

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT

Mr. Speaker: Before I call upon Shri Anil Kumar Chanda to move his motion of Thanks to the President I have to announce that under Rule 19, I fix that the time-limit for speeches will ordinarily be not more than fifteen minutes except the Prime Minister for whom thirty minutes or more will be allowed if necessary for replying to the debate on behalf of the Government.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): With regard to the allotment of time to the Opposition parties, I gather that yesterday certain discussions took place. But I stand here only to bring to your notice the position of unattached Members, of whom a considerable number is here. I hope that anything done outside this Chamber yesterday would not put us in a straight jacket. I would be glad to know what has been your decision regarding unattached Members.

Mr. Speaker: The allotment of time is rather a ticklish question and there is no solution to it, unless hon. Members are prepared to adjust among themselves. I have received communications from certain groups, not official groups but sets of Members who go together, that they have come to some arrangement and I think it is better that people come to some arrangement among themselves. As the House is constituted today, I am afraid, unless some adjustments or arrangements are made by Members among themselves, it is not possible either to have all points of view represented in a debate or even to do bare justice to some sections of the House.

Apart from groups, I may assure hon. Members that those who are unattached to any group will not be left out of consideration. They will be given some time; but my personal difficulty has been that I really do not know who and how many Members are either attached or unattached. If an hon. Member stands, I might perhaps mistake him to be an unattached Member and he might turn out to be a party Member. That is my difficulty; however, I will do what is possible. It would be better if the unattached Members who wish to have their say give me a list of their names. I will see what is possible but I cannot promise anything. It all depends upon the number of Members on the list and the time available.

Shri A. K. Chanda (Birbhum): I beg to move:

That an address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"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 16th May, 1952."

I understand that it is a parliamentary convention that the Leader of the House chooses a junior Member, a new Member to move a Vote of Thanks on the Address given by the President. I understand that it is also a convention—may I be permitted to say, a humane convention—that when a new Member goes through the tribulations of a maiden speech, utmost kindness and consideration is shown to him by other Members of the House. I hope I shall be able to draw in a generous measure on that kindness and consideration from my fellow Members.

I am not merely new to this House: I am altogether a new entrant into the parliamentary arena. It is indeed a far-cry from the sylvan serenity of Rabindranath Tagore's Shantiniketan Ashram to the imperial grandeur of these halls and if I feel sometimes lost, I hope I shall have your kindly hands stretched out to me.

I assure you that the motion that I have placed before the House has come from the bottom of my heart without any mental reservations at all. Along with millions of my countrymen, as a citizen of this great country, I am really grateful for and proud of the achievements of our Government during the past five years after India's Independence and I also live expectantly for the good and great life that has been envisaged by the plan and programme laid before us by our respected and well-beloved President. I believe the vast millions of our countrymen also feel likewise along with me, otherwise the Government of the President would not have been given a fresh lease of life in such an overwhelming measure by 170 million voters of this country, who have been recently enfranchised by the most generous and liberal of constitutions. This is the first time that this first Parliament of New India is meeting and I hope you will permit me to express my appreciation and thanks, and I believe in this I am voicing the sentiments of the whole House, to the Members of the provisional Parliament who fashioned and designed our Constitution as also functioned as the Parliament of India before the elections

could be organised. They have done their work in a most magnificent manner and they deserve well of the nation.

It is very heartening for us new Members of this House to see here today many of the veterans of old. And I hope that we the new Members will have the privilege of their guidance and advice from time to time as needed.

I have already expressed my great appreciation of the work that has already been done by our Government during the first five years of our independence. As a student of history I know of no country which had the advantage of such wise leadership during the formative years of its life. For the consolidation of the State we needed no gallows nor guillotine, nor even concentration camps or mass liquidation. The attitude of the Government to its opponents has been very generous. The attitude of our Government, it may be interpreted, has even been lenient to some of the citizens of this country who to me it seems owe their mental and spiritual allegiance to some other land. Our Government has been sober because it has been strong, it has been tolerant because it has been wise, it has been progressive, it has been dynamic, and when occasion so needed it also has been firm.

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): May I rise on a point of order, Sir? Is it proper for the proposer of the motion to attribute motives and say that some owe allegiance to other countries?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member need not be so hasty as that. Let Mr. Chanda proceed.

Shri A. K. Chanda: It is true, and it is a sad fact that we have not been able to bring a measure of happiness to our people. It is indeed a sad fact as expressed by the President himself that our life is bare, it is bereft of joy and any significance. Freedom by itself to the vast majority of our people would mean very little if it does not mean a richer and a fuller life for them. But Government has no Aladdin's lamp to transform everything overnight. Let us think of the legacy that we have inherited from the Britishers after 200 years of their rule in this country. An average life expectancy of 27 years, a percentage of literacy of 15 a *per capita* annual income of Rs. 301,—obviously these are factors which will not ensure a rich and full life for any people. It is therefore, Sir, that our President in

his address has asked us to labour, to labour assiduously and consistently for building the future of this country. It is needless to stress that a nation's prosperity cannot be built by words. It is built upon a foundation of labour and labour alone and I hope in this great task of re-building and re-fashioning the future of our country we on the Government side will have every co-operation from the friends sitting on the opposite benches for I know, they too love the country even as we do. If we sink for a while our politics and if we join our hands together and march hand in hand to the goal which is common both for them and for us, that is a free, prosperous and progressive India, the goal will not be very far off. I believe, it was a great son of Bengal who once asserted that a subject nation has no politics. Perhaps it is a greater truth to say that an impoverished country and a famished people have no politics either.

These are days of rationing and you also, Sir, have rationed our orations in this House. It is perhaps good that it should be. Brevity is not merely the soul of wit—it should be the soul of Parliamentary orations also. I wish therefore to divide the time devoted to me and my hon. friend, the seconder of the motion, by dividing the work between us. Whereas I wish to restrict myself generally to the international aspect of the address, my friend the seconder who comes from the South where famine looms large in the horizon will be referring to the home aspect of the Address.

12 Noon.

Talking about the international political situation, our Government has given us a standing and a status. It has added considerably to the stature of India as a nation among the family of nations. But the conditions in the world at large are not such as to make us feel very happy. We had staked so much of our hope and faith in the United Nations Organisation but it seems that the ghost of Geneva is haunting Lake Success. That ghost has to be exorcised if peace and prosperity is to be ensured to the vast millions in this world. We have been and we are extremely distressed at the treatment we have had from the U.N.O. with regard to Kashmir. The United Nations, ostrich like, refuses to recognise the existence of Red China. By this partisan outlook alone it has lost the allegiance of a quarter of the world's population. South Africa defies, and defies quite successfully its mandate. The U.N.O. has developed

[Shri A. K. Chanda]

a most unrealistic attitude on Korea which has become a veritable festering sore. But it is with regard to the Tunisian question that our faith has grossly been shaken. We have invariably seen that wherever the interests of the smaller nations are involved the Security Council of the United Nations turns a deaf ear to their arguments. With regard to Tunisia the French Government was there and argued that according to article 2, section 7 of the Charter, no domestic concern of any State could be brought under the discussion of the Council. It was the very argument that we advanced in 1948 when the Hyderabad question was before that Council. But our arguments were of no avail possibly because the interests of no great power were involved. We feel that the U.N.O. has relegated itself to the level of a debating society albeit very expensive. But it is the only organisation which today we have in this world for peace, universal peace, and for the advancement of freedom of the people, and if the United Nations Organisation fails, perhaps another generation will have to be sacrificed at the merciless altar of the war gods.

Nearer home we are happy that our relations with our neighbours go on improving every day. Nepal which we look upon in many ways as our younger brother is marching with sure and steadfast steps on the path of progress. In this our Government has given every possible help, material and moral, to Nepal. It is needless to say that our help has been given without any motive or consideration whatsoever. We hope a great future will be in store for this small country nestled on the lap of the mighty Himalayas. Our Government has also given all possible help to Burma, that much harassed land of Burma. We have not borne them any rancour for the rather distressing manner in which after getting freedom she turned out our nationals serving under that Government and also our people living there. The most heartening thing is the friendly relations which we have been able to develop between new China and ourselves. We have nothing to do with the complexion of their Government—it is entirely their own concern—but right from recorded history China and India have been friends, not in diplomacy but as kindred souls born of the same spirit. Under the enlightened leadership of our Prime Minister, it is good that we have been able to form a fresh and new bond of friendship with that country

It is now nearly a month that we have terminated state of war with Japan and it is with genuine enthusiasm that we welcome Japan into the family of nations. We do not forget that towards the beginning of this century it was Japan's victory over Russia that first infused us with a spirit of hope. It was Japan who, first among the Asiatic nations, had the courage and the competence to speak on terms of equality with the mighty and proud nations of Europe and America. We shall hope that Japan has learnt the lesson and she will never again deviate from the path of Buddha and take to the path of aggression.

People are not wanting who very often censure our Government that it lacks a coherent and consistent foreign policy. Perhaps, it is good that we have no policy at all. The word 'policy' is rather repugnant to my taste. It is redolent of the marketplace. It is all right if a small trader has a policy. For a great nation like ours, we have a principle and it is the principle which was enunciated by the Father of the Nation and so scrupulously followed by his spiritual heir, the Prime Minister of the country. The principle is 'Friendship towards all; aggression towards none'. That principle is based on truth and justice and I am sure India will never deviate from that principle—not at least so long as our present Prime Minister continues to be where he is.

With these words, I place the motion before my fellow-Members after expressing to them my sincere gratitude for their patient hearing to my maiden effort.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"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 16th May, 1952."

Shri Venkaraman (Tanjore): I have great pleasure in seconding the motion so ably moved by my hon. friend from West Bengal. His speech did not contain the touch of a maiden speech in any manner. He spoke so well that an old Member like me is beginning to feel somewhat doubtful whether I would be able to equal him in the debates that will take place hereafter.

My hon. friend has dealt with the portions of the Presidential Address relating to foreign affairs so well that

if I should attempt to traverse the same ground, possibly I will mar the good effect he had created in this House. However, I feel that I should draw the attention of the House to one aspect, namely, the question of Indians in Ceylon, only to impress through the debates in this House on the better minds of the peoples of Ceylon that they should try their utmost to influence their Government and see that the Indians who have helped so much to build up the civilisation of that country, to build up the economy of that country, are not now left in the lurch and dropped like hot potatoes, once their services are no longer required. It is up to the people of Ceylon to see that their Government pursues a policy of friendship and cooperation with our great nation, so that a brotherhood of Asiatic nations may be established.

I shall now refer to some aspects of the Presidential Address relating to home affairs. The Address takes consolation at the tendency for recession in price levels and for the decline that has been going on since the middle of last year. We have suffered under a spiral of increasing prices for the last several years and the middle and lower middle classes and more particularly the working classes have suffered incalculable harm during the course of this great rise in prices that followed as an aftermath of the war. Always, the middle classes have been attempting to catch up with the ever increasing prices and their attempt has ended just in the same way as a dog chases its own tail. We are very happy now that this process has been arrested, and that the process of a decline in prices is coming over not only in this country but all over the world, and that the benefits resulting from a fall in prices would accrue to those classes which very badly deserve as well as want it.

But the fall in prices is not without some serious repercussions on the community. We have noticed that the mills want to close down the third shift in textiles. We find that the automobile assembly is closing down in Calcutta. The tea interests are clamouring that the Minimum Wages Act which has been passed and implemented, and the Plantation Code which tries to serve the cause of labour, should be delayed in their enforcement. These are very serious consequences and unless Government takes note of the repercussions created by the fall in prices, it will be very difficult for the classes that sadly require a lower price level to go on leading a normal life.

We are happy to find that at page 7 of the Address the President has said that the Government proposes to ensure that production and employment will not be affected by reason of the fall in prices. Unemployment is a scourge. It is indeed very unhappy that an able-bodied man, a man who is ready, able and willing to work, should be denied work and unless we are able to combat the mass retrenchment and unemployment that are consequent upon the fall in prices and the fall in production, the very thing which we welcome as a measure that is intended to benefit the lower classes will prove to be a measure of great harm to those classes.

Then, I will deal with production and planning. The Government have come forward to start a new Department, namely, Ministry of Production. We welcome, and I am sure the country outside would welcome too, the creation of such a separate Ministry. You have very large Government, State-owned industrial enterprises and it is necessary that they should be placed in charge of one unified control, so that this particular Department may be responsible for the production, maintenance as well as the consequences of the several steps taken by this particular Government, or any other successor Government.

In this connection, I would urge that an Economic Service may be created and that it may be drawn from people in the commercial houses and people serving in the several industrial and commercial establishments, who can look forward to progress inside the Department or Ministry of Production, so that starting from lower grades they may work up their way to be the Managers and the Managing Directors of these State-owned enterprises, because I understand that by constant shifting of the executive heads of industrial concerns, the continuity in policy is lost and very often there is a conflict between the past and the present way of conducting the work. Therefore, it would be a good augury if along with the creation of a separate Ministry we are able to create a separate Service which will man all our industrial and economic units of production.

Then I shall refer to that sore point which has been agitating all of us, more particularly those in the South, namely, the food situation. The Presidential Address does not pretend that that situation has been entirely controlled or that it has eased. We find that the stock of foodgrains is comfortable, but it is no comfort to the

[Shri Venkaraman]

people to say that there is a large stock of foodstuffs so long as they are not able to get it and so long as they are not able to eat it. It is no consolation to a bank clerk to be told that the bank has large balances; nor is it a comfort to the treasury clerk to be told that the treasury balances are big. It is only to those who can eat out of the large stocks which we purport to have that the benefit will accrue. Therefore, I find that a large section of the population in the State from which I come are faced with this situation, that while there is inadequate food and inadequate supply, they have not also got adequate purchasing power to buy even the little supply which is available there.

