus* about the precedence that they

were to have when they went to have their holy bath. We also knew that these people were always troublesome and were not.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is not all this likely to wound the susceptibilities of a large section of people? Is it all relevant?

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am sorry; if you hear me out, I think the susceptibilities of nobody would be injured.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Particularly the religious susceptibilities of a large section of the people who attended it. All this description, I am afraid...

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am not talking of those who have faith in these things. I am talking of ourselves as Congressmen before Independence.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):** Not all are Congressmen. Gandhiji himself was described as half naked.

**Acharya Kripalani:** When I have finished my speech, whatever offends the religious susceptibilities of any part of this House, I will humbly withdraw. You will give me the privilege of saying what I have to say. If after that you feel that religious susceptibilities have been offended, I will make ample amends.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have heard the hon. Member sufficiently. I did not want to interfere or intervene at an earlier stage, but these remarks are sufficiently damaging to the feelings and the religious susceptibilities of Hindus particularly as nearly 40 lakhs of people took part in this. I do not think this ought to be used as the forum for creating differences of that kind, particularly when religious susceptibilities are so acute and the people are sensitive. Therefore, I would appeal to the hon. Member.

**Shri S. S. More:** Can we not speak against superstitions?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** These are religious susceptibilities.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I was going to say that this attitude of ours did not

mean that we were not Hindus. We took pride in our religion, but we did that because in spite of temples, forms, ceremonials, rituals and even some superstitions, it allowed perfect freedom to individuals to discard all these and believe in the spiritual values given in the Gita and the Upanishads. We were proud of our Hinduism because of its idea of God who was immanent in the universe and present in every human heart and yet transcended all this, that there is. He is without form or quality—Niranjan Nirakar. We were proud of Hinduism's tolerant spirit which not only tolerated but accepted all faiths as so many paths to the same goal of salvation. Our religion was the Hindu religion of the spirit that promised that even in this life, if a man willed it, he could be a *jeevan mukta* as perfect as his Father in Heaven. This satisfied our reason and our modern scientific spirit and I believe it was not opposed to Hindu orthodoxy. If this had not been so, how could we have discarded caste and untouchability? How could a man like Gandhiji have found his solace in Hinduism, the man who had broken many ancient idols? Gandhiji never entered a temple except for courtesy's sake and then also a temple in which the entry of untouchables was not prohibited. Gandhiji had not only discarded old superstitions but also many of the new fashionable ones coming from the West. This was our attitude.

When some of us culturally rediscovered India, it was its ancient thought and philosophy and the great strides that our country had made so early in history, in science, in mathematics, in astrology and in medicine. We rediscovered the grandeurs of our ancient architecture, sculpture and paintings, the delicacy of our old literature, dramas, poetry, music and dance. This was Indian culture, not its barbaric pomp and show or its religious rituals and worship and its many and colourful festivals.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Is it in order to use the word "barbaric" in this connection?

**Acharya Kripalani:** "Barbaric pomp" is a very common expression in English, and I thought it was a very fine expression.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I am protesting.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I submit, Sir, this is not unparliamentary. If my friend's susceptibility is touched—what other word I can use I do not know—I can substitute this if my friend suggests another word.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** As to whether it is unparliamentary, I have got my own interpretation. Words that may not be unparliamentary in England may be unparliamentary here. It is not exactly that we are borrowing from their sentiments and superstitions. Their practices are different from our practices. When a large concourse of people—40 lakhs—attend, to say that they are indulging in barbaric pomp, I feel, is not an expression which ought to be used. I am not guided only by May's Parliamentary Practice. I think it offends a large section of our people who took part in this.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not referring to exactly what you were pleased to say just now, but that does raise a certain question that a Member of this House should not, in suitable language, criticise even the religious views of somebody else. That does raise a rather far-reaching issue if it is especially something that he considers gross superstition. If some of us consider untouchability a gross superstition and worse, we offend people. We know that. Nevertheless, we say it. So, where is one to draw the line about those matters?

**Acharya Kripalani:** May I submit that "barbaric pomp" is not derogatory to anybody. It only means great pomp of ancient times. It is a common expression used in English. I am speaking in English and how can I avoid a word which will be suitable here? Really it means ancient pomp. All right, take it as "ancient pomp".

**Shri S. S. More:** You should use Indian English.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** As to what has been referred to by the hon. Prime Minister, it is not a general observation that ancient practices that have to be modified ought not to be criticised. I find that is not the subject matter here. A number of people died on a particular occasion, the Kumbh Mela. That is the tragedy. From that we are going to general superstitions. Are we now amending the Hindu Code or discussing Hindu rituals and superstitions here to say that these ought to be eliminated and some steps have to be taken. The tragedy has gone to the winds. This other comedy has come! That is what I am opposed to.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am as orthodox a Hindu as you are or as anybody else.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is all right. I am entitled to say that expression offends the general Hindu feeling, so far as this particular matter is concerned. It can be used when the appropriate occasion arises for removal or when a Bill is introduced or a Resolution moved to avoid such superstitions, if they are superstitions. I am not deciding that issue today. Then, possibly, the House has got absolute right, but it is not appropriate on this occasion. That is all that I wanted to say.

**Acharya Kripalani:** May I again submit that I am not saying anything about those who believe in these things. I said we in the Congress before independence considered these..... (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may kindly proceed.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am so sorry. It seems that my English is not understood.

I was saying that our Indian culture was concerned with our achievements in philosophy and science in the past and had nothing to do with religious ritual, worship and colourful festivities which leave us only a few work-

ing days in the calendar. But what are we doing now? We widely advertised the Mela and invited all and sundry to come there assuring them that all travel facilities and hygienic conditions and accommodations were in perfect order. This was never done by our predecessors. They rather warned people against the conditions that were likely to be created.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor):** On a point of order, I would like to know if the hon. Member is reading a quotation or is reading his speech.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is sufficiently competent to speak offhand and extempore. Whenever he refers, he refers to certain notes, so as to be precise.

**Acharya Kripalani:** When sometimes I see the notes, I see it so that I use the exact words.

We said that the conditions will be perfect. Not only that, we also advertised that all high dignitaries of the Congress and of Government will be present there. We saw to it that we provided accommodation for them at public expense, and also for their ever-increasing Hindu families. Formerly, in these *melas* there used to be sadhu camps or *akharas* and we added now our own camps and *akharas* to them. Previously there used to be the procession of the Nagas, but we added to them our own exhibitionists strutting on the *mela* grounds, guarded by police who saw to it that our path was clear from all ordinary traffic. We went in the *mela* with our cars, and any number of passes were given to our friends. We always had the right of way. It is not the first time that the politically important people, the princely order attended *melas*, but they usually walked to their ceremonial bath with bare feet, and with only a *dhoti* on; on such occasions, they left their princely paraphernalia behind. Some of them went to the bath measuring their bodies with mother earth. Such was their faith.

The Governor of the State, who considers himself the embodiment of Indian culture and calls himself Raj Pal pitched his tent....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. No references ought to be made on the floor of this House, relating to the conduct of the Governors or the Raj-pramukhs of any State. They are high dignitaries, and under the Rules, no references ought to be made to their conduct.

**Acharya Kripalani:** When a reference has been made to it in the President's Address, that ought to be considered. The Governor pitched his camp in the *mela* grounds, long before the *mela* began. Is that.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Let there be no references to the conduct of a Governor or...

**Shri S. S. More:** Can we not appreciate their conduct?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** When there is appreciation on the one side, there will be denunciation on the other. Therefore I avoid both.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** That is factual. How can that be avoided?

**Acharya Kripalani:** Am I not entitled to say what the Governor did to induce the crowd?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no. The Governors will take care of themselves. We have no jurisdiction to speak on what the Governor did. No references ought to be made here either to Ministers of the State Governments, or to the Governors of States.

**Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru):** Should not facts be allowed to be stated?

**Acharya Kripalani:** You might as well ask us to shut shop. Are we not entitled to say what the Governor did?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I protest against it. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I have a right to protest even against the Chair, I suppose.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):** On a point of order. Under Rule 249...

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** On a point of order....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let the other hon. Member state his point of order first.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Rule 249 (v) of the Rules of Procedure says:

"A member while speaking shall not—

.....(v) reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms;..."

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** That is what I wanted to point out.

**Shri S. S. More:** It does not mean 'appreciate'.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** I wanted to raise a point of order, that there is already a motion which the hon. Speaker has admitted, regarding this Kumbh Mela tragedy. When there is therefore a properly drafted motion, as the hon. Member has pointed out, the conducts of Governors and other high dignitaries are quite relevant to the discussion, and therefore they are permissible.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** May I read the Explanation to Rule 249 (v), which reads:

"The words "persons in high authority" mean persons whose conduct can only be discussed on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms under the Constitution or such other persons whose conduct, in the opinion of the Speaker, should be discussed on a substantive motion drawn in terms to be approved by him;..."

So I think that is very clear. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** In spite of all the protest<sub>s</sub> of the hon. Member, I consider that references to the conduct of Governors ought not to be made on the floor of this House.

**An Hon. Member:** Is that your ruling?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is my ruling.

**Acharya Kripalani:** The Governor was invited to the sadhu and Naga camps and received...

**An Hon. Member:** Blessings and prasadam<sub>s</sub>.

**Acharya Kripalani:**...ovations, not prasadam<sub>s</sub>...

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** In spite of your ruling, there are still references to the Governor.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I really cannot understand this. I submit that surely one cannot avoid references to people, because they are high dignitaries. I just do not understand it. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. It is not necessary to pursue this matter.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Is it for the Prime Minister, who is the Leader of the House, to give a ruling, or for you, the Deputy-Speaker?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. There is no good misunderstanding this matter. My ruling was only this. Any reflection<sub>s</sub> on a high dignitary of a State ought not to be allowed on the floor of the House, especially when there are the State Legislative Assemblies; just as we do not make any reflections on the President here, likewise, we ought not to make reflections on the conduct of high dignitaries of States. If a Member says, the Governor went there, others went there, it is all right, but to say he went in this manner and that manner, does not conduce to a proper discussion here. And since it is a serious reflection on a Governor who is not before us, the hon. Member can avoid all this.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I certainly want to avoid everything that is offensive, but I cannot avoid the facts, that the Governor went and received addresses in the sadhu camps and Naga camps. These sadhu associations passed resolutions supporting the Congress Governments, and strengthening the hands of authority, while all the time what was needed was not the strengthening of the hands of authority, but their heads of, and also infusing in them some kind of feeling for the poor. During the British regime, these same sadhu associations passed resolutions of loyalty to the foreign Government. I submit that this practice lowers the prestige of religious bodies, bringing them into controversial party-politics. This is not the function of the Church, whether Hindu or Catholic, whether in the Kumbh or in Travancore. It must be discouraged in the name of religion, morality and constitutional propriety.

All this was being done while train-load<sub>s</sub> of people were coming in every moment, and the crowds were swelling. We allowed them to come and congregate in a narrow area. They came filling not only the inside of the carriages, but also the footboards and the roofs of the carriages. This led to fatal accidents. Yet we did not care to regulate all this travel. Whether a man had a ticket or not did not matter, he could hang on any train where he could find a foothold. I say, allowing passengers to travel like this is criminal. During the war years when there was rush of passenger<sub>s</sub> from sea-port towns, strong barricade<sub>s</sub> were put at stations to see that entry was regulated. No platform tickets were ever issued. Why was not all this done even after fatal accident<sub>s</sub> were reported?

