

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Why should he put another Bill which is not there at all?

Mr. Speaker: There will be no end to this discussion if we take up Bills in that manner in the House. Whatever it may be, the point will be considered, and if possible, an effort should be made that once a List of Business is drawn up, we should act according to that order. Otherwise, it places hon. Members in an awkward position.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: There are some exceptional circumstances where we have got to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but let the exceptions not be the rule. That is the point which the hon. Lady Member is making.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of the Council of States:—

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Amendment Bill, 1954, which has been passed by the Council of States at its sitting held on the 19th February, 1954."

ABDUCTED PERSONS (RECOVERY AND RESTORATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Secretary: Sir, I lay the Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Amendment Bill, 1954, as passed by the Council of States on the Table of the House.

DETENTION OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following telegram dated the 21st February, 1954 from the Sub-Divisional Magistrate Sadar Agartala:—

"Shri Biren Dutt, Member Parliament from Tripura having committed acts of violence rioting, obstructing and attacking public servants on duty and inciting others with him to do the same unlawful acts and causing grievous injuries to several policemen on duty has been arrested at 06-30 hours today the twenty-first February under Sections 148, 149, 333, 341 etc. Indian Penal Code and detained at the Central Jail Agartala."

PAPER LAND ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION UNDER THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS ACT

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. 18/12/53-Public, dated the 10th December, 1953, in accordance with sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952, [Placed in Library. See No. S-36/54.]

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—Concl'd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the Motion of Thanks and the amendments.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I make a suggestion?

Mr. Speaker: Before I hear the suggestion, I may state that the discussion ends today. What time will Government require for reply?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It was exactly in regard to...

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): The Prime Minister would like to address the House between 4-45 and 5 P.M. because he has to go away at 6 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: So, I would call upon the Prime Minister at 4-45.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I was just asking your permission to mention this matter. Last time we lost one whole hour because you were pleased to allot some time for discussion of an adjournment motion. I take it that the discussion might proceed the whole day today and the Prime Minister might very well reply tomorrow just after the question-hour. It is a procedure we have followed very often in the past.

Mr. Speaker: As regards the first thing, it is not the Chair who took up the time of the House. The hon. Members wanted it by a motion they tabled. If the Members are very keen on debates of this type, I think they should hold over their motions for some time at least. That is one thing. So, I do not think the time factor really comes in that way. Secondly, the Prime Minister is intervening in the debate. The debate will go on till 7 o'clock. So, the hon. Member will get some time after the Prime Minister has finished. We will now proceed with the Motion along with the amendments.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): May I remind you that I have given notice of an adjournment motion?

Mr. Speaker: I had replied to the hon. Member and he agreed that his other proposal may be examined. There is no occasion for mentioning it now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That is why I submit that I wanted to ask your permission for that motion. The attention of the hon. Minister may be drawn to it.

Mr. Speaker: A copy of it has gone to him and attention has already been drawn, but its admissibility has to be seen and its importance has to be

examined to enable me to give my consent. That we shall see.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would request that this matter may be taken up today, whatever its result may be, negative or otherwise, because the question is that the elections ...

Mr. Speaker: He need not raise the question here and give publicity to it. Whatever it may be, I have said that I will examine the matter and see what is possible to be done in the matter.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Motion of Thanks moved by Mr. Deshpande from Nasik. Formerly Nasik was a part of Ahmednagar, and I am glad that my friend from Nasik has moved the Motion of Thanks on the Address of the President. I rise to support the Motion.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

In the beginning of the Address, the President has referred to our foreign policy. From the beginning, our foreign policy has been one of peace and friendship with all the nations of the world. The U.N. Charter would show that all the nations of the world have agreed to have peace in the world, to have friendship among all the nations of the world and also to see that there is welfare of human kind. But we are very sorry to see that there are blocs and parties with the result that the main object with which the U. N. was formed is not carried out. It is only our country which has been following from the very beginning a policy of peace and a policy of friendship with all the nations of the world. In this respect, the President is very noble in making a reference to our foreign policy. Our Government is trying its best to see that there is peace in the world. Our Government have also taken up the responsibility of serving on the Neutral Nations

[Shri Bogawat]

Repatriation Commission. They are also trying to see that the war that is going on in Indo-China is put an end to. It is clear, therefore, that our Government are striving their best; to bring about world peace.

The President has also made a reference to our friendship with Pakistan, and the recent developments that are taking place. I am reminded of the events that happened towards the beginning of the second quarter of this century, when there was Fascism and Nazism in Germany. Germany wanted to invade Russia, in order to acquire Ukraine and the very good lands there. Puffed up with the strength of his armies, and the military power that he had, Hitler invaded Russia, but the Russians being a united nation, opposed the Germans very strongly, with the result that Hitler had to yield. There was division in his armies, and there were also differences between Hitler and his generals. Ultimately, Germany had to suffer, and Fascism and Nazism were defeated. Today we see that there is an arms pact between America and Pakistan. It makes us very uneasy, when we hear statements by Pakistan authorities that the question of Kashmir will be solved, when there is this military aid. But why should there be this military aid? It obviously shows that there is an attempt to coerce or use force, in order to solve the Kashmir problem. If these are the intentions, obviously there are bound to be very serious developments. The President has made a reference to this also, without specifically mentioning the U.S.A.-Pakistan pact.

Many hon. Members have said that we should start militarisation at once, and that we must stop even the Five Year Plan. I was astonished to hear such a remark coming from a very important Member of the House, viz. Shri N. C. Chatterjee, who said:

"Stop your Five Year Plan for some time. The Five Year Plan is a big flop. It has not really

galvanized our national enthusiasm".

I am sorry I have to differ from him in this respect. The Five Year Plan has done much for our country. It has effected several improvements. We have, for instance, the community projects and the irrigation projects. Nearly eight lakhs of acres of land will be irrigated by the various community projects in our country. This has brought about an improvement in our food position. In 1951-52 and earlier, we had to purchase foodgrains from other countries, but today we are proceeding very fast in regard to achieving self-sufficiency. Our agricultural as well as industrial production are also increasing. In view of all these improvements, I strongly feel that the Five Year Plan must be continued vigorously. Unless we do that, our nation would not be very strong. Our Government is trying its best and there is co-operation throughout the country. I can say that our National Extension Scheme is doing a lot of good. There is healthy competition between taluk and taluk and villages are coming forward to include the schemes in their taluks. Similarly, a number of people are helping the nation in the community projects, and they are doing a lot of labour for the sake of the nation, and our country is fast progressing.

Here, I must make mention that as it is the policy of our Government to remove poverty, to remove social injustice, to remove the inequality between classes and masses, and they are doing their best towards this end though the country is poor and famine-stricken in some areas. I must also make mention that last year there was a severe famine and scarcity in Maharashtra in Bombay State and this Government (the Central Government) and the Bombay Government helped the famine-stricken people, and they helped the famine-stricken people to such a great extent that the starving people could be saved. The Minister of Agriculture, Dr. P. S. Deshmukh, the Food Minister, Shri Kidwai.

and even the Prime Minister visited the famine area, and so the enthusiasm of the people was very great, and the people were not afraid even though there was very great difficulty caused by famine. Now, Sir, I must mention here that my area which is an area very liable to famine, must be improved. People there are always poverty-stricken and always miserable, and there is always scarcity every third or fourth year. In my district covering my constituency, there are very good projects—the Unla and Kutradi Projects. They are the best projects in Maharashtra and if these projects were taken in the Five Year Plan, certainly, the poverty of that area could be removed. But one thing is there: a small beginning is made, and some area would be irrigated, though the vast area which is stricken with famine, from Panchmahal and part of Poona to Ahmednagar, Sholapur and Bijapur, is the tract which is very liable to famine. I draw the attention of the Government to the fact that care should be taken to see that these areas are improved so as to remove the poverty of the people.

Similarly, there is a very important project, the Rhandra project. There is a reservoir Bhandarthara, and there is a water fall in the nearby Akula taluk in the Ahmednagar district. If this power project is taken on hand, then there would be electricity in two districts—Nasik and Ahmednagar, several industries could be started, and thus, industrially also, this undeveloped tract could be developed. This is very essential, and I request the Government to take into consideration this very important project. We have made representations and have also requested our State Government to take up this project but as the State Government is in difficulties for getting money, I request that the Centre should come to the help of the undeveloped area.

Then, there is need of railway connections in this undeveloped area of Ahmednagar and adjacent parts. I bring to the notice of the Railway

Minister that except one Dhond-Monmad line, there is no railway in our parts. Cotton is produced there on a large scale. Our neighbouring district, Bhir, is also without any railway. Recently, from the speech of the Railway Minister, I find that work on Khandwa-Hingoli line is to be started, and so, if this Hingoli railway is joined to Ahmednagar from Parliwajinath or Parabhani Stations or the railway nearby, then a very big tract of the undeveloped area would come-in under the railways, and that would be a very good development.

Here, Sir, I must say that this area is very rich in soil. There are very good crops in Bhir, but in the whole district of Bhir there is no railway and Bhir is adjacent to Ahmednagar district. So I request the Railway Minister to see that railway from Ahmednagar to Parliwajinath or Parbhani is joined. It would then be of very good use. There was some suggestion from the Railways that from Ahmednagar to Paithon or from Srirampur to Paithon there should be a railway. Srirampur is a very important place. It is an irrigated area and there are so many transactions and so much transport that a railway line is quite essential. So I humbly submit that unless there is a railway line from Ahmednagar or Srirampur to Aurangabad or Parliwajinath or Parbhani through Bhir district, there would not be development.

After saying this, Sir, I come to the other point. We have fought the battle for freedom under the leadership of Mahatmaji. We got freedom and now we are fighting under the leadership of Pandit Nehru the economic battle, and we are developing our nation on a very large scale. The Father of the Nation taught us many things. He had showed us the light. He had showed us the way to truth, to peace and to non-violence. If our cause is for peace and for truth, we are sure to succeed in our determination. The

[Shri Bogawat]

Father taught us to sacrifice everything whenever the time came. I say that if there is any calamity in the country and if we are united, no power on earth can defeat us because union is strength. 'United we stand, divided we fall'. So I appeal to all the Members of this House and every body in the country that we must be united. If we stand united, we will not be afraid of any power on the earth. With these remarks, I conclude.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Sir, I beg to move:

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

"but regret that no mention has been made of any plans for the amelioration of the Backward Classes, and in particular of Adivasis."

Before I proceed to the main theme of my amendment, I would like to meet some of the arguments that have been put forward by some speakers preceding me, and, in particular, I would address myself to the charge on the floor of this House by the Maharaja of Patna, an hon. Member from Orissa. He accused the Government of Bihar of not having given him, another Maharaja and their colleagues protection at a meeting in Saraikele, and he gave certain details of alleged rowdyism that had been perpetrated against him and his colleagues. Sir, I have stressed more than once on the floor of this House, 'Hands off Bihar', and I would again stress it as strongly as I can. I would advise hon. Members who have the temerity to come to this House and accuse Government or individuals for acts they might or might not have done, because they are only alleged and published in the papers,—they should not go into places where they know obviously they are in for trouble. Blood has flowed over the issue of Saraikele and Raj Kharsawan.

Sir, you are an old enough Member, of the Provisional Parliament as well as this House, to remember that I had tabled an adjournment motion when Sardar Patel was the Minister in charge of the States Ministry. Now, feeling is very very strong in certain areas and my hon. friends in Orissa do themselves no good—they do not advance their cause—by irritating us here where we cannot hit back because we will not hit below the belt. That is the point.

As far as Bihar is concerned, we have been robbed of 11 States; 11 States that historically, geographically and in every way belonged to the province of Bihar have been taken away. It was only when blood flowed in Raj Kharsawan that they were given back. Now, my hon. friends come here and think people of that particular area are going to receive them with open arms, when they are preaching heresy of the worst order. I need say no more than that; but, I would only warn them that they should know they are treading on dangerous ground and, if the authorities fail in their obvious duty, they must not blame the authorities any more than they should blame themselves. It is a very very disturbing thing to all of us. There is the States Re-organisation Commission that has been appointed. We certainly want the Commission to work peacefully and harmoniously so as to be in a position to examine all the problems dispassionately and objectively. But, when things like this are started by my hon. friends from Orissa and other States, all that I can tell them is they are certainly not working with non-violent methods. This is a matter in which we feel very strongly. We are dealing with that section of the Indian community which is not able to be articulate like others. I am talking of the primitive tribes. Sir. They are primitive in every sense. When so-called civilised persons go and speak arrant nonsense, it is misleading to them; and the primitive man will react in his own primitive way. Don't blame

them if certain things happen. As so-called civilised men, you ought to have more discretion. I would only say that. I certainly repeat my warning not only to the political leaders of all parties in Orissa but also to political leaders in West Bengal and in Madhya Pradesh because Madhya Pradesh has also robbed us of several States that belonged to us through the centuries. When we are seriously endeavouring for the unity and prosperity of this country, whether this State should go to Madhya Pradesh or West Bengal or Orissa or even to Uttar Pradesh, to the province of the Leader of the House, we have no objection. But, let us look at the whole problem dispassionately and without any anger.

Coming to the Address as such, I do not know to whom I have to address myself. There is only one Cabinet Minister present on the Treasury Benches—the other one is not a Cabinet Minister—and it seems to me very strange, that the Leader of the House, who very soon will be intervening in this debate, is not here to meet the points that I am putting forward.

An Hon. Member: There is one Cabinet Member there.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I have complained about this again and again that it is discourteous to the House that when a very important matter is to be discussed, the Cabinet Ministers—those of them who have, as it were, to get an appraisal of what we are trying to say on the floor of this House, are absent. I repeat this and I have repeated it again and again. I think it is high time that the House receives greater respect because Congressmen are speaking and non-Congressmen are also speaking on very vital problems of the country. I have no hesitation, as I said on previous occasions, in giving a broad support to the theme of the President's Address, but while I support it, it does not mean that I am in agreement with all that has been said there, nor do I mean that there is nothing lacking in it—far from it. The President's

Address should assume a pattern which gives this House an indication, particularly, of the legislative programme that is to be before Parliament. As far as the President's Address is concerned, it is overwhelmingly retrospective. It is history, geography and accountancy, all put together and it gives a very rosy picture of the claims of Government in regard to their achievements. This is nothing new. We get the administration reports and we know how far the Damodar Valley Project has progressed, or any other project for that matter and what stage it has reached. We do not come to listen to the President to give us a glimpse of the obvious. That is my complaint in regard to the character of the President's Address this year. I will not say that it is insipid as that would be inaccurate. I would, in fairness to Parliament, urge that the Address should assume a pattern which would be more prospective than retrospective, particularly in the legislative planning. After all, what is the Address for? It is not to give a history of what has happened in the past. That we have from the administration reports, but, what is of great concern to us is as to the programme Government have ahead of this particular House.