The famine conditions in Rayalseema—which are now spreading to other parts in the South—have got to be combated. The President's address says that famine will be fought regardless of cost. We are happy that Government has taken such a strong decision in this matter. The famine in the South is not merely a food famine, but it now threatens to be a famine in water. Madras is now in the grips of a very severe water scarcity and the life of the city threatens to break in the course of the next few weeks. The water-supply in the southern region has got to be attended. I would in this connection venture to say that the Krishna-Pennar project for which we in this House have been agitating for quite a long time should be given a very high priority, so that the water which is now going waste to the sea may go to quench the thirst of the people of Madras.

I shall now briefly touch on the question of legislation that is pending before the House. I personally very warmly welcome the Hindu Code Bill. Members of the last House know very well how some of us were very anxious that the Hindu Code Bill should be passed. We notice that Government have decided—notwithstanding the filibustering, notwithstanding the dilatoriness of some—that they will go forward with this measure of great reform. The Hindu Code Bill cannot be passed at one stretch, because it covers a very wide area. It is, therefore, necessary—as Government have decided—to split it into parts. Ever since British jurisprudence came into this country, Hindu law has not progressed along with the times. It became fossilised by the interpretation of precedents, with the result that what is today accepted as canons of good society like monogamy, divorce,

right to inheritance to all people, are denied under our old existing law. It is necessary that if we want to keep our face in this progressive world, if we want to march onward with the rest of the society, we should immediately take on hand this measure of reform of the Hindu Law and I am sure the House will give its utmost co-operation regardless of the party to which Members may belong.

Lastly I am very glad that Government intend to appoint a Press Commission which will go into the question of the organisation of the Press monopolies, if any, existing in it, the conditions of working journalists who sustain the entire organisation and all aspects of the Press, so that freedom of thought and expression which we have embodied in the Constitution will become a reality. Freedom of thought and expression cannot obtain, unless the press is a strong one, an independent one and is not controlled by merchants, traders and speculators who may use the press for their own purposes. It is a welcome sign that Government have understood the need for an independent Press in a country like ours and have come forward to appoint a Commission. I am sure when the Commission comes to be appointed, some representatives of the working journalists, some representatives of the public as well as of the judiciary will be appointed on it, so that they may objectively examine the whole position.

I have great pleasure, Sir, in seconding the motion.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I have first of all to point out that the time of twenty minutes allotted to me is too meagre for me to deal with all the points which have been raised in the President's Address. Hon. Members of this House know that I and my friends are new to parliamentary procedure and practice, with the result that we do not know whether we will be able to put our views clearly before you. Whatever might be the language in which we speak, whether our English may be good or not, you will hear from us the voice of the people.....

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Saran North): On a point of order, Sir, may I know if the hon. Member has moved his amendment? He is beginning with a speech.

Mr. Speaker: He can do so at the end also. It is not necessary for him to move it in the beginning. He has tabled the amendment.

I find that there are two hundred amendments covering ninety different subjects. There is a large number of amendments on one and the same subject. Redistribution of States on a linguistic basis is one; food, famine, etc. is another. The third subject is scheduled castes, backward classes and scheduled tribes.

Obviously, it is not possible for this House to debate each and every one of these amendments during the short space of three days. I would therefore suggest—if it is acceptable to hon. Members—that they may select the amendments for discussion and limit the discussion to a certain number of specific amendments, instead of taking the whole mass of amendments. If that is attempted to be done, practically there will be no discussion on anyone and all the three days really intended for discussing the various important subjects at issue will be lost.

Moreover, hon. Members will have an opportunity of discussing all and sundry subjects, when we take up the general discussion on the Budget. It is, therefore, better,—more for the opposition—to select the amendments. The other alternative for me would be—in case they do not agree to this—to go by the order in which the amendments have been received, with the result that only half a dozen of them will be discussed during the course of three days and the others will be left out.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): May I suggest—as we did on the previous occasion—that you may take all the amendments to have been moved and the opposition, I suppose, will decide which of them would be pressed at the time of voting.

Mr. Speaker: The point is this. Undoubtedly last time this course was adopted, though, personally, I had expressed myself against that course. Such a procedure may satisfy the desire of a larger number of Members to speak, but our object is to have a debate, to make out certain specific points and whether we agree or disagree from the Government, the chief idea is to place before them different points of view which will be helpful in shaping their policies. So, vague and general speeches really help none. The effect of the debate is lost practically.

Therefore, now when there is a definite nucleus of an opposition, I would like that matters are specifically discussed rather than some general obser-

vations are made. I would not encourage the procedure of taking all amendments together. I would certainly press the selection of amendments. Obviously you cannot muddle all subjects together. But let us focus attention on certain specific points first and then go according to the priority of importance. That is my own idea about it and I shall be very unwilling—I do not say, I shall over-rule—to submit to a general desultory discussion by having all the amendments taken together. That is my point. I am saying it in the best interests of the debate. That depends on the House, however. If they do not want this kind of thing, I do not think I shall go the length of insisting upon that. But so far as possible I do insist upon it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I agree with what Dr. Mookerjee has said, because if only certain amendments are taken and the Opposition is not allowed to talk on other points—and there are many points in the Address which need the attention of the Opposition and the House—that will place us in a difficulty. You may kindly deem every amendment to have been moved, and on the last day the Opposition will join together and see which are the amendments to be formally put to vote. We hope, Sir, you will give us the opportunity. Because, as I submitted in the beginning, as far as we are concerned we are new to the House, and if opportunity is not afforded to us the time-limit is so short that we may not be able to speak on all the points—and there are several points which we want to stress. It would therefore be better if you lay down that all the amendments are deemed to be placed before the House, and on the last day we will put some agreed amendments so that they may be put to vote.

An Hon. Member rose—

Mr. Speaker: I have understood the point of the Opposition. I am suggesting a course in the interest of all concerned, and more to the interest of the Opposition—not that I am more partial to them and against Government, nothing of that kind.

The hon. Member seemed to confound the debate on the President's Address with a general debate or discussion. They are going to have an opportunity at the time of the Budget—a general discussion on the Budget—when every item of Government policy will come under discussion. The President in his Address makes reference to certain specific questions of

[Mr. Speaker]

Government policy, and instead, therefore, of trying to have this as an occasion for a general debate, to my mind, it is better if attention is devoted to those questions. In fact the object of the President's Address is to bring before the House the main sum and substance, that is to say, certain specific matters. Therefore, if you keep the distinction in mind that this is not a general debate on the entire general administration, it would be better. And there will be the opportunity of a general debate also soon after—not that, it is going to come next year. The Budget is shortly coming in for discussion. Then there will be three days when the hon. Members can make out all those points which are left out here. If the attempt is to cover all points on both occasions I am afraid they will not be able to cover effectively and pointedly as I would like them to cover and speak upon. It is, however, a matter entirely—I should not say for the Opposition—but entirely for the House to decide as to how it will proceed. And if at all I am showing an inclination of being a little—I should not say lenient,—but a little soft, it is only on account of the consideration that a large number of Members are new. But for this fact, I would not have even gone the length of saying these things. It is for them to decide as to how they will debate and on what points they will debate.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: If I may say so, the point of view which you have stressed has already been considered by quite a large section of the Opposition, and I do not think it is being intended by the speakers that they will just have a rambling general discussion. Stress will be laid on quite a number of points by individual speakers. Therefore, if you allow the debate to continue, allowing the amendments to have been moved, I suppose there will be no difficulty.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): May I make a submission? As you just said article 87 of the Constitution which refers to the President's Address definitely restricts the discussion on the address only to those points which have been referred to in the President's Address.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Or amendments thereon.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: No. The amendments cannot exceed those points. I would refer you to clause (2) article 87.

Mr. Speaker: I may make the position clear. I am not standing on any

technicality at all—even though the point made out by Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar has force. Because, though it is said that the discussion should be on the points contained in the Address, still it is always a point for debate—and a moot point—as to what is covered and what is not covered. In a sense the Address takes a general view, because it gives an indication of what Government is going to do. Therefore, even granting the technicality that the amendments should be with reference to the matters contained in the Address, so far as practical results go it will throw open the entire administration for discussion, and it will be a very difficult and delicate thing to decide whether a particular point is within the contents of the Address or beyond. So I do not propose to go into that. It is said that the Opposition have considered the point; yes, they are entitled to consider and hold also that their view is the most correct view and the differing view ought not to prevail. I have no quarrel with that. But I would like to make it clear that I am relaxing the practice—and it should be my business in this Chair to see that all debates or practices are moulded in a proper manner—and this should not be taken as a precedent next year again that “Well, last year you allowed this, therefore this year also you must allow it”. I think I should give at least one year's notice now, that next time I shall strictly stick to my ideas about the scope and the limitations of this debate. I find that there is a confusion about two debates and to that extent the House is not proceeding correctly in my opinion—I have no authority to over-rule the views of any other people, they may hold them—but so far as the effective conclusion is concerned, I think, so long as I am here my view should prevail.

If, therefore, the Opposition wants this procedure, I have no objection; I am not even referring the matter to the Government. I am sure they will agree to any type of debate, whether general or specific in respect of certain amendments. The Prime Minister nods in assent. So there is no question.

There is one more point and that is about the amendments and the notice to amendments. Considering the fact that a large number of Members are new, I was myself thinking of relaxing the notice period. I had a mind and I expressed it, I believe, informally that amendments may be tabled on the lines of legislation. But that is only

an exception for this year for the considerations which I mentioned. My previous ruling had been that there shall be no amendment tabled when once the motion is moved, because it cannot be expected that from day to day amendments should go on being tabled, making the debate more and more rambling. Today some amendments have come. I am waiving the notice in respect of them. But no further amendments will be received hereafter, and the discussion will go on as the hon. Members desire.

Then, as regards putting to the vote of the amendments, as speeches are going to touch all amendments, only the amendments in the names of Members who have moved them can be taken, with the result that the number of amendments for the end—I am not talking for the general speeches now—will automatically be restricted to those of the hon. Members who will be called upon to speak. That is the position. I believe I am clear.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I hope the time that has now been spent will not be taken away from me, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No. It will not be debited to his account.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: The address read as a whole in my opinion is a declaration of war on the people of India. I say this because millions of people in this country had waited to see that the workers were not thrown out of factories; the clerks and others who are facing retrenchment as well as other people who have no food, who were not able to go to the ration shops and draw their rations,—they were waiting to see what is the policy of the Government, whether their problems could be solved immediately and whether there is any plan by which the problems can be solved. Those people who were looking to the address for some immediate relief, were certainly disappointed. There is one thing to be said. Something has been said about Rayalaseema but not in one place the word 'famine' is found in the address either accidentally or by the pressure of the people of Rayalaseema; indeed there is no mention of Sundarbans and there is no mention of other places where every day in the newspapers we see that there is a famine. The men there are dying; the cattle are dying and the famine is continuing in this country. In the address there is no mention of famine and other things. If that is intended to show that the people are happy, that there is only a

small distress in the country, certainly the address disappoints all people, and all the other people outside the Parliament House who are waiting to see what would be done to them by this House.

In the third paragraph of the address it is said: "India has, after a long period of subjection, gained her freedom and independence, but freedom by itself is not enough—it must also bring a measure of happiness to our people and a lessening of the burdens they suffer from." When we examine the freedom and the independence that we have got for the last five years, what happiness have the people got and how far have the burdens of the people been lessened, we will certainly say that the conditions today show that we have not gained freedom or independence. Every day we are getting worse. There is victimization of our railway workers, ordinary workers, textile workers, handloom workers and we hear every day that the handlooms are closed, the textile mills are closed and that lakhs of workers are thrown out of employment. Even in Delhi since the subsidy was stopped 3,88,000 people were not able to draw their rations from the ration shops. When the refugees in this country complain that their small rations are not enough, that they have been driven from their shops, that they have no shelter, they have no home and they are on the road-side, certainly we say that the freedom and the independence that we have got today is not really the freedom of the poor man and the textile worker. Lakhs of handloom workers have been thrown out of employment according to the reports that we have received. In Malabar itself 26,000 workers are lying idle. In Travancore and Cochin where the main industry is the coir industry, all the coir factories are closed and half a lakh of people are today starving. The same is the case with mica workers in Bihar and workers in Tamil Nad. During the last five months or one year a number of workers had been thrown out of employment. Every day you see a number of people being thrown outside and a number of factories being closed. Even during the question hour an answer was given that the factories are being closed and some people are turned out.

As far as the condition of food is concerned, for the last five years we had been trying to do something but today the position is that there is famine in the country. Beginning in Rayalaseema it has spread to the whole of India and the address does not give any indication to show that there will

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

be immediate relief for the famine stricken people of this country. As for the subsidy, people outside thought that in the address there will be a mention about the restoration of the subsidy and that there will be some declaration by which the next day they will be able to go to the ration shop and buy even the meagre rations they are getting today. The food problem is not solved and cannot be solved unless Government understands what really is the basic reason for the food situation today. As long as the whole problem is kept in the hands of landlords and the wholesale dealers and also the officers who go to the villagers and procure food from the poor peasants and not from the landlords and as long as the land is not given to the tiller of the soil, there is not going to be any improvement. We have tried to remedy the situation for the last five years. There is the five year plan and there is the community plan. We will not be able to do anything by these plans. The basic reasons why we are not able to improve production is because the tiller of the soil is not the owner of the land, does not understand that the more he produces the more he will be able to enjoy and if he produces more, there will be nobody coming forward to evict him. Further Government is not able to spend money on improvements. We have had debates, we have had adjournment motions during the past five years and I am sure that nobody on the opposite side will say that we had been able to solve the question of food and it is therefore necessary that some drastic steps should be taken. If we say to the people that under the community project after 5 or 6 years we will be able to produce something more, certainly they who have great hopes that something will be done will be disappointed, because they are already starving. The most important problems today in the country are food and land and these two problems have not been solved.