Again, why were inoculation restrictions withdrawn? If Government was too nervous to offend what are called religious susceptibilities, it could have exempted a few conscientious objector<sub>s</sub> from the restriction. On the fateful day, the V.I.Ps—I do

not know what that means—from the head of the State downwards went along with their families for the purificatory bath in the holy Ganges. May I ask, Sir, when did this change in our mental attitude come about? Sir, I am talking of Congressmen and not of orthodox Hindus.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Are there not orthodox Hindus among Congressmen?

**Acharya Kripalani:** They are orthodox in the sense that Gandhiji was.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** They rule the country.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is the conduct of Congressmen the subject-matter of discussion on the President's Address?

**Acharya Kripalani:** I was saying, Sir, that we never considered a dip in the Ganges on a particular day destroyed all our sins. I say without any fear of contradiction that many of us have no such beliefs. We went there inspired by our exhibitionist urge. We went there at the instance of our old dames. We went there, consciously or unconsciously, to make political capital out of this mela, to strengthen our shaking hands, and some, I believe, went there to strengthen their shaking heads also.

Sir, even in modern times, it is quite possible for some of us to believe that the sins of the faithful who intensely believe in these things are washed away by the waters of the holy Ganges. But it is not the waters but their faith that cures them and impels them to sin no more. But for those who lack this faith, and who, after the bath, are not deterred from sinning again, these baths become a blasphemy. We went to participate—most of us—in this blasphemy. Not only this, but in the name of culture, we made respectful what the modern mind considers at most an old, antiquated custom. We made the Kumbh Mela fashionable. In doing so we have tried to rehabilitate the value and respectability

of forms and ceremonies against which all our reformers from Buddha to Gandhi have worked. We have tried to undo the work of medieval reformers like Kabir, Guru Nanak, Guru Gobind and in modern times of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Dayanand, the great poet Tagore and he whom we call the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi himself, for whom there was only one God and that was the God of Truth. We are dragging our country back to the middle ages and its forms, rituals and superstitions in the name of Indian culture. We do so also in the effort to make ourselves popular with the masses so that they may keep us in power. And because we do these things without faith, our efforts fail as miserably as they failed at the Kumbh Mela and the country is involved in universal gloom, I say, let us beware in time for the sake of our country and for the love of our religion. I have done. I wanted to talk on other matters, but, as I have been constantly interrupted, I leave them to the others to talk about.

**Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla):** I rise to support the Motion which has been placed before us this afternoon. The world today is in a state of turmoil and tension. The clouds that are threatening world peace and world harmony are gathering in volume. In this state of fear, in this condition of suspicion, the foreign policy that is being pursued in this country by the Government deserves the support of everybody and every section in this House. The power blocs on both sides are doing their worst in order to generate an atmosphere of fear and insecurity. Under these conditions, the steps that are being devised by the Government require all the support at the command of the nation.

The Pakistan-American military pact which was ill-conceived, was at the beginning, vehemently denied, but a little later, the same pact was vociferously acclaimed by the parties to the pact. Now it transpires that it

[Shri Tek Chand]

is a *fait accompli*. The conflict is being brought closer to our frontiers. The arena of conflict is coming nearer to this country. Reports are afloat that as a result of this agreement arrived at between the Governments of Pakistan and the United States of America, members of the opposite bloc have been alerted and reports are percolating that there has been a concentration of troops, making of air bases and of highways and other preparations towards the Himalayan region. It is, therefore, necessary that if such a conflict cannot be avoided, and it takes place, the position, to a certain extent, of the non-belligerents, neutral countries like ours, will be threatened. Therefore, in order to avoid any violation of the territorial integrity of this country, it is imperative, that the Government should see their way that the Himalayan region is strengthened, is protected, is developed, not only from the point of view of defence but also from the economic point of view.

5 P.M.

In Korea, our Government has earned not only the goodwill but also the gratitude of millions of people and, in particular, of the two contending commands facing the cease-fire line. India accepted the chairmanship of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, and I will be failing in my duty if I were not to say a word in praise of the splendid work done by the Custodian-Force. Their assignment was difficult, their task was delicate, and the atmosphere was surcharged with mistrust, with hostility and with deep-seated suspicion. Their difficult and onerous duty, they have been able to discharge with firmness, with tact, with patience, with understanding and, above all, with friendliness. The difficulties that were to be faced by them for some time were unexpected, but our force managed to steer clear between the Scylla of prejudice on the one side and the Charybdis of passion on the

other. It is a matter of great gratification for us that our soldiers of peace should have conducted themselves in a most exemplary manner.

I will be failing in my duty, Sir, I were not to mention the splendid services, and the great prestige which has been brought to this country by a distinguished lady Member of this House who has conducted in a most splendid manner the deliberations of the United Nations Organisation as its President. These are no small achievements in the field of foreign politics, on the international front.

Eleven months ago, on March 10, the President was pleased to introduce the President's rule in PEPSU. Conditions in PEPSU had become rather dismal. The legislators, to whichever group they belonged did not honour the rules of party affiliations. Crime was rampant. Gangsters and dacoits were going all over the country. Their number was legion. This was the state of affairs prior to the time when the President took upon himself the administration of that State. The atmosphere was conducive to crime. Unlicensed arms in thousands were recovered, and among the unlicensed arms were included Bren guns, Thomson guns, hand-grenades and rifles galore. The safety and security of the common man was in jeopardy throughout the State. But ever since the President's rule was introduced, there has been a very marked decrease in crime, and today the common man can live without fear and in peace. As a result of the integration of certain services in that unhappy State, under the rule of the President there has been brought about a tremendous saving of lakhs. Not only that; there had been introduced certain agrarian measures which have conduced to the benefit of the cultivator.

In the economic field, we have reason to be satisfied and happy. Particularly, you will find that the last year's

excess in output of foodgrains over the preceding year has been no less than 5 million tons. The goal of self-sufficiency appears to be within sight. The wheels of industry are humming and it is expected that the multi-purpose river valley schemes which will very soon be in operation—some of them have already started bearing fruit—will soon turn the wheels of industry to the advantage of the people.

Regarding rehabilitation, I have a word to say. The displaced persons have reason to feel satisfied with the help that has been rendered to them by the Government. No less than Rs. 72 crores have already been spent on housing, besides several other aids.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA  
in the Chair]

On behalf of displaced persons, at least from West Punjab, I wish to assure this House and the Government that any amount spent upon them is not a liability. Whatever has been spent upon them is an investment and the Government are going to get dividends in the form of added produce and added strength to the nation as a result of their hard labour, industry and nation-building activities.

Taking an overall picture of the country, we have reason to feel satisfied that the nation is on the onward march and our strides are long and speedy. There are one or two matters on which more attention deserves to be given. I wish the achievements of the railway department were better. Their achievements in the matter of manufacture of locomotives are excellent, but in the matter of opening new lines, after a period of one year the railways might have claimed that they had been in a position to add more than 225 miles. In this country with large and extensive territory, an addition of 225 miles of railways is not very much. In view of the requirements and the needs of this country, it is desirable that the activities of the railways should be energised to greater effect.

There is one side on which closer attention is required, and that is the picture of unemployment. Steps should be taken, whether in the form of community schemes or others, whereby a man who can wield a pair of strong arms should not find it difficult to earn his livelihood for himself and for the members of his family. With these words, Sir, I wish to associate myself with the Mover and Seconder of this Motion.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I begin my observations with a reference to the great tragedy at Allahabad. It was really a double tragedy. Firstly, the collapse of the administrative machinery which resulted in the colossal loss of human lives which shocked the whole of India. (*An hon. Member:* The world). The second was the amazing explanation given by the Chief Minister of the State of Uttar Pradesh that he came to know of this tragedy only late in the afternoon, sometime after he went to the tea party held that evening—on the very day of the tragedy. But, Sir, it seems there is a triple tragedy. The last tragedy is Acharya Kripalani's speech. I wish he had not delivered that speech.

**The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi):** He too felt like that.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I am sorry; if I had known he was capable of this performance, I would have taken him to the Kumbh Mela and would have seen that he had a dip in the *Sangam*. That would have mellowed him down and that would have possibly....

**Shri Tyagi:** Done away with him.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** .... cured him of his malady.

Honestly, that Mela shows the unity and integrity of Hindustan—that wonderful congregation which has been going on through decades and centuries. Indian history says that the foreign travellers used to come there. Even the Chinese travellers:

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

went to the *Sangam* when similar religious congregations took place, and they have reported pages and pages in their historical writings, and they have furnished inspiration. I wish Kripalaniji, before he spoke in that strain, had seen that wonderful demonstration. Our religion is still alive and still dynamic and is a great cohesive and synthetic force. The whole of India, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, people from all parts and sides, all sections and cadres of life came and congregated. They did not go there because of our Railway Minister's advertisements; they did not go there to attend a religious congregation because of the Congress Government's advertisement. That is a poor tribute to India, that is a poor tribute to Hinduism, a poor tribute to the millions of people who went there for the purpose of discharging what they naturally believed to be their sacred duty. It is a national festival of the deepest spiritual significance. Sir, my grievance is that the Government of India did not do its proper duty; it ought to have been tackled by our Union Government as a national festival. It is a national responsibility thrown on the Centre and they ought to have tackled it and not left all the arrangements to the Provincial Government. My grievance is different.

Sir, there must have been a break-down, a deplorable break-down of administrative efficiency. Otherwise this thing would not have happened. Those who were there would tell you that this could have been possibly avoided. Possibly,—I do not know—possibly the presence of too many V.I.Ps—very important persons—caused too much of strain on the security services or the police services and it has got to be looked into. But, what is most amazing is this that the Chief Minister of that State actually put forth his explanation that he did not know. Obviously, the President did not know. I refuse to believe that the President would ever be a party to a social function, any kind of

festivity or merry-making on that day when so many hundreds of human lives were lost and so many people were trampled to death or to almost like death. Even when the Britishers were here, when the Bihar earthquake happened, that very day Lord Willingdon was giving a tea party and that party was cancelled. I cannot believe that this could be consciously done. But, it is amazing that the Chief Minister did not know and the other Ministers—all of them—did not know. I have read that one Congressman in the U. P. Assembly had said that he informed some Ministers and yet nobody knew of it. Even if it is true, even if the story is credible, it casts a grave reflection on the entire bureaucratic machinery. What were they doing? Elementary duty demanded that they should have immediately informed the Chief Minister, they should have immediately informed the Home Minister and the Prime Minister of India who were there. If that was not done there was something very very defective. The whole machinery was not working properly. I would have expected—and the whole of India would expect—that drastic action should be taken against those men. It is no good merely appointing Committees. We know that it is the impression that if anything is to be shelved, it is done by simply appointing Committees and saying that we will take action hereafter. It is a gross dereliction of duty, on their own admission. They were all at Allahabad and they had gone to the *Sangam*; they had their camps there. I have seen the Governor's Camp; I have seen with my own eyes other Camps. It is not right to say that they did not know anything. When I was there I thought that the sanitary arrangements were good, much better than what was expected and they were making a conscious effort to keep the place clean—and it was fairly clean—in spite of the great congregation. But something happened with regard to the police and security services. I do not know what it was and what steps

have been taken by the Chief Minister to bring to book those delinquent officers who failed in their elementary duty of informing the Chief Minister of this tragedy—and also the Prime Minister of India. It is an amazing dereliction of duty.