There is also another suggestion I have to offer for the Leader of the House, now that he has come here—and he is most welcome. What I would say is that the President's Address should be above controversial matters. I have one instance which I can quote and which, to my mind, should not have appeared in the Address in the shape it has appeared. We all feel grieved at what has happened at Kumbh Mela. The tragedy is under investigation but I find that in the President's Address a pat has been given to the U. P. Government. I maintain that this is out of place as far as the President's Address is concerned. It is not that I object to it. I am only pleading that the President's Address should assume a particular pattern which is of value to the House as such. In the past I

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

have pleaded, and I am very glad that the House has accepted it, that foreign policy discussions should be above party politics. Similarly, I plead here that the Address should assume a particular pattern.

I can now go on only to a few of the matters as the time is limited, and before I come to the question of the amelioration of the Backward Classes, I would like to mention only two points which have already been mentioned in the President's Address. One refers to the nationalisation of the air services. We shall have a future occasion for discussing this particular matter in detail but, for the present, I would like to ask the Government: How much longer are they going to take to let us see the effect of nationalisation? When the nationalisation Bill came up before the House, my attitude was very clear on the subject. I was in favour of rationalisation, but Government did not accept that. Now that we have accepted nationalisation, I expect some immediate results at least. I find on an examination of the whole situation that the position is exactly what it was before the Bill was introduced. Nationalisation came into existence many months ago, but there has been no change whatever in the accounts. The eight airlines are still continuing as though they were individual entities. There has been no such thing as co-ordination of accounts. If you today go to any airline—it may have assumed a new name, instead of the Indian National Airways, it may be No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, or No. 4 Line—as far as organisation and administration are concerned, the position is exactly what it was before. I would urge upon Government that if they really mean nationalisation, they should have no hesitation whatsoever in taking decisions. That is to say, they must not wait in an endeavour to please this line or that line. If there are eight lines that are nationalised, there cannot be eight Chief Engineers; there cannot be eight General Managers and so on and so forth. The present difficulty seems to be that Government are frightened

of displeasing vested interests. Government have the full support of this House, I think I am right in saying, even of the Members of this side who do not always agree with the Treasury Benches in this matter. When the demands of the Ministry of Communications are on the anvil here I shall have more to say, as will have other people also.

Coming to the river valley projects, Sir, admittedly there have been difficulties. It is not exactly the fault of Government that things have not gone according to plan or schedule. I do not blame Government for that. But when certain things get known and even then Government do not menu matters, then I have a grievance. Now, on the floor of this House, by the Leader of the House, by the Minister of Finance and by the Minister of Planning, who is the Minister in charge of these river valley projects, a categorical and definite assurance has been given and repeated from time to time that villagers evacuated from areas that would be submerged by water would be given land for land—in fact more

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): House for house.

Shri Jaipal Singh: And house for house.

Now, Sir, I understand Government have changed their whole attitude to this very very important problem, particularly in regard to the tribal people. In regard to Maithon what is the Planning Minister saying today? "Give them money". My hon. friend the Leader of the House knows only too well what a disastrous step that would be—to give cash, to give money to these people. You must never turn them away from land. If you have to transplant them from land, it should be on land. Money with their disappears in no time.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I ask what particular place the hon. Member is referring to?

Shri Jaipal Singh: Maithon. I can mention many other places also in the Damodar Valley Corporation—the whole valley. But this is a thing I have been pleading for. I know Government have difficulties. Unfortunately politicians come in between and try to upset the plans of Government. But, Government must never be weak-kneed in these matters. An assurance has been given to the people. Persons like me have gone round asking the tribal people to support the Government in the various nation building activities. After a couple of years we find that Government have yielded to certain pressures.

Now, Sir, in the last few seconds that I have, I come to the question of Adivasis. I have said in my amendment that no mention has been made in regard to ameliorative efforts concerning the backward classes. I do not mean to say that no mention whatever has been made. I am not saying that. But somehow or other, because there is the Backward Classes Commission this particular issue has been ignored. I feel that Government are just playing for time. If you look at the progress report of the Plan you find that the approach is not a direct one. In this particular case all that I can say is that the attitude seems to be: "Let us go ahead with the raising of the general level and *ipso facto* these hill people, these jungle people will benefit". I cannot help feeling that is not the right approach that the Leader of the House has been pleading for everywhere. There is a special way of handling, particularly the tribal problems, and I would urge Government to take more seriously the question of these special measures. I know they have already taken certain steps—I congratulate the Leader of the House in starting a new cadre for the Agency for the North-East Frontier. That is a special measure. But something still has to be done in other parts of the country also. Let us not wait for the cry

to be started: just because it happens to be a frontier area where they are giving a lot of trouble, Government is doing something? If the attitude of Government is that things will be done only when people resort to incendiarism or something like that. I say this is a very unfortunate way of tackling problems.

Generally speaking, as I have said in my earlier remarks, one cannot but congratulate Government on its achievements. One cannot but congratulate the Government; on a deeper appreciation of the difficulties that confront the Government, I feel Government have done very well but I do not want the Government to run away with the idea that just because we acknowledge this, therefore, nothing more has to be done and that nothing has been left behind. With these words, Sir, I have great pleasure in moving my amendment.

Shri B. N. Reddy (Nalgonda): Sir, it appears that hating communism or Communist-baiting, as it is called, has become the habit and profession of certain Members of the party opposite. Wild charges are made against the Communist Party without trying to prove them.

During the First Session, a charge was made against the Telengana Communist Party that there the Telengana Communist Party was having some sort of a wireless connection with some Middle-European countries but the Member did not take the trouble of proving this at all. Another Member from Madras makes another wild charge against comrade Gopalan that he said certain things against the Prime Minister in Madurai or some other town. Shri Gopalan challenges him but the Member keeps quiet. The other day another Member from the opposite side has made certain wild charges, false charges against the Communist Party. He said that in the recent Madurai Congress of the Communist Party, a secret circular was distribu-

[Shri R. N. Reddy]

ted among the members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. I am a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. I do not know what exactly he means by the secret circular, which I have not received myself.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Because it was secret.

Shri R. N. Reddy: But when a Member makes a charge the burden of proof lies on him that such and such document was distributed and it was a secret document. A few days ago, this was publicised by a notorious agency which is also suspected as a foreign agency working in India—an agency called the Democratic Research Service from Bombay.

All fantastic charges and information was published.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): The whole Communist Party is a foreign agency.

Shri R. N. Reddy: Let the hon. Member have his opinion, but let him wait.

Immediately after that the General Secretary of the Communist Party contradicted the same and denounced it as a tissue of lies. I shall just read an extract from the statement of the General Secretary of the Communist Party.

"My attention has been drawn to a statement issued by Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas on behalf of the Democratic Research Service which claims to have discovered 'a secret circular' of the Communist Party of India giving details of preparations of armed struggle undertaken by the Party," declared Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the Communist Party, in a statement issued to the Press on January 24.

Also in his Press Conference Mr. Tricumdas narrated, what he thought, took place at the Madurai Congress of the C.P.I.

"People know well what the Democratic Research Service is, who finances it, and how it specialises in the game of provocation and falsehood, and therefore, but for the publicity which has been given to the alleged circular and Mr. Tricumdas's statement, I would have treated them with the contempt they deserve.

It should be obvious to all that the alleged document is a crude forgery and the statement based on it, as well as the narration of alleged proceedings of the Madurai Congress of the C.P.I. are nothing but a tissue of lies, which are being circulated in order to justify suppression of the Communist Party and of the democratic movement since their growing strength have unnerved the most reactionary circles in India and their patrons, the American imperialists, whose agency, as is well known, the Democratic Research Service is."

[SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY in the Chair]

Madam, some more information I have about this so-called Democratic Research Service in India. Here is a statement published by a Member of the British Parliament, one Mr. Ian Micardo. I will read the statement itself. This statement was published in the *Free Press Journal* on the 17th of this month:

"The extensive propaganda machinery of the United States Information Services in Indian cities has been unfolded by Mr. Ian Micardo, Bevanite M.P., in an article published in the Bevanite newspaper, *Tribune* recently.

Mr. Micardo, who formed his views after a tour of the country recently, wrote, 'in each of the big Indian cities, you will find large and luxurious buildings occupied by the USIS, which turns

out great quantity of well-produced, if not subtle, propaganda material. But the activities of the people of the USIS appear to be almost self-defeating.

In Bombay area, they have aroused bitter hostility amongst the business community for outrageously practising an impudent piece of naked McCarthyism. There has been set up an organisation whose very name bears a suspicious odour; it is called the Democratic Research Service.

This outfit keeps itself very closely to itself, and therefore, no one knows how democratic it is, what research qualifications it has got, or who benefits from its service. But what is known is (a) who runs it, (b) where it gets its money from, and (c) what it does.

Mr. Micardo continues: "The business done by Indian firms with Communist countries is done within the policy of the Government of India and with the full approval of the Government. That fact, however, does not protect those businessmen and firms from having their activities spied on, so as to provide reports to McCarthyites in Washington.

There is, therefore, no wonder that Indian businessmen resent it. They say: we accept the duty of making our business activities conform to the policy formulated by New Delhi—but one Government is enough for any firm, and we owe no allegiance to Washington.

One of those businessmen told me: I will run my own business and mind my own business; I wish the Americans would also mind their own business.' "

That is the secret, Sir. Of course, there is much to know about the Democratic Research Service. This throws some light upon it; how they function their organisation and where they get their funds from. I do not

know what exactly the connections with this Democratic Research Service are, of the hon. Member who spoke from the Press reports published by this Democratic Research Service. Such fantastic charges are made without trying to prove them, and I am really sorry, that this is a blow to the very prestige of this House, not only this House, but to the Congress Party also. I am very sorry to say that our Prime Minister, being both the leader of the Congress Party and the Leader of the House, has not put an end to this sort of wild abuses and wild charges against a party which is a part of this Parliament. I hope, Sir,—I am sorry, Madam,—this will not happen again.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Madam, may I remind the House that you had once declared from that seat that the Chair has no sex?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, yes. That always stands.

Shri E. N. Reddy: Now, with regard to the very policy of the Communist Party, I have to say that the Communist Party has a policy today. It has a policy statement. It is not a secret policy document or tactical document as the Member on the other side has put it. This is an open document, a policy statement of the Communist Party, which was adopted by the conference of the Communist Party in the year 1951. I have a copy with me and I have absolutely no objection in keeping it on the Table, because this 'keeping on the Table' has become almost a scandal. Any paper that is found in the bazar or anywhere is brought into the House. It is read in the House and it is said, 'I am going to keep it on the Table', as if, merely reading a paper and keeping it on the Table makes it a true document or a true paper.

An Hon. Member: What about that?

Shri E. N. Reddy: I am ready to keep it on the Table. I have absolutely no objection, but the thing is,

[Shri R. N. Reddy]

this is an open document and will be in the bazar. You can go to any bookstall and get it.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member to hurry up because there are many persons who want to speak.

Shri R. N. Reddy: One more point that I would like to touch upon in the Presidential Address is the estimation of the economic situation that the President has made. The Presidential Address gives a very rosy picture of the economic condition in the country. The President says that a certain amount of extra food-grains have been produced and this is going to be hopeful for the country. But, one thing is forgotten absolutely and that is the growing economic crisis in the country. If the economic condition has improved, and if really the country is going towards prosperity, I cannot understand how the unemployment problem can be explained. Unemployment is growing day by day. It has gone up to almost Himalayan heights in India today. The President says that the economic condition is improving. Unemployment is there not only in the industrial towns, but it has also gone to the rural areas too. I can give quotations from the *bourgeois* papers themselves. Here is an extract from the report of the Grow More Food Enquiry Committee, June 1952, page 51. The President of the Committee was Shri V. T. Krishnamachari. The Committee explains how serious is the unemployment threat to the agricultural population in the villages.

“Owing to the seasonal conditions, work in agriculture is possible only for a portion of the year. Over four-fifths of the country in which there is no irrigation, this period is three or four months in the year. In the one-fifth in which irrigation is available, the working period is nearly double this, for example, six to eight months in the year. In other words, roughly four-fifths of the

agricultural population can find work in farming operations for one-third or one-fourth of the year and rest for about double this period.”

What does this mean? It means that in rural areas, unemployment among the agricultural population is so serious that only one-third of the population, if these figures are properly worked out, get employment in the year and the remaining two-thirds go unemployed. How serious the position is, can be gathered from the figures that are given here.

What is the condition of our cottage industries today? The cottage industries, especially our handloom industry, have completely gone. The handloom industry is absolutely ruined. The weaver produces the cloth; but he is not able to find a market because the poverty-stricken peasant is not able to purchase the cloth. The condition of the industries is also the same. Industries are being closed. Our President talks of over-production. Government talks of over-production. Yes; there may be over-production. But, the crux of the problem today is, although the production is there, the purchasing capacity of the people has gone down so much that people are not in a position to purchase whatever is produced in our country today. That is the position. Why has this condition come? It is because the Government has failed to tackle the basic problem, that is the agrarian problem. The basic problem is the absence of purchasing capacity in the poor peasant and the agricultural labourer today. His problem is, the feudal fetters and feudal exploitation by the landlords, zamindars and jagirdars are completely ruining him. He is getting poverty stricken day by day. The failure of the Government lies in not trying to smash these feudal shackles that are making the peasantry poor day by day. That is the problem.

The other problem to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government, which the Government has failed to solve is that it has not been able to smash the imperialist grip over the country today. Our country is completely under the grip of British capital. Unless the Government does these two things, break the imperialist grip over the country and also break the feudal grip over the poor peasantry, our economic problem cannot be solved, the problem of our market cannot be solved and there is no hope of any solution of our economic problems.

4 P. M.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): This is the beginning of the third year and for anyone who has watched this scene, the last two years should give an idea as to the guiding lines our country is following. I personally am not restricted by any narrow party views or party interests. I therefore propose to speak my own mind as to what I have observed during the last two years

Something has been puzzling me, because with the best of intentions we are not reaching those targets that we are so anxious to reach. There must be something wrong somewhere, because the intentions are good. There is something lacking somewhere. Is it the machinery? Is it the structure? Or, is it a wrong programme?

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): Both.

Dr. Jaisoorya: I do not wish to hurt anybody's feelings, but something has been puzzling me, namely, the extraordinary situation in this country that you do not find in any other country. In our country, we have a dual function personified in one man alone, namely, the head of a government and the head of a political party in one. That does create confusion, because you cannot separate these two functions so completely as to have what I might call a clear, ruthless, rational view of things as they stand in juxtaposition to each other.

The Leader of the House will concede that I have never been his enemy. One the contrary, I have been for years his friend. The more I see the situation, the more I find that it is one that you find nowhere else in the world. We are trying to separate the judiciary from the executive. We are trying to separate the Church from the State. But in India we have got two functions which ought to be separate from each other united in one, so that without hurting anybody's feelings I may quote the European analogy of the Pope and the Emperor in one person alone. When in doubt, the Emperor consults the Pope and by the same token, when in doubt the Pope consults the Emperor, and since the two are on extraordinarily good terms with each other and have no difference of opinion, generally the Pope agrees with the Emperor and the Emperor agrees with the Pope. This creates confusion.