Then I come to foreign policy. In the address it is said: "We have consistently pursued a policy of friendship with all the countries of the world and that policy, though sometimes misunderstood has been progressively appreciated by others and is yielding fruit." I want to show to the House a few instances and I want to know whether the relations with all the other countries are the same. When passports had been denied to our own people wishing to go to Russia and China and when some cultural and other missions from there are not allowed to come to this country while anybody

from America with his bag and baggage—not one or two persons but anybody in the name of anything—can come to our country and anybody can go to America, I ask,—is there no partiality? Does it show that the policy that is followed is the same? Today the villages in Malabar, Travancore and Cochin and every important town in India is full of American spies and they have got the opportunity to enter into our social life, to enter into our economic life and everywhere they are coming with money bags; there are unemployed people in the country and they want to corrupt them and when we say that our policy is a policy of friendship with all nations, I do not understand the meaning. There cannot be a policy where you can be a friend of the aggressor and also a friend of the aggressed.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (Kannur Distt. South cum Etawah Distt. East): You were a friend of Hitler.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; let the hon. Member continue his speech.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There cannot be a policy where you can be a friend of Mr. Churchill and also a friend of the people, the patriots in Malaya who are fighting for the freedom of Malaya. In the Address it is stated that we are trying to see that something is done to Tunisia. You cannot be a friend of the French Government as well as the people of Tunisia who are fighting for their freedom. Either you can be the friend of the people who deny the freedom or you can be friend of the people who fight for their own liberation and for the freedom of their own country. This policy should be made clear now. Under the cover of neutrality or an independent foreign policy we say today that we are the friends of all. We are the friends of those who continue the germ warfare in Korea and we are the friends of those who for the last two years are continuing the germ warfare by which infectious diseases are spread all over the country. We cannot say that we are the friends of the Korean people as well as those who throw bombs in Korea. There are only two things. Either you must be friend of those who fight for the freedom of their country or you must be the friend of those who deny freedom to those people. There is no mention of Viet Nam, Indonesia, Malaya or other countries.

As far as Ceylon and South Africa are concerned, the Address says that we are very much concerned about Ceylon and South Africa. When we are remaining in the Commonwealth, not today, but for the past so many

years, when the Commonwealth countries had been treating our own brothers in South Africa with contempt and treating them like untouchables, we say that we are sorry for our brethren in South Africa; I do not know what the meaning of this is. Today, in Ceylon, they are offering satyagraha for the right of vote. They are fighting against that Government. Our Agent was there in Ceylon for the last so many years. What was the agent doing? Did the Agent not know that they did not want to see that the Indians, who have gone there and worked for the last so many years, are not entitled to voting rights? Today, to say that we are sorry about Ceylon, that we are sorry about South Africa, and we will do something, has no meaning. It is time that we take a strong line of policy and tell the Members of the Commonwealth that we will not be in the Commonwealth because we have self-respect, because we love our country and because we love our friends wherever they are, in South Africa or Ceylon. They are working there. We must keep up the dignity and prestige of our nation. We will have to inform the Commonwealth that we are out of the Commonwealth because our brethren in Ceylon and South Africa are treated in such a way as to dishonour our Nation. We must keep up the prestige of our country. It will not do to say that we sympathise with our people in Ceylon and with our people in South Africa. We have been sympathising. At the same time we have been telling those Governments; we have been requesting them to do justice. What is the result of all our requests? And yet they are Members of the Commonwealth; they do not care at all.

Today, it is time that our foreign policy should be so clear that we can only be the friends of those who are fighting for the liberation of their country or the friends of those who deny that freedom. Something has been said about Korea; but no mention has been made about the germ warfare; we are very anxious about it. The cruelties that are perpetrated in Korea are so bad that no human being could sit quiet, seeing the killing of people by spreading infectious diseases, diseases which will spread to the whole of the country. If the Government does not believe that it is correct, let the Government send a Parliamentary mission to Korea to see whether it is correct or not and then let them say that we are against those people who are carrying on a germ warfare and that we do not support them.

There is no mention of linguistic provinces in this Address. Not only that; there is mention of communalism, provincialism, and casteism. That is, if anybody says, I want a linguistic state, that man will be branded as a communalist, a provincialist or a man who has got casteism. I have also the pleasure to say that I was a Congressman from 1930. We have passed resolutions that we were fighting against the British Imperialists, that we want to unite all sections of the people, first let us drive away the foreign enemy and when we have driven him away, each one of us will have a linguistic State and we will be able to develop our language and culture, our industry, etc. Why is it today that there is no mention of linguistic provinces? Swami Sitaram a congressman is starving and is offering satyagraha. There is a very strong agitation for a separate Andhra province. There is no difference between a communist or a congressman or a socialist; they all are united in their demand for a Visal Andhra; they are for an Aikya Kerala. But, no mention is made of this. Today, if you demand a linguistic province, you become a provincialist, you become a communalist. I say linguistic states are not given because if linguistic states are given, today, there will be no Congress Government in Madras, there will be no Congress Government in Travancore-Cochin. Today, the people who lead the Government will not be the Congress party, but will be others. These are the facts of today. We must see to it that we keep our promises made to the people that linguistic states will be established. In spite of the 30 years' struggle for an Andhra province, and in spite of the keen struggle for the last six months for an Andhra State, there is no mention of linguistic States.

One minute, Sir, and I shall stop. The only thing that has been stated in the Address is that Government is watching with attention all the things that are happening in this country. Government will watch with attention and has watched with attention what is going on in the country for the last five years. We have heard of what you have watched. We have heard of the jeep scandal; we have heard of the grenade scandal, and so many other scandals. Are we to think that the Government have watched with attention all these scandals for the last five years? Government say that they are watching with attention what is happening. You have watched Rayalaseema; you are watching Hissar and Sunderbans. Government say that they are watching

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

with attention. You have watched textile mill workers being thrown out; you have watched coir factory workers being thrown out; you have watched mica workers being thrown out; you will watch all the workers being thrown out. You will be saying that there is the Five Year Plan and that the community projects will bring you happiness, in five or six years. We have to tell the Government that they will be continuing to watch these things, when the people will become their own masters. Till that time you will be watching things. I have to request that the writing on the wall must be read. If the Government are not taking a definite and strong policy to see that the economic crisis that is deepening in the country is solved, then, certainly they will be responsible for creating chaos in the country and Government will have to take the whole responsibility for that.

With these words, Sir, I move the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Which particular one?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the address takes no real note of the serious famine situation developing in various parts of the country, proposes no measures for the amelioration of the conditions of the people, suggests intensification of repression through preventive detention and other measures, refuses, the formation of linguistic provinces, ignores the basic needs of industrial planning and fundamental agrarian reconstruction, accepts the humiliation of India's membership of the British Commonwealth and Empire and strengthens our present bonds of subservience to imperialist forces."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

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

"but regret that the address takes no real note of the serious famine situation developing in various parts of the country, proposes no measures for the amelioration of the conditions of the people, suggests intensification of repression through preventive detention and other measures, refuses the formation of linguistic provinces, ignores the basic needs of industrial planning and fundamental agrarian reconstruction.

accepts the humiliation of India's membership of the British Commonwealth and Empire and strengthens our present bonds of subservience to imperialist forces."

There is now very little time left at the disposal of the House. I think, in view of the allotment of time proposed and agreed to, I should now call upon Mr. Srikantan Nair.

Shri S. N. Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): Under the circumstances, I think, that instead of moving my amendments, I may support the motion moved by others as well as by myself.

Am I to move my amendments?

Mr. Speaker: It is taken as moved. Let him give the number of the amendment.

Shri N. S. Nair: The Presidential Address has been a clever piece of rhetoric written in a very beautiful language. It takes you by surprise; it takes you on the wings of poesy and fantasy and suddenly drops you into nothingness. What I have to say on this Address, I shall confine to the subject of the common man and common woman of India of today, and leave the more serious national and international problems to be dealt with by more capable and competent hands.

[SHRI M. A. AYYANGAR *in the Chair*]

Coming to the question of the common people, I am sorry to find that there is not a single note of sympathy anywhere in the Presidential Address regarding the lot of the toiling millions of India. Even regarding Rayalaseema, we find only one statement that the grave need of the hour is water: water for the soil. The human beings there are left to shift for themselves. What about the poor men, women and children, who are the very flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood, who have lived a living death every hour and minute of their existence and lost their lives due to the famine conditions there. What of those men and women who have left this country and sought their fortunes elsewhere, instead of remaining in their own homes and suffering the horrors of famine? Those that have remained there are only the sick, the old and the infirm and perhaps they are not more valuable in the eyes of the Government of India than the soil of Rayalaseema.

Another extraordinary aspect of the Address is that the Government

considers the rise in the price of foodgrains to be a matter of credit. The argument advanced is that the states demanded a lesser quota because of higher prices, this argument naturally reminds us of the famous satire of Jonathan Swift. When the people of Ireland complained of continuous recurrence of famine Swift wrote that it would be a very good scheme to chop up all the infants of Ireland and send them packed as meat for their English masters.

Another matter which I would like to bring to the notice of the Members in this House is that several causes have been given for the fall in prices of the various articles in general but no specific mention has been made of the fall in price of copra and coconut oil, which is stupendous and extraordinary. There is a special reason for this. The Government of India have recently reduced the import duty on copra and coconut oil. What for? It is only to help the Birlas and the Tatas to run their soap-manufacturing industries with greater profit that they have cut down the import duty. The result is that 12.5 million people suffer from this deliberate cut in import duty. Of course the Birlas and the Tatas run the Government. It is a capitalists' Government and the Government has to take dictation from the capitalists. The middle-class people of Kerala, depend to a very great extent on coconut and coconut products to supplement their income and they are suffering acutely from this reduction of duty. We demand with a single voice irrespective of party affiliations that the import duty on copra and coconut oil be raised once again, so that the Ceylonese who are now trampling our brethren under their feet may not profit by this reduction in the import duty.

Another matter of importance to which I would draw the attention of the House is the coir industry. Mr. Gopalan dealt with the manufacturing side of it but I want to touch on the cottage industry side of it. The Congress Ministry claims to be following the example of Gandhiji in their policy to develop cottage industries. The coir industry supports one million people of the South West coast of India. This cottage industry has received a severe setback, because the British Government and the other European Governments have adopted stringent measures against the coir and other products of India. We should include these products in the trade agreements we

conclude with them and see that something is done to the industry. Up till now nothing has been done for coir industry. If we could do one-tenth of what has been done for the Jute industry we will be able to provide one million families with work and food in the West coast of India.

Another matter of importance which I want to bring to the notice of the House is the restriction imposed on monazite by the Government of India. The House may know that in Travancore-Cochin we are fortunate to a very great extent in our mineral wealth. But the Government of India curtails the production of monazite which costs £250 per ton. Four small bags of it will fetch £250. Since monazite is not allowed to be manufactured there what is done is that along with other waste it is thrown into the sea. Otherwise we could get millions of rupees, if only the Government of India decided to allow monazite to be sold to any foreign country irrespective of political considerations. I do know that political considerations are involved in the selling of monazite, from which thorium for atom bombs is produced. The Anglo-Americans and the Russians have ample thorium to make hydrogen and atom bombs. If there is any shortage of monazite it is only for industrial purposes. There is no reason why we should not sell our monazite to any purchasing country which is able to pay a reasonable price, so that in turn our country might get capital and other industrial goods for the development of our own industries.

On the other hand, what is done now is that there is a definite specification that there should not be even one thousandth part of Monazite in final ilmanite and if there is more it would not be shipped. Raising the specification of monazite even to 5 per cent. will be harmless, as it will not prove profitable to extract this monazite by any foreign country. In the interest of the workers in Chavara and Manavalakurichi in Travancore-Cochin State I submit to the Government that they should reconsider the question regarding the specification of monazite and also in the interests of the country and its industrialisation. We should consider the question of shipping monazite from this country to any other country abroad.

I want now to draw the attention of the House to the anti-labour policy of the Government. I want to refer to the recent shooting in Gorakhpur, where workers only demanded that they should not be discharged and also

[Shri N. S. Nair]

to the shooting in Pesumalai Estate in Travancore-Cochin, where the INTUC led the workers. *(Interruption)* If you say that your unions are controlled by Communists, it means that you are inefficient or you are yourselves Communists. The poor workers only wanted their share of rice to be given to them and instead of that they were showered with bullets. The final casualty is not known for it is hedged in on all sides by forests.

Then in the matter of compulsory adjudication the usual policy is that whatever is favourable to the management is enforced and the awards of the industrial tribunals are invariably on the side of the capitalists and if there is an award in favour of the workers it is not enforced. It is my humble submission that instead of enforcing adjudication all matters be settled by arbitration and conciliation. The Address of the President shows that the policy of the Government is a dead horse—dead, both morally and intellectually.

Mr. Chairman: What is the amendment number which the hon. Member is supposed to have moved?

Shri N. S. Nair: No. 15.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

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

“but regret that the address contains no assurance of the discontinuance of the present anti-labour policy of the Government, although five years have nearly passed since transfer of Power.”