I am sorry to say—although the Chairman of the Commission is a great friend of mine and I have confidence in him—the personnel of the Commission does not inspire confidence. There have been too many local officials—those officials ought not to have been there—I do not say anything against them individually—but it would have been better if the Government of India had appointed a Committee. It should not have been tackled at the Provincial level. It ought to have been done at a higher level. I am making this charge and the Government of India should have to meet this charge that they also had not done their duty. They ought to have tackled it as a Central responsibility. It cannot be done by simply promulgating an Ordinance. You have said that article 123(3) makes the Ordinance-making power co-existent with Parliament's power to legislate; therefore you have got the right to promulgate Ordinances. You have got the right to do it but you have got a duty, a responsibility to do something else also, a duty to discharge and properly tackle such a colossal national festival. There is no good saying there were barbarities. There is no good quoting Raja Ram Mohan Roy and other reformers. There are millions of men who are born in India who would go to the Kumbh as a spiritual duty. They think it is their spiritual duty to attend such functions. Men like Shri Ramakrishna Paramahansa and Swami Vivekananda, who did the greatest social service and who were great reformers had faith in it. The Ramakrishna movement is the greatest reformist movement in India and the Ramakrishna Sadhus were there doing their duty. There have been great teachers who have been going there.

It is not a matter of ridicule; it is a matter of faith. It was not a congregation of forty lakhs—the entire congregation was not there—it was floating. Therefore, at least sixty to seventy lakhs of people were there. But the greatest thing was that it showed the inherent democratic nature of the congregation. Rajas and Maharajas were sitting along with the poorest and the most destitute, living on the Jhusi bank side. Millionaires and multi-millionaires were living with the poorest and ordinary people; the plebians and the patricians were living together. This was a great sight and it would have done Mr. Kripalani's soul some good if he had been there actually and seen the function. Anyhow, we regret that speech and shall have to ask Mrs. Kripalani to take particular care of Acharya Kripalani's mental and physical health.

I come to the other topic, of Pakistan's military pact with the United States of America. Sir, this is a very serious situation. I am sorry that the President's Address does not show that our Government really realises the danger. There is not a call to India's humanity, there is not a call to India's manhood for militarisation. I wish Mr. Tyagi would stand up and give a clarion call to India and to India's manhood. Our demand is militarisation; militarise the youth of our country. What will you fight Pakistan with, which is arming with American aid? By mere speeches or homilies or parliamentary orations? You will have to make the country strong; you have got to make an appeal in order to bring about a united front. That is not here. Some speeches had been delivered by the Prime Minister, really as President of the Congress, for national solidarity and cohesion, but here they are also abusing the other parties. That kind of deplorable attitude must be altered. You must realise the danger. There is the danger to the peace of India. There is the danger of invasion.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Pakistan was created by people who were not satisfied with what they got. You will remember that the father of Pakistan, Mr. M. A. Jinnah had said "I will not have this truncated Pakistan in any shape or form." But other League leaders were crying and shouting for the creation of an Islamic State and they said "Let us accept it as a spring-board." They are trying to treat Pakistan as the spring-board and therefore, that is a greater danger—the greater danger is that they are casting their covetous eyes across the borders and looking towards India. What are we to do? How are we to fight? It is our duty and the duty of the Government of India today to see that every young man of India should be given compulsory military training. Prepare the country from the military point of view. Start basic armament factories. You have not got bombers; you cannot manufacture tanks; you cannot manufacture other things; you cannot manufacture various war equipments; you have not got the armaments to fight with and you have to depend on foreign countries. If the Prime Minister were here, I would have asked him and he would have to answer this point. Mr. Nixon, Vice-President of the United States of America, had declared that he had offered India military aid. Were any strings attached to it? Were any conditions attached to it? What happened? People are very anxious to know why it is that the Prime Minister of India, who is also the foreign Minister, rejected Mr. Nixon's offer. What was it that was attached to that offer? We have got to rely on other countries for the necessary war armaments. We have not got sufficient materials and armaments and yet we have got to fight to preserve India and preserve India's independence by taking the necessary help from a military point of view. It is no good simply saying that what Pakistan has done is regrettable. What Pakistan has done is deliberate. They are trying to sabotage the negotiations or the talks we had here in Delhi between

the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Pakistan. They want that problem to be solved by recourse to arms. Otherwise they would have never acted like this. We ought to realise it and shape our foreign policy in a more realistic manner. We shall tell Pakistan that we will stop all negotiations on that point if they go on in this manner. You must take it as an unfriendly act; you must take it almost as an act of belligerency and prepare India on that footing, and prepare our manpower on that footing. My information is that in East Pakistan and also in West Pakistan they are giving military training to boys of certain age. They are training them up, and on the border regions, especially in East Bengal, they have ordered that all non-Muslims should be removed within a certain area and they are keeping it a pure Pakistan area. That shows the way things are moving. I want to know what our Government is doing. Infiltration is going on here and many things are happening. I ask the Prime Minister and our Government to shake off their complacency, to be more realistic, to be more careful and to train up India's youth and build up the necessary war industries. Stop your Five Year Plan for some time. The Five Year Plan is a big flop. It has not really galvanised national enthusiasm; it may have done some propaganda work, but basically it has not solved the unemployment problem and it has not solved the economic distress, either of the classes or of the masses. I say, divert the funds which you have and employ them for the purpose of building up India's defence strength adequately. You know that the greatest man who thought of the Five Year Plan was Sir Viswesvarayya. He was the first man who wrote about the Five Year Plan and gave some lead to India, and then others followed. In his first book *The Five Year Plan* he concentrated on two things. He said "First build up India's military position, make it strong and build up defence industries. Secondly, build

up education, without which democracy or responsible government would be nowhere and would be a mere farce." I am, therefore, asking the Government to be more realistic and to realise the dangers ahead. Take the country into confidence and re-shape your policies. Your dynamic neutrality, to my mind, has been a dynamic failure. We have got no friends in the world. We are very proud that Mrs. Pandit is there as President of the United Nations, but apart from that, on every vital issue—even on the Kashmir issue—the United Nations have gone against us. We have not been able to get them even to name Pakistan as an aggressor, which was the real issue, and yet we are negotiating with Pakistan. Call off the question of plebiscite. Accept the Constituent Assembly decision of accession to India as final and irrevocable. Do not let down Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. See that there is no impediment created to that finality and to that irrevocability. For that one of India's noble sons has died and I was working with him and continually preaching that the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir should reflect every section of the public voice, and that public voice has been clearly expressed. That expression is final. There should be no talk of plebiscite as it would only lead to confusion and uncertainties and stimulate anti-national forces to work against India and in favour of Pakistan.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya** (Muzaffarpur Central): On an occasion like this, one is confronted with too many ideas and too many points, but a Motion of thanks on the Address of the President is an occasion generally to express not merely the thanks but also the sentiments of the people whom we represent here. While immediate problems naturally attract immediate attention, there are other issues which could, on an occasion like that, be faced and facts with regard to them presented. One of the immediate issues which has been no doubt agitating the minds of many Members in this House and

even outside is with regard to the Kumbh Mela tragedy. I had myself the good fortune of going to the Kumbh Mela and having a bath at the Sangam.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra** (Monghyr North-East): And having come back alive.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya**: I wish my friends were there and I have no doubt that they would all have come back alive if they had only a little forethought. I was also present in London on the 3rd June when the Coronation of the Queen had taken place. When I reached Allahabad on the 1st of this month, my impression was—my friends may not appreciate it—that I should sit down and write an article headed "This and That". The number of people assembled in that big City of London was certainly not greater. I have not been a great admirer of the manner in which the present administrative machinery is run. In fact, I have misgivings about it. I have also a feeling that in the matter of administrative machinery we are not going ahead. But I must tell the House that I felt exceedingly happy of the general administration at the Mela. The cleanliness, the orderliness, the attention which the police and the traffic-control officers were paying, were—I hope my friends will not take it as an exaggeration—in no way inferior to what I witnessed in London on a similar occasion. The police were exceedingly polite; they were in a very helpful mood. The traffic control was giving all the directions necessary, and but for this tragedy I think the Congress Government could well have claimed that it was a fine feather to their cap.

I have no doubt that the feeling of sorrow which permeated the whole of that vast concourse of people was shared by perhaps every authority present there. I felt perhaps circumstances had conspired to bring about that incident. I do not know whether my hon. friends will agree, or not, but let me assure them that I looked at the point very critically. I went over the grounds. I met and talked

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

with at least quite a few hundred people. One of the main difficulties was the rains on the previous evening. The whole place had become so slippery that whatever the administrative machinery would have done, whatever arrangements the Central or the State Government might have endeavoured to do, they could not have been able to do a great deal. Then I was also shocked to see another thing. I am sorry my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee has gone away. On an occasion like that where there was a purely religious congregation, I expected institutions largely connected with such functions to be present. But they were absolutely absent. I had hoped that the Hindu Mahasabha, the Ram Rajya Parishad and other institutions.....

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar):** We were there.

**Shri S. C. Mishra:** They could not perhaps be tolerated!

**Shri Syamandan Sahaya:** They might not have been tolerated. They might perhaps have been put in jail. So much the better for that. But the fact of the matter is that on an occasion like that, one would have expected that out of about five or ten million people who had collected there, there would have been at least a hundred thousand *sadhus*. It could have been so arranged that they might have given a helping hand to the people. One of the problems, one of the difficulties that actually created the situation was a *sadhu* procession which was going to have a dip in the Ganges. They could have shown that even those institutions could on occasions like that be very helpful. But that, Sir, I found was wanting.

The other noticeable fact was that while the necessary arrangements had been made up to a point, I must admit that the administration did not visualise perhaps the tremendous situation they were faced with. One

of the arrangements which I found singularly lacking was that there was no separate arrangement for people going to take their bath and for people coming out after taking their bath. If this little precaution had been taken, I do not say there would have been no casualties, I am quite sure that the number of casualties would have been very much less. On one point I associate wholly with what some of my hon. friends have said. I was surprised and shocked myself that the head of the administration of the State had no information.....

**Shri S. C. Mishra:** On a point of information, Sir. Were the arrangements in this respect similar to the ones made in London at the time of the Coronation?

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** There cannot be a comparison in this respect because there was no question of taking a dip: they were all in the streets. But in the Westminster Abbey, where about 15,000 people had collected in a small place there were separate arrangements for exit and entrance.

What really shocked me was not even this incident, but that the administrative machinery composed of a large number of executive and police officials, should not have been able to inform their Chief Minister till about 4-30 in the evening of an incident like this which actually took place between 9-30 A.M. and 10 A.M. There was no question of anybody telling anybody else. That question did not arise. I was going at about ten o'clock in my car to some *ghat* where I had arranged to get into a boat. I did not ask anybody whether such a tragedy had happened. I saw people beating their heart and saying "I have lost this, I have lost that." Hundreds of people were talking among themselves. Some of them warned me: "You don't go for a bath. this is what has happened." So, this information was not one which had to be sought. I must admit

that I was shocked that such an important incident where so many lives were lost could not reach the authorities in due time. After all the time lag between ten o'clock and four o'clock was a big one when everybody was at the spot.

The other thing which I also felt should have been done was that some of our important men—I do not mean either the Prime Minister or the President—should have stayed on for a few days after the incident. I know arrangements had been made. The executive was there, the police were there. But you know the feeling that is evoked in the heart of the person sympathised with. Some of these high officials, some of these dignatories, some of these eminent persons, should have been going round, trying to see whether the wounded, whether the suffering, were really being cared for properly. They should have seen to it that the dead bodies were restored to their relatives if they were there. There was also a large number of lost persons—boys and girls. Somebody should have been going round to see that these little children were restored to their parents. Now, these things I found absent. I, however, do not accuse the administration of lack of sincerity, but I certainly feel that they did not have the necessary imagination and foresight. Perhaps in a difficult situation like that a mistake like that might have happened. It might not have struck some people; but it was a great omission. It would have created a great deal of good feeling for the Government; or at least those who suffered might have remembered perhaps for the rest of their life, how a person so highly placed was able to render advice and assistance. This, I submit not by way of criticism but in a vast country like this, congregations like that go on and it would be well for the Government to take account of the mistakes crept in so as to be able to avoid them on a similar occasion when it happens again.