With a versatile mind like the Leader of the House, sometimes the change-over or switch-over is so kaleidoscopic that I who watch him so carefully and sympathetically am sometimes confused, because this lightning rapidity reminds me of those remarkable twins, the amazing twins, that Alice met in Wonderland—tweedledum and tweedledee. The two functions need not be identical. The outlook need not be identical. The interests of a party may be reactionary. The interests of a government may be progressive.

I shall now give you an example. It is as recent as the 7th July 1953 and therefore is still valid. The Prime Minister said:—

"The Government would be guided by the people's will. If the Government makes mistakes, it would confess having made them and try to rectify them."

In two years, I have not heard one single statement saying that the Government has made mistakes. The Congress President said that the social aspects of a country were intimately connected with economic and political

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

problems. Provincialism, communalism and casteism must therefore end. One could not obviously live with one foot in one century and another foot in another. Quite right. But let us examine facts. There is no doubt of the fact that the Prime Minister wants this country to be modern. His mind is modern. He is the only modern thinking man in the whole Cabinet, but when I examine the present activities of the old Party that I once belonged to, *viz.*, the Congress Party, it is no longer the progressive party, it is now making way for medievalism, obscurantism and opportunism. We cannot have it that way.

The Prime Minister said in his speech very recently at Kottayam:

"I do not believe in the stars, sun or moon affecting the destiny of India. I believe in human beings moulding the destiny of India and not the distant stars. It is you and I, all of us, who are going to shape the destiny. We are not going to mould it by reciting *mantras* and prayers, but by action."

While he does not believe in the effect of the planets and the stars, I am not so sure that the other members of his Ministry do not believe in the action of planets and stars, they are consulting the Astrologer Haveli Ram. There comes the difference. There comes the difficulty. Sometimes it is necessary to separate the facts, because we all want to support the Prime Minister in his progressive views—for instance, the attitude he has taken towards the Appleby Report is certainly very commendable. Because, no country, whatever its good intentions are, can function effectively unless its machinery is up-to-date.

The whole tragedy in this country is this: we have framed a Constitution that itself makes centralisation of work impossible. We have decentralised politically, and now we want to centralise economic policy. That is the reason why our Planning Commission is

failing. Unless your Planning Commission has mandatory power and not recommendatory power, it is bound to fail.

There are several aspects that I want to tell you about the Planning Commission, and why it is bound to fail. Because your Constitution itself prevents you from doing it, because the States can challenge you and they need not obey. I should not say anything about the States because the more I think of the States, the more I have to laugh. This is what has happened. You have built planning and the planners, and you have put them into ivory towers. This is just the same as what happened with Chancellor Papen of Germany in 1932. He built his Cabinet of experts. They were full of good ideas and were meant to represent the best possible compromise between many conflicting interests, but alas, he had overlooked the fact that what matters in politics is not what is being done and how it is being done, but—more important—who does it. Prejudice is the very essence of politics. Therefore, when we come to think of it, while the ideas are all right on the top, it does not infiltrate below and downward because of the bad machinery we have. The question may arise: why are we failing in the Five Year Plan? I believe we are honest enough to say we have attempted too much. We have attempted it from the top, and not from below. That is why belatedly, I read in the newspapers that the second Five Year Plan is going to be a people's plan. We could not achieve our targets because we have not built up our machinery properly. To try to rectify it after three years is wrong. Our Constitution prevents proper centralisation, and this is one of the reasons why the Plan has not succeeded. Centralism requires extremely high efficiency, otherwise it fails.

If you had shown the French statesman, Talleyrand, your Five Year Plan and asked him his opinions on the Plan, he would have said, Monsieur, this is worse than sin, it is a mistake.

I next come to the question of administration. Let me tell you that our bureaucracy is in no way inferior to any other bureaucracy. I have seen bureaucracies in many countries, and what is lacking here is the guiding line. We are still dependent upon the administration manuals left behind by the Britishers, and they are still being worked in water-tight compartments by men of the 'tie-and-collar mentality', as the Prime Minister has said. Merely changing from a tie and a collar to a closed coat does not solve problems. It only solves the external, shall we say, to a small extent, by levelling, but what about the levelling of the mentality? The shell has changed, but the core has remained the same. Changing the core will depend not so much upon gentle methods of persuasion, as by telling them, you jolly well change or get out. That is the only way we could do it, because there is the time factor also. We have got to fulfil the Five Year Plan within the scheduled time, and it cannot be fulfilled, unless the machinery to implement it is geared properly. I was shocked—and I hope it is wrong—when I read in the newspapers or somewhere, there was a proposal to harness the *sadhus* to sell the Five Year Plan to the masses.

Secondly—I always support the Prime Minister—the Prime Minister said:

"Sometimes I feel that the world might be better off if there were a few less of moral crusaders about. Everyone wants not only to carry on the moral crusade in his own environments, but also to impose his moral crusade on others."

In the history of Rome, Emperor Hadrien also tried to bring in some moral reform, but the result was that his own daughter ran away, and the historian wrote:

"Few administrators have ever attempted to enforce or advocate moral reforms. They have invariably left it to hypocrites and cranks."

As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to support the Prime Minister in every progressive move. I know that he wants to do something for the country. But not only is his machinery a liability, but I regret to say, his own party is a liability.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): No, no, you are a liability. You are flattering the Prime Minister, and abusing all other Members of his Government.

Dr. Jaisoorya: I do not flatter, I am talking of the party to which I belonged.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): The party to which you belong. (Interruptions.)

Dr. Jaisoorya: There are a few gracious women in this world of whom we can truly say that they are ladies in their own rights. My old party to which I belonged is also a lady in her own wrongs! I still have, somehow, a sneaking love and sympathy for my own party, and therefore, hard-boiled as I am, I still want to see this big party really supporting the leader in progressive things and less about Kumbh Mela. Within two hours of the Karachi accident, Delhi knew it, and we cancelled the tea party—within two hours—between nine and eleven of the clock. Within smelling distance of the tragedy—the Kumbh Mela tragedy—although the All India Radio in the afternoon had given the news to the world, nobody seemed to have informed the higher authorities that something had happened. I blame the officials, and it is probable that the officials thought, as in the old days of Wajid Ali Shah, 'सरकार आराम कर रहे हैं' and did not inform the authorities. This is a thing which I cannot understand,—whether this new aristocracy should be protected just because something is unpleasant!

श्री टंडन (जिला इलाहाबाद—पश्चिम) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस विषय के केवल एक श्रवण

[श्री टंडन]

पर बोलना चाहता हूँ। उसका सम्बन्ध कुम्भ मेले से है। वह प्रयाग का एक दृश्य था। मैं प्रयाग का रहने वाला हूँ और जब यह दुर्घटना हुई, उस समय के पास मैं मेले के भीतर पहुँचा था, यद्यपि उस दुर्घटना के स्थान से लगभग दो मील पर। मैं वहाँ भारतीय संस्कृति सम्मेलन में व्यस्त था, जिसका उदघाटन एक दिन पहले, अर्थात् दो फरवरी को राष्ट्रपति जी ने किया था। वह अधिवेशन तीन और फरवरी को भी था। मुझे मेले में इस दुर्घटना की बहुत हल्की सी सूचना मिली थी। सब बात यह है कि इस दुर्घटना का गम्भीर चित्र मेरे सामने दूसरे दिन सबेरे आया। इस समय मैं उस दुर्घटना के व्योरोँ पर कुछ कहने वाला नहीं हूँ। आजकल वहाँ जांच करने वाली समिति बंठी है। उस के सामने ब्यान आ रहे हैं, कई प्रकार के ब्यान आए हैं और बहुत विश्वसनीय भाइयों के ब्यान इस बात पर आए हैं कि माँतें कितनी हुईं और किन कारणों से हुईं।

जो भूल प्रबन्ध की हुई उसके ऊपर मुझे कोई टीका टिप्पणी भी नहीं करनी है। उस का ठीक पता कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आने पर लगेगा और तभी टीका टिप्पणी का समय होगा। परन्तु यह तो स्पष्ट है कि कहीं न कहीं कुछ गहरी कमी और त्रुटि थी, नहीं तो इतनी कल्पना तो होनी ही चाहिए थी कि जब लोग ऊपर से जा रहे हैं तो ढाल के नीचे कोई जबरदस्ती बैठाला न जाय, जैसा कि स्पष्ट है कि लोग बैठाले गये। पुलिस ने मार मार कर बैठाला गवाही में भी है, यह बहुत स्पष्ट बात है। तो कल्पना की कमी, और फिर पुलिस के आदमियों की कमी। कहीं न कहीं त्रुटि है। २०० फीट लम्बा एक गड़ढा ढाल के नीचे उस के पास बना रहे जिस में कि कीचड़ हो यह भी प्रबन्ध की कमी है। यह स्पष्ट बातें

हैं। मगर मुझे कुछ दूसरी बातों पर कहना है।

यह मेला एक प्रतीक है, हमारे देश की मनोभावना का। किस प्रकार से लोग वहाँ दौड़ते हैं। उन के अन्दर भावना होती है कि हम गंगा जी में दो डुबकी लगा कर स्वर्ग में चित्रगुप्त जी के खाते में जमा की और एक कलम लिखवा लेंगे, एक क्रेडिट एन्ट्री वहाँ पर हमारी हो जायगी।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ): पुराना खयाल छोड़ देना चाहिये।

श्री टंडन : मैं पुराने चित्रों को, विचित्र चित्रों को और चित्रगुप्तजी की जो काव्य कल्पना है, उस को छोड़ देने में कोई बहुत लाभ नहीं देखता। मगर जो छोड़ने की बात है इस मेले के सम्बन्ध में वह है यह मूढ़ ग्राह, यह सुपरिस्टिशन की दो डुबकी लगाने से हमारी मुक्ति हो जायगी। यह महा गहरा मूढ़ ग्राह है। यह सहारा देने की, प्रोत्साहन देने की बात नहीं है। आज दो रास्ते हैं जो हमारे लिये भयावह हैं, डर के रास्ते हैं। मैं भारतीय संस्कृति का उपासक हूँ, परन्तु भारतीय संस्कृति को दो रास्तों से बचाना है। एक रास्ता तो वह है जिस पर हमारे पश्चिम की नक़ल करने वाले भाई चलते हैं। पश्चिमी ढंग की चीजों को, रीति रिवाज को, उस की ज़बान को अपना कर पश्चिम की नक़ल करना या उसकी प्रतिलिपि बनना यह हमारे देश को शोभा नहीं देता। मैं उस का रूप नहीं दिल्ली में देखता हूँ। देश को नहीं दिल्ली का मानसिक रूप नहीं देना है क्योंकि वह भी एक मूढ़ ग्राह है। यह मत समझिए कि मूढ़ ग्राह, सुपरिस्टिशन, बेपढ़े लिखे लोगों में ही होता है। अंग्रेजीदाँ लोगों में मुझे बड़ा गहरा सुपरिस्टिशन दिखाई देता है। वह भरे हुए हैं मूढ़ ग्राह से। कपड़े

पहलने में मूढ़प्राह है कि ऐसे कपड़े पहनेंगे तो हमारी ज्यादा इज्जत होगी। खाने पीने में, रहने सहने में सुपरिस्टिशन दिखाई देता है। उस मूढ़प्राह से हमें देश को बचाना है। भारतीय संस्कृति की रक्षा हमें करनी है। इसका यह मतलब नहीं कि हम अच्छी बातों को भी विचार पूर्वक न लें। मेरी मान्यता है कि हमारा देश बौद्धिक रहा है, मैं इसपर बल देता हूँ। बहुत से अंग्रेज इतिहासकारों ने कहा है कि हमारे यहां परिपाटी को पूजने वाले बहुत हैं, कंजर्वेटिज्म बहुत है। इस में आशिक सत्य है, लेकिन पूरा सत्य नहीं है। हमारा देश अपने भ्रान्तिरिक्त तल में बौद्धिक रहा है, बुद्धि का गुजारी रहा है, बुद्धि के ऊपर उस ने किसी किताब को नहीं रखा है। यो बुद्धेः परतस्तु सः। बुद्धि के ऊपर केवल ईश्वर को माना है, ईश्वर के बाद संसार में बुद्धि तत्व ही है। मैं बुद्धिवादी हूँ, बुद्धि के ऊपर सब पुस्तकों को, सब ट्रेडिशनस को नापने तौलने के लिये तैयार हूँ। यही हमारे यहां का कर्म प्राचीनों का था। हाँ, दो, चार, पांच सौ वर्ष पहले एक अंधेरी रात आई हमारे देश में, उस में हम ने इन मूढ़प्राहों और परिपाटियों और ट्रेडिशनस को पूरी तरह से पकड़ा। परन्तु यदि हम विचार करें तो देखेंगे कि हमारा देश अपने भागों को बदलने में, परिपाटियों को सुधारने में पीछे नहीं रहा है। हमारे देश का ही एक वाक्य है, इस तरह का वाक्य संसार में मैंने और कहीं नहीं सुना। जब यास्क मुनि के शरीर छोड़ने का समय आया तो उन के चेलों ने उन से पूछा, "महाराज, आप जाते हैं, अब वेदों का अर्थ कौन करेगा?" ध्यान रखिये, वेदों का, यास्क मुनि निरुक्त के कर्ता हैं। निरुक्ति वह शास्त्र है जो वेदों के शब्दों को सामने रखता है और उस का अर्थ निकालता है। चेलों ने पूछा, "अब आप जा रहे हैं, वेदों का अर्थ कौन करेगा? हम लोग

किस ऋषि के पास जायें?" यास्क ने जवाब दिया, "किसी ऋषि की जरूरत नहीं है, तर्कों वें ऋषिरुक्तः।" इसका क्या अर्थ तर्क, लाजिक, सिलाजिज्म, यही ऋषि है, वेदों का अर्थ करने के लिये।" यह वाक्य था कि तर्क ही ऋषि है। तर्क का मतलब बुद्धि क्योंकि तर्क का सहारा तो बुद्धि है, तर्क बुद्धि के बिना बढ़ता नहीं। बुद्धि को ही ऋषि बनाना और बुद्धि ही अर्थ करेगी। यह वाक्य हमारे देश की पुरानी परिपाटी को बताता है। हमारा देश बुद्धिवादी रहा है, परिपाटियों का दास नहीं। परिपाटियों अवश्य बनती हैं, किस देश में नहीं है? आज क्या अमेरिका और इंग्लैंड परिपाटियों से बंधे नहीं हैं? बहुत जगहों पर परिपाटियों की बहुत गुलामी रहती है। अगर बुद्धि भी साथ हो तो वे ठी होती रहती हैं। हमारे यहां परिपाटियाँ चलती हैं लेकिन बौद्धिकता पुराने समय से समाज पर प्रभाव डालती रही है।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि आज जहाँ एक ओर हमें पश्चिमी नक़ल से बचना है, वहाँ अपने देश की परिपाटियों का भी जो धर्म के नाम पर चलती है, विश्लेश करना है। 'यह मोक्ष मेला', किसी ने वहाँ पर कहा था, मैं उनका आदर करता हूँ, 'श्रद्धा और भक्ति का सूचक है'। मैं प्रयाम का रहने वाला हूँ। गंगा से मेरा गहरा प्रेम है लेकिन मेरा गंगा में मूढ़प्राह नहीं है। गंगा में बड़े बड़े षडियाल रहते हैं, क्रोकोडाइल रहते हैं। क्या वे वहाँ बुद्धि से, श्रद्धा से रहते हैं? नहीं। मरुत्वाह दिन भर गंगा में रहता हूँ। मेरे मन में गंगा की उपासना इस लिये है कि गंगा के किनारे तपस्वियों ने तप किया था गंगा का जल पवित्र है। परन्तु इस भेड़ियाघासान जो कि एक छोटी सी जगह में जहाँ संगम है वहाँ हजारों आदमी एक साथ स्नान करूँ