The House then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past two of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chuir]

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): I have several amendments here, but I wish to speak on three of them, No. 66, No. 67 and No. 71

As regards foreign relations, it has often been said that the prestige of our country has been very much enhanced in the family of nations. I for one refute that statement because if we had any prestige at all, the Kashmir question and several other matters like South Africa—treatment of Indians in South Africa and now

treatment of Indians in Ceylon—would not be possible, and no other country would stand the situation that has existed in Kashmir for four years and yet the matter is not yet settled. The fact of the matter is, although our country is neutral, it is passive neutrality, there is nothing active in it. I therefore suggest that if the Prime Minister had continued the process, that he had started in the beginning, of holding the Asian Conference in 1948 with such a fanfare that it aroused hopes in many hearts all over Asia, if he had continued that process of mobilising the forces of peace in the Asian countries, there would be a third force which would neither be in this bloc nor in the other but stand for peace and peace alone, because these countries in Asia can never have the armaments that the modern democracies like Great Britain and America have, or in the other bloc Russia has accumulated. It is therefore that the only way to avoid war is for the small Asian countries and also the South American countries to get together in the cause of peace and mobilise the people so that the popular will may prevail and the Atom Bombs of either bloc will not have the effect that people think they will have.

In this connection I wish to remind the House that only in the recent past, five or six years ago, Mahatma Gandhi's “soul force” which took its roots in the heart of every Indian, was able to drive out of here the great imperialist power Great Britain. With all its cannon, ammunition and all that, it could not stay here in the long run. So, the example of a force for peace which depends and relies on the will of the people is there before us, and I should say that judging from the success of that movement,—it is also spreading in certain sections of people in the democratic countries—I would say that that is the only way of preserving peace, avoiding war and bringing peace and prosperity all over the world and not only in Asia.

I was already saying that the statement that we have enhanced our prestige in the family of nations is not at all tenable because of the Kashmir situation and South Africa. Then I come to the Commonwealth. In the Commonwealth we still remain, but if in the Commonwealth, countries like South Africa segregate the Asian people, Indian people, disenfranchise them—Ceylon does the same thing—and with our neutrality, with our love of negotiations we remain in the Commonwealth, it seems to me that

the other countries are taking advantage of our passive neutrality and riding rough shod over the rights and privileges of our people, resident not only in the Commonwealth countries, but elsewhere.

Then, I come to the food situation—Amendment No. 67 is about food. With regard to food, this has been the burning problem ever since this Government took charge of the country and every now and then we have had plans, “food drive”, “production drive on a war basis”, “intensive cultivation”, “Grow More Food Campaign” etc.—all of them have failed. The Prime Minister had said about two years ago that the country would be self-sufficient in food by the 31st of March 1952, but long before that date, the Planning Commission gave out in its report that it may be that for five years India could not be self-sufficient and India would have to import foodgrains from outside. It is very unfortunate that the power at the Centre as well as in the Provinces do not wish to tackle this problem at the root. The very first thing is that the people, the cultivators do not have the incentive to produce more. That is because most of the land in this country—about 80 per cent of it—is in the hands of about 10 per cent of the people who own thousands of acres, sometimes even one lakh acres. These lands are let out on crop sharing or on high rent and the tenants are evicted almost every year. The piece of land is taken out from one hand given to another, and in that way there is no incentive in the cultivators to improve the lands and the yield on the land is going down from year to year. Besides that, since the beginning of this Government's regime in 1947 there have been so many evictions—in spite of the laws passed by the Provincial Governments that there will not be any eviction there have been so many evictions—that the Planning Commission itself says that within five years about a crore of acres of land have remained fallow. You will therefore see that the crux of the food problem is, taking the land out of the hands of people who do not cultivate and giving it to those who cultivate, so that when a tenant knows that the land is his perpetually, that he will enjoy it and his sons and grandsons will enjoy it, he will improve the yield as small cultivators have done in any other parts of the world.

Again, I must say that the statistics that the Government gives us are not correct. I have seen myself in many parts of Orissa that there are thou-

sands of acres of uplands which are not fit for paddy cultivation, for water cultivation, but in which rabi crops are grown sometimes. Those lands are being eroded—there is no grass on them. They can be brought under cultivation only by Government by starting a land army, not the *Bhoomi Sena* that the Government is having now but a regular land army of people who work on land; Government should maintain them, give them their food and clothing like the army. They alone are the people who can bring that land under cultivation. Again, I say that this tractor cultivation, that is this mechanised cultivation which does not accomplish the results that are expected, will never do. It is the manpower of the country that has brought so many crores of acres of land within generations, under cultivation, when the tractor was never heard of. Therefore, it is they who can bring the land under cultivation.

There is not much time, so I will say a little about amendment No. 71 with regard to the welfare state that this Government always talks about. I have recently seen that the Adibasis, the tribal people and the Harijans, the *bastis* do not even have a surface well to have drinking water. They drink all kinds of rotten water, bathe in that water, get skin diseases and stomach troubles and they lose their vitality to such an extent that if there is a case of cholera in the village the whole village is wiped out. Now, Adibasis and Harijans have in the Constitution been given as a first charge to the Government and it has been laid down that Government will spend special amounts of money and have a backward classes commission to see that the work is properly done. Five years have elapsed and I say there are dozens of villages where neither in the Adibasi *bastis* nor in the Harijan *bastis* is there a well for drinking water not to speak of tube-wells which we in the cities want nowadays, there is not even a surface well in these villages. Under these circumstances I do not see how we can say that this Government is bent on building this country as a welfare state. I particularly point this out because about one-third of our population consists of Harijans and Adibasis. If one-third of our manpower is wasted in this manner I do not see how we can advance. This is a thing which not only the Government but the people, the Indian society has neglected. These people have been neglected for so long and it is only during the last ten or fifteen years that Mahatma Gandhi had brought the problem to our attention so that we

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

must advance them to our stage of development, so that we can pull together to build the welfare state. I therefore refute that statement of a welfare state. The fact of the matter is that this Government has only pious words and nothing else, no action. It is just like the *sloka* in the Upanishads which in our prayers we repeat daily:—

सर्वे सुखिनः भवन्तु, सर्वे सन्तु निरामया ।

सर्वे भद्राणि पश्यन्तु, मा कश्चिद् दुःखं भाग्यभवेत् ॥

[May everyone be happy, may everyone be free of disease. May everyone see the good and may none be subject to sorrow.]

But do we act up to these noble sentiments? Our forefathers have repeated this for generations. I say that these Harijans and Adibasis have remained in this condition for generations for centuries past, but now that we are conscious of their condition if one-third of our people are left in this state we cannot make any progress. Is it not essential that their welfare should be the first thing that the Central or Provincial Governments should take up? I do not want to bring in provincial matters here, I know very well that is not a subject to be discussed here, but I bring it to the attention of the Government for this reason that the Government does contribute some money, whether a large amount or small, for the development of these people, and therefore it is the duty of the Union Government to see that the rudiments of a healthy existence are provided for them at the start.

I beg to move:

(i) That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regret that no mention has been made—

(a) of the developing of a Third Force in conjunction with the independent small nations, which alone will be able to ensure peace and prosperity in the world;

(b) of the intention of the Government with regard to foreign possessions in India; and

(c) of the Government's policy with regard to the treatment meted out to citizens of Indian origin in foreign countries.”

(ii) That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regret that no mention has been made—

(a) of the extreme suffering and hardship caused to the people by the withdrawal of food subsidies and the ways and means to mitigate them; and

(b) of the serious famine situation prevailing in many parts of the country.”

(iii) That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regret the absence of any mention of what Government have done and plan to do in the future, with a view to advance the scheduled tribes and scheduled castes, educationally, socially and economically, so that these two backward communities may come upon the standard of the more advanced people of the country, before 1961.”

Mr. Speaker: Amendments moved:

(i) That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regret that no mention has been made—

(a) of the developing of a Third Force in conjunction with the independent small nations, which alone will be able to ensure peace and prosperity in the world;

(b) of the intention of the Government with regard to foreign possessions in India; and

(c) of the Government's policy with regard to the treatment meted out to citizens of Indian origin in foreign countries.”

(ii) That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regret that no mention has been made—

(a) of the extreme suffering and hardship caused to the people by the withdrawal of fo

subsidies and the ways and means to mitigate them; and

- (b) of the serious famine situation prevailing in many parts of the country."

(ii) That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"but regret the absence of any mention of what Government have done and plan to do in the future, with a view to advance the scheduled, tribes and scheduled castes, educationally, socially and economically, so that these two backward communities may come up to the standard of the more advanced people of the country, before 1961."

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Twenty-one years ago two striping students came out to India in search of a grand adventure. One of them has moved the Motion of Thanks to the President for the address given to us a few days ago, the other is standing here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to oppose the Motion. This I consider to be a curious twist of destiny that two seekers of truth, two young people fully imbued with the desire to serve the country have after twenty-one years of sojourn turned out to be occupants of opposite camps. I feel that this one single incident would bring into focus the present discontent in our midst today.

In the address of the President reference was made to the teachings of the Father of the Nation. I regret to say and I say this without fear of contradiction that the teachings of Bapu have become a very precious commodity intended only for export purposes. I feel that after five years of Government in this country in the name of the people, the teachings of Gandhiji have been completely forgotten. I recall the Prime Minister's ringing exhortation to the country years ago, before he assumed office, that he would hang the blackmarketeer from the nearest lamp post. Today if I do not misread or misinterpret the conditions in the country it occurs to me that the Government of the land has been sold out to reaction, has become a cat's paw of vested interests, has become the hand maid of the rich peasant, with the result that the concept of *Daridranarayana* which Bapu has familiarised through a quarter of a century of his earthly ministrations to us, has been completely forgotten. My hon. friend the mover of the motion

26 P.S.D.

of thanks used a very rich phraseology which I have noted down. He spoke of his transition from the sylvan surroundings of Shanti Niketan to the imperial grandeur of this city. If I do not do him an injustice, the Government in this country today has been so thoroughly obsessed with imperial grandeur, that the people, especially the party in power, who have for half a century been the trusted servants of the nation have today become a ruling class. To the extent a ruling class prevails in this country, there is a complete distrust of the Government and more than everything else a destruction of the ethics which the Father of the Nation taught us.

I have spent three years now continuously in the field. I have made a bonfire of the hundreds of books I have read and the dozens of books that I have written on questions of high policy. I sought to become an Indian, and I am prepared to say with all the conviction at my command that the Government of the land today is completely subject to the tyranny of the local tycoons of the ruling party. There is interference everywhere. There is corruption, nepotism; in fact, these have become catch words and they have lost their meaning. It occurs to me that nothing has been done in this land to set right the lop-sided administration which is cracking up.

When one dispassionately views the manner in which we as a people who have obtained freedom are conducting our affairs, we would come to the inevitable conclusion that we are developing a sky-scraper mentality. We are trying to streamline our economy. We are trying to do too many things in a hurry and at a tremendous cost. I have noted down here the tragedy of India in terms of figures. We have spent Rs. 735 crores within five years on the import of black foreign food. We are spending or are planning to spend Rs. 650 crores on gigantic multi-purpose projects. As one who has spent more than ten years in almost every continent in the world, I am not here to say that I do not want modernisation or industrialisation in a big way. But at a time when the ravages of partition are still staring us in the face, when there are scarcities everywhere, a stitch here and a stitch there would have helped us to increase production. On the other hand, we are throwing away hundreds of crores of rupees on multi-purpose projects and other undertakings involving huge expenditure and taking, in Government's own estimate, a long number of

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

years to fructify. To my mind, if one third of this money or even less is distributed more or less on a proportionate basis to every district in the country, with a little improvement here and a little improvement there, a minor water works here and a minor rivulet there, we would have increased our production immediately. The country cannot afford to wait for these multi-purpose projects to fructify if we are to stave off starvation, hunger and the consequent demoralisation which, if I do not misread contemporary history, will lead to rebellion. I must say without a sense of shame that our people are in a sullen and rebellious mood. I am not wedded to any Ism. I am an Indian first and nothing more. I think I will be expressing the sentiments of most people here if I say that people have today voted no-confidence in the Government, and the gentlemen opposite are returned here on a minority vote, and we have a minority Government. Things would have been different if there had only been a certain amount of collaboration on the part of those who opposed the present ruling party. History would have been written in a different way. It occurs to me that if we only go back to the people, even as Bapu said that we must make peace with the people, things would turn out differently. This is not what the Government is doing at the moment. It is completely isolated. Members of the Government are living in their ivory towers. They feel that exercise of authority would lead them safely and would permit them to carry on the Government for five years. In all probability, they will do it. China has done it for longer years. I do sincerely trust that we will not go the China way. Again, if I do not misread contemporary history, we are on the brink of disaster.

One more word and I have done. The President has made a reference in his address to the policy of peace pursued by India in the sphere of international relations. I am a student of international affairs in a small way. I have seen the League of Nations at work 20 years ago. I have also seen the United Nations in action. It occurs to me that it will not be a correct picture to say that we are at peace with other countries in the world. On the basis of documents that I have studied, I sincerely believe that there is not a single friend for us in the world today. We have assumed the position of a 'Solomon come to judgment'. We have been accustomed to declaring from the house

tops that we have a foreign policy which is correct. I do not think any Foreign Minister of any country in the world in recorded history has declared from the house tops that his foreign policy was correct and that the foreign policy of the rest of the world was wrong. It occurs to me that if we look more internally than externally, if we develop sanctions, if we create concord with the people, and prepare them to march with the Government step by step, then there will be meaning to our words. Neutrality must be defended. We are not prepared enough to defend neutrality, because we have not made an effort to do so. The people as I said earlier are strangers to the Government. I am pleading on this solemn occasion for peace between the Government and the people, and if what I have said this afternoon makes an impression upon the Government that we must again go back to the people, then I would have done my duty towards the country and towards my constituents. I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the 'policy of friendship' pursued by the Government of India has today left us without any sincere friends in the world."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved.