I do not think that I have much time now, but I shall detain you for a few minutes over what we call the

present international affairs. There has been a feeling, I must admit, not in any small section of the people who form themselves into Opposition, but even in groups outside the parties forming the Opposition here or in the States, that in the matter of our international relations, we probably would have done better or might have done better. Let us not forget one thing. International, even personal, relations, even family relations are not built up over a couple of years, much less international relationship. Since when have we really started having international relationship? Only a few years. It is difficult for the world or the other nations to know exactly the trends that we follow, our psychology, our background, our intentions and our aspirations. It is the same not merely for the people outside or the nations outside but it is the same with us. It becomes exceedingly difficult at this stage of formation for India to just say 'I shall go and ally with this Power, or I shall go and not ally with this Power'. No one, I suppose, is aware yet of how international relations are built up. We are just fresh in this matter. We notice every day or perhaps every week that on some matters the British and the Americans agree; on other occasions, we find the British and the Americans disagree. I was talking to a friend who has just returned from the Middle East and he was telling me that the British have an impression that the Americans are ousting them from all posts in the Middle East. Knowing, as we do, the internal relations between these two countries, it becomes difficult to accept that statement. But perhaps there may be some internal arrangements in international relationship. Therefore, to say that we have not been able to make friends is not good enough. My feeling is that even in this short period, it will be conceded, that we have built up a position for ourselves. We may not have been able to create friends but is it not good enough that we have not been neglected? The world has to take account of what India says and feels. It takes cognizance of the

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

intentions and aspirations and the desires of this country and of its views. An Indian citizen is the Head of the U.N.O. India was entrusted with the difficult task in Korea. All these things indicate that we are building up a position for ourselves. On certain issues, perhaps, we might have erred. I am not willing to say that on every international point what we have done is right. After all, our international position, our external policy has to be judged not from a single incident; it has to be judged from the totality of what has happened during the last four, five or six years and I think even the worst critic of the present Government will have to admit that India has been able to build up a position in the international sphere. There have been lackings and lacunae of which, I suppose, no one is aware more than the Government themselves.

There is one thing on which I shall just say a word. I am perhaps exceeding my time by a second or two. That is to draw the attention of Mr. Tyagi about his military equipments and the requirements of the military in this country. In this matter, I agree with the friends who have said that the amount that should have been spent to build up factories for having our own military equipments, perhaps, has not been as it should have been. In the present context of things there is no use relying on other countries for supplying you with what you need with regard to war materials. I agree with some friends who have said that even if it means stopping improvement in every other thing for the next five years, you have to do it to improve the military. I know it is exceedingly difficult that we must train every young man—to give military training. But one thing is enough. Could not the N.C.C. be enforced on all colleges? Could not Government give us a helping hand in the matter? I am sure if the Central Government and the State Governments gave a helping hand to Universities they shall be

able to improve to a large extent all the requirements by training young men at least with certain amount of military training and military background.

With these words I associate myself with the Motion of Thanks that has been moved.

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Deshpande. This is an occasion which is utilised for assessing the problems and the difficulties through which we have been passing and which we may have to face in the near future. Considering the fact that we have been enjoying freedom and the right to arrange things according to our own will and volition for the last five years, I would submit this: compare it with the progress made in any other country in the world under similar conditions. With the difficulties which we had to face and with the handicaps through which we had to pass, I think a dispassionate observer will only come to the conclusion that we have done, if not what every man would like to have been achieved, at any rate what is fairly good. That is how I would put it. Ever since the dawn of freedom, or practically two years prior to that, the situation in the world has been not at all one which was conducive to the development of a nation which had not been free in the past. We have as well to look to what is happening round about in the world and see that in the bargain we do not lose the freedom which we have earned and keep ourselves as far as we can away from the forces of destruction which are vying with each other in what they are doing. For instance, there is what is known as the bloc of countries behind the 'Iron Curtain.' That is one group. They also talk in terms of peace always. There is the other group at the present moment headed by the U.S.A. It also has been saying the same thing. Both of them have devised atom bombs and other weapons of human destruction of

which they themselves have become afraid now.

I would refer, Sir, particularly to the troubles which we have to face. So far as we are concerned the position will be borne out from the fact that we are really passing through a period of crisis. The whole world is passing through a period of ferment. Ever since the 2nd of February, 1953, or the beginning of 1953 since when there was a change in the administration of the U.S.A., our worries have increased. You will find that on the 2nd of February, 1952 the present President of the U.S.A.—I have nothing against him and I am not going to criticise him, but in order that we may be able to assess what is likely to happen, it is much better that we note what is happening round about us—on the 2nd of February, 1953 the present President of the U.S.A., who was formerly the man responsible for what we now know as the N.A.T.O. and the European Defence Army, declared a change in the foreign policy. It is like this:

"Our foreign policy must be clear, consistent and confident," the President said. "...It must be developed.....in the spirit of true hipartisanship. It must be coherent and global."

Formerly, as we are all aware, the U.S.A. wanted to keep itself aloof from all developments in the world. What they thought was: "We are self-sufficient and we need not bother about others." Ever since they entered the last war they thought, having come in, they would like to avoid it. But now the policy is that it must be "coherent and global". They are trying to follow a global policy. For what purpose? They say:

"The freedom they defended in Europe and the Americas was no different from that imperilled in Asia'.

What they wanted to do and they did in Europe, it is clear from the statement of policy, they want to repeat in Asia. And that also is

clear, for what purpose. Not that they have any intentions against us, but their policy is directed against Communism and the countries which have gone behind the 'Iron Curtain.'

'Their policy for making the free world secure would envision all peaceful methods and devices. "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves." He would ask Congress later to join in a resolution "making clear that this Government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings.....etc.'

Therefore you will find that that really was a new chapter which was being written so far as these two Powers are concerned. And situated as we are, on one side, on our eastern borders, we find that there have been certain grave developments. I do not say that they might be exactly the result of the Communist countries themselves. Probably they might be due not only to the activities of the countries behind the Soviet bloc but also due to the conditions which had been created in those eastern countries by the exploitation which had been carried on for centuries there by the countries in the West that are now talking of freedom. Therefore we are, as I would say, just between two giants. At the present moment, as our President has referred to, there is tension in the world. There is no doubt about it. And the tension is the result of the machinery for destruction which had been developed by these two blocs and of which they themselves are now afraid.

For instance, in his address to the United Nations this is what President Eisenhower says:

"In size and variety the development of atomic weapons has been no less remarkable. This development has been such that atomic weapons have virtually achieved conventional status within our Armed Services...etc.....In

[Shri Pataskar]

the first place, the secret is possessed by our friends and Allies... The secret is also known by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has informed us that, over recent years, it has devoted extensive resources to atomic weapons..... If at one time the U.S. possessed what might have been called a monopoly of atomic power, that monopoly ceased to exist...etc."

The result is that the tension between these two blocs has increased so much that, in spite of all our desire to remain peaceful, we have naturally to be very cautious about what is happening, around us, because we find that all sorts of efforts are being made. This has added to the difficulties through which we have to pass. A Germany which at one time was conquered by the Allies is split in two or more parts and both sides talk of re-uniting the same. But if we read between the lines, probably nobody is anxious to do so; or the way in which they are proceeding does not show that any result is likely to be achieved in the near future.

This tension in the world having increased, it has, as I have said, added to the difficulties through which we are passing and which we have to face so far as our external relations are concerned. It is from that point of view that we have to look at what the aid to Pakistan by U. S. A. means. We are not concerned with what Pakistan does. Having once conceded Pakistan it is, and it should be, nobody's desire to interfere in what they do. But I remember Burke's remarks in his "Reflections on the French Revolution". When there was revolution in France some people said: why should English people worry about it? So Burke's answer to that was: if our neighbour's house is on fire it is better that we keep the fire engines to play on our house for a while ready and well-equipped; it is better that we take note of it; we cannot exactly ignore it. Therefore, even if it is Pakistan's business as to what they

should or should not do, we cannot ignore that they are our neighbours, that we are so closely connected by ties which existed for centuries, and that they were once part and parcel of our body politic. Therefore we are very anxious that anything that they do may not disturb us. We are not ordinarily concerned with what they do. It is entirely their business. But we must take note of what they do if it constitutes a danger not only for them but for us as well. I would like to point out one thing. There has been, for instance, this trouble between North Korea and South Korea which is a pointer to countries like Pakistan, like us, as to what we should do. Therefore it is more as a matter of friendly advice that I would suggest this, if they would care and understand.

I was surprised to see some of the proceedings in the House of Representatives in the U.S.A. in March 1953. There it was clearly disclosed that America is anxious to conserve its man-power. In South Korea they lost very heavily. They had to give three lakhs and fifty thousand soldiers while the rest of the 16 countries who joined them gave only fifty thousand or so. The result is they want to conserve their man-power in America. This has been clearly stated in the speeches in the U.S. Congress. Besides there is the question of cost. They say that the cost is sixteen times more for an American soldier to be trained and equipped and made ready than a South Korean soldier. Therefore they want to conserve their man-power. It is one of their declared policies which they have stated in the House of Representatives and the Senate. What they say is—because the South Koreans are very good people they tell them—"give us guns and save your sons". I will read that portion from the Congressional Proceedings. It is a very important statement made by one of the American Representatives on 12th February, 1953, at the time when the new policy was enunciated in the

House of Representatives by the present President General Eisenhower. And this is it:

"America must conserve its man-power: to do so was a necessary economic strategy. South Koreans, he said, had the qualities for making good soldiers."

There were the 'rice soldiers' in India in former times, and the British also said that they were very good people, because they would themselves starve and make very good provision for English soldiers. A similar compliment is being paid to these poor, unfortunate South Koreans.

6 P.M.

He, i.e. member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Overton continuing said:

"Gen. Van Fleet had said that 16 South Korean soldiers could be trained, fed and paid for the price of one American."

Then he further said:

"I shall make no effort to paint for you the horrible picture of misery and desolation that we found in Korea, a little country that has for 2½ years suffered the tortures of a big war. Even so, regardless of their miseries, they are saying 'Give us guns and save your sons'."

Any country which wants to take military aid from the United States should remember what the British did some centuries ago in India. There were not enough British soldiers who came and conquered our country. There were the so-called Indian soldiers who contributed to the enslavement of their motherland. The same thing happened in Korea. Let any country which wants to take military aid learn the lesson of history. Let it remember what is happening in U.S.A. They want to make it a global thing. When President Truman was there, they were content with a national policy, but on

the 2nd February they have announced a global policy. They want to rope in as many countries in the East as possible in the name of freedom, so that while they give military aid their own men could be saved and by supplying guns there would be employment also for their boys.

Let nobody, therefore, look askance at us. There are some people in our country who think, "Why should our Government behave in this way? If Pakistan takes aid, why should not India take aid?" If we do, we will be only like two parts of Korea. Just as there is a South Korea and a North Korea, there will be an India and a Pakistan. Therefore, we must beware of all talks of taking aid from one bloc or the other. We should be guided only by what is in the interests of our country. Ever since President Eisenhower announced his new policy of global strategy against the Soviet bloc, our troubles have begun. Therefore, we ought to be on our guard.

Certain hon. Members said that we are not doing enough to arrange for our own defence. I beg to differ. It is only five years since we have had anything to do with the military defence of the country.