[श्री टंडन]

प्रोत्साहन देना उचित नहीं है। यह बुद्धि के विरुद्ध है। मैं इस को भारतीय संस्कृति का विरोधी समझता हूँ। जो लोग इस प्रकार की तबीयत को प्रोत्साहन देते हैं वह सही नहीं करते हैं। वह भारतीय संस्कृति की रक्षा नहीं करते।

मैं अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हमें इन दोनों भयावह रास्तों से बचना चाहिये, एक ग़ोर पश्चिमीय नकल और दूसरी ग़ोर अपने यहां की सब रीतियों को बिना समझे बुझे प्रोत्साहन देना। हमारी संस्कृति प्राचीन है लेकिन बौद्धिक है। जिस तरह का हमारा यह मेला है उस तरह के मेले मुसलमानों में भी चलते हैं; वे भी भ्रवश्य ही बुद्धि के विरुद्ध हैं, उन में कोई भ्रवल नहीं है। मुसलमानों के मेले चलते हैं, हिन्दुओं के मेले चलते हैं और वहां बहुत भीड़ भाड़ होती है। उन में चोर डाकू आते हैं, लुंगाड़े भी आते हैं और श्रद्धावान बहुत थोड़े आते हैं। प्राचीन समय में यह इस लिये होते थे कि वहां अच्छे लोग इकट्ठा होते थे, अच्छे विचार करते थे। आज भी विचार के लिये कुछ थोड़ी सी सभायें होती हैं, वह ठीक है, वहां लोग जायें, परन्तु इस भावना को प्रोत्साहन न दिया जाय कि लोग दौड़े दौड़े दूर दूर से आयें और जल में डुबकी मार कर चले जायं चाहे उनकी भावना न बदले, और वे तप और सत्य का ग्रंथ ले कर न जायं। हमारी प्राचीन अर्थात् के अनुसार सत्य और तप भारतीय संस्कृति के मुख्य ग्रंथ हैं। जहां तप और सत्य नहीं हैं वहां भारतीय संस्कृति नहीं है।

शासन से मेरा कहना है कि आप इन दोनों रास्तों से देश को बचाइये। एक तरफ खाली पश्चिमीय नकल न कीजिये। दूसरी तरफ ऐसे ऐसे मेलों को, जैसा कि अब की बार रेल वालों ने किया, बहुत प्रोत्साहन न

दें। रोक थाम कीजिये। मैं जानता हूँ कि आप की भी सीमायें हैं। जब लोग एक क्रम मानते हैं तो उसको आप रोक नहीं सकते।

श्री त्यागी : भीड़ ज्यादा होती है तो सुभीता देनी पड़ती है।

श्री टंडन : ठीक है, प्रबन्ध करना पड़ता है, लेकिन भीड़ आपके इस के लिये न्योता न दीजिये। निमंत्रण न दीजिये। भीड़ का आवाहन न कीजिये। आप ऐसे अवसर पर लोगों को समझाइये कि भीड़ न करें और गंगा में एकान्त स्थान पर नहार्यें।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह सब पुराण चल रहा है या क्या हो रहा है ?

श्री टंडन : मैं यही कह रहा हूँ कि आप भारतीय संस्कृति को बिना समझे बुझे कीचड़ में घसीटें मत। भारतीय संस्कृति मुड़गाहों या सुपरस्टीशन्स का बंडल नहीं है। जो लोग भारतीय संस्कृति को नहीं समझते हैं वह समय समय पर उसकी बुराई कर देते हैं। वे लोग भी उस को गलत समझते हैं जो उसको ग्रंथविद्वातों का बंडल समझते हैं। भारतीय संस्कृति बौद्धिक है, बुद्धि के ऊपर निर्भर है। जहां बुद्धि नहीं, जहां युक्ति नहीं, वहां भारतीय संस्कृति नहीं, वहां धर्म नहीं। बृहस्पति स्मृति का एक वाक्य याद आ गया, उसे कह कर बैठता हूँ। कहा है : "केवलम् शास्त्रा मिश्रत्य, न कर्तव्योः विनिर्णयः" केवल किताबों का जिनको शास्त्र कहते हैं, सहारा ले कर धर्म का निर्णय नहीं हुआ करता।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

"युक्ति हीन विचारेणु, धर्म हानिः प्रजायते।"

जहां बुद्धि नहीं है, युक्ति नहीं है, उस विचार से धर्म की हानि होती है।

यह मैं सब सदस्यों से कहना चाहता
 चाहे वे हिन्दू हों चाहे वे मुसलमान हों चाहे
 इसाई हों। जो धर्म की युक्ति पर आधारित
 नहीं है वह धर्म कहलाने के योग्य नहीं है।
 भारतीय संस्कृति, भारतीय धर्म बौद्धिक है
 और युक्ति पर निर्भर है। इस कारण से मैं
 शासन को सलाह देता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के
 मूढ़ग्राहों को बिना समझे बूमने प्रोत्साहन न
 दिया करे। बस मेरा यही निवेदन है।

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram):
 This year's Presidential Address is a catalogue of achievements, a general review of the political situation, and an anticipation of aspirations and hopes to be realised; no legislative programme of business has been placed before us. I am mentioning this, Sir, not by way of criticism, but only to underline the fact that hon. Members of this House are entitled to analyse the grounds for optimism and suggest steps for averting the dangers that face our country. I shall be concerned however with only three questions which have been raised in the Presidential Address: an aspect of our Foreign Policy to which little attention has been paid, the employment situation, and the threat to the concept and continuance of a secular State that has acquired a new and formidable shape of late. I shall deal first with foreign policy, particularly as it affects the recent Ceylon-Indian Agreement, and in speaking on this question, I should like hon. Members to bear with me for a while. I have to refer to this very painful and delicate matter especially as it concerns people of Indian origin who have been drawn predominantly from the South. I appeal to all sections of this House to understand the difficulties and dangers which people of Indian origin face in Ceylon, and which we cannot afford to ignore. In order to understand the recent Ceylon-Indian Agreement the House must bear in mind certain aspects of the squeezing policy that have been followed by the Ceylon Government about a year and a half ago or thereabouts.

The Government of Ceylon pursued a policy of squeezing out large numbers of people of Indian origin by administrative measures. Fortunately for us, the Government of India for once took a firm stand by imposing a ban on the entry of such people from Ceylon. Only if India's representative in Ceylon, our High Commissioner, gave permits could they be allowed to land in India. This had the salutary effect of stopping the ejection of large numbers of people of Indian origin who had qualified for citizenship in Ceylon but who had not been recognised as citizens by the Government of Ceylon. Partly as a result of this definite policy there followed talks between the Prime Minister of India and the then Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. Dudley Senanayake in London. Tentative conclusions, according to authoritative reports reaching us, were arrived at whereby the bulk of the people of Indian origin not absorbed as yet by Ceylon were to be immediately granted citizenship or allowed to reside as permanent citizens and eventually absorbed in Ceylon. It was also reported that our Government then did not accept these tentative conclusions and make them final because of its objection to compulsory repatriation in principle. I want to ask a straight question, Sir: What has transpired since the talks were held in June last to warrant a change in front and the acceptance of terms which are more disadvantageous to us and also to people of Indian origin in Ceylon in whom we have necessarily to take a direct interest?

We have accepted two tricky conditions: firstly, the number of citizens or people to be absorbed as citizens, has been left indefinite; and secondly, the Ceylon Government has a right to give inducements to people of Indian origin to leave that Island for India. What is the effect of these provisions? The effect of these provisions is to give an opportunity to forces in Ceylon to scale down the figure of people who are expected to be absorbed, a figure which might be, I fear, far lower than what might have been possible had the ten-

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

tative conclusions of the London Conference been finalised. As for inducements, it depends almost entirely on two factors: firstly, the meaning which the Ceylon Government intend to give to the principle of inducements and secondly, the manner in which our High Commissioner in Ceylon uses his undoubted powers to prevent forced repatriation in the guise of inducements to leave Ceylon for India. I hope that the Government of India will adopt a strong attitude on this issue and that it will take proper steps to instruct our High Commissioner to be on the alert, so that we might have, as a result of a fair balancing of forces a just operation of what must be considered to be a difficult and ambiguous understanding.

Many criticisms have been made of the Ceylon-Indian agreement. One criticism which was made in another place was that separate electorates are a curse and that the Government acted unwisely in accepting the principle of separate electorates. I suppose my hon. friend's witters are unwrung by the concession that he has made in favour of separate electorates for a limited section of our population of Indian origin in Ceylon. Citizenship, let us remember, is after all an internal affair and it is left to each sovereign State to determine the conditions for admitting people to enjoy the rights of citizenship. If it is felt by the Government of Ceylon that people of Indian origin in some areas should not be allowed to influence, what I feel and what is at the back of their minds, the balance of power of parties in Ceylon, we cannot quarrel with it if it decides to have them on a separate register. May it not after all be better to have people of Indian origin on a separate register rather than to have them on no register at all, and eventually leave it to the passage of time, good sense and natural tolerance to have them on a common register?

There is another aspect of the Indo-Ceylon problem which was emphasised by the Prime Minister as President of

the Indian National Congress in 1939 and which paradoxically enough has not received due recognition from the Government over which he presides. What active steps have we taken either on the diplomatic or on the political front to bring the population of Indian origin into live association with other political parties in Ceylon? This after all, is the main problem which faces Indians overseas in many lands and this is the problem to which we will all have to address ourselves sooner or later. Those who have decided to apply for citizenship rights in Ceylon must be absorbed and there is therefore a duty cast on us to hasten the process of absorption. We, on the other hand, have been oblivious of this aspect of the matter, allowed ourselves, our High Commissioners and agents to be reduced from the position of mediators into one of sponsors of a separate existence, thus diminishing our prestige and weakening the very people whose interests we claim to have at heart. This is inevitable if we do not take positive steps to bring about an identification of the interests of those of Indian origin with those of the indigenous population. I recommend therefore to the Government that we should send to Ceylon a goodwill mission consisting of members drawn from all parties in India so that they might bring about this highly desired and desirable objective. May I not once again request the Prime Minister to approach this problem from a human angle, to take proper steps to safeguard the interests of our people, and to instruct our High Commissioner to be on the alert, so that the agreement may be worked to the mutual advantage of both countries?

I now pass to the question of employment. I do not agree with hon. friends opposite that the employment situation has appreciably improved in our country. There is, a feeling that those who are unemployed will always get used to it if after a while they do not get employment. There is also the other factor that after harvests a certain increase of activity is bound to be witnessed in the trading sector and hence

a certain degree of improvement is witnessed which is purely seasonal. The situation, however, is definitely bad on the economic front. Our revenue receipts have gone down. While non-development expenditure has been stationary, the cash balances with the different States are still high. We are now having something like over Rs. 80 crores in many of these States, instead of Rs. 50 crores. There is also this other point which we have to realise, that so far as the absorption of treasury bills is concerned, we have absorbed only to the extent of Rs. 20 crores and not to the extent of Rs. 100 crores as anticipated at the time of the last Budget. So we have not spent even a fraction of what we anticipated, the economy continues to be in a stationary condition, and investment has not increased. How is it possible to assume that employment has increased?

I shall deal, rather briefly, with the threat to the very concept of a secular State. It is clear that the constitutional provisions allowing a place to English for fifteen years concerns all States and the Union. When one particular constituent unit like Bombay passes an executive order or a legislative enactment affecting this policy we have a right to expect from the Union Government a clarification of its views and standpoint. I want that clarification to be made. Such a clarification need not, and should not, be a review of State action; nor need our views on policy be binding on our courts of law. Parliament has a definite responsibility which it cannot avoid. We must have a discussion on this policy as affecting us. It is in the context of this responsibility, in the context of the background relating to the continuance of English for fifteen years, that we will have to be concerned with articles 29 and 30 relating to minority protection and find out how far we are respecting the spirit and intentment of the constitution. It is not only appropriate but desirable that both the Union Executive and the Union Parliament should have an opportunity of expressing their views on this matter, at least as a guidance to

individual State action. Especially let us remember that courts of law are concerned with the limited question of constitutional validity whereas we will have to be concerned with broader issues of high policy. The very continuance of a secular State has of late been brought into jeopardy, by the recent order passed by the Government of Bombay segregating Anglo-Indian children from children of other communities. Besides the concept of a secular state relates not to individual federating units but to the Union as a whole, and the actions of a State sometimes have as in this instance far-reaching repercussions on a secular State—just as policies and actions of individual States might have repercussions on foreign relations, foreign trade and other matters of national importance. In fact, the Prime Minister who is the fond parent of the Directive Principles and the concept of a secular State in our Constitution should be the first person to intervene and save his creations from asphyxiation and doom.

I have not the time to refer to the Kumbh Mela tragedy. It is a sorry tale of woe. I do not wish to say harsh things which would add more passion to what is already in evidence. But I ask one question. How long are we going to have explanations of pathetic helplessness on this matter? Is it after all correct to affirm that we do not have responsibility for what has occurred? For instance, at an early stage when the Uttar Pradesh Government relaxed Cholera inoculation restrictions, many of us realised that there would be a great influx of population into the Kumbh Mela Area. Had the Central Government acted with promptitude, and insisted on restrictions being observed possibly, so many millions would not have congregated and the tragedy might have been averted. I do not want to elaborate this point, but I leave it to the consciences of Ministers to find answers to the doubts that I have raised.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru Sir, I am grateful to you for this permission to intervene in this debate at this stage.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

During the last few days a great many speeches have been delivered here, and many and diverse subjects discussed. It is rather difficult for me to deal with all those matters, and therefore, with your permission, I will only deal with some of them.

First of all, may I repeat what, I think, I said on a previous occasion in regard to the President's Address. Acharya Kripalani said that the President's Address was 'formal' and not 'inspiring'. Others have also said something to that effect. Now, if I may say so, the President's Address is meant to be formal. Of course, it is always better to be inspiring, but inspiration is not so easy to find as to express. The President's Address is a formal statement, naturally, for which the Government is responsible. Sometimes the hon. Members have thought, and sometimes even the Press outside has criticised it, that the President's Address has repeated what the Government have said. What else can we do? This is a Government statement of broad policy which the President lays before the joint session of the two Houses. It can be nothing else. It cannot be sensational, normally speaking. It cannot state any very novel fact, normally speaking. If any very important step is to be taken by Government, they would naturally come to this House, discuss it here, and not spring it as a surprise on them in the President's Address. Therefore, I would beg the House to consider the context in which the President's Address is delivered.