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

"but regret that the 'policy of friendship' pursued by the Government of India has today left us without any sincere friends in the world."

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): Let me thank you for giving me this first opportunity after coming to this House to say a few words on the President's Address. Before I proceed, let me congratulate the two friends who made maiden speeches. One friend was Shri Chanda and another was Shri Gopalan. Shri Gopalan was obsessed, I am sorry to say, by an ideology of and a loyalty to a country which is not our own. Otherwise, I cannot understand his reference to germ warfare etc. and also the way in which he referred to the Americans here. Not that I want to defend anybody, but I want to say definitely that our loyalty should be to this great country of ours and to none else. First that, and afterwards we may owe our loyalty to humanity and to the world. I would request him and those with

him to face the problems of this country with that idea in mind, so that we shall be able to contribute our best during the discussions in this House.

Within the short time available to me, I shall deal with only one or two important problems. First, I want to say a few words about the village community projects. Much has been talked about village improvement and about rural development. I have heard about Brayene's Rural work in Gurgoan. There are great books on the subject too. When I happened to be in this House under the leadership of my late revered friend Shri Bhulabhai Desai, one crore of rupees was allotted for such rural welfare; a cartoon was then published by Shri Shankar who still continues to delight us with his cartoons. There was a big tank and a lot of water in it. Pipes were laid out to bring the water to the bottom, i.e. the people, but at certain ends big taps exhausted the water—salaries of Rs. 5000, salaries of Rs. 3000, salaries of Rs. 2000 etc.—and when it reached the villager, it reached him in drops and even those small drops evaporated in the summer. So, nothing was left. I would suggest that the same thing should not be repeated. I have had the pleasure of going through the pamphlet which has been circulated about this community projects administration. Page 32 gives an account of the cost of these projects. The total cost of the projects has been estimated at Rs. 65 crores, but the expenditure on supervising personnel which is supposed to be 125 is Rs. 5,74,000. On other personnel it is proposed to spend 3 lakhs; on field workers Rs. 3 lakhs. Equipment for personnel comes to Rs. 1,85,000. The total cost is Rs. 13,45,000, which is certainly more than 20 per cent. of the amount allotted.

3 P.M.

I would in this connection like to sound a note of warning to persons in charge of this administration. If we are really to uplift the villages, money should not be given to administrators, to civilians, to people who have nothing in common with the villagers, except to administer laws to them. And may I also add that care should be taken to see that people who work these should be people filled with village ideologies,—not people who advise others to live in villages, while they themselves roll in luxury

in towns. I hope a good selection of officers will be made and this money will really reach the villages, so that they may develop in prosperity to the extent that is possible.

One other warning which I would like to give in this connection is this. People are raised not by grants from above, but by their own self-efforts. The best thing that we can give, the great contribution that we can make, is to inspire them to work, so that they may work for themselves. No country in the world, no people in the world have been raised by external help alone. External help may be of assistance, but each has to be raised by himself. The habit of spoon-feeding is a vital mistake. I would, therefore, like to recommend to the people in charge of this administration—I have had some talk with them—to study what is being done under the rural welfare scheme in my own province—Madras. For schemes costing Rs. 5,000 we give a grant of Rs. 500, so that the people themselves may come forward to make up the rest. It is they who have to help themselves. Unless we inspire people to depend upon themselves, make them manly, make them strong, make them feel that they can solve their own problems, no grant in the world can help them.

While on this subject, you will excuse me if I were to say a few words about this agreement that has been entered into under the Point Four Programme between the United States of America and ourselves. About one or two matters in the agreement, I am not very happy. Article 1 deals with preliminaries; article 2 appoints two representatives, one for the United States of America and another for India; under article 4 Rs. 25 crores are to be contributed by the United States of America and Rs. 25 crores by India. Perhaps one of the clauses in the agreement came into it without proper thought. This village project administration is part of the Government of India. It is not a private organisation it is not a missionary organisation; it is not a philanthropic organisation—it is a department of the Government of India—and I am surprised to see this clause in it:

“Pursuant to the recommendations of the Committee, specific project agreements shall be executed by an officer of the designated Ministry on behalf of the Government of India and by the Director on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. Each project agree-

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

ment shall define the scope and the specific character of the project to be undertaken, the method by which it is to be carried out, the period within which and the agency or agencies through which it shall be executed and all other matters required for its effective implementation. * * *

With respect to each project the Committee shall render to the Government of India a quarterly report of operations and progress of the project, the precise form and coverage of such report to be determined in consultation with the Director at the time of the execution of the relevant project agreement."

The Director who is referred to is the representative of the United States of America. I should really have thought that in the working of the Government of India no external agency should have any place. I think that in the sovereignty of this country, nobody however great, however well intentioned, however good, however friendly, should have a voice. I think we would have been wiser to give this fund to an independent body, in which the Government of India may have a good voice. Fifty crores are by no means a large sum which private bodies cannot manage. In that body the United States of America—the Government which contributes—can well have a voice. The Government of India can well have a place. (*An Hon. Member*: Money is important.) Yes, money is important; but more than money is the independence of this country. I want all that money to come, if we could get it. But that money should be utilised not through a Department of the Government of India, with a foreign power having a voice in the administration of that Department, but by an independent body. I do feel that the proper thing would have been to make a separate organisation of it and not make it a Department of the Government of India in which another power has a right to interfere and give its opinions.

I have read the reply which the American Ambassador, Mr. Chester Bowles,—I understand he is a noble man of a noble country—gave to Dr. Kumarappa. I believe their intentions are good. I do believe that it is their intention to develop this country. But I believe that this work

should have been done by a separate organisation, and not through a department in which another Government has a voice.

Another matter on which I would like to say a few words is Ceylon. Ceylon is very near to us. I do not know whether you know that only a strait of 22 miles separates the mainland of India from Ceylon. On either side we have the Tamils—on this side we have the Tamils of India; on the other we have the Tamils belonging to Ceylon. The problem of Ceylon is not usually understood or appreciated in Northern India. It is very simple, Sir.

Till 1947 there were no problems at all. Till 1947 all Indians had suffrage. Let me make one point clear. It is not that the Indian settlers want a new privilege. No. They had this privilege from 1932. From 1932 there is adult suffrage in that island and all the Indians who went there, subject to a minimum residential qualification, had the privilege of voting. But what happened? In 1947 they made a small difference—but that became worse in 1949—The Indian and Pakistan Residents' Citizenship Act was enacted under which they had to register themselves to keep their suffrage. At first the Ceylon Indian Congress decided that Indians should not register themselves, but later on they agreed to it. About 2,37,000 applications, representing approximately 8 lakhs of Indians were made for citizenship. The tragedy is that although two years have passed since April 1950, the period originally fixed by the Ceylon Government for the receipt and scrutiny of applications, only a small number, about 7,000, of applications were reported to have been disposed of, representing approximately 24,000 people, and only 9,000 persons were granted citizenship. It is not a new right that is being claimed. In the previous voting list there were 1,65,000 Indians registered as voters. The Government of India wanted that they at least should be given citizenship. Even that was refused. The population of Ceylon is 65 lakhs—approximately the population of two districts of this country.

The Home Minister of that State proclaimed and said: Look here, unless you go under, unless you dub yourselves as slaves, unless you say you have no citizenship in this country, unless you are prepared to accept this low status. I will not give you protection. He said in other words: I will set rowdies and thieves on you, you will be attacked, every such thing will be done, and no protection will be

given to you. No Minister of a State worth the name could have made a speech like that. The matter was taken up by the Government of India, I know. But with what results? We know till now there are no results. In this matter we are not dealing with a country like South Africa, an entirely different nation, with an entirely different culture, an entirely different civilization. No. The whole population of Ceylon is composed of three kinds or really three waves of people that went from India; first during the time of Asoka, and Sangamitra, then in Pandyan's time in 1,000 A.D., and then about two or three hundred years back when labourers were wanted to make the New Ceylon and hard-working Indians, men and women, went there who laboured and died and who established their rights because of the work that they did. And to these people they have given this treatment. It is something which affects not only our hearts and minds but something much more than that: it affects our status and the dignity of this great country. I would like the Government to take up this matter seriously. I do want to suggest and it is not proper for me to suggest what we should do, or what measures should be adopted. I would leave it to the Prime Minister. But I would say that this is a matter which should be faced squarely and strongly so that justice may be done to our people in that country.

I do not want to say anything more. A reference has been made to the conditions in Rayalaseema in the address. Let me tell you that Rayalaseema is suffering in the grip of a great famine. My hon. friend Mr. Sitarama Reddy will, I am sure, deal with this matter in greater detail when he speaks. I must congratulate the Army for the great work they have done there. But there are other districts like Coimbatore which are suffering from famine which must be attended to.

I do not like to take much more of your time except to say that we have done well, as well, as could be expected from any Government, and in the future we hope we will do much better so that prosperity may be brought to the people.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): At the inauguration of the first Parliament of the Indian Republic we were looking forward with hope and expectation to the Presidential address. We thought that at this historic occasion he would enunciate some new policy which would extend some benefits to the people; we thought

that he would propose some immediate and concrete measures to lighten the heavy burden on our people; we thought there would be something in it to enthuse and call the people to rally round the National Government to participate in the great task of building the nation. I am afraid we have been very greatly disappointed. What was in that speech? It was the usual, formal speech meant for a ceremonial occasion, full of platitudes, beautiful words and high sounding and empty phrases. There were phrases of "national and social justice" and "pledging ourselves to the service of the nation". But the whole speech was marked by a tone of placid complacency. We missed the sense of urgency that should have been there, to grapple with the serious problems that face the country, the serious problems corroding the very life of the nation.

Today India is suffering from the most vital problem of food. There is food shortage, high price of food, famine and near-famine conditions prevailing in more than one part of the country. How did the President tackle these problems in his speech? This super-priority problem has of course been taken notice of by him. He has devoted two paragraphs to them, for which we are thankful. But in what language are those two paragraphs couched? He does not want to commit himself one way or the other. He mentions Rayalaseema but forgets the word 'famine'. What is the phrase used? We are told that "scarcity conditions" prevail in Rayalaseema. He remembers Rayalaseema but does not remember other parts of South India, Bihar, Madhya Bharat or Hissar and Sunderbans (Bengal). Then he mentions that there is "distress and discontent" because of the rise in the price of food. Does that give you a correct picture of the condition of the country? Is it merely "distrust and discontent"? He forgets that satyagraha has been launched in Bombay, Poona and other places over this question and that there is strong public agitation in most of the towns and even in Delhi where Parliament is in session. Does the address give us any idea of the intensity of the problem? Do we get any idea of the misery in which the people are steeped in the famine areas? We do not see anything. That is why we are greatly disappointed. We wonder whether the Government is fully apprised of the situation. More than that, there is nothing in the speech to show that any concrete and immediate steps are being taken to meet this challenge in the present food situation.

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

We are told that natural calamities have brought this about. I have been a Member of this Parliament before. Before me Food Ministers have come and gone, but the food situation has remained the same and the plea for inability to cope with the problem has been the same—natural calamity, drought, failure of rain. How long is this Government going to make this plea? Can any modern Government afford to make this plea for ever? I understand—I do not know whether the information is correct—that in India we now have a twentyfive years cycle of bad period. In the Indian monsoon there are good and bad periods and I am told that now we are in the midst of the bad period. We have had five years of rain shortage and we may have another twenty years of rain shortage. I do not know whether Government has any report about this. If that is so, are we going to make the plea of natural calamity and sit tight for twenty years and wait for better days? Government must step in and do something.

That brings me to the other question. Let us see how far this food situation is created by nature and how far it is a man-made famine—I am deliberately using this phrase. The time at my disposal is very short. I therefore cannot go into it at great length. I will just take a few glaring things. It is well known—or I should use the word notorious—that the vacillating policy of the Government with regard to the abolition of zamindari has led to large-scale eviction of tenants. During the five years of Congress rule 10 million acres of land have gone out of cultivation. This is admitted in the Five Year Plan. The reason given in the Five Year Plan is that landlords were afraid that "adverse rights would accrue to the tenants if they remained on the land." I know that some of the land has since then come back under cultivation, but the main damage remains. So, 10 million acres going out of cultivation means 2 million tons of food being lost to us annually. What did the Government do to stop these evictions, I want to know. I have a little experience myself of this. When I was a Member of the U.P. Legislature I myself went on behalf of the kisans to Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant over this matter. Nothing was done. I can quote several instances. Time and again tenants have raised this cry, but nothing has been done and thousands have been evicted.