**Shri S. S. More:** Will America wait till you are prepared?

**Shri Pataskar:** I shall answer that.

At the present moment, we are trying in all possible ways to develop our resources. What are our steel plants meant for? They are not meant for merely providing discussion about the location of the plants. Steel is one of the basic metals required to defend ourselves. We should neither be vain of what we are doing nor should we proclaim from the house-tops that we are not going to succeed. Defence is a serious matter. Anybody can criticise and suggest ways and means by which we can at the earliest moment be in a position to defend ourselves.

My hon. friend asked me, "Is America going to wait for you?" Neither

[Shri Pataskar]

America nor Russia is going to wait for us. But that does not mean that we should be a handmaid of either of them and reduce ourselves to the position of South Korea or North Korea. These blocs have created so many of machines of destruction that it will take generations for us, even if we wish, to come in line with them. It is not necessary for us to go on those lines. I am sure that in course of time these two blocs will destroy each other, if we act shrewdly, wisely and well. We can keep clear of both of them. I wish both blocs do not go any further the way they are going. We cannot reach self-sufficiency in arms with the short time at our disposal and with the resources we have. If we attempt to do it we have to stop all our internal progress. We must strive in both directions. Because if there is no improvement in the economic situation, we might be hit indirectly, in spite of our not being included in some bloc. I, therefore, say that this was the point that I wanted to place, for consideration of our neighbours, particularly our neighbouring country which was so long a part of our own country—Pakistan. I would appeal to them not to indulge in threatening but to look more seriously to what the U.S.A. is doing. I read out extracts from the speeches of President Eisenhower and others to show what is going on in the United States. It is, therefore, dangerous to ally yourself with them. It is not because of Kashmir or something else that we are protesting against Pakistan for this military aid. We are afraid, because, as I said, just for saving the man-power in the United States, they are encouraging the South Koreans to create soldiers at 1/18th of the cost at which an American soldier is trained and equipped. It is very easy to imagine what would be the result; and from this point of view it is better that all countries in Asia, in spite of their differences, are forewarned of the consequences and then take the right course. For instance, look at Indo-China. What is happening there?

Soldiers are being created there like the South Korean soldiers. Battle goes on merrily, people are killed and the country is devastated. Therefore, this is the thing that all Eastern countries should take note of. If they are backward they should try to improve their economic condition but should not become handmaids of any of the blocs. This is my last appeal to our neighbouring country of Pakistan so far as the military aid question is concerned.

Shri S. S. More: Why do you call it last?

श्री गिडबानी : अध्यक्ष जी, मैंने जो संशोधन पेश किया था वह इस सम्बन्ध में था कि प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने अपने भाषण में जो आज अमरीका और पाकिस्तान के बीच में मिलेटरी समझौता हो रहा है, उसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ ऐसी बातें जाहिर नहीं कीं और न देश को चेतावनी दी और न ही यह कोशिश हो रही है कि सब पार्टियों को मिला करके यह जो समस्या हमारे सामने पैदा हुई है उसका सामना करने के लिये क्या करना चाहिये। मेरा यह संशोधन था :

"but regret that in view of the likely developments owing to the U.S.A. Military aid to Pakistan, that no steps have been taken to bring all political parties together and take them into confidence in regard to measures to be adopted to meet the developments."

इसके अलावा मेरा एक और भी संशोधन था :

"but regret that while expressing sympathy to the relatives of those who have suffered in the Kumbh Tragedy no mention has been made of giving compensation or relief to them."

और इसके सिवा मेरा तीसरा संशोधन यह था कि :

“that while appreciating the reference to the problem of housing, regret that the steps taken so far to tackle it are very inadequate.”

मेरी यह तीन तरमीमों थीं। पहली तरमीम के सम्बन्ध में मैं जो कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आप जानते हैं कि फारसी में कहा है :

“चिराकारे कुनद आकिल कि बाज आयद पशेमानी”

ऐसा काम क्यों करो कि तुमको पछताना पड़े। इस को कहने के लिये मैं इसलिये मजबूर हुआ हूँ, विवश हुआ हूँ कि हम लोगों ने पाकिस्तान बनाया, अगर पाकिस्तान न बनता तो आज साढ़े छः वर्ष के बाद पाकिस्तान और अमेरिका के समझौते से हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी, हिन्दुस्तान की स्वतंत्रता, हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा को खतरा पैदा न होता। लेकिन उस वक्त हमने समझा कि पाकिस्तान बनने से दोनों देश, पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान, दोस्त बन जायेंगे और हमारे देश की भी उन्नति होगी, प्रगति होगी और पाकिस्तानी हमारे दोस्त बन जायेंगे। गलत बात का गलत नतीजा निकलता है। इस बात को कहने के लिये भी मैं आज विवश हूँ कि आज हमारे कांग्रेसी भाई और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट राष्ट्रपिता का बार बार नाम लेते हैं। उस राष्ट्रपिता ने भी चेतावनी दी थी कि :

“By creating Pakistan you are introducing poison into the body politic of India.”

हिन्दुस्तान में, हिन्दुस्तान के सियासी शरीर में आप विष डाल रहे हैं, इसका बहुत बुरा

परिणाम होगा। लेकिन उस राष्ट्रपिता की बात को किसी ने नहीं सुना, जिसका परिणाम आज यह हुआ है कि साढ़े छः वर्ष के बाद जो स्थिति आपके सामने पैदा हुई है वैसी भयंकर स्थिति, वैसी शोचनीय स्थिति कभी भी किसी मुल्क के इतिहास में सामने आती है। मैं देखता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति आने के पश्चात् भी कांग्रेस ने प्रस्ताव पास किये, कहीं कहीं प्रस्ताव पास होते हैं और कहीं कहीं प्रस्ताव भी नहीं पास होते हैं। लेकिन आज तक कोई ऐसी कोशिश या यत्न नहीं किया जाता कि देश को इस के लिये पूरी तरह से सावधान भी किया जाय, देश की अलग अलग पार्टियों को मिला कर, उनको विश्वास में लेकर उन को बुला कर साथ लिया जाय। ऐसा देखने में आता है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी अपनी शक्ति के घमंड में उसी बेपरवाही से चल रही है जैसे कोई भयंकर स्थिति देश के सामने नहीं है। मेरा आप की सरकार के साथ काफी विरोध है, मेरा हृदय बहुत दुखी है, मैं आज भी, अपने निर्वासित भाइयों की साढ़े छः वर्ष के पश्चात् जो दशा है, उसको देख कर बहुत दुखी हूँ, मेरा रात दिन दुखों में ही गुजरता है, तो भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, इस मोहकमे के मंत्री साहब अपनी शक्ति के घमंड में कुछ समझते नहीं हैं, बोलते नहीं हैं, अपने ढंग से चलते हैं, तो भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज की देश की स्थिति के कारण मैं आपको आश्वासन देता हूँ, आप अपने घमंड में न रहिये, आप अपनी कम्प्लैसेन्सी या बेपरवाही में न रहिये, आप ऐसा न समझिये कि कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। कई लोगों के मन में यह बात है कि आखिर क्या होगा, जब कोरिया में कुछ नहीं हुआ तो यहाँ क्या होगा। जब पाकिस्तान बना तब भी आपने सोचा कि क्या होगा। कौन जाने भविष्य में क्या है, मैं कोई ज्योतिषी नहीं, कोई एस्ट्रालजर नहीं, लेकिन मैं इतना जरूर नकहा चाहता हूँ कि और याद भी

[श्री गिडवानी]

दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब पाकिस्तान बना तो पाकिस्तान वालों ने कहा :

“हंस हंस के लिया पाकिस्तान,  
लड़ कर लेंगे हिन्दुस्तान ।”

यह उन लोगों के दिमाग में है। वहाँ के लोगों के दिमाग में भी है और कभी कभी बौरा करके अलीगढ़ में भी पहुँच जाती है जिस अलीगढ़ से यह बात शुरू हुई। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस मामले में आप बेपरवाह न रहें। मेरे पास कहीं कहीं से खबर भी आ जाती है कि वहाँ तैयारियाँ हो चुकी हैं, वहाँ बेसेस बन चुके हैं, वेस्टर्न पाकिस्तान में नये नये अड्डे बन रहे हैं और अमरीका वहाँ पहुँच रहा है और आप पागल बन कर, अपनी पार्टी के घमंड में बैठ कर उसी तरह से चले जाते हैं जैसे दूसरी जनता हिन्दुस्तान में है ही नहीं। तो बावजूद मेरे दिल के दुखी होने के, बावजूद मेरे उन लोगों का नुमाइन्दा होने के, वैसे तो मैं पार्टी का भी नुमाइन्दा हूँ, लेकिन मैं इस को छिपाना नहीं चाहता कि मैं पहले उनका नुमाइन्दा हूँ जो अभी तक निर्वासित कहे जाते हैं, उन के सम्बन्ध में मुझे जो कुछ कहना होगा वह तो मैं कहूँगा ही, लेकिन बावजूद इस के कि मैं विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग आप के साथ हर मामले में शामिल होंगे बशर्ते कि आप भी हाथ बटायें, आप अपने दिल को विशाल करें, बापू के नाम को ले कर बापू की सहिष्णुता पर और उन की पालिसी पर अमल करना सीखें। आप अपने घमंड को छोड़ें तो देश में बहुत कुछ हो सकता है।

इस के सिवा इस बात की भी बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि जनता के अन्दर भ्रम न पैदा किया जाय, बार बार छोटी मोटी बातों पर गोली चलाने से जनता को आप विपरीत बनाते हैं, जनता को आप अपने विरुद्ध करते हैं, जनता को आप अपने से दूर करते हैं, जब

इतनी भयंकर समस्या आपके सामने है तो भारतीय जनता के पूरे सेवक बनिये। इस बात को छोड़िये कि आप का राज्य है, आप की मैजारिटी है, जैसे कल कहा गया कि हमारी मैजारिटी है, हटाना हो जिसे हटाये आ कर, संसार के इतिहास में आप से बड़े बड़े हट गये, दिल्ली में कई हुकूमतें बनीं और कइयों के कन्नस्तान भी बने, इसलिये इस घमंड को छोड़कर मनुष्य मात्र के विचार को रखिये। हमारे त्यागी भाई हंसते हैं, जब वह उन बँचों पर नहीं थे, जब वह मंत्री नहीं बने थे, तो क्या उन के दिल में था, क्या उनकी अजादी थी, क्या उनकी स्वतंत्रता थी, आज इस चक्कर में जा कर क्या सब बातें भूल गये। मैं नहीं चाहता कि वह भोगी बनें। मैं कहता हूँ कि त्यागी सच्चे त्यागी बनें और इस बात को समझें कि जनता को आप को अपने साथ में लेना है, जनता को अपनी तरफ लेना है। अगर कोई भी मंत्री किसी विपक्षी, इधर की पार्टी को घमंड के साथ जबाब दे तो वह मंत्री बनने के लायक नहीं है, इस को छोड़ कर ही आप जनता के सेवक बन सकेंगे। मैं आप से इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं आप के साथ हूँ, नेशनल इमर्जेंसी में कौन ऐसा देशभक्त होया कि देश के हित को देखते हुये आप के विरुद्ध हो। लेकिन आप अपने घमंड को छोड़ें, अपनी दलबन्दी को छोड़ें। खाली उपदेश देने से काम नहीं होगा, अमल करने से होगा और आप अमल कीजिये। तो पहली बात जो मुझे आप से कहनी थी वह यह कि मैं आप को यह आश्वासन देता हूँ, मैं दूसरी पार्टियों की तरफ से तो नहीं कह सकता, लेकिन जो दुखी हैं, निर्वासित लोग, वह आप के साथ चल सकते हैं, यह ६० वर्ष का बुड्ढा आप के साथ काम कर सकता है लेकिन आप का हृदय विशाल बने, आप बापू के नाम को न लें, वापू के काम को लें।