The hon. Member, Mr. Jaipal Singh, said that the President's Address should not deal with controversial matters. I agree with him, I believe in the sense he meant this, because obviously, if the President's Address refers to controversial legislation, that is a controversial matter. He gave us an instance—the reference in the Address to the Kumbh Mela tragedy and, he said that the President had given a 'chit' or a pat on the back of the U.P. Government. Well, I was surprised to hear that and I looked

back on the Address. All that the President said in that connection was that the U.P. Government had taken great pains to make satisfactory arrangements for this great concourse of human beings. But, the trouble occurred. I really do not know how anyone can call that 'lack of pre-judging'. The fact that the Government took pains—they might have failed, they might have committed mistakes subsequently—but the fact that it took pains is a fact which nobody can challenge or dispute. It is not a controversial matter. Well, I do not agree with him. Now, this debate has unfortunately been somewhat overshadowed by this Kumbh Mela tragedy which, important as it is and tragic as it was, really bears little relation to the wide topics that we are discussing. As my hon. friend Shri Tandon stated, we should await the results of the enquiry that is being held there. In regard to one aspect of it, which was specially stressed by Acharya Kripalani, a broader aspect, I hope to say something at a later stage. But, the main subjects that we have to discuss here, I submit, are the broad issues before the country, whether in the international field or in the domestic field and we should avoid going into narrow issues which we can discuss at other times.

If you look at the world today, it is full of problems, tensions and fears. It seems to be wrapped up by a mantle of fear and search for security, and, unfortunately, search for security often leads to an addition of the tension of the world. Obviously, no country, not even the greatest country and the most powerful country in the world, can have it all its own way; much less any country like India, with no power in the sense of military might or financial power, with the only power, if you like to say so, of our faith in some things, if that is any power. Therefore, we may well complain of things that we do not like; but, we should look at things in their true perspective, as to what can be done and what

cannot be done, and try to do our best. We cannot always bring about the results which we hope for. But, anyhow, I believe if we try to do our best some good results follow.

Today, we have in Asia especially, special problems which we have to face. The geography of India, centrally situated as we are, apart from any other reason connects us with these problems both in the west of Asia, and in the south-east and east, and inevitably we have to shoulder this responsibility, apart from the mere size of our country, bigness of our population, and our potential resources, and all that. So, we have become tied up occasionally with external matters even though we have tried to avoid involvement as far as possible.

The House knows that only yesterday some of our troops that had been sent to Korea have come back. Others are following within a few days and that chapter in Korea is over, that is, the chapter in which our Custodian Force and our representatives in the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission functioned there. I need not say much about that now. Most of the facts are known to Members. They have appeared in the public Press. I hope at some later stage, in a few days time, to place a statement upon the Table of the House, more for record than for any additional information. In regard to Korea.

The object aimed at by this Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission has not been attained—or fully attained—and unfortunately, most of the problems remain unsolved. That is a misfortune. But I think most people agree that our representatives there on the Commission who had a very very delicate task to face, as well as our Custodian Force, did as well as they could have been possibly expected to do, with the result, I think that however much there might be differences in the view point that was taken up by our representatives, all parties concerned have paid a tribute to their impartiality in this

work. (Cheers.) The cheering of the House indicates that the House would like to send out its good wishes for their return.

5 P. M.

Although all or nearly all the problems remain, Korea had nevertheless one bright feature about it, namely, that the fighting there which was terrible for two or three years, stopped; at least, that slaughter ended. Only the problems remain, although the problems are difficult enough.

There is one thing in this connection that I might mention. The House probably knows that there was a difference of opinion about many matters but more specially as to how this Commission should end its labours about the prisoners of war that were with it, and the opinion of the Chairman, i.e. the representative of India, was that the various processes laid down in the agreement between the two parties had not been gone through; however, there was no alternative left to the Commission but to restore those prisoners of war to their own detaining sides.

One particular difficulty faced us in the past few days. That was in regard to seventeen persons—I am not sure about the figure, but I think it is seventeen—undertrial for very serious crimes, including murder. They were being tried under court-martial set up by our forces there. Unfortunately, those trials could not be completed, partly because of lack of cooperation by some parties. The result was that those persons charged with serious crimes raised the problem as to what should be done with them. It was patent that the Indian Custodian Force could not continue with the court-martial, because it was not going to remain there. It was patent also that it could not bring them with it to India. On the other hand, it seemed obviously right that the trial of those persons who had been so charged should somehow be completed and they should be punished or acquitted after trial, as the case may be. So, in this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

dilemma the Indian Custodian Force decided to hand over those persons to their own detaining sides with a strong request that these trials should be proceeded with and completed. I do not know exactly what is likely to happen to them, but I do feel that it would be a travesty of justice if persons who *prima facie* have been shown to have committed those very serious crimes are merely discharged.

I mentioned Korea, but there are so many other places in the world which offer tremendous problems. Only recently, the House knows that the Four Great Powers met in Berlin, and for many, many days there was argument about Germany, about Austria, and about other matters. Unfortunately, that argument did not yield any substantial results except for one thing which was a bright spot towards the conclusion, that is, the four Great Powers agreed to hold a Conference in Geneva on the 26th of April to consider the Korean problem and also Indo-China. I presume that the Chinese Government has agreed to this procedure, because it is intimately involved and its presence is obviously essential.

Now, I just mentioned that in Korea, whatever difficulties there might remain, the fact is that war has stopped. It is a very big thing. Unfortunately, in Indo-China war has not stopped and is being continued in a very terrible way. It is six years now since this Indo-China war began and for the present I do not propose to say anything more about it, because of this that anyhow all of us here—and many others, I have no doubt—would obviously welcome some kind of ending of this actual war, but more especially when it has been proposed to discuss this matter two months hence by the Great Powers concerned. It seems a tremendous pity that this war should continue when a serious attempt is going to be made to find a way out. Now, it is not for me to suggest anything, and certainly it is with no desire to intervene in any way or intrude or involve ourselves or any-

thing like that, but I do venture to suggest to all the parties and the Powers concerned that in view of the fact that this matter of Indo-China is going to be discussed at the Geneva conference two months later, it might be desirable—it is desirable, I think—to have some kind of cease-fire without any party giving up its own position, whatever they might consider their right etc., because, once one starts arguing about rights, then there will be no end to that argument. So, I would make this very earnest appeal in all humility—and I am sure this House will join with me—to the Powers to strive to have a cease-fire there. Then they can discuss it in their own way. I repeat that so far as we are concerned, we have no desire to interfere or to shoulder any burden or responsibility in this connection.

Now, from this Korean war, even more so the Indo-China war—and if I may mention some other places where not a war of this kind, but nevertheless, continuous military operations have been going on, like in Malaya, like in some parts of Africa—one sees that nowadays once even a little war starts, it goes on and on; military operations start, they go on and on. It is difficult to stop them. It is difficult to conclude them or to reach at any satisfactory solution of the problem through those means. Now, without going into this question of Indo-China, it is patent that for these last two years the balances have sometimes been weighted this side or that without making too much difference. Sometimes one party advances in a military sense, retreats a little. I do not know exactly what the military position is, I cannot say, but any person can see that for five years they have been fighting and killing each other without any decision being arrived at. That itself, I think, might lead us to certain conclusions. If even in these relatively small wars it is difficult to arrive at a conclusion by military means, what is likely to happen if, unfortunately, a big, global war

descended upon us? Would it be an unending affair which went on and on with nobody to end it, no final conclusion arrived at, or what else would it be? It is dangerous today even to start a small war. People may think that it may be a small operation. It is not. It goes on and on regardless of the merits of the case. And therefore it is desirable to keep this in mind, and therefore, in Indo-China certainly, but I hope in the other places I mentioned also,—some other approach might be made, at any rate to end this killing, because there can be no doubt that, apart from the horror of this continuous killing in warfare or in military operations, this leaves a tremendous trail of bitterness and conflict behind. It does not matter ultimately what the result of military operation is, if in the minds of millions of people fear or bitterness remains, because that will give rise to all future troubles again, and there is no ending of that. Personally, I am convinced that there can be no true solution of these problems at this stage, by the method of warfare, whether it is in a small way or in a big way. So, I would appeal to the Great Powers and the little Powers and all concerned, perhaps, to make an effort in this direction, and to see in some other way, but anyhow to begin with to try to stop by cease-fire or otherwise these operations.

Now I refer to the Berlin Conference which was recently held, and which, if I may say so with all respect, was rather disappointing, apart from this final conclusion which we must welcome, i.e. a meeting will be held in Geneva. Nevertheless, I would like the House to consider that even that Berlin Conference, which brought no good result, itself is a good sign; the mere meeting together and discussing and considering various viewpoints—all these, at any rate, not only avoid any more tragic developments like war, but indicate this continued search for peaceful settlements. I have no doubt that the people of all countries in the world hanker after peace, hanker after real peace, not merely an absence of shooting war. What have we got to-

day? We call it the cold war; and the cold war is undoubtedly better than a shooting war, anything would be better than a shooting war. Nevertheless, a cold war is a pretty bad thing. It means obsession against each other, it means fear all the time,—fear of war and fear of losing one's security,—with the result that there is continuous tension; so far as the economic side is concerned, it is upset, of course, because it cannot function normally; politically, there is this tremendous tension, hatreds, dislikes and always living on the verge of violence on a big scale.

I wonder how this generation that is growing up in many parts of the world, thinking always in terms of the cold war, in terms of the possible big war, in terms of hatred of this country and that, those people and these people, will function when it grows up. The environment, the context in which the present day generations are growing up, seem to me a terrible thought. The other day, some hon. Members might have seen the Children's Art Exhibition that was held in Delhi, organised by *Shanker's Weekly* children's Number. There were thousands of pictures from all over the world, produced by children. It was an extraordinary collection, a very fine collection, apart from its artistic merits, showing what children all over the world were thinking. It was an oppressing thought, when I saw those pictures; how many of those children have produced nightmarish pictures, just some kind of horrible nightmares,—as if they had had. It showed possibly the fear of this environment in which these children are growing up, of hatred, of violence, of possible wars, and all that. So, this is what we are contending against, quite apart from the avoidance of war. Almost, one might think that there is some evil enchantment over the world, which oppresses us, and hence oppresses the widespread feeling of people all over the world, for peace and goodwill, and to live their normal lives; and we cannot go out of this enchantment. We meet in conference and the like-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and sometimes we talk to each other at long distances, much hoping for peace and settlement and some way out but somehow functioning so as to make this difficult. That is the basic problem before the world and with that, you come—that is somewhat complicated for us in Asia—by all kinds of new forces being let loose in Asia and to some extent in Africa. We are interested in the world's problems because they affect us as they affect the whole world. We are interested particularly in Asian problems because we are part of Asia. We are interested in African problems for a variety of reasons, a very minor reason being of course that, whether it is in Africa or parts of Asia outside India, large numbers of Indians live there. We are interested in them. But the real problems are not of Indian overseas but of the people who live in those countries overseas. None of these problems, I venture to say, is going to be settled now by compulsion and violent compulsion. Somehow, the forces which were kept in check in the past cannot be kept in check now. I may venture to put forward an objective analysis without really going into the merits. My sympathies are clear, the House's sympathies are clear, but apart from sympathies,—it is not an objective analysis,—I think, one cannot suppress, for whatever reason, these basic forces of nationalism, of freedom, that have arisen in Asia or in Africa or elsewhere. To that, of course, I would add the feeling, the strong feeling, against racialism which exists in those continents.

Now, that is the position. The House knows our policy. It is sometimes miscalled a neutral policy or neutralism, and we are told that we are sitting on the fence, that we are afraid of this country or that country, and that therefore we have not got the courage of our convictions. Well, we lack many things, and sometimes, maybe we even lack wisdom but I do not think we lack the capacity to express our thoughts clearly or to express them without

being oppressed by fear. I think that people in India, by and large, suffer less at the present moment from this oppressive fear which envelops great continents and countries than those in many other places.

This policy that we have adopted has grown naturally out of our past history, past tradition, past way of thinking, and present conditions. It is a policy which can be justified both on the idealistic grounds and on strictly practical considerations. We do not want to enter into this circle of hatred, violence and fear which the cold war embodies. As far as possible, we do not want other countries that remain out of it, to enter it, because if we are searching for peace, if the world is searching for peace, it may not get the peace it desires, certainly because the problems are terribly complicated. But anyhow one should do two things: one is to avoid doing anything which adds to the tensions of the world today, which adds to the fears of the world today. The other is of course a more positive approach of reducing those tensions. Now, if some step is taken which actually adds to those fears, then it is, I submit, an ill-service to the cause of peace. So in this context we have to function in this world, and to function with the courage of our convictions and without fear. At the same time, being friendly to all countries does not mean that we agree with the views or the activities of other countries; we have our own views. But it is my conviction and, I believe the House also agrees with me in this matter, that at any time, and more especially at the present time, it does not help even to say, if you like, even to express your opinion in condemnation of some other country, even though you might think that it is the right opinion; because that merely adds to those tensions, and when people are moved by so much anger and prejudice, their minds are not open to reason or logical argument.

Now, so far as India is concerned, we try to avoid entanglement in foreign issues. We cannot hope to

wholly avoid it of course, because we have to play our part in this world, and no country can be isolated, much less India—whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere. But we are particularly concerned with our neighbour countries, and naturally we wish that our relations with these neighbour countries should be as close and cordial as possible. I am glad to say that they are so, unhappily with one exception. So far as Burma is concerned, we are on terms of great cordiality and friendship. There are at present some talks going on with the Burmese Government in regard to certain matters, certain issues between the two countries, and I have little doubt that they will result in a satisfactory agreement. So far as Ceylon is concerned, many hon. Members have referred to the recent Indo-Ceylonese Agreement and partly criticised it; partly, they felt that there might be something in it which might lead to wrong results. As a matter of fact, as I have stated previously, this Indo-Ceylonese Agreement in regard to the people of Indian descent in Ceylon is not a settlement of the problem at all; it is a first step towards that. In fact, it repeats what actually is the position: it only repeats that position in a friendly way, in a better way, in a cooperative way. In the solution of this problem, it is perfectly clear that the cooperation of the two Governments and the goodwill of the two Governments and of the people concerned is essential. Now, if this agreement leads to that atmosphere of goodwill and co-operative effort, we have achieved a great thing. Have we given up any vital principle in it? I submit, not. I will not go into the details of it. It is true that in some places in Ceylon some kind of interpretations have taken place which have extended the scope of this agreement. Obviously, we are not bound by interpretations with which we do not agree and which do not flow from that agreement. The main thing is that we have put this question after several years on a different level of approach, a friendly level, and I hope that this will yield results.

The House knows that for some time past, for a month or more, there have been discussions going on in Peking between our representatives and the representatives of the People's Government of China in regard to certain matters affecting Tibet. These discussions are still proceeding. They are proceeding on the whole satisfactorily and I hope that before very long they will also yield a satisfactory result.