Let us take the Grow More Food campaign. Crores have been spent on

it. Much growing of food has been done on files and papers, we know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I must point out to the Members that they must not carry on their talks in a manner so as to disturb the speech. Hon. Members may differ from the speaker, but they are bound to hear the speaker very attentively. We must maintain silence and allow others to hear. This continuous talk disables me from catching what the speaker has been saying. This is happening at all times, not only with this speaker but with many other speakers. It does not redound to the credit of the House that Members should be indifferently talking and cracking jokes or making some remarks, when very important problems are being discussed from different points of view.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I would submit out of the crores that were spent on the grow more food if some of it had been diverted to the raising of a land army in three years we might have put under cultivation 10 million acres. If that had been done, we would have had another 2 million tons of food grains every year. In England in 1942, during the war year, mind you, the women's land army brought 5 million acres of land under cultivation. If that could be done in England, why can that be not done here? Had this land army been raised, not only would our food grains have increased but something more could have been done. That disciplined army could have changed the face of our countryside. We could have started model villages and co-operative farming. A disciplined national life would have come into existence, but nothing was done. Let us take another important problem—irrigation. Without irrigation Indian agriculture cannot improve. The Government has undertaken very big river valley projects. They are good projects and no doubt they will yield good results but let us see how much of the problem these projects will tackle. We have 26 crore acres of land needing irrigation. Under the British regime 4½ crores acres were under irrigation and these river valley projects will bring another 1½ crores. Some people say that the project will fructify in 6 years' time and others in about 10 years. At the completion of the projects 6 crore acres of land will come under irrigation and it will give us an additional yield of 3 million tons but, within the 10 years, the population also will increase and whatever little foodgrain we will gain will be counterbalanced by the increase in the population, and the cry for food

will remain. If we have to tackle this problem, we have to think of the remaining 20 crore acres of land. What are we going to do about that? We have not got the money to start very big projects to irrigate 20 crore acres of land and so we have to think of wide spread minor irrigation projects. By voluntary labour of the people in the states, we shall have to make small canals, Tanks and wells. How can this be done? Voluntary labour is there in this country, but we have to enthuse them and bring them forward. If they are enthused, they will come forward. What can create that enthusiasm? It is not created on conditions of frustration and hunger. If we want the people to be enthused, if we want the people to come forward and build the nation, we have to give them something and what is that something that our land hungry people want? They want land. A re-division of land is a pre-condition for the creation of enthusiasm among the people. But what has been done about the land re-division? In the five years of the Congress Government, nothing has been done. In the five year plan there is a sentence which says that they are afraid that this would unleash "organized forces of disruption". Does it mean that the stalmate should continue? It appears to me that this Government is not aware of the acuteness of the problem and not conscious of the urgency. If the Government is not conscious of the urgency, there is someone in India sitting in a corner at Wardha, a thin frail man who is conscious of that urgency and, how has he taken up the problem? In this hot weather, when we are sitting, in air conditioned rooms this naked man is walking miles and miles of this hot country begging for land, that is how he is trying to tackle the problem of land division. Having despaired of the Governments intention or ability to tackle the problem he has started his own programme. This man who believes in peoples' economy has started this on his own and what was said by the expert of the Government, Mr. R. K. Patil? He scoffed at the scheme and said this was unscientific and will lead to further fragmentation. To this Vinobha ji has rightly retorted "I am only trying to give half a bread where there is none and I cannot wait indefinitely for sweets and delicacies". So we want peoples' economies and we want practical people to take charge of things and help build country. I say that voluntary labour is there; they would come forward provided we know how to harness it. I had the experience of seeing a bit of this when I was in Noakhali with

Mahatma Gandhi. What did I see? I saw people from the highest caste to the lowest, rich and poor alike. They came out with their spades, they built the road for Mahatma Gandhi when he was on his walking tour. I know it can be done if enthusiasm is created. In 3 years the minor irrigation projects would have given an additional yield of food grain to the tune of 4 million tons. If the Government had followed a correct policy, if the eviction had been stopped, if the land army had been created, if these minor irrigation projects had been taken up, I am sure that 8 million tons more of food grains would have been available every year. Therefore I say, this is not a nature-made famine but this is a man-made famine. I pose this question to the House: Who are responsible for this man-made famine? It is not for me to answer, but it is for you to do so. If the Government cannot take up these projects immediately, I know there is plenty of cultivable uncultivated land lying fallow. Why cannot the Government take this land over and give it to the people to cultivate? Even if this can be done, that would yield a good deal more of food grains. But unfortunately in some places where these projects are started, even these lands are going to private vested interests. The result is that chronic under-nourishment, death and famine have become a common feature in the country. I understand that 6 men out of ten, and 8 women out of 10 are under-nourished and I should think that 9 children out of 10 are under-nourished. I have the misfortune to work among the masses and I have seen with my own eyes how the health of the children have dwindled down. I am sorry to observe that there is no mention about the refugees in the President's address; that is perhaps to give an impression, that the Government have solved the problem. When the refugees came from West Pakistan in 1947 they came after suffering great hardship and travail but they were healthy. In these five years they have become pale skeletons. When I address a public meeting, I deliberately look around to see a healthy face. I do not see a healthy face. There is acute malnutrition in this country and no nation can build itself up on this basis. Our nation is going down. I ask the Government: Can the Government build a stable state out of hungry people? The hunger of the people does not allow them to be patient for long. Let the Government take the warning. Hungry mothers cannot see their children dying before them. How long will Indian woman-

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

hood and motherhood tolerate this? Women make very good material for satyagraha. A time will come when hungry men and women will not tolerate this degradation. Therefore, I hope that the new Government will show us something new, will hold forth to us some new hope. Let me end whatever little I have to say with a phrase of our Prime Minister. If you go into the Secretariat in each room of the building, you will find this message of Shri Jawaharlaljee: "I am not interested in excuses for delay. I am interested only in a thing done." We also are interested in a thing done and we want to see the people of our country well fed and happy.

Shri H. S. Reddy (Kurnool) : While supporting the motion of thanks to the President for his address, I should say that I was surprised to hear the mover of the amendment to the motion say that the address was a declaration of war against the people. I do wish that he had substantiated his statement. It is easy to make a statement like that. I watched carefully and attentively to see whether he was going to substantiate the statement that he made. No; he did not do it. I ask him to read the address carefully. Paragraph 16 refers to the increased production in certain sectors of industry and partly also in foodgrains: not very much. I see production in jute has gone up by about 50 per cent. and similarly in respect of some other products. Is this mention by the President of this fact a war on the people? No, Sir. Can we mention that the Government propose to start community projects which are going to help the people to a better way of life, be called a war on the people? No, Sir. That is why I say that it is mere verbiage unsubstantiated by facts. I would have very much liked the hon. Member who moved the amendment to substantiate what he said.

Then, again, he made a statement that there was large-scale unemployment, that people were thrown out and that so many factories were closed. I do wish that he had quoted a few figures. I hope at least some of the Members of his party when they speak next would give a few figures, because, that would give the Government a chance to know where the unemployment is, what are the factories that closed and which is the field in which there is unemployment. It is true there is under-employment. In a poor country that cannot be helped. But, every effort has been made to

see that as far as possible under-employment or unemployment is alleviated. Merely to say that certain things have happened, without substantiating the statement by facts and figures does not carry us any farther. One hon. Member on the opposition side said that the speech made by the President was full of platitudes and verbiage. But, I do wish that the hon. Members who spoke from the opposition had stuck to some facts, and brought out some facts instead of indulging in high-flown and familiar verbiage.

Now, much has been said about the non-mention of scarcity or famine areas, about non-using of the word famine in the President's address. I may say to the hon. Members, as one having held the port-folio of Revenue in the Government of Madras till a few days ago, and knowing what has been done by the Government both at the Centre and the State to relieve the famine conditions in my State of Madras, that that criticism is unfair and not correct. When the Government of Madras.—I was at that time in charge of Famine Relief—approached the Government at the Centre for a loan, it was expeditiously sanctioned. I know for a fact that the hon. President was anxious to visit the areas affected by famine in Madras. I know the anxiety that the hon. President felt. I have personally known the hon. President from a long long time ago and I know his heart throbs in sympathy for the poor. To say that the hon. President has tried in his address to discriminate or not mention or particularly avoid using a particular word, does not fit in with the character, reputation and antecedents of our noble President.

Now, the problem of Rayalaseema has been mentioned. I am glad that it has been mentioned. It is something that I wish this House should take up, because I come from that area, I have lived in that area, I have tried to do something for that area and I know something about it. It has been rightly stated by the hon. President that the problem there is of water; more than food, it is water. It has been accentuated by five years of drought. It may be news to several Members of this House to hear that in that area water is a luxury, even in ordinary days. That has been there for centuries. The previous Governments that ruled this land never took any steps to supply that primary need of all human beings, good drinking water. It would surprise hon. Members if I say that there are places

even today where a person has to go at least two miles to fetch a pail of drinking water. Now, with the assistance that we have had from the Rural Water-supply scheme inaugurated by the Government of Madras, a lot of work has been done. Particularly, I should like to take this occasion to thank the Army for the good work that they have been doing, for the excellent work that they have been doing and for the noble work that they have been doing. I am sure that this is a problem that cannot be left at this stage and forgotten. Rayalaseema is an area where the problem of drinking water supply has to be tackled on a large scale. I should like a system like the grid system, whereby you supply electricity from a central place to other places, evolved through these multipurpose projects that are being undertaken in that area. A system should be devised by which you can pump up water that can be used for drinking purposes in every one of the villages. It may be a costly scheme that I am suggesting; but it is a scheme which has to be put through because in a Welfare State, the people cannot be allowed to go without this primary need, good drinking water.

Now, I should congratulate the Government on the formation of a separate Ministry of Production. That is essential for the welfare and progress of this country. Particularly, in South India, I should like the Government of India to take up actively and pursue the question of the utilisation of Lignite in South Arcot district. That is a material, which, if fully exploited and used, is going to solve the economic problem to a very great extent in South India so far as fuel supply is concerned. It is going to revolutionise the whole economy of South India, and incidentally also have a very good effect on the economy of North India also. Today, in South India for all steam engines, whether it is Railways or other heavy industries, coal is being imported from North India. If we are able to take up the utilisation of lignite, I am sure that the problem of coal supply for the industries and the railways would have been solved.

The next thing that I would like to stress is the utilisation of the great mineral resources in the south. There are rich mineral resources which have not, so far, been assessed or tapped. I should like this new Ministry of Production to take up this question very actively because that is a problem that deserves to be tackled with urgency. In the south, a large-scale utilisation of fire-wood means destruction of even some part of the forests

where trees are available in the forests. If we are able to utilise this lignite, we can save our forests and incidentally, saving of the forests would mean better rainfall, and better living conditions in the south. I should like to stress both these aspects, namely, the utilisation of lignite and exploring the mineral resources of South India.

An hon. Member referred to several other areas in Madras State which have been affected by the famine. With the aid of the loan promised by the Government of India and the assistance they have promised by way of grant, the Madras Government have been tackling the problem of relief of distress in various districts. I am sure if the attitude displayed in the matter of those areas is forthcoming in regard to other areas also there will be no distress in the whole of this country.

The question was raised that lots of money were being spent on multi-purpose projects and that adequate attention is not being paid to other projects. So far as I know about my own State and I take it that it is the experience of other States also, the Governments there have not merely been paying special attention only to big projects but in Madras we have a programme of tank restoration, improving the existing tanks and a scheme of minor irrigation spread over five years which will cost Rs. 10 crores. Some hon. Members have been laying very great stress on these minor irrigation schemes. Thousands of minor irrigation tanks have been restored, repaired and but for the unfortunate failure of rain continuously for a period of years in a large area of Madras, the conditions in that State and incidentally in other parts of the country too could not have been as bad as they are today. It is not as though the States or the Central Government have not been paying attention to small irrigation schemes. They have not merely been thinking about them but executing them.

But we do want these large scale multi-purpose projects for we are deficit in food and unless this problem is tackled through long range schemes it cannot be solved satisfactorily. We must have a proper balance between large scale and small scale schemes of irrigation and that is the policy pursued, so far as I know, in the State from which I come. I am sure in other States also the problem must have been tackled in the same way. Ultimately it all depends, as has been correctly said in the address by the President, on the cooperation of all

[Shri H. S. Reddy]

citizens. We welcome criticism: it is necessary. Wherever there are difficulties it must be pointed out, otherwise we cannot correct ourselves. But at the same time, in offering criticism, there should be no exaggeration. What is to be done should be pointed out to the Government, but at the same time those that point out the defects should voluntarily cooperate with the Government, because ultimately unless the people of a State cooperate with one another for the common welfare of the people, we cannot function effectively and I hope that the appeal made by the President for the co-operation of every citizen to improve the lot of the poor will be responded to by every Member, whether he sits on this or that side.

Shri R. N. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I rise today to move the amendments standing in my name: This is a solemn occasion. For the first time in the history of this great country popularly elected representatives from Amarnath to Kumarika and from Kamakshya to Dwarka have gathered in this august House today, after the general election which has just been concluded through adult franchise. And on this historic occasion, in the first session we expected that the President would have made some mention of the special problems of the Indian States. Great and revolutionary changes have taken place during the last five years in the life of the people of the States. It has been said that it was a bloodless revolution. Though I have no wish to minimise the significance of that expression I am not prepared to admit that it was a bloodless change. For on the very first day, when the integration started, on the 1st January 1948, it was inaugurated in a blood bath, a massacre of hundreds of Adibasis in Kharswan. We cannot forget that chapter of our history. It is a black chapter in the history of this country, that puts to shame the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre or any other massacre in any other country. But I do not wish to raise this issue or remind the House of those unfortunate happenings which are of the past. Many wrongs have been committed. Some of them are irremediable. We cannot bring back to life those who have gone but we expected that the Government would pay some attention to those who are still living.

Many wrongs have been committed and are still continuing but I will mention the most important from

our point of view, from the point of view of the people of Orissa State, whom I have the honour to represent here today. For centuries Seraikilla and Kharswan have been known as the Orissa State. The people speak Oriya. They were grouped together in one administration with the other states in Orissa. They were always known as the Orissa State and were integrated with Orissa. But subsequently there was dispute between Bihar and Orissa and in deciding that dispute all the principles of democracy which our leaders used to shout from housetops, were thrown overboard and I am sorry to say that principles became the first victim to the whims of persons at the helm. An inconsistent policy was followed in regard to these States and an inconsistent decision was arrived at.

I wish to refer to the state of Junagadh, a state in Kathiawar. Some of the smaller states of Saurashtra like Babriwad, Mangral, Manavdir, Surdagarh and Bantwa were unknown and were probably a few acres in area some with a population of only a few heads and yet when the question arose as to whether those states should be integrated or not or merged in the Saurashtra Union, they were conceded their democratic right. There was a referendum, there were resolutions by duly elected people of the states and subsequently they were merged in the Saurashtra Union.