श्री अलगू राम शास्त्री : हृदय तो विशाल है ।

श्री गिडबानी : हृदय विशाल कहाँ है । अपने आप लोग दूकानें बना कर पार्क में बैठे थे, लखनऊ में उनको लाठी मार कर निकाल दिया गया, जो आप के पास आये थे । आप की यू० पी० ने सारे देश भर में मुसीबत पैदा की, मैं इस में जाना नहीं चाहता । लियाकत अली आप के यहाँ पैदा हुये, खली-कुत्तुर्गम आपके यहाँ पैदा हुये । वहाँ लोग दूकानें बना कर बैठे थे । अच्छा हो कि मैं इस को यहीं छोड़ दूँ ।

कुम्भ के बारे में मैं बहुत कहना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि यहाँ उस के बारे में काफी कहा गया है, लेकिन जैसा मेरे बिहारी भाई ने कहा, यह अचम्भे की बात है, मैं बम्बई में था, तीन बजे वहाँ बुलेटिन शायाम हुई, अस्-बारों में आया, वहाँ के ईवनिंग बुलेटिनस में आया कि वहाँ इतने आदमी मारे गये और आप के यू० पी० के गवर्नर जो कि उस वक्त इलाहबाद में बैठे हुए थे यह खबर न पा सके । यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता । कहीं घोटाला हुआ, कहीं अन्धेरा छाया हुआ है, कहीं ओला पड़ा हुआ है । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि यह कैसी बात है । मैं कहता हूँ कि यह ईमानदारी की बात नहीं है, जब तक गवर्नर का एक्सप्ले-नेशन नहीं आया था, मैं कह रहा था कि यह क्या हिन्दुस्तान में हो गया । यह तो बड़ी कहावत है कि :

“नीरो फिड्ल्ड व्हेन रोम वाज बनिंग”

आज इतना कहा ही जा सकता है कि “कुम्भ वाज क्राइंग ऐंड मुंशी वाज मेरीमेकिंग” । मैं नहीं कहता कि जान बूझ कर हुआ लेकिन आखिर हुआ तो क्यों हुआ ? कल इन बच्चों पर बैठ कर मैंने डा० लंका सुन्दरम से कहा कि आखिर हिन्दुस्तान को क्या हो गया ?

४६-४७ वर्ष से मैं काम करता आता हूँ लेकिन मुझे स्वप्न में भी नहीं खयाल था कि हमारा राज्य आबेगा तो उसमें ऐसी बात होगी और अगर होगा तो हम तत्परता से चलेंगे और उसका डिफेन्स भी करेंगे, जवाब देते रहेंगे । कहना यह चाहिये कि हमारी भूल हुई, अगर पार्टी हुई तो पार्टी गलत हुई, हमें कुछ है इस बात का, जिन्होंने हमें नहीं बताया वह जिम्मेवार हैं । अगर यह बात किसी के कान तक पहुँची और उसने कान बन्द करके पार्टी चलाई, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस आदमी को चाहे वह कितना ही बड़ा क्यों न हो आज गद्दी से हटना चाहिये ।

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : यह बात जल्दरी है ।

श्री गिडबानी : तब लोगों को बड़ा संतोष होगा । वह कहते हैं कि एक कमेटी बनाई है । लोग कहते हैं कि ऐसी कमेटी बनानी चाहिये थी जिसमें पब्लिक मैन होते और जिसमें उनको विश्वास होता । इस मामले में लीपा-पोती करने की बात नहीं है । खबराते क्यों हो । आपकी इतनी मंजारिटी है । बार बार काटजू साहब कहते हैं कि हटा दो । तो जमाना किसी का हमेशा नहीं रहता । इसने बहुतों को हटा दिया और कइयों को हटा देगा । जब मैं छोटा था तो मथिलीषारण गुप्त की भारत भारती पढ़ता था । उसमें एक जगह लिखा है : संसार में किसका समय है एक सा रहता सदा, है निशि दिवा सी भूमती सर्वत्र विपदासम्पदा । जो आज राजा बन रहा है रंक कल होता वही । जो आज इस गद्दी पर बैठा होता है वही कल मारा मारा फिरता है । तो मेरे भाई कभी इस बात को न सोचें । मैं कहता हूँ कि घमंड को छोड़ दीजिये, झूठे प्रचार को छोड़ दीजिये और कह दीजिये कि यह गलत बात थी । एक पब्लिक मैन की कमेटी बनाइये कि जो जांच करे ।

[ श्री गिडवानी ]

अब एक बात में रिफ्यूजीज के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। कल मैंने मंत्री साहब से सवाल किया था कि दिवाली गिफ्ट के तौर पर जो रिफ्यूजीज को कम्पेन्सेशन दिया गया था वह कितने आदमियों को मिला, तो उन्होंने कहा था कि कुल नौ लाख रुपया दिया गया। पर अखबारों में यह आया है कि १६ लाख रुपया दिया गया। यह बात ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी ने बताई है। इसमें वह जमींदार नहीं हैं जो गैर पंजाबी हैं। वह तो प्रायरिटी लिस्ट में ही नहीं हैं। तो सौ आदमियों को १६ लाख रुपये देने से तो काम नहीं चल सकता। यह बहुत बड़ा काम है। उसको तेजी से करना चाहिये। जो गरीब हैं, जिनके कलेम नहीं हैं, उनको सौ सौ और दो दो सौ कर्जा दिया गया है वह उनसे वसूल किया जा रहा है और उनका सामान कुर्क किया जा रहा है और कभी कभी उनको जेल भी भेजा जा रहा है। इस तरह क्या विस्थापित बसेंगे। यह गलत है।

चौथी बात में मकानों के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। उन मकानों का जिक्र किया गया है जो कि रिफ्यूजीज के लिये बने हैं। मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई जब पंडित जवाहरलाल ने बम्बई में आइल रिफानरी का उद्घाटन करते हुये कहा था कि मजदूरों के लिये एक एक ही कमरे के मकान बने हैं। मुझे हैरानी हुई कि प्रधान मंत्री को यह पता नहीं है कि हजारों मकान ऐसे बनाये जाते हैं और रिफ्यूजीज के लिये तो बन रुम टिनेमेंट ही बनाये गये हैं और उनके लिये पाखाने भी अलग से नहीं हैं। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट प्रधान मंत्री की बात तो माने। मेरी तो शिकायत इसी बात की है। मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में प्रश्न किया था मगर न जाने वह क्यों डिसएलाऊ हो गया। मैं कहता हूँ कि तहकीकात की जाय कि हिन्दुस्तान में कितने लोग हैं जिनके पास मकान नहीं हैं।

सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने सेंसस लिया है कि इन दिनों दिल्ली में ६००० लोग ऐसे हैं जो छत के नीचे नहीं सोते हैं। बम्बई में तो तीन चार लाख ऐसे लोग हैं जो छत के नीचे नहीं सोते। न मालूम सारे हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे लोगों की क्या तादाद होगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसकी पूरी तहकीकात की जाये। रिफ्यूजीज के लिये जो मकान बनाये गये हैं उनमें एक एक कमरा और बरांडा होता है और पाखाना तीन तीन चार चार के लिये एक होता है। और उसका भी किराया इतना होता है कि कई जगह वह नहीं दे सकते और उनको निकाला जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट प्रधान मंत्री के वचन पर अंमल करे। एक कमीशन या कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाय तो इन मकानों की हालत को देखे कि जो रिफ्यूजीज को दिये गये हैं और औरों को दिये जाते हैं। बम्बई में जो मकान लेबर को दिये गये हैं उनका वह किराया नहीं दे पाते हैं। जो जमीन की कीमत है वह भी उसके साथ जमा कर दी गयी है। तो वह इतना किराया कैसे दे सकते हैं।

तो मैं इन तीन चार बातों को आपके सामने लाना चाहता था। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि कांग्रेसी अपनी सत्ता के मद को छोड़ देंगे और जनता की सेवा करने वाली सरकार बनायेंगे, जिससे जनता की सेवा होगी। जनता ज्यादा मुसीबत में है। नहीं तो यह चन्द रोज का मामला है।

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : आप भी कांग्रेस में आ जाइये तो सब मामला ठीक हो जायगा।

श्री राबे लाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : सभापति जी, आज कुम्भ की घटना को लेकर अनेक वक्ताओं ने अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। इस हाउस के सभी सदस्यों को उससे दुःख हुआ है और यहां पर सम्बेदना भी प्रकट की गई है। परन्तु जहां इस दुर्घटना को लेकर

उसकी भर्त्सना की गई है वहां हम यह भूल जाते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने जो प्रबन्ध किया था और जो इन्तिजाम किया था उससे बहुत बड़ी दुर्घटना बचा ली गई। मैं यह निश्चय पूर्वक कह सकता हूँ कि ऐसे कुम्भ के मेले पर हंजे आदि के प्रकोप से हजारों आदिमियों को अपनी जान से हाथ धोना पड़ता है। परन्तु ऐसे मौके पर जहां कि सत्तर लाख आदिमी एकत्रित हुए वहां उत्तर प्रदेश की गवर्न-मेंट ने सफाई आदि का इतना अच्छा प्रबन्ध किया कि जहां हमारे कुछ सौ भाइयों को जान से हाथ धोना पड़ा वहां उन्होंने सफाई के द्वारा और अच्छे प्रबन्ध के द्वारा बीमारी को रोक करके हजारों आदिमियों को मृत्यु के मुख में जान से बचा लिया और इस प्रबन्ध के लिये हमें उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार के प्रति आभार मानना भी उचित है। यदि इतना अच्छा प्रबन्ध न होता तो एक बहुत बड़ी दुर्घटना वहां होती। श्रीमान्, इस विषय पर अभी तक किसी ने अपने विचार प्रकट नहीं किये जो बहुत जरूरी था।

यह कुम्भ के मेले बहुत ही प्राचीन समय से चले आ रहे हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में चार ही ऐसे मुकाम हैं जहां बारह वर्ष के बाद कुम्भ के यह मेले हुआ करते हैं, प्रयाग, हरिद्वार, उज्जैन और नासिक। इनका इतिहास भी बहुत पुराना है। पौराणिक कथाओं के अनुसार इनका समय उस समय से माना जाता है जब कि समुद्र मंथन हुआ था। जो कुछ भी हो परन्तु इतना निश्चित है कि यह बहुत प्राचीन मेले हैं और यह हमारे भारतवर्ष में उस जमाने में जबकि आवागमन के साधन नहीं थे सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को तीन चार साल के बाद एक मुकाम पर मिलने का एक बहुत बड़ा अवसर प्रदान करते थे। हिन्दुस्तान के भिन्न भिन्न भागों से लोग चल कर, दूह दूर की यात्रा करके इन स्थानों पर