Now, so far as these neighbouring countries are concerned, our relations are very good. They are very good with countries of Western Asia and with Egypt. It is unfortunate that with Pakistan, which is not only our close neighbour but which is more closely bound to us by past history, culture tradition and all manner of other bonds than any other country, there should be certain remaining problems which have affected our relationship. I shall not go into these problems.

So far as canal waters issue is concerned, it is still being discussed in Washington between the parties' representatives. I believe, considerable progress has been made, but that is all I can say. I do not know what the final result will be. Other issues like evacuee property are still pending and of late on these matters, there has been a great deal of frustration for us. The major issue remains—Kashmir. I shall deal with this matter a little later; and I shall also refer to certain new developments which have taken place in regard to Pakistan.

I have referred to foreign affairs; but the most vital thing for us, obviously, is our domestic position, the economic progress that we might make or try to make; that is the essential factor. You can measure it by production, per capita consumption, the reduction of unemployment, as you like, because they all go together. This is hardly the time to go into these matters fully. But, I do wish to lay stress that after all in this variety of problems that we are faced with, this is the most vital and major problem for us. The fact that I do not

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 deal with this at length in this present reply of mine does not indicate that our Government attaches any less importance to it; but, it cannot be dealt with in this scrappy way. For my part, I would welcome the House to discuss any aspect of it more fully, if and when we have the time for it.

But, I would like hon. Members to look at this picture a little objectively. It is the right—and may be the duty—of the Opposition to criticise and condemn. I accept that; I like that. If there is not that criticism—and even harsh criticism, if you like.—any government is likely to become slack. And, therefore, it is not with any desire to limit that criticism of the Opposition that I would submit that we might look at this problem a little objectively. It is very easy, in a very large country like India, passing through these difficult times, facing difficult problems,—to criticise and find fault, and that criticism may well be justified, and the faults that are pointed out may well be there. And, at the same time, you may well find other factors which are admirable or which are praiseworthy or which are worthy of commendation. They are both there and one can pick and choose; in a country like India you can make a list on either side. Ultimately one has to see, in the balance, what is happening, whether we are going on in a particular direction or not and whether it is the right direction. I think that if I could take hon. Members with me on a voyage of discovery of India as it is today, I have no doubt they could show me many things that I am not aware of, but I could also show them many things, of which perhaps they are not fully seized, although they read about them in newspapers. Nevertheless, it does make a difference when we see things actually in practice before us and have some kind of emotional awareness of what is happening instead of merely reading something, because I travel about India and see what is happening there both in regard to vast and magnificent undertakings that are now taking shape and that will give results very

soon, and, in regard to many small things and in regard to what our own people are doing themselves. It is not governmental effort; it is what the people are doing, maybe with the help of some governmental effort. I am excited and I have a sense of exhilaration—I wish to make it clear—not in praise of the Government with which I am associated, though I think in many matters the Government has done well, but I rather think not as the Government functioning, but as the people of India functioning. It is a matter of pride to me to see the millions of our countrymen and countrywomen gradually moulding this new India that we are striving for. It is to be moulded—I have no doubt about it—not only in the big places about which you read in the newspapers, but in tens of thousands of the villages of India today, and I hope that those tens of thousands will become hundreds of thousands in a year or two. When India is in travail of giving birth to new things all the time, a new India is taking shape, and I feel that all our old history—whatever it is, 5000, 8000 or 10,000 years—will stand as witness to see what is happening in this old, ancient country of ours which has put on a new garb. It is a magnificent adventure that all of us are engaged in, and when I look at this, I do not think of it as something for which my Government is responsible or the Party with which I am connected is responsible, but as something in which all of us here in this House and all over the country are responsible in some measure. Therefore, I would beg hon. Members to look at this picture in this way, not in the slightest degree limiting their criticism or condemnation—it is right, it is a democratic way of functioning, and I would welcome it, but nevertheless I think it is unfortunate that in criticising Government, very often hon. Members opposite criticise the people of India too.....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Not in the least.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ...and do not realise that it is ultimately the people of India who are functioning to-day.

Shri S. S. More: No, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Members, who do not apparently agree with that statement, if I may say so, simply indicate that they are somewhat out of tune with the people of India. I do not mean to say that the Government's way is the best way. I am not referring to that. It may be a better way. This Government may adopt a better way or some other Government may adopt a better way, but after all, the amount of divergence may be considerable. Nevertheless, fundamentally, the work that is being done in India is the work that any government would have to do and it is the work which the people of India are doing. It is an essential item and I shall come back to it at a somewhat later stage in another connection.

It is an important thing that we should keep in tune with the people of India. My hon. friend Dr. Jaisooriya, was kind enough to say some good words about me, about my modern way of thinking and all that. Well, whether I am modern and to what extent I am modern is a matter which can be considered separately at leisure. But of one thing I am deeply conscious, that in this great journey that we are making,—call it a pilgrimage,—towards a better future, we have to go with 360 million companions. It is not my modernity, or anybody else's conservatism, or reactionary tendencies, whatever that might be, that matters. I am all for modernity. But remembering that we are fellow-travellers with hundreds of millions of our people, we have to go with them, carry them with us, or be carried by them,—put it as you like—and not isolate ourselves in that ivory tower attitude, or a feeling of being superior to others. We may be superior intellectually. But the journey is of the people of India, not of individuals, or a small group here and there, who may consider themselves superior.

Therefore, in that journey we have to convince them, we have to carry them with us. And how? We have adopted a democratic method here. Apart from this democratic method we have, even in the course of our struggle for freedom, adopted a peaceful method. Of course, normally speaking, democratic and peaceful methods have to go together.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Non-violently.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe the hon. Member does not like the peaceful method! If there are certain basic things within the context of a peaceful and democratic method, I believe much can be done. Indeed I believe that if you go outside that context we are not likely to do much. I am not for the moment discussing economic theories, whatever they might be, and I am not discussing anything for the wide world. I know my India, I hope, a little and I cannot, and I do not presume to advise any other country as to what they should do internally or externally. But looking at the picture of India as we have it, I have no doubt in my mind that any method that is not a peaceful method is likely to yield terrible results. And if you break up the unity of India, all your efforts at progress will be doomed, naturally. I want to keep these two things apart. I want to appeal to hon. Members opposite for co-operation in the fullest measure in these great tasks, keeping entirely apart their policies, their view-points—I do not wish to touch them—and their freedom to express them and to criticise us and condemn us. Nevertheless, try to separate the two things. If there are failures of, if you like, a Government that is not up to your high standards, or any standards, certainly, criticise, by all means. But a Government which for the moment represents the people of India, however humble, however little the members of the Government might be, however many failures they may have to their credit, nevertheless, because they represent the people of India, something of the greatness of the people of India comes to this Government.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

provided we represent the masses. So, I would beg to them, I would beg of the hon. Members to look at this tremendous adventure of India. It is an adventure and at the same time—speaking not only of India but of other countries also—it is, if you may call it, a struggle for survival for many of our countries, in Asia and elsewhere, either from the possibilities of war or from economic troubles. We have to fight this great fight and win—and we are going to win. Then why should we not have a common ground to fight this on all fronts in our democratic, peaceful way, criticising and holding to our different policies as much as we like? I do not suggest that any person or any group should give up his view-point; it is necessary that all view-points—even those view-points with which I may entirely disagree—should be fully expressed.

Some hon. Members spoke; I think it was in connection with the proposed military aid which possibly the United States Government might give to Pakistan and the consequences that might flow from it. They said, referring to this why our Government, or I, do not take them into confidence so that we may all function in unity. Of course I want all of us to function in any grave matter affecting the nation,—or for the matter of that, in any other matter—with as large a measure of unity as possible. And for my part, I will be happy to consult any Member of this House or groups in this House on such occasions. But it is obvious that a united policy must be based on some unity of outlook, basic unity of outlook. If there is divergence right at the base, it is difficult to build up a structure of unity and follow a united policy. If some hon. Members in this House tell us that our foreign policy has been completely misconceived and misguided and we should throw it overboard and do something else, obviously there is no unity of approach left there because that policy is not merely a tactical exercise but something based on our growth, our movement and our thinking as well as a number of other considerations. And

it has shown good results; that is my judgement—hon. Members may challenge it. There must be some unity of outlook like that.

If I criticise or feel that it is an unfortunate move for the United States of America to give military aid to Pakistan, one hon. Member gets up and says: why don't we also accept military aid from the United States? That shows that either it has been our misfortune not to explain our policy with the precision which could enable him to grasp what it is, or he considers me completely wrong; because, if I consider that military aid being given to Pakistan is wrong, quite apart from the question of India, from the Asian point, from a number of view-points, then if we commit that wrong we will be doomed and we will have no justification left for any policy after that. Therefore, we must be clear about that. Or, some other people would suggest; because the United States of America has done this, rush up to the Soviet Union and get their military aid! The whole thing is based on some kind of inverted thinking. What I mean is this, that the whole thing is entirely opposed to either approach. As I mentioned, it is entirely opposed to the basic policy that we have been pursuing. And if we take any country's aid—I am not going into the merits of it—any outside country's aid, well, our whole policy ends there and we have to consider afresh as to how we should proceed in the matter. Therefore I submit that there must be some unity of outlook.

Apart from this, there are certain basic things which, I submit, must be borne in mind. If we are to proceed peacefully and democratically there is, under our Constitution, the authority of Parliament; our President who is the symbol of the State, above party and the rest of it. He may of course, as President in his Address represent what the Government wish to do. It is a different matter. But he is a symbol of the State. There is our Flag; our National Anthem. I am

mentioning obvious things. I am mentioning them, and what I say I am not saying by way of complaint but in sorrow: it is a matter of deep grief to me that at the beginning of this session some hon. Members deliberately and ostentatiously kept away when the President addressed the joint session of both Houses of Parliament. I am not going into the merits. But the President is a symbol of the State, of the dignity of the State. And it is not so much here, but in some of our State Assemblies also this is being done with the Governor there, who is also a symbol. It is totally immaterial whether you like the Governor, whether he is beautiful to look at or not so attractive to look at. These are symbols of the State, of the unity of the State. And if we do not respect that symbol we do injury to the conception of the unity of that State. If one party does it and another does it, it may well become a practice for some group or other to act in that way because they do not like something. I do appeal, not only to hon. Members here but elsewhere, that these conventions ought to be observed. Why is there a convention—which we have taken from other parliaments, notably the British Parliament—for me to say “the hon. Member opposite” or “the learned Member” or “my learned colleague”? These are conventions. It does not quite follow when I say “learned Member” that he is very learned! But these are conventions to promote, if I may use the word, civilised behaviour. Because, if we use these terms, it does pull us up; it keeps up a certain level of conduct which is becoming and dignified. We are the Parliament of India and high dignity attaches to us. And it is right that we should set an example to others.

I will not say much about the economic conditions except to say this on my behalf and on behalf of my Government, that in regard to economic matters we approach them with a completely open mind, with no dogmas, no fixed ideas about them. We are prepared to discuss anything with anybody—about our Five Year Plan, or

about our Second Five Year Plan—and prepared to change anything, accept anything, if we are convinced. Because the problem is a difficult one. And I hope the House will agree that there is no easy remedy for it. It does not matter what policy we pursue so long as we do hard work and have unity. It may be that some other approach other than the one we are pursuing might produce better results. Let us examine it. We are prepared to examine everything.

An hon. Member talked about our administrative machinery and quoted me at some length. Well, we are examining that and I hope that we will be able to improve it in that way. I would like to say this however—because the administration was criticised—that it is easy to criticise it and it is easy to point out some failures here and there. Nevertheless, I think our administrative machinery has adapted itself and is adapting itself to present day conditions, with some considerable success, and that as a whole our administrative machinery—not the machinery, but rather the people, the personnel of that machinery,—is as good as you can find in any other country. Naturally, I do not speak for all of them. When they are tens and thousands I cannot speak for all of them; there are people who are excellent, good, fair, and all that. But, taking it by and large it is so, and I submit with some respect that I speak with some knowledge of other countries as well as my own. But, anyhow, we have to improve it and we have to adapt it to the changing conditions. I entirely agree with the hon. Member who said something about our old rules and regulations and all that about the Services and the way the administration should function. I entirely agree that all this should be replaced. In fact, we are at the present moment engaged in that process and I hope, within a measurable distance of time, this would be done. It is a complicated structure and not so easy to change things because one change will bring about another change. Anyhow, I submit to this House that it is, at the present moment, open for innumerable

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

criticisms to be made. I criticise my own Government and that too frequently. I do not see why I should not. But, of course, there is a difference between my criticism and perhaps some other criticism. I criticise in a friendly way—often that criticism may be expressed in angry terms actually—because it is a matter between one's colleagues. But, we want to improve. We want the help of everybody to do that. It is a terrific job, this governance of India, at any time, more especially after these vital changes, more especially in the context of the world today. I believe, speaking with all humility, we have done rather a good job of it, in spite of all the failures. Maybe, somebody else would have done it better. But, let us consider this matter, economic, administrative and everything, with a view to find better ways of doing it and adopt that better way.

Now, I should like to refer to the proposed U.S. aid to Pakistan. Recently the House has seen that there has been a Pact between Turkey and Pakistan and it is said that this is likely to be followed by some kind of arrangement between the United States and Pakistan for military aid. I spoke about this matter in December last, before the House adjourned, and expressed our concern about it. That concern was not so much due to any ill-feeling against Pakistan—it was not at all due to that—and certainly not due to any ill-feeling against America. But, I felt then and I have felt strongly ever since that this step is a wrong step and a step which adds to the tensions of the world, to the fears of the world, a step which if it can be justified at all, can be justified only on one ground that it is a step towards peace and that it is a step towards ensuring security. No doubt I am prepared to accept that that is the feeling governing some of the people behind this step. But, I am quite clear in my mind.—I need not labour that point, it is obvious,—it seems to me that instead of adding to the security of the world or of Asia, it adds to the tension in Asia, it adds to the

feelings of insecurity in Asia and it adds, therefore, to the fears and apprehensions in Asia and elsewhere. Therefore, it is a wrong step from the point of view of peace or removal of tensions. It may be that from some military point of view,—I am no soldier—it may be justified. I cannot say that. But, I do submit that soldiers are very fine persons, and soldiers are very necessary, at any rate, in the present day world, but when it comes to the judging of world affairs through the soldiers' eyes and ears, it is a dangerous thing. A soldier's idea of security is one thing; a politician's or statesman's may be somewhat different. They have to be co-ordinated. When war comes, the soldier is supreme and his voice prevails almost, not quite. But, when it comes to the soldier's voice prevailing in peace time, it means that peace is likely to be converted into war.

How then do we balance? Here is this kind of evil enchantment over the world which prevents us from going in the right direction; here is the world with all the strength and power in it to solve the economic problems, poverty and all these things. For the first time in history, it has got strength and power to do it. But, instead of proceeding to do that and having a better future for the whole of humanity, we have these fears, and tensions and representations for war, and maybe war itself. It is an extraordinary thing.

How are we to lessen these tensions? Not by thinking in military terms all the time. I agree, and I accept this, that no country can ignore the military aspect. No country can weaken itself and offer itself as a target to some other country to take advantage of that weakness. Having accepted that, nevertheless, if one is to try for peace, it is not by talking of war, by issuing threats and by all the time preparing for war in a rather loud and aggressive way, whatever the country involved might be.