There was difference of opinion about the accession of Kashmir. But it is of course a different problem. But the inconsistency in the Government policy makes the whole situation very anomalous. In regard to Hyderabad this right has been conceded. Our Government recognises that the Constituent Assembly of Hyderabad will decide on the constitution of Hyderabad and it may either confirm or not the accession of Hyderabad to India. Then there is provision as regards Bharatpur and Dholpur. When the question arose of splitting up the Matsya Union merging Bharatpur and Dholpur with U.P. and the whole of the Matsya Union in Rajasthan there was difference of opinion and then our Government appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Shanker Rao Deo. They tried to ascertain public opinion through public meetings and as they could not give their clear opinion. They suggested that the whole of Matsya should be merged in Rajasthan, but

at a later stage opinion in Dholpur and Bharatpur should be obtained through a plebiscite or other means. In article 5 of the Covenant there is provision that at a subsequent date the Government of India will take steps to ascertain the wishes of the people as to whether those two states should be taken out of Rajasthan and merged in U.P. or should remain in Rajasthan, and this covenant was confirmed by the Government of India.

But this policy has not been consistently followed. In the case of Seraikella the question of the people's wishes did not come into the picture at all. There also the wishes of the people as one of the factors had been conceded. An enquiry committee, the Bavdekar Commission had been set up to ascertain the wishes of the people but for some reason best known to our Government suddenly they changed the whole thing and without ascertaining the wishes of the people a decision was taken over the heads of the people. The people have been transferred from one state to another like chattels. The excuse made was that Seraikella and Kharswan were islands in Singbhum—with no contiguity with Orissa and therefore they were transferred to the Government which had the administration of Singbhum district under its jurisdiction.

The situation has subsequently changed. On the 1st January 1949 Mayurbhanj was merged with Orissa. Hence Seraikella and Kharswan are no longer islands cut off from Orissa but are contiguous with Orissa through Mayurbhanj and therefore the reason for their transfer to Bihar no longer holds good.

When the right of self-determination and ascertaining of the wishes of the people has been conceded in other cases why should the people of these two States be denied that right? There cannot and must not be different yardsticks to measure the democratic rights of people of different States. For whatever reason those states were integrated with Bihar at that time it is clear those conditions have changed. In the last general election the election was fought on the issue of their restoration to Orissa and the people have clearly given their verdict by an overwhelming majority of votes by electing a candidate from our party. Our party contested the elections on

this issue alone and our opponents forfeited their deposits. Therefore now that the verdict of the people is clear the reason for the integration with Bihar is gone. This is a question of the integration of an Indian state with a particular province and did not depend on the appointment of a boundary commission. Therefore the question need not wait for any boundary commission.

Therefore, Sir, this question need not wait for ascertaining public opinion or anything else for what clearer verdict could be desired than the one at the last general election. Now, this verdict is clear and if our Government really means what it says, in its professions of democracy, if it is not nearly a platitude or lip sympathy or, rather lip loyalty, then Sir, our Government is now on trial. They have to prove their sincerity by implementing the verdict of the people. The time is short. There were a number of things that I wanted to raise, especially with regard to the people of the Indian States, how they have been crushed under an increasing burden of taxation and how their lives have been completely upset, but there would be occasions to speak on those problems at a later stage. Therefore I think it is not right to take more time and encroach upon other members' rights to speak today. Now Sir, I want to move my Amendment No. 96. I beg to move:

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

"but regret that no mention was made in the address about the readjustment of boundaries of States on linguistic and cultural basis and about the immediate restoration of Seraikella and Kharswan to Orissa."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved :

"but regret that no mention was made in the address about the readjustment of boundaries of States on linguistic and cultural basis and about the immediate restoration of Seraikella and Kharswan to Orissa"

Prof. Agarwal (Wardha): As a new Member of this House and as one not coming from the sylvan surroundings of Shantiniketan but from the rugged surroundings of Wardha, I have very great pleasure in seconding and supporting the motion that has already been moved.

The President in the course of his address, has referred to the high

[Prof. Agarwal]

destiny of this nation, and I have always felt that India is a land of destiny and that our distinguished President and Prime Minister are the great men of destiny. And what is the message that the world expects of us, from this land of Gandhi? As the President remarked, it is the message of peace, and non-violence. And I can say, that more than anybody else, our Prime Minister has upheld these ideals of peace and non-violence in the sphere of international politics. Some Members on the Opposition have criticised that the foreign policy of the Government of India is tilting towards the Anglo-American bloc; but those who criticise the foreign policy of the Government on this account, do not know our Prime Minister. He has and I am sure, will stand like a rock against the onslaughts of Imperialism and imperialist designs whether they come from the Anglo-American bloc or from the Russian bloc, and I have no doubt that the policy of our Government so far as foreign affairs are concerned, has been eminently successful.

The President, in his address, has also referred to the need for defending the newly-won freedom. I think I voice the feelings of all of us that it is necessary to defend freedom more so, because it is newly won. But it is rather a difficult task to reconcile the ideals of non-violence with the maintenance of a big army costing about 50% of our national revenues. I am sure the Government would pay attention to this aspect of our problem, and will see to it that our expenditure, real expenditure on the Army, goes down gradually. Of course, nobody would suggest that the army should be disbanded outright. But much can be done, if the army is harnessed to peaceful purposes for constructive activities, as a matter of routine. It is a matter of great satisfaction to all of us that the army is doing a very good job in Ravelasema. But I only wish, that such activities should become a normal feature of our Military, and if this is done, I am sure the heavy burden of defence would be very much reduced in reality.

The President, in his address referred to the question of stoppage of subsidy on food. I can assure Members of the Opposition that we the Members of the Congress Party are no less concerned about the

distress and the agitation that is taking place all over the country. But, as the President observed in the course, of his address, Government took this step in order that the States that demand food from the Centre may be more realistic, and I think it will have a definite advantage in time to come. But I also hope that as the President observed, the Government would do all in their power to reduce this misery and this difficulty that the public encounters. This can be done by opening fair price shops for population below a minimum level of income, say, Rs. 300. Below that people should get the advantage of subsidy, above that they need not.

I may also refer to the Five Year Plan. I admit the plan is a valuable document and that it has been prepared after great endeavours and labour, but I do hope that when the plan emerges in its final shape, it would present to us a picture for which the people will have real enthusiasm. That picture should make the people feel the glow of freedom for which we have always been yearning. And this picture can really evolve if we keep before us, as every planner does, the ideal of full employment. In the present plan it is maximum employment that is visualised. Our ideal should be full employment, and what is more, the solving of the question of under-employment, and this can be done by spreading on a large-scale the small-scale industries throughout the countryside through decentralised economy that Gandhiji visualised, by opening minor works throughout the country and in every village if possible. If that is done and if every citizen is guaranteed the right to work which is the fundamental right under the Constitution, I am sure the Five Year Plan would be a much better plan which would arouse the enthusiasm of the masses.

4 P.M.

Lastly, I would only express the hope that Government under the able guidance of our Prime Minister, and every one of us will feel a sense of urgency about doing things. We might have very nice plans and schemes, but there is no time to waste. Time is of the essence and five years is a long period; we have to do things within a year or two. Time passes on and the people feel more and more dissatisfied because they cannot afford to wait longer. I am confident that the Government would realise this,

so that the country may march from progress to progress.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): I rise to move my amendments Nos. 192 and 193. I beg to move:

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

"but regret—

- (a) that the complacency and under-estimation of the widespread food crisis in the country at a time when the price of food has gone far beyond the purchasing power of the people and in large areas of Bengal and elsewhere people are living in actual conditions of famine;
- (b) the failure to mention the abolition of Zamindari system and the distribution of land to the peasants free, without which the grow more food campaign and solution of food crisis can never be achieved;
- (c) that there is no mention of measures to reduce prices of food grains which have been constantly raised due to the food policy of the Government and has now gone completely out of reach of the buying power of the people; and
- (d) that there is no mention for special subsidies for state governments where famine conditions exist, in order to enable them to open cheap grain shops and give free doles."

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

"but regret that there is no categorical declaration about granting basic rights to women with a view to placing them on an equal social status with men."

The first speech made by the President of the first Republic of India was thought to be one in which we would see some promise of alleviating the distress, the terrible distress from which our people are suffering today. Today I will only dilate on one very special point, a point which is disturbing the minds of the people most, and that is the food situation.

This speech has shown utter unconcern over the tragedy and the heart-rending condition of those people. There is neither an appreciation of the depth of the crisis, its widespread nature, nor what it means in terms of human suffering. Having been elected from a constituency, Basirhat in West Bengal, where over three lakhs of people are starving, are living on grass roots, are living on tamarind seed powdered down, are living on one meal every three or four days, to me it has been surprising to see that the President has shown utter unconcern and complacency over a situation which has within itself the most dangerous potentialities of mass destitution. I have seen thousands of women and children crowding around, some hardly able to stand up, babies who have swooned, women half-naked and emaciated. And here again we have seen that the West Bengal Government have sought to show that there is really no such great distress as we on this side of the House make out to be. The same idea is conveyed again in the Presidential address. We find that the same type of attitude was taken up by the British Government in 1943 when they did not want to declare the Bengal famine a famine and yet we found that we paid with the precious lives of 3½ million of our people. The same thing we find today in Rayalaseema, the same thing we find today again in the Sunderban areas where the Government refuses to declare these distress areas as famine areas. Neither has the President thought it fit to say anything about the food policy, that policy which has brought such untold sufferings, which has brought destitution and starvation to the millions, nor is there any promise of a change of that policy. We find first and foremost that the prices have shot up, that food subsidies have been reduced, and we are told that this is for the good of the country because it will make State Governments sit up and say that they really do not want so much, and therefore imports will fall and all will be well for the country. Then again, nothing has been said of the import policy. The import policy has shown a marked partiality for the U.S.A. This has been shown in the way the President has given expression of thanks only for the U.S.A. without mentioning such countries as China and Russia who have come to our aid in times of distress. Yet this U.S. grain has been expensive: it has cost our exchequer a sum of Rs. 25 crores because it has to be undersold—the people are unable to buy it at such a high rate at which it had been bought. Nor has the Rs. 90 crores

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

loan given for buying the wheat been an entirely philanthropic deal. We had to pay 2½ per cent. interest on that and that has cost us quite an amount.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Then there is the whole policy of procurement whereby it is the poor peasantry, even sharecroppers, who have been looted of their grain whereas the zamindars who have surplus stocks have gone scotfree. We have known cases in our constituencies where procurement has been obtained at the point of the gun. Then there is the policy whereby paddy-growing areas are converted into jute growing areas; it is the definite policy of Government to increase such things as jute cultivation. Then there have been irrigation projects; big irrigation projects have been undertaken but smaller ones, minor scale ones which would have helped our agriculture within a very short space of time have not been undertaken. Again, we have seen in our constituencies that embankments kept up by the zamindars have been cut and salt water allowed in and huge areas of paddy fields turned into fisheries. In these ways, instead of building up our food reserves we have on the other hand seen a steady decline in the yield per acre. We see that in 1938-39 Madras produced about 8½ million tons of grain; now we have about 5,875,000 tons of grain from that Province. Then again, we find that we have spent in three years about Rs. 500 million for the grow-more-food campaign and in return what have we got? We have got nothing more than 2,040,000 maunds of grain even at Government estimation. Yet the President wants us to be satisfied. He tells us that we have food reserves. If we have food reserves, with these high prices of grains beyond the buying capacity of ordinary persons, why then do we see ration quantum reduced to a level which denies the nation a healthy quantum of food? Why do we see the blackmarket? Why do we see the sorry spectacle of starved peasantry? I can see that the President has not gone to the root of the evil. He has not shown that without abolition of the zamindari system, without giving land to the peasants free.—I repeat free, without that there can be no solution of the food crisis.—there can be no increase in yield per acre, there can be no increase

in the buying power of the peasant. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, without promising that nothing else can really satisfy the people's demand for food.

I would just like to make a reference to one other thing and that is to the question of what people had wanted to see in the address. People had wanted to see in the speech of the President references to many things: they had demanded cheap food, they wanted restoration of the food subsidies, they wanted restoration of the quantum of rations, they wanted opening of cheap grain shops, they wanted the grant of relief doles, they wanted the abolition of the zamindari system. None of these were promised; not even a change in policy was advocated in that speech. That is why people have been disappointed, sorely disappointed. But if the Government fails to act, the people have learnt by their experience to win their inherent right to live by the strength of their movement. Already there are big movements afoot in the country, and even the outer walls of this House have echoed with the slogans of the hungry. The people's right to live cannot be overruled by any speeches here. I would contend, that the people's strength is invincible. They will not allow a re-enactment of the Bengal famine of 1943.

Mr. Chairman: Amendments moved:

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

“but regret—

- (a) that the complacency and under-estimation of the wide-spread food crisis in the country at a time when the price of food has gone far beyond the purchasing power of the people and in large areas of Bengal and elsewhere people are living in actual conditions of famine;
- (b) the failure to mention the abolition of Zamindari system and the distribution of land to the peasants free, without which the grow more food campaigns and solution of food crisis can never be achieved;
- (c) that there is no mention of measures to reduce prices or

food grains which have been constantly raised due to the food policy of the Government and has now gone completely out of reach of the buying power of the people; and

- (d) that there is no mention for special subsidies for state Governments where famine conditions exist, in order to enable them to open cheap grain shops and give free doles."

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

"but regret that there is no categorical declaration about granting basic rights to women with a view to placing them on an equal social status with men."