एकत्रित होते थे, वहां अपने विचार प्रकट करते थे और इन विचारों को लेकर अपने अपने स्थानों को जाते थे और जो कुछ बातें वह अपने साथ ले जाते थे उनको वहां के लोगों को बतलाते थे और उनका प्रचार करते थे। तो इस प्राचीनता को कायम रखने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि इन महत्वपूर्ण मेलों का प्रबन्ध केन्द्रीय सरकार अपने हाथ में ले ले। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के सबसे बड़े सूबे की सरकार है वह भी इतने साधन होते हुये भी उसका इन्तिजाम यदि नहीं कर सकती और उसमें खामी रही तो मेरा विश्वास है कि दूसरे छोटे प्रदेशों की सरकारें, जैसे कि मध्य भारत है, जहां पर कि हर बारहवें साल कुम्भ का मेला होता है, इसको कैसे कर सकेंगी और उनसे कैसे आशा की जा सकती है कि वह अच्छा प्रबन्ध कर सकें। ये राष्ट्रीय मेले हैं। इन में सारे देश के लोग आते हैं, भिन्न भिन्न सम्प्रदायों के लोग आते हैं। और भिन्न भिन्न राजनीतिक दलों के लोग भी कार्य करने आते हैं। इसलिये यह जरूरी है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इनके प्रबन्ध में हाथ बंटावे और इसकी जिम्मेदारी को अपने सर पर ले। मुझे आशा है कि जो दुर्घटना हुई है उसकी गम्भीरता पर विचार करते हुये भविष्य में जो इस प्रकार के मेले होंगे उनके प्रबन्ध का भार केन्द्रीय सरकार अपने सर पर लेगी और उनके प्रबन्ध में हाथ बंटायेगी।

अभी गिडवानी साहब ने यह कहा है कि ऐसे समय में कांग्रेस दूसरी पार्टियों का सहयोग लेने की तैयार नहीं होती है। मुझे यह सुन कर बहुत ही आश्चर्य हुआ। कांग्रेस पार्टी ने कभी किसी के सहयोग को लेने से इन्कार नहीं किया। लेकिन हमारे बिरोधी दल के भाई हमेशा यह सोचते हैं कि वह सहयोग तभी वे सकते हैं जब कि उनकी विचार धारा को और उनके कार्य-क्रम को गवर्नमेंट मानने को तैयार हो और यदि सरकार उनसे

[श्री राधे लाल व्यास ]

सहमत न हो और उनका सरकार से मेल न बैठे तो वह कभी सहयोग देने को तैयार नहीं हैं ।

पाकिस्तान ने अमरीका से बातचीत की है और उनको मदद मिलने वाली है । लेकिन हम को यह देख लेना चाहिये कि मिलिटरी एड के मिल जाने से ही, जैसा कि उन्होंने पाकिस्तान के बनने पर शुरू से ही कहा था "हंस कर लिया पाकिस्तान और लड़ कर लेंगे हिन्दुस्तान" वह जमाना अब बदल गया है । अगर लड़कर ही हिन्दुस्तान अपने पास रख सकते थे तो अंग्रेज कभी भी आसानी से हम को छोड़कर नहीं चले जाने वाले थे । वह जमाना गया जब कि बन्दूक और तलवार और गोली के बल पर किसी पर शासन रखा जा सकता था । यह जनतन्त्र का जमाना है, और दुनिया की पिछड़ी से पिछड़ी जातियों ने भी साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ बगावतें कर दी हैं । दुनिया में अब कोई ऐसा देश नहीं रहने वाला है जहां कि साम्राज्यवाद थोड़ी देर के लिये भी पनप सकता है । तो हमें इस मूल सिद्धान्त को हमेशा ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि दूसरों को लड़कर अपने कब्जे में करने के प्रयत्न का क्या हथ होता है । इसका हमें इतिहास से सबक लेना चाहिये । जर्मनी ने यूरोप को जीतने के लिये बहुत बड़ी फौजें तैयार की थीं । इसी तरह इटली ने भी अपनी शक्ति को बहुत बढ़ाया था और दूसरे देशों पर आक्रमण किया था । उसी तरह के जापान के भी मनसूबे थे । लेकिन इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि वह अपनी पाकिस्ती में सफल नहीं हो सके । वह दूसरे राज्यों को अपने कब्जे में नहीं कर सके । बल्कि उनके अपने राज्य ही उन के पास नहीं रह सके, उन की भी हानि हो गई । इसी तरह अगर पाकिस्तान यह सोचता है कि वह अमेरिका से मिल-

टरी एड लेकर हिन्दुस्तान को जीत सकता है तो वह उसकी बड़ी भारी भूल होगी । मैं समझता हूं कि इस एड को ले कर और इस तरह सोच कर वह अपने विनाश को ही निमन्त्रण दे रहा है और इस से उसकी ही बहुत बड़ी हानि होने वाली है । इस में कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती । इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है । इस तरह की घटनायें घटी हैं और वह निश्चित तौर पर घट कर रहेंगी ।

तीसरी बात यह है कि अगर पाकिस्तान यह समझता है कि वह इस एड को ले कर काश्मीर पर हमला करके काश्मीर को हड़प सकेगा तो यह भी उसकी बड़ी भारी भूल है । संयोगवश काश्मीर में एक बहुत बड़ी घटना उसी दिन हुई जिस वक्त कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति अपना अभिभाषण संसद् के सम्मुख दे रहे थे । काश्मीर की जनता ने उस रोज यह फैसला किया कि काश्मीर की जनता का सम्बन्ध हमेशा से हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहेगा । ऐसे मौके पर संसद् के सदस्यों की ओर से हम काश्मीर की जनता का अभिनन्दन किये वगैर नहीं रह सकते । काश्मीर से हमेशा हमारे सम्बन्ध रहे हैं और काश्मीर के मामले में हम ने कभी हस्तक्षेप नहीं किया । हमने हमेशा उन पर ही छोड़ा कि वह अपना निर्णय खुद कर सकते हैं । संविधान में हम ने उन्हें एक विशेष धारा रख कर उनको यह आश्वासनी दी कि वह अपने भविष्य का निर्णय आप करेंगे और यह बड़ी प्रसन्नता की बात है कि काश्मीर की जनता ने स्वेच्छा से हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहने का अपना फैसला किया है । उन्होंने इम्पिटिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को भी स्वीकार किया है और जैसा कि प्रेस रिपोर्ट से पता लगता है, उन्होंने, वहां की गवर्नमेंट ने, अपने मुभाव हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान में सम्मिलित करने के लिये भारत सरकार के पास भेजे हैं । मुझे आशा है कि जो

हमने वादे किये थे वह हमने पूरे किये और जो आशायें काश्मीर की जनता की हैं कि वे हमेशा से हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहे, वह आशा भी उनकी पूरी होगी और हम साथ साथ चलते हुये अपनी आजादी को कायम रख सकेंगे।

तो यह काश्मीर का मामला इस तरह से निबटता है और जो संसद् ने वहां पर उनकी प्राप्टिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को स्वीकार किया है उस को आवश्यक संशोधनों के साथ हमारे संविधान में अवश्य ही शीघ्र शामिल करके इस अध्याय को समाप्त किया जायगा। यू० एन० ओ० में यह मामला जरूर हमारी ओर से है। लेकिन हमेशा के लिये यह नहीं रह सकता। हम ने काफी मौका दिया कि यू० एन० ओ० इस को निबटाये। लेकिन हमेशा के लिये हम इन्तजार नहीं कर सकते और न काश्मीर की जनता को ही हमेशा के लिये हम उसके हाथ में बगैर निर्णय के रख सकते थे। काश्मीर की जनता ने जो फैसला किया है उस के लिये वह स्वतंत्र थी। हमने उनको स्वतंत्रता दी थी और उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से जो फैसला किया है उसके अनुसार उन को संरक्षण देने और उसको कायम रखने की हमारी जिम्मेदारी होनी चाहिये।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में पंचवर्षीय योजना के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। कुछ बातों में काफी सफलता मिली है और कुछ बातों में नहीं मिली है। उन्होंने खास तौर से सामुदायिक योजनाओं का और राष्ट्रीय विकास योजनाओं का जिक्र किया है। मुझे भी कुछ स्थानों में इन को देखने का मौका मिला है। जहां तहां अभी कई ऐसे स्थान हैं कि जनता वहां खुद काम करना चाहती है, वह परिश्रम भी करना चाहती है, पैसा भी लगाना चाहती है, परन्तु अभी तक जितना प्रयास शासन की ओर से होना चाहिये और

जितना उन का पथप्रदर्शन करना चाहिये उतना अभी तक नहीं हो सका है। इसलिये अगर इस ओर शासन और अधिक ध्यान दे तो बहुत कुछ देश का कार्य और निर्माण का कार्य आसानी से हो सकेगा और जनता बहुत कुछ आगे बढ़ सकेगी। कई जगह के लोम सड़कों का निर्माण करना चाहते हैं, स्कूलों की इमारतें बनाना चाहते हैं, बोर्डिंग हाउस बनाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन उनको रास्ता बतलाने वाला नहीं है, उनको टैक्निकल गाइडेंस नहीं है। तो शासन अपनी नीति का ऐलान कर के जगह जगह अगर बतलाये कि क्या काम हो सकता है, जल्दी से सरवे कर के उन को रास्ता बतला कर उनके लिये योजना बनाये और बतलाये कि कितनी उन को मदद मिल सकती है और कितना वह काम कर सकते हैं, इस तरह से शासन कार्य करे, तो मुझे आशा है कि कई जगह से प्रस्ताव आयेंगे और इस दिशा में बहुत कुछ कार्य देश का हो सकेगा।

हाउसिंग, गृह-निर्माण, का जहां तक सवाल है, अगर यह जनता के सहयोग से और जनता के परिश्रम से किया जाय तो बहुत कुछ रुपया जो ठेकेदारों की जेब में और दूसरे लोगों की जेब में चला जाता है वह बच सकता है। कई जगह हमारे मजदूर भाई हजारों की तादाद में रहते हैं और यदि वे एक दो घंटे परिश्रम करें, उनको मैटि-रियल दिया जाय, सामान और सामग्री दी जाय, तो बहुत कुछ सस्ते मकान, कम कीमत में अच्छे मकान तैयार हो सकते हैं। तो यह जो विकास योजनाओं में और सामुदायिक योजनाओं में कार्य पद्धति अपनाई गयी है उसको हिन्दुस्तान में शासन की ओर से जहां कहीं भी मकानात और इमारतें बादि बनाई जाती हैं, उस में भी अगर यह नीति अपनाई जायेगी तो बहुत कुछ शासन का पैसा बच सकेगा और बहुत सारा धन जो

[श्री राधे लाल व्यास]

दूसरों की जेब में जाता है, करप्शन में जाता है, उसकी बचत हो सकेगी।

श्रीमान्, साथ ही मुझे यह भी निवेदन करना था कि सामुदायिक योजनाओं, विकास याजनाओं और उन के साथ ही पंचवर्षीय योजना जो चल रही है, उसके अतिरिक्त देश में चरित्र ऊंचा उठाने के लिये और लोगों में बल पैदा करने के लिये भी बहुत आवश्यकता है। लोगों में बल केवल बन्दूक और तलवार आदि से ही उत्पन्न नहीं होता है। वास्तविक बल लोगों के चरित्र को ऊंचा उठाने से पैदा हो सकता है। इस कार्य के लिये हमें हिन्दुस्तान में सब से ज्यादा ध्यान शिक्षा की ओर देना है। यूनीवर्सिटी कमीशन रिपोर्ट को काफी अर्सा हो चुका है। उसमें बहुत सी सिफारिशें हैं और उन सिफारिशों में एक सिफारिश जिस पर बहुत अधिक जोर दिया गया है वह है रिलीजियस एजुकेशन का दिया जाना। यद्यपि उस में "धार्मिक" शब्द है, लेकिन रिलीजियस को उस के व्यापक रूप में समझा जाय तो मारैलिटी, मारल-एजुकेशन, से ही उसका मतलब हो सकता है। इंग्लैंड में भी इस को अनिवार्य रखा गया है। यह निश्चित बात है कि जब तक हम बच्चों के चरित्र को ऊंचा नहीं उठायेंगे, लोगों का और देश का चरित्र ऊंचा नहीं उठ सकता है। आज हिन्दुस्तान में हम देखते हैं कि कहीं स्ट्राइक होते हैं, कहीं असहयोग होता है, कहीं गैर जिम्मेदारी के प्रदर्शन होते हैं। इन सब को रोकने के लिये और एक अच्छा वातावरण बनाने के लिये बहुत जरूरी है कि हिन्दुस्तान में ठीक ढंग से एजुकेशन दी जाय। प्राचीन समय में हिन्दुस्तान ने जो कुछ भी प्राप्त किया था और जो कुछ उसने उन्नति की थी उसका कारण था तो वह