6 P.M.

I have stated before that Prime Minister of Pakistan, I believe and I

am convinced, earnestly wishes, as I do, that there should be good relations between India and Pakistan. I have no doubt about his motives in this matter and I hope he has no doubt about mine. It is not a question of motives. If a step is taken which necessarily has some harmful results, all the best motives in the world cannot prevent them. Mr. Mohammed Ali has made various statements about this matter. He has stated, first of all, "Why should India object?" Of course, they are a free country; I cannot prevent them. But, if something affects Asia, India specially, are we to remain silent about it, if something, in our opinion, is a reversal of history after hundreds of years? We have thought in terms of freeing our countries, and one of the symbols of freedom has been the withdrawal of foreign armed forces. Of course, there may be a lack of freedom even then possibly, but, anyhow, an external symbol is the withdrawal of armed forces. And whatever the motive, I say the return of any armed forces or anything like it from any European or any American country is a reversal of the history of the countries of Asia. It was suggested some two or three years ago in connection with Kashmir—and I saw it was suggested by somebody only the other day—that some other countries send forces to Kashmir, some European or American country, whatever forces they might be. We rejected that completely because, so far as we can see, on no account, whatever the occasion, may be, are we going to allow any foreign forces to land in India.

Now, that is our outlook, and that is something more than Indian outlook. It is an outlook, which, if I may say so, applies to the whole or a large part of this continent of Asia and therefore we viewed with apprehension—we viewed with regret as one views something which may not be perfectly clear but which is pointing in a wrong direction—this business of military aid coming from the United States to Pakistan. I am sure the United States Government had not these considerations before them because they think,

718 P.S.D.

naturally, in their own environment, and that is the difficulty. I dare not, and I am not prepared, to express my opinion except in the most philosophical manner, about problems—distant problems—of Europe. I do not consider myself justified. But I do consider myself justified in expressing opinions about my own country, and to a slight extent, about my neighbours, and to a slightly less extent about Asian countries, not because India has the slightest desire for imposing its views or wishes on any other country—I have denied that; we seek no leadership; we are going to have no leadership over any other country—but because we have passed through similar processes of history in the last two hundred years or so, because we have had similar experiences; therefore, we can understand each other a little better. Therefore, if I speak, to some extent I may be in tune with some of my neighbour countries. If the Prime Minister of Burma speaks, he, or the head of any other country round about, is likely to be in tune with my thinking—I do not say I am the leader of Burma or the Prime Minister of Burma is the leader of India—because we have had this common background, common experiences. Therefore, it has led us to think to some extent in a common way, because we have common problems.

Now, the problems of Asia, therefore, have to be solved, and Great Powers and others should necessarily, because they are great Powers, have a great interest in solving them, but if the great Powers think that the problems of Asia can be solved *minus* Asia in a sense, or *minus* the views of Asian countries, then it does seem to be rather odd.

Now, I refer to Kashmir. I should be very brief about Kashmir. First of all, the House knows the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has just passed certain resolutions, or certain parts of its Constitution which it was considering. This is a process which started two or three years ago. It was halted in between, but it started then. We

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

made it clear then that it is perfectly right, it is perfectly open to the people of Kashmir to frame their Constitution—in fact, they were hanging in the air—but that so far as our international commitments were concerned,—i.e. India's—we naturally would honour them, unless something else happened. But the fact that the Constituent Assembly decided something was a fact, an important fact, because it represented the wishes of elected people in Kashmir. But it cannot come in the way of our absolving ourselves from our international commitments, in regard to the plebiscite, in regard to anything. That was the position, and that remains so. To ask me, as I have been asked by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to repudiate the Constituent Assembly's decision, is manifestly, if I might use the word with all respect, quite absurd. There is no question of my repudiating what the Constituent Assembly expressed as its wishes. But as I said, our international commitments remain, and we are going to proceed with them, in due course, always in consultation with the Government of Kashmir.

Now it is true I said this, and I referred this matter to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, that this U.S. aid has somewhat changed the context of events. I do not yet know what this aid will be, what shape it may take, or in what form it will ultimately be. When I expressed with all respect our views about this matter, I dealt with the whole question, not from the quantitative point of view, if I may say so, but the qualitative point of view. The thing itself is so bad. Whether quantitatively it is exceedingly limited did not matter to me; a thing so bad is, as I said, itself a reversal of history. It is a qualitative matter, but the quantitative matter is also important; both are important. Now, Mr. Mohammed Ali made the other day a remark, which rather surprised me, that if we get this military aid from Kashmir, this will make it easier to solve the Kashmir problem.

An Hon. Member: It is a threat.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a remark which is odd. It can only mean one or two things. It either means that with the help of the military aid, the military way will be easy of solution, or it means that with the help of that aid, a certain pressure can be exercised in order to solve the problem. It can mean nothing else. So, these things have to be considered carefully.

Hon. Members say, as they often say, withdraw this from the United Nations, or do this and that. Well, we are not going to do something which is against our assurances and our commitments. India has a certain reputation in the world. There is no good discussing now what was right or wrong five or six years ago. We have to consider the position as it is today. As I said earlier, we propose to honour our commitments, and stand by them to the extent that is possible, in the sense of the removal of the difficulties that have stood in the way.

Now I have taken a good deal of time of this House, but I must say something about what my friend Acharya Kripalani said in regard to the Kumbh Mela. I am not dealing with the Kumbh Mela as such, because, let us wait for the inquiry. But one thing I would like to say; the great Acharyaji referred to Government as inviting and encouraging and pushing people into the Mela, because we had special trains and the like. I do submit that this is not a correct appreciation of the situation. The Railways make arrangements, wherever large crowds are expected—we have to,—and as a matter of fact, hundreds of thousands of people could not come on this occasion because there was no accommodation in the railways. The hon. Member referred to people travelling on the roofs of carriages, it was true especially on the metre gauge section. It shows the pressure on the railways was such that people simply went up and stood on the roofs of carriages. There was this pressure,

and the railway had to make the best arrangements possible. All these arrangements had been made ten years ago, I forget now, at the last Kumbh Mela at Hardwar,—I believe hundreds of special trains, 300 or 400 special trains, were run. One has to do that.

I wish to deal with another aspect of the matter. There was an accusation that Government rather wanted to exploit this Mela apparently for some party advantage. I was surprised to hear that. It is not my view nor is it the view of the Uttar Pradesh Government. If I may say so, so far as I am concerned, I am in agreement, at any rate, with my friend Shri Purshottama Das Tandon on what he said just now about this business of people going and imagining that their faith or the country's faith or anybody's faith is governed by the planets, the sun or the moon, and they could wash away their sins in the Ganges, and that kind of thing. I do not wish to shock anybody's faith or to pain him, but perhaps many Members in this House know that I seldom let to go an opportunity to escape when I don't say something against astrologers and the like. I think they are a most undesirable crew. Further, they do a lot of harm to the country.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): They continue to flourish.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No; I hope they will not. I have no doubt about that. One hon. Member referred to superstitions. Well, I agree with him, but I would add this: there are very few of us who are free from some kind of superstition or other. It is always the case of one's own orthodoxy and the other's heterodoxy; one's own superstition which is justified and the other's is sheer superstition! There are, of course, religious superstitions, but there are political superstitions and economic superstitions,—all kinds of superstitions. Let us fight all these superstitions, and, if I may say so, the only way to fight them really is to

increase what I call the temper and the climate of science. And that is why the best thing that this Government has done, I think, is the establishment of those National Laboratories where scientific experiments are carried on.

But there is another aspect I would like to bring out here. I went to the Kumbh Mela, as I have been previously. Well, as the House perhaps knows, I was born and bred in Allahabad; well, more or less you might say, born and bred on the banks of the Ganga and the Yamuna, and the Ganga and the Yamuna are very dear to me as companions from my childhood. Whenever I have had the opportunity, I liked bathing in the Ganga. But I made it a point of never bathing there on a sacred occasion, so as not to mislead others. If I get a chance to go there—unfortunately I do not have many chances, and I do not mind it—on such occasions, I go, but on such occasions, I deliberately do not bathe there lest I should be misunderstood as encouraging that.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): But others do the opposite.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be; of course, I cannot answer that. But the point I was going to put to the House was this: that the stars or the bathing in the Ganga do not affect me in the slightest, but I am very powerfully affected by this huge course of human beings, of Indians, wherever they are. I am affected by them, and I want to be in tune with them, to understand them, and I want to influence them in the best manner possible. Therefore, I try to go there—not to the Kumbh Mela—if I have the chance to meet them I have gone to Melas previously, but not with the idea of merely condemning them. They are a very fine lot. They have their superstitions. If I can convince them of what I consider is wrong, I try to convince them. But it doesn't do me much harm if they go and have a dip in the Ganga, and I do not see why I should waste my energies over it; there are many other things that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

perhaps I have to fight. Ultimately, one does this, I suppose, more positively in other ways. And here I must say all my sense of history comes up before me and when I think of the long course of years and centuries that these people have behaved in this way, well, I want to understand that—why that has happened, why that is happening, what force there is, apart from the superstitions, in that? There must be something else about it, because—to come back to what I said at an earlier stage—I want to be in tune with them, being myself what I am, not in tune with their superstitions but be in tune with them, because I am their fellow-traveller, and I have to understand them.

That is by way of a personal explanation, if I may put it so, to the House. Sir, I have taken a good deal of the time of the House and the House has been good enough to listen to me patiently. I thank the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Velayudhan.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : सभा-पति जी,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have not called the hon. Member. I called Mr. Velayudhan. Does he want to speak?

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): No, Sir.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मुझे यह कहना है कि.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Veeraswamy.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मुझे भी अपने विचार यहां रखने का कोई चांस मिलेगा। शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के ऊपर बड़ा अन्याय हुआ है। पंडित जी उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं बोले, इस अलये में कहना चाहता हूँ कि

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

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, it is a great honour to me that I was called upon to speak just after the reply of the Prime Minister of India to the debate on the President's Address which has been going on for the past three days.

I want to confine my attention only to three aspects of the Presidential Address. But before that, I want to make some observations with regard to the foreign policy of our Government. Sir, I am convinced that everybody in this House and outside will endorse the foreign policy of the Government of India and appreciate the efforts of the Prime Minister of India who has been straining every nerve of his for establishing peace throughout the world. Sir, I need not go very deep into this point to state that the country is with the Prime Minister of India and the Government of India with regard to its foreign policy. From Kashmir to Cape Comorin, from the eastern border of West Bengal to the western border of East Punjab, everybody in this country and every party—I do hope,—stands with the Prime Minister of India with regard to foreign policy. If there is anybody, who may, of course differ, but who does not endorse the policy of the Prime Minister of India, then I need not say that he is an enemy of this country. If there is any country in the world which is under the impression that the people of India, as a whole, do not endorse the foreign policy of India, it is thoroughly mistaken.

Now, I want to go into the three aspects with which I want to deal. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Presidential Address was a bitter disappointment to the people of this country. The speech was dry and without any substance. The people would have expected with much eagerness some

announcement by the President of India envisaging some radical changes in the social and economic set-up in this country but they were bitterly disappointed as nothing encouraging to the suffering part of the population was said in the Presidential Address.

Sir, the Presidential Address is a policy statement, as the Prime Minister just now said in his reply to the debate. Every year, the people naturally look forward to the date of the Address, which, they expect, would show the way for their salvation. But, what is the use, Sir, of the Address when it does not give an iota of its attention to any of the crying problems of the day, such as the acute unemployment problem, the question of illiteracy of the people, the pathetic conditions of the beggars, the appalling conditions of the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and other backward classes, the sufferings of the landless agricultural labourers and the worsening standard of living of the low-paid government servants? The Presidential Address should have given much attention to these problems which I have just mentioned and also shown the way for solving those problems. Sir, everybody in this House, as well as outside, knows that the unemployment problem is growing every day on a colossal nature, and lakhs of educated youth and also uneducated people are wandering about in search of some occupation or other but in vain. In our country starvation deaths are occurring every day. The unemployed people commit suicide, unable to bear the agony of starvation for many a day; it is because they do not get any employment anywhere and they do not get any income with which to feed themselves. The Presidential Address has just mentioned the problem of unemployment but satisfied itself by saying that the Planning Commission is revising the Five Year Plan to give more employment to the unemployed.

Sir, I want to make a reference to the Constitution. Article 43 says:

"The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organisation or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to promote cottage industries on an individual or cooperative basis in rural areas."

The State need not give all the facilities that the Constitution enunciates, but should see that the people, who are unemployed, are given at least some food to keep their soul and body together—to sustain themselves. The State has completely failed in its attempt to solve the unemployment problem. My opinion is that the President's Address should have indicated the measures that ought to be taken by the Government either to solve the unemployment problem by giving employment to the people who are unemployed or to give relief to them at least till such time as they find occupation for the unemployed people. I do not understand to what extent the employment exchanges have been solving the unemployment problem. I know that the employment exchanges are not able to find jobs for the unemployed people. I was told in Tiruchirapalli that the Central Government departments are not co-operating with the employment exchanges with regard to finding jobs to the unemployed people. Of course, the State Government is co-operating and every department of the State Government is notifying the vacant posts to the employment exchanges and they select candidates and send them to the departments where they are required; but so far as the Central Government departments are concerned, they are bent upon making money from out of these unemployed people. They notify the posts vacant in newspapers, and the poor applicants spend their money and apply, but realise that they are not given posts. If there are ten posts vacant, applications are in-

[Shri Veeraswamy]

vited from the public and thousands of people apply to that department for these ten posts, but only ten people are selected and the remaining thousands of people go without any employment but after having given a lot of money to the Government. When the people are starving, the Government take money from them but do not give any employment to them.

The other point that I want to deal with is the appalling conditions of the Scheduled Castes in this country even after seven years of Independence. Article 46 of the Constitution says—

“The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation.”

What is the use of having put this Article in the Constitution, without having any desire, to carry out that provision? What have the Government done for solving the problem of the Scheduled Castes? Even now they are groaning under the evil of untouchability and they are poverty-stricken. They are homeless and foodless. They are working under the sweat of their brow, but they do not enjoy the fruits of their labour. Almost all the Scheduled Caste people in the rural areas are agricultural labourers. They do not own a bit of land in the village, but there are lands lying waste. There are people who are fit enough to work and who are prepared to cultivate the soil with their own labour and at their own cost, but the Government—whether it is the State Government or the Central Government—is not prepared to give the lands to the landless agricultural labourers, who especially belong to the Scheduled Castes and other Backward Classes. I cannot appreciate the Government for doling out money to students belonging to the

Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes. I know very well that there are thousands of Backward Class students who have not got any scholarships from the Central Government, and there are also other Scheduled Caste people who are not able to get scholarships. The giving of scholarships to some students or reservation of some jobs for the Scheduled Castes—and even some minister-ships—are not going to solve the problem of the Scheduled Castes. This is our established view, and I am fully convinced of what I say. I request the Central Government to give a directive to all the States to see that at least the waste lands lying in every district of every State are assigned to the Scheduled Caste people who are landless agricultural labourers.

The last point that I want to mention in this House is in regard to the Kumbh Mela tragedy. Sir, it is a shame to our country that lakhs of people had collected in one place to celebrate the Kumbh Mela and hundreds of people should have been killed in a stampede. Sir, the other day you pointed out when Acharya Kripalani was speaking that it was not fair on the part of Members to speak of the superstition of the people. There would have been about forty lakhs of people gathered to celebrate the Mela; but there may be one rationalist in the Hindu society who will condemn it outright. Sir, India has produced great thinkers, revolutionaries.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has misunderstood my ruling. Government did not arrange the Mela. For thousands of years past the Mela had been going on. Government cannot prevent it, unless the hon. Member were to suggest that Government should have issued an order under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, and banned people from bathing in the Ganges. What was under discussion was the arrangements made by Government. It was in that connection that I said that a discussion on superstition and

similar matters was not relevant. There are occasions when certainly an hon. Member is entitled to express his views on superstition. All that I said was that this is not the occasion and therefore it is not relevant; that is all.

The hon. Member must conclude now.

Shri Veeraswamy: Sir, India is a country which has produced great thinkers and revolutionaries. It has produced great men like Buddha, Valluvar, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Mahatma Gandhi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not on a discussion of superstition. It is unnecessary to go into these matters.

Shri Veeraswamy: Sir, I find whenever our Ministers visit temples, they are accompanied by all the official paraphernalia. Why should they visit temples and worship the gods and goddesses in their official capacity? I have no objection to their going to temples in their individual capacity, but they should not go in their official capacity. It affects the secular aspect of our State.

Sir, the Madras State Government have adopted the symbol of a *gopuram* as their emblem. On the two-anna postal stamp issued by the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department we have the figure of the dancing deity of Hindu religion, and on the post-card the three gods of Hindu religion, the creator, the protector and the annihilator. Why should we have the images of deities of Hinduism on postal stamps? So, I, as a citizen and as a Member of Parliament who am interested in perfect democracy also and in the secular aspect of the State, want to emphasise that the State should not participate in any religious function—whether it is Hindu or Islamic or Christian—and I who come from the South, especially as a Dravidian belonging to the Dravidian Federation which is a rationalist movement, hate this sort of attitude on the part of the Government to destroy secularism and to become Hindu-minded or to encourage super-

stitions and other religious dogmatisms and fanaticism. With these words I finish my speech, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I give five minutes to Mr. Nand Lal Sharma.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar):

नमोऽस्तु रामाय सलक्ष्मणाय

देव्यं च तस्यं जनकात्म जायै ।

नमोऽस्तु रुद्रेन्द्र यमानिलेभ्यो

नमोऽस्तु चन्द्रार्कं मरुद्गणेश्यः ॥

I repeat this *sloka* of Maruthi simply because it was recited by Hanuman when he was in Lanka and was surrounded by demons all over. (*Interruptions.*) I am very sorry to begin (*Interruptions.*) The Deputy-Speaker has been pleased to allow me only five minutes and if I am interrupted, I will request him to extend my time. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not be interrupted.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I start with the greatest calamity in Indian history—Kumbh Mela; and I am also pained to learn that, adding insult to injury, many of the hon. Members in the House have rather attacked the Hindu feelings, Hindu society and ceremonies along with the calamity.

That the death of thousands of people, rather the whole of the great calamity, is simply due to superstition is also a superstition in itself. Millions of people who went over to take their bath in the Ganges and have been taking their baths for the last millions of years were not all of them in superstition—that at least is not a superstition. Mahakavi Kalidasa has been describing the same, Valmiki gives a description of it, and Vyas refers to the same; and that till to-day the quality of Ganges water has surpassed all other waters is clear and I do not understand how this has been regarded as a mere superstition. I think this is an anti-national mentality to be talking of the most reasonable tradition of ours as a mere superstition.

An Hon. Member: And a progressive one also.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I am not going to dilate upon the failures of the Government or how the thing has been done but one thing, that no information could be given to the authorities, is clear; no enquiry committee is going to proceed with it. (Interruptions.) This is an admitted fact and this is itself a very serious charge on the efficiency of the Government. If, supposing, there is an attack tomorrow on our frontiers and yet we come up and say we could not inform the authorities concerned or the Head of the State, what will become of the safety of the country? For those gentlemen at the spot, whatever their other failures may be, this is the greatest failure and they must be taken to task on this account.

Because there is very little time at my disposal, I want to talk on one thing. The remarks made by our Prime Minister and by Acharya Kripalani—both of them—have injured the feelings, not only of myself, but of all those whom I represent and those millions, who, in spite of restrictions by the Government—the toll tax and the inoculation restrictions—have gone for a dip in the Ganges, at the confluence of the Ganges and the Yamuna amidst other restrictions, difficulties and hardships of accommodation and climate. Acharya Kripalani who sticks to the title 'Acharya' in spite of his opposition to all ceremonials, is still in a superstition for himself—without understanding the meaning of the term 'Acharya'.

आचिनोति च शास्त्राणि आचरान्
स्थापयत्यपि ।

स्वयमाचरते यस्मा तस्मादाचार्यं

उच्यते ॥

He is an *acharya* who has searched into the *shastras* intesively and extensively, who has established traditions according to the *shastras* and has moulded his own conduct according to them. Unless these three factors are there, one cannot claim to be called '*acharya*'—unless it be

that he was only a "death priest."

Shri Velayudhan: He is a modern *acharya*.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: In Punjab he is a "death priest." There is no question of modern *acharya* because it concerns the language to which the term belongs.

As regards the Address of the President I may simply say one thing about the cultural building of our nation. I am sorry that the leaders, the House, and generally the President and the Cabinet are silent on that point. There is no talk with regard to Hindi institutions or Sanskrit institutions that teach into the mode of our Indian life. Nothing is being done in that respect and those institutions are being allowed to die out. The most illustrious luminary of our education, Maulana Azad, is totally in dark with regard to the real Indian system of education. He has recently published some pamphlets in Urdu which have also been distributed here. Urdu is not the national language; neither is it a regional language. Yet no care is being paid to Hindi and Sanskrit and the real Indian *vidyalayas* and *patasalas* are being allowed to die out. I really warn my friends here as also the Government to look into this matter. These institutions and the pandits and scholars of Hindi and Sanskrit who have sacrificed much of their lives and comforts of life and have been serving the cause of their nation for keeping up this cultural language of theirs, are being subjected to all sorts of troubles, and no regard is being paid to them. With regard to Sanskrit universities and Hindi universities nothing is being done. I request the Ministry of Education and the Cabinet itself to pay more regard to this.

One word with regard to the *Ayurved* system of medicine. Last time when we discussed the subject one remark came from our hon. Minister for Health that she was not going to allow a cheap system of medicine to be prevalent in the country because she wanted the best possible medical aid to be available for every

villager. That was an ideal, or rather an El Dorado to talk about. Ayurved is suited to the temperament, climatic conditions and pockets of the common man, and it is the most scientific system of medicine. But it is being ignored. And I say the allopathic system of medicine, as it is called, is the most unscientific one. They mix some medicine here, some medicine there and try the mixture to cure some disease, without knowing what disease the particular medicine has cured and what symptoms have been affected. I say this is not science. The Ayurvedic system is based on *Tridosh* theory and I request the Cabinet and the Government to consider and give it due weight.

Dr. Katju: Sir, the Prime Minister has in his speech dealt with almost all the important problems, foreign and home problems, in a very comprehensive manner and I would just like to add one or two words on two or three matters. One, with which I am mainly concerned, is the law and order problem. It is a matter for rejoicing that on the whole, in spite of attempts made here and there in the name of *Satyagraha* and other shibboleths, peace and tranquillity has prevailed in the country and the people of India have shown their shrewd commonsense. In spite of all sorts of inducements, peace has prevailed and the countryside has behaved in an orderly manner.

The second thing to which I should like to draw attention and with which I believe most of the hon. Members are familiar, is that, when we are talking about our economic progress and of our big projects and other such things, we should pay tribute to what the villagers have done, not in one State or another, but throughout India, by voluntary labour. I was reading only this morning a report from Vindhya Pradesh in which it was stated by the Lieut.-Governor that in his extensive tours he has found that what he calls "schemes on one-third basis" have attracted much attention throughout the length and breadth of Vindhya Pradesh,—the State contributes one-third

and the villagers contribute two-thirds. I have been travelling round extensively in the countryside in many many States, and I think, it has been, as the Prime Minister quoted, 'a most exhilarating experience', what the people have done—building hospitals, schools and other such things, building bunds, stopping the flow of rainwater, bringing land under cultivation and all that. We go to the Damodar Valley, we go to the Hirakud Dam and we talk about it. But this villagers' labour is a thing which requires further notice and it is up to us to extend a word of congratulation to our countrymen throughout the length and breadth of India. Sometimes, I think that while we in the towns are talking, the people in the villages are working and acting. They are full of enthusiasm. They have now realised that after a long, long dark night, the sun of freedom has dawned and they are now in a free India.

That brings me, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, to the last topic which I wanted to touch upon and that is the Kumbh Mela. This was my fifth Kumbh which I saw. The first Kumbh that I went to was when I was in the Law College at Allahabad in 1906. I have been continuously seeing what is called the Kumbh and the Ardh Kumbh and the fervour has been throughout very great. But, this year I went and I mixed in the crowd and jostled with lakhs of people. As I told you, the impression that I got this year was that the one thing which had moved all these masses of men was that this was the first Kumbh in a free India. My hon. friends whom I honour greatly, Shri Tandon and Acharya Kripalani talked about superstition. I respectfully suggest that that is a very narrow view to take. People went there this year because they thought that India had become free after thousands of years.....

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Dr. Katju:and this was the first Kumbh they were witnessing after Independence. (*Interruptions.*) People have talked about railways and Government providing facilities and all that. This is all talk on these Benches. You go and see there. Millions of people came in bullock carts—mil-

[Dr. Katju]

lions, literally millions—thousands of miles from the countryside. All the People did not come by rail. They came by bullock carts and other ordinary transport. There must have been thousands who had walked. Please remember this. The Prime Minister touched upon a matter, but in a passing manner. Speaking for myself, the water of the Ganges is to me like the water of the Chambal which I revere also, coming as I do from Madhya Bharat, or the water of any other river. Narbada is sacred: so also Tapti, etc. But, what attracts me to the Ganges is, I imagine when I have a dip in the Ganges, I feel a sort of a change, a marvellous wonderful change—you laugh because you do not understand the significance.

Some Hon. Members: They laugh because they do not believe in God.

Some Hon. Members: They are nastiks. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Will hon. Members please resume their seats. There is no good of going on laughing. There are various religions in this country. Shall I allow Members to attack the Mohammedan rites or the Christian rites? What is this kind of attitude on the part of hon. Members? Here we are not concerned with religion. Is it the question here whether the Government ought to have prevented the Kumbh Mela? It is not so. Facilities are afforded wherever there is a large concourse of people. Of course, the unhappy incident has occurred. I think attention will be paid to this particular matter. I would appeal to hon. Members not to laugh. It is not right. When 40 lakhs of people were going, it does not mean that only depressed class persons were going; there may have been many educated men there. Therefore, to laugh over such matters is very wrong. I am only sorry that such things should happen in this House.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): He was putting things in a dramatic way.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members have always got their own dramatic ways.

Shri Nambiar: He was saying that it was a political meeting.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would say this to hon. Members in their own interests, in the interests of this country and in the interests of amicable relations in the Parliament. We have got so many castes and creeds on the floor of this House. We are not going to vindicate any of them here. Any hon. Member can go on talking on that; I am not going to allow it here.

Dr. Katju: Hon. Members will please consider.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Minister may address me.

Dr. Katju: The hon. Members seem to be a well-fed lot and they laugh so well.

I was not speaking from any religious point of view. I daresay that Cauvery is as important and as appealing to the people in the south as the Ganges is here. You see Ganga and Yamuna are dear because they are the cradles of Aryan civilisation in India. It is not a question of a holy or a sacred river and my going to paradise by bathing in it. When I go for a dip in the Ganga whether at Hardwar or Allahabad or any other place, I think personally I am doing something which connects me with my ancestors who flourished tens of thousands of years ago. Whenever I go for a dip in the Ganga on the occasion of the Kumbh, I am not talking of any salvation and all that sort of thing, my mind goes back to the Kumbh which was visited by the Chinese pilgrim in 640 A.D., He has left a description of it. You read again what was done by Harsha. You go back to those days. There must be a continuity of history. You cannot be proud of ancient and free India unless you have that sense of pride in what they did. Of course, so far as superstition is concerned, destroy everything. You may say that so far as Ganga water is concerned, you consider it to be like the water of any running stream. Probably many people share that view. When I go for

a dip in the Ganges, I do not say that I am going by a ladder to heaven or that it will lead me to my ancestors. But, I go there for being connected with my forefathers and the forefathers of the whole nation in that way. My hon. friends are talking here. Of course, it is most unfortunate that this tragedy happened. It has shocked us all, but I can testify from personal knowledge that right up to the second February while I was there, it was a wonderful management. I saw there not a single fly. The Public Health Department had worked wonders. The public health staff was working, I tell you, in such a devoted fashion that I have never seen before during the last 48 years. But this thing came. All those people who were engaged in this Mela management are now covered with a sort of obloquy and all sorts of charges are being made against them. And then we are hearing lectures here about eradication of superstitions and that Government should do something to cut this out. Very well, you do not give them room by your railway trains. Can you stop them coming by ponies, by bullocks, by bullock carts? They will do so. In the olden days, the youth travelled by bullock-carts right up to Cape Comorin.

My hon. friend there said: "Let not Government officers and Ministers go there in their official capacity." I used to go very often, when I was Governor of Orissa, as a worshipper to the Jagannath temple, but no one thought that I was going there as the Governor, as the symbol of the State. I went there in my personal capacity. I was a Hindu, therefore I went there. If it is a secular State, it does not mean that a Christian should not go to the Church.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is hon. Minister no longer a Hindu? The hon. Minister used the past tense. He said "I was a Hindu".

Dr. Katju: I do not want to detain the House any longer, but it seems to me, with great respect to Acharya

Kripalani who is not here and to Shri Tandon whom I look upon as my Guru, that they have approached the question from a completely wrong point of view.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as Amendments are concerned, does any hon. Member want that any of his amendments should be put to the vote of the House?

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I would like all my amendments to be put.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, I am not going to allow them.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: You are not allowing me always when I am asking.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has always got the knack of disturbing the House. What is the amendment he has moved?

I will now do this. Hon. Members know which amendments they have moved. If any hon. Member wants a particular amendment to be put to the House now, I shall do so.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Numbers 18 and 19.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They were selected, but they have not been moved. Therefore, I am not going to put them to the House.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: (My-sore): Number 48.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No other amendment* need be put to the vote of

*The other amendments were deemed to have been negatived.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

the House. I will now put the original Motion of Mr. Deshpande to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"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."

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Tuesday, the 23rd February, 1954.