एक ही था कि हिन्दुस्तान की शिक्षण पद्धति बहुत अच्छी थी, बहुत साउंड थी। इसलिये हिन्दुस्तान में आजकल जो शिक्षा दी जा रही है, उसके बारे में मुझे बड़े दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ना है कि जितना ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था वह नहीं दिया जा रहा है। इस विषय पर बहुत गम्भीरता से विचार किया जाना चाहिये। शिक्षण पद्धति को २में बदलने की बहुत शीघ्र जरूरत है; यदि हमारे यहां शिक्षा ठीक तरह से दी जायगी तो मुझे निश्चय है कि हमारा देश ऊंचा उठेगा, बलवान होगा और अधिक कार्य-शील होगा। उस दशा में हमारा देश सारी दुनिया में शान्ति फैला सकेगा और शान्ति को कायम रख सकेगा।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ चूँकि मेरा समय हो गया है, मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ और आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Sari D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I am a very harmless teacher, stranger to the very contentious field of politics. We harmless teachers do many harmless things. One of them is that sometimes we arrange paper-reading contests. While I was listening to the various speeches of the Opposition I felt as if I was present at a paper-reading contest and the honourable person who was reading the paper was talking mostly irrelevantly. I say this with due humility as a member of the audience and not as a judge of the contest. Every speaker, who has taken part in the discussion today, has begun with the Kumbh fair tragedy. The tragedy is unprecedented and this tragedy has been mourned by every house and every home in the whole of India. I believe there is no Member in this House or any other legislative body or any other corporate body who has not felt that a very solemn occasion was marred by this

very fateful occurrence. I was not present there myself—I wish I were—but I have met some persons who have come back from that fair. Only this morning I met one of my old teachers. I read with him when I was a student of the ninth class.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** His teacher.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** My teacher and, therefore, his grand-teacher. I met that very revered teacher of mine, who is much more energetic than my friend who interrupted me just now, and he said to me that he had returned only recently from the Kumbh fair and that he had found all the arrangements to be excellent, and that if anything like what has happened has happened, it should make us feel that there are many things which are beyond the power of man and which show that all the plans of man sometimes go wrong. It was a very fateful thing, but I do not believe that the administration and the Rajpal and other persons should be dragged into this thing. To call them Nero, call them by this name and by that name, if I can use the expression, that is something like 'mental bombast'. It is a very happy expression used by Coleridge and I do not mind using it. A criticism of this kind is only an instance of mental bombast. We are all very sorry for what has happened and I think the Government has done well in appointing a Committee. A distinguished Member of the House gave a very good certificate to the Chairman of that Committee. If I may use his words, he said that he had faith in that Chairman. We should wait for the report of that Committee and then if we find that the administration was guilty of any act of commission or omission, I would be one of those persons who would not mind calling the wisdom of the administration into question, but I must say that we should not try to make so much out of this tragedy, which concerns all of us and over which, I think, no Member of this House feels more than myself.

There was another point that was raised and it was this. Another hon. Member while referring to the U. S. A.-Pakistan Military Pact said: "Stop your Five Year Plan: it is a flop." I think I am quoting the exact words which he used. I must say, Sir, that these are very unfortunate words. To call the Five Year Plan a 'flop', I would submit humbly, is a misuse of words. If you call this Five Year Plan a flop you are destroying the faith of the people of your own country; you are destroying the faith of the people in your own Government; you are destroying the faith of your people in democracy. There is a National Extension Service scheme in my constituency which I recently visited, and I know what valuable work they are doing there. Roads are being built; hospitals are being opened; children's parks are being started; high schools are being put up; nurses are being trained and people are being taught new methods of production; people are being taught how to look after their cattle—in fact the whole life of the village, if I may use that expression, is being transformed gradually without the use of the whip. I know you can transform the life of the people with the use of the whip overnight, and I know there are some people who might like to use the whip. But this is being done in a most voluntary manner, in a most democratic manner.

If I remember alright, Mr. Aneurin Bevan, who recently came to India and delivered a speech in the Central Hall, said that India is launching upon one of the biggest experiments in the history of the world. That is to say it is getting things done, it is building a new India, according to the methods and procedures of democracy. This is something unique, something new. Here, on the other hand, is an hon. Member who said that this Five Year Plan was a flop. The Five Year Plan is the life-breath of the nation and if you stop it you stop the life-breath of the nation. I

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

consider the use of these words, very unfortunate.

Mr. Patil, speaking the other day on the Five Year Plan said:

न बुद्धि मर्द जनयेत

Don't create doubts in the mind of the people.

Here are our friends who say: "You Congressmen don't cooperate with us. We stretch our hand of cooperation; but you don't cooperate with us." Here are these people who are trying to undermine the faith of people in the very things in which the Congress Party has put its utmost confidence—and still they say: 'You don't cooperate with us.'

This Five Year Plan, which is a very mighty experiment, is going on and I consider it was very gracious on the part our President to have referred to the achievements of the Plan. The Five Year Plan is one of the major events that has happened in India during the last six years and I think any one who under-rates it is not doing justice to the New India that is growing up before our very eyes.

Sir, there was another point raised and it was about the U.S.-Pakistan Pact. I think no one understands this much more than a person who belonged to what is called Pakistan today, who was born in that area and who has come over to this country after Partition. I must say that the problem of this U.S.A.-Pakistan military alliance will not be solved in the way which some of the Members have suggested here: 'Militarise the nation.' They think that militarising the nation is like giving sweetmeats to school children on a holiday. I know some chiefs of states used to go to the schools—I myself had some experience—and then they said: In honour of the visit of this ruler, Rs. 50/- is given and you distribute *laddus*. I think *laddus* are an all-India proposition—distribute *laddus* among the pupils; that is what they used to say. They say: militarise the nation. They think militarising the

nation is distributing *laddus*, distributing cheap sweets amongst pupils. Militarise the nation! Are we not doing everything in our power to defend our country? See what is happening. See the Territorial Army, the Auxiliary Territorial Army, the N. C. C. and the Auxiliary N. C. C. You do not go to schools and colleges; you do not go to camps which our Defence Ministry puts up for the training of the army personnel. If you see them you will find that we are trying to create a corps, a substantial, sound, efficient corps, which will come to our rescue, to our aid, if the need be. But, I think this U. S. A. Pakistan military alliance is something which is very difficult to talk about because I read some papers which are published in Delhi; they are all very good papers, and while I read them, I do not know whether this U.S.A.-Pakistan alliance has materialised or not. But taking it for granted that this U. S. A.-Pakistan military alliance has materialised, I can assure you that, as our Prime Minister has said recently and as he has been saying all the time, the full remedy of this will not be the strength of our army—that also should be there—but the determination and the will of the people and I know, if Pakistan turns its eyes towards us,—its aggressive attention to us—I know all the Members of this House would be there to enthuse the nation and I do not think that the U.S.A.-Pakistan alliance will be able to do any harm to our country. We have won our freedom; we will retain our freedom and we cannot be deprived of our freedom whatever the alliances—military or economic or whatever kind—may be. We believe in the will of the people and the determination of the people.

Sir, I have been recently visiting my constituency, villages, small towns. People talk of unity. What kind of unity do they want? They want some seats over there, that is also one kind of unity (*An hon. Member*: No, No.) I am not talking about you. I am talking about the people

at large. What kind of unity do they want? They want unity; some of the friends should vacate these seats and some of the friends there outside—and not here—should come. This is not.....

**Shri Gidwani:** Some of them may go there.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** You will have precedence over me. I have been visiting some places in my constituency; I went to some villages, some towns, small towns and what have I found? Here these people are talking about unity and there in the villages and small towns, this feeling of unity has been created. You can understand how our so-called leaders are out of touch with the feelings and sentiments of the people. I visited Mukharian, a small town. All the parties, all the political parties in India, were there and they were there to say that they will give a good account of themselves. I do not want to use any word that amounts to war mongering. They will give a good account; they will present a united front if any harm is done to India. I think the talk of U. S. A.-Pakistan military pact has brought about national solidarity, national unity in India and I am sure this has been a great advantage. I am sure that our Defence Minister will see to it that we have armaments—we have armament factories; we are building more factories and we have that kind of man-power and resources which will enable us to come out very triumphantly in a battle.

One word more. The President's Address is one of the noblest utterances that anybody can think of. An artist said that in art you have three distances. An artist has three horizons: there is the innermost horizon, there is the middle horizon, and then there is the outermost horizon. And no artist is worth his name who does not take into account all these three horizons when producing a work of art. I think our country is a work of art, and our President has given us an idea of that work of art. First of all, he has

referred to our immediate problems and he has given us wise guidance on them. And he has given us wise guidance on those problems which we are tackling gradually, the Five Year Plan and other things. Above all, he has given the outermost horizon, the fundamental and basic principles of our national policy: peace, tolerance and self-help. I see self-help everywhere. I see the growing peace in the minds of the people, and tolerance. I am sure with the immediate objectives in view and with the middle and outermost objectives in view, we are going to march forward and do very well. I am sure our President has given us the right lead, the right kind of guidance and given us that wisdom which we very badly stand in need of.

**Shri U. C. Patnalk:** Sir, in rising to speak on my amendment (No. 9) I feel great diffidence, because in the present situation it is not a question of what we have to speak but what we ought not to speak. Friends on either side have referred to a very important development in recent days, namely the Pak-U.S. pact, although there has been some difference in approach. Different people have taken it in different light. Some take it as a welcome thing; others do not anticipate much trouble. I take it that the majority of hon. Members who have spoken today have referred very seriously to the effect and possible consequences of the alliance as far as India is concerned.

There is no doubt that this pact has changed our entire approach, and it may greatly influence the policy of our administrative machinery in various spheres. It is quite true that the U.S. military aid does not necessarily mean that Pakistan will go to war with India; it is possible that she may not do so. We always hope for the best, and we all earnestly hope that Pakistan will not take a step which will make another Korea of this sub-continent.

But at the same time, it is for us to be prepared for the worst. If the worst comes to the worst, if Pakistan does launch upon a large-scale offen-

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

sive against this country—if at least to increase her bargaining power regarding Kashmir or to cut India off from Kashmir, Pakistan were to start an offensive,—we have to consider what are the possible effects of that offensive, what are the possible acts of aggression that we can expect; we have also to see how we can meet that situation in the present state of affairs.

7 P.M.

It is not a matter to be treated very lightly because it is our duty to see that we retain the freedom that we have earned—not that it will

be a very great attack upon our freedom. We do believe that it will not be an attempt to invade and occupy the entire India. But, there is no doubt that if they want to take the offensive, they can create a lot of trouble for us and they can take the offensive in so many ways.

**Mr. Chairman:** I understand the hon. Member is going to take long.

**Shri U. C. Patnaik:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member can continue tomorrow.

*The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Thursday, the 18th February, 1954.*

---