श्री हरिहर नथ शास्त्री : अभी सुबह से ले कर अब तक कई तकरीरें हुईं। पिछले चन्द घण्टों में कई तकरीरें में ने सुनीं और खास कर आखरी स्पीच (speech) जो कि हमारे मोअज़िज़ दोस्त ने दी, जो शायद बंगाल से आई हुई हैं, उस को सुना। इस के लिये में खास तौर से उन को मुबारकबाद दे देता हूँ कि उन्होंने बड़े पुरजोर शब्दों में बड़े अच्छे ख्यालात का इजहार किया है। में यह सोचता हूँ कि शायद वह गलत जगह में बैठ गई हैं और उन के लिये मुनासिब और माकूल जगह वह होती जहां कि हम लोग बैठे हुये हैं। उन्होंने ठीक कहा है कि मुल्क में इस वक्त गल्ले की हालत खराब है, देश की इकानामिक सीचुएशन (Economic situation) खराब है। पिछले चार साल के अन्दर इस मुल्क की हुकूमत ने और हमारे नेताओं ने जो सब से बड़ा काम किया वह यह कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर उन्होंने आजादी की जड़ों को मजबूत किया। एक ओर फ़िरक़ेबाराना, जमाअतों की तरफ़ से और दूसरी ओर उस जमाअत की तरफ़ से जिस की नुमाइन्दगी करने के लिये हमारे मुस्लिफ़ बैंचों के ऊपर कुछ लोग बैठे

हुये हैं, आजादी की जड़ों को कमजोर करने के लिये पूरी कोशिश में लगे थे। ऐसी हालत में हमारे मोहतरिम लीडर और इस हुकूमत ने एक शानदार काम किया जो कि तबारीख में हमेशा सुनहरे हरफ़ों में लिखा जायेगा।

यह ठीक है कि हमारे देश की इकानामिक सीचुएशन खराब है और पिछले चार साल के अन्दर जो कुछ भी हुआ है वह बहुत ही कम हुआ है। अभी प्लानिंग कमीशन (Planning Commission) की एक योजना सामने है और सिर्फ़ यह उम्मीद की जा सकती है कि वह प्लान (plan) कामयाब होगा और उस के जरिये से जो मुल्क के तबालात हैं वह हल किये जा सकेंगे। इस चुनाव के बाद पिछले तीन चार महीने में मुझे खुद इस मुल्क के बहुत से हिस्सों में दौरा करने का मौक़ा मिला और इसमें शक़ नहीं कि मुझे यह देख कर परेशानी हुई कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर ऐसे फ़िरक़े मौजूद हैं जिन की वजह से कि अड़चनों और दिक्कतें बढ़ती चली जा रही हैं। गोपालन साहब ने भी अपनी स्पीच में ठीक कहा कि मजदूरों के ऊपर तरह तरह की परेशानियां हैं और इस मुल्क के अन्दर सरमायेदारों का कम से कम एक ऐसा तबक़ा जरूर मौजूद है जो इस बात में दिलचस्पी रखता है कि जम्हूरियत की जिन जड़ों को हम इस मुल्क के अन्दर मजबूत करना चाहते हैं वह कमजोर हों और सरमायेदाराना हुकूमत इस देश में क़ायम हो। लेकिन में यह समझता हूँ कि हम अपने लीडर की रहनुमाई में रहते हुये जो यह टैंडेंसीज (tendencies) हैं उन का मुकाबला कर सकेंगे और बहादुरी के साथ मुकाबला कर सकेंगे और कामयाबी के साथ मुकाबला कर सकेंगे।

अपोजीशन (opposition) की तरफ़ से हमारे एक दोस्त ने, जिन का नाम मुझे

[श्री हरिहर नाथ शास्त्री]

मालूम नहीं है, शायद वह किसी स्टेट से आये हुये हैं, इंटीग्रेशन (Integration) की जो गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी है उस को क्रिटिसाइज (criticise) करते हुये यह सलाह गवर्नमेंट को दी है कि अवाम की तरफ़ जो गवर्नमेंट का फ़र्ज है उस को अदा करना चाहिये । मैं उन से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि शायद आज भी वह सन् १९४६ के पहले के ज़माने में रह रहे हैं जब कि इस मुल्क की पुरानी हुकूमत ने, ब्रिटिश हुकूमत ने, अपनी ताक़त को मज़बूत रखने के लिये इस मुल्क में प्रिंसली आर्डर (princely order) कायम कर रखा था । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले पांच साल के अन्दर इस मुल्क की हुकूमत ने चाहे और कोई काम न किया हो लेकिन अगर एक काम उस ने किया जिस की वजह से कि अवाम की भलाई हुई और जिस की वजह से मुल्क में आज़ादी की जड़ें मज़बूत हुईं तो वह काम यह था कि उसने प्रिंसली आर्डर जो इस मुल्क में था उस को ख़त्म कर के इस मुल्क में एक पोलिटिकल यूनिटी (political unity) की बुनियाद डाली ।

हमारे दोस्त गोपालन साहब ने एक बात कही जिसको सुन कर मुझे हंसी आई । उन्होंने कहा कि हम इस मुल्क से मुहब्बत करते हैं । बड़ी अच्छी बात उन्होंने कही और मैं सोचता यही हूँ कि वह बात सच्ची हो लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि उन की पार्टी में और हम में जो एक खास तफ़रक़ा है, जो खास मतभेद है, वह यहीं है कि वह अपने मुल्क से मुहब्बत नहीं करते हैं । मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ, जो दावा उन का है वह दावा ग़लत है, । खुदा ने हालाँकि उन को शक़ल हिन्दुस्तानी की दी है, लेकिन जहाँ तक ज़हनियत का सवाल

है वह शुरू से ले कर आख़िर तक उन के अन्दर आज भी रूसी ज़हनियत भरी हुई है और यही उन के अन्दर ख़राबो है । उन्होंने जो हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी (Foreign policy) है, उस को क्रिटिसाइज (criticise) किया । यह वही पार्टी है जिस ने कि सन् १९४७ में, जब कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर पहले पहल एक डिमाक्रेसी (democracy) की बुनियाद कायम हुई और पण्डित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के हाथ में हुकूमत की बागडोर आई, तो यही पार्टी थी कि जिस ने डंके की चोट से इस बात का ऐलान किया था कि यह पीपुल्स गवर्नमेंट (people's government) है । पीपुल्स गवर्नमेंट वह उस वक़्त जरूर थी, क्योंकि उन को उम्मीद थी कि जिस तरह ईस्टर्न यूरोप (Eastern Europe) की जो पावर्स (powers) हैं वह रूस की 'टेलाइट्स (Satellites) बनी हुई है, उसी तरह से जो हमारा मुल्क है वह भी रूस का एक सैटेलाइट बन कर रहेगा । आगे चल कर उन को इस मामले में ना-उम्मीदी हुई और इसलिये उन्होंने हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी को क्रिटिसाइज करना शुरू किया और उन की निगाह में आज फ़ारेन पालिसी बुरी है । लेकिन इस में तो कोई ताज़्जुब की बात नहीं है, क्योंकि जो लोग इस मुल्क के अन्दर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से वाकिफ़ हैं वह इस को अच्छी तरह समझते हैं । मुझे उन लोगों में होने का दावा है जो पिछले २६ और २७ साल से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की जो पालिसी है, जो उस की नीति है, उस को बहुत ग़ौर से और बारोकी के साथ देखते रहे हैं । वह लोग इस बात को जानते हैं, महसूस करते हैं और समझते हैं कि इस पार्टी की पालिसी कैसी रही है । पहले पहल मुझे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सम्पर्क में आने का मौक़ा उस वक़्त मिला जब कि

सन् १९२७ ई० में इस मुल्क के अन्दर पहली बार कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी एक आरगनाइज्ड (organised) शकल में हिन्दुस्तान के ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट (Trade union movement) में आई। जब से मैं इस की पालिसी को देख रहा हूँ। हमारे दोस्त ने कहा कि किसी जमाने में वह कांग्रेसमैन (Congressman) थे। हम सब जानते हैं कि सन् १९२८ के पहले इस मुल्क के अन्दर आम तौर पर जो कम्युनिस्ट हैं वह कांग्रेसमैन थे क्योंकि कम्युनिस्ट इंटरनेशनल (Communist international) की यह पालिसी थी कि जो नेशनलिस्ट मूवमेंट मुस्लिफ़ कोलोनियल कंट्रीज (Colonial countries) में हैं उन का अंग हो कर कम्युनिस्ट चलें। लेकिन जब सिक्स्थ वर्ल्ड कांग्रेस (sixth world congress) हुई तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपनी पालिसी तबदील की और कहा कि जो नेशनल मूवमेंट मुस्लिफ़ देशों में है उन की मुस्लिफ़त करो। तो यह पार्टी है जिस ने कि राष्ट्रीय झंडे को जलाना शुरू किया और इस पालिसी की मुस्लिफ़त की। और उस के बाद हम जानते हैं कि किस तरीके से सन् १९३४ में सातवीं वर्ल्ड कान्फरेन्स (world conference) में अपनी पालिसी को बदला। किस तरह से सन् १९३९ में अपनी पालिसी को बदलते हुये रूसी-जर्मन पैक्ट (pact) किया और किस तरह से मुतवातिर अपनी पालिसी को बदलते रहे। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर अपनी फ़ारेन पालिसी के सिलसिले में उन्होंने जो राय दी है, जो सलाह दी है, इस सिलसिले में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ और जैसा और भी चन्द मौकों पर कह चुका हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क की जो डोमेस्टिक पालिसी (domestic policy) है उस में ग़लतियाँ हैं, कई क्रिटिसिज़म्स जो अपोजीशन

की तरफ़ से आये हैं उन को मैं मंज़ूर करता हूँ और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर कई स्टेट्स हैं, कई सूबे हैं जहाँ की सरकारों की पालिसी जो है वह उस पालिसी से, जो हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर फ़ालो करना चाहते हैं, बिल्कुल इन टून (in tune) नहीं है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर का विज़न (vision) कुछ और है, इमेजिनेशन (imagination) कुछ और है, लेकिन कुछ स्टेट्स (states) का तौर तरीका कुछ और है। और अगर इस मुल्क के अन्दर डिमाक्रेसी की जड़ों को मजबूती से जमाना है तो उस के लिये जरूरत है कि इस चीज़ को देखा जाय कि जो हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पालिसी है, जो मुस्लिफ़ स्टेट्स की पालिसीज हैं उन पालिसीज के अन्दर हारमोनी (harmony) हो, तभी वह आगे बढ़ सकती हैं। लेकिन इस सब के बावजूद मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी का ताल्लुक है, अगर कोई चीज़ इस मुल्क के अन्दर है जिस ने इस मुल्क की इज़्जत को दुनियाँ के अन्दर ऊंचा उठाया है और आगे बढ़ाया है तो वह हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी है। और मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जो यह फ़ारेन पालिसी है उस के अन्दर किसी तरीके की तरमीम या तब्दीली की गुंजाइश नहीं है।

मैं यही चन्द अल्फाज़ आप के सामने अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन अपनी तक्रार को खत्म करने के पहले मैं एक मर्तबा फ़िर से इस बात की तरफ़ ख़ोर दे कर कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे देश की आज की जो एकानामिक सिचुएशन है वह बहुत खराब है। सरमायेदारों की तरफ़ से इस मुल्क की जो मजदूर जमात है उस के ऊपर बहुत जुल्म और सख्तियाँ हो रही हैं। मैं इस देश के बहुमत भ्रजदूर आन्दोलन का प्रतिनिधि

[श्री हरिहर नाथ शास्त्री]

हूँ जिसने ४ साल पहले तय किया था कि शान्तिमय और समझौता तथा पंचायत के तरीके से काम करेगी। लेकिन पिछले चार साल के तजुबों से मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ कि जब तक कैपिटलिस्ट क्लास (capitalist class) में पुराना नजरिया कायम है और जब तक वह हालत नहीं बदलती तब तक जो हमारी पुरानी पालिसी थी उस पालिसी का कायम रखना नामुमकिन होता जा रहा है और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह वक्त आ रहा है जब कि गवर्नमेंट को यह तय करना पड़ेगा क्या रास्ते अख्यार किये जायें जिन से आज जो मजालिम और जो अत्याचार मजदूर जमात पर हो रहे हैं उन को सक्ती के साथ रोका जा सके वना सिवा इस के कोई चारा नहीं रहेगा कि हम उस तरीके को, जो हम आज तक करते रहे हैं, उस को छोड़ कर डाइरेक्ट ऐक्शन (direct action) की पालिसी को अपनाते हुए काम करें और मजदूरों की जमात को जिन को हम रिप्रेजेंट (represent) करते हैं, सवालों को पूरा करने की कोशिश करें।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri H. N. Shastri (Kanpur District—Central): Sir, a number of speeches have been delivered since this morning and of the many speeches that I have heard so far during the last few hours I would particularly like to make a mention of the last one delivered by my hon. Lady Member who probably hails from Bengal. May I congratulate her for expressing some very good ideas in very powerful words. I wonder if she has not taken the wrong place, the most appropriate and befitting place for her is on this side of the House. She has rightly maintained that the food and economic situation in the country is worse at the moment. The greatest thing that has been achieved by the Government and leaders of this country during the last four years is that the foundations

of independence have been strengthened. On the other hand, some people belonging to certain communalist groups and the party which is represented here by some hon. Members occupying the opposition benches, went on trying to cut at the very root of our freedom. Under such odd conditions the achievements of our hon. leader and Government deserve to be written in letters of gold in our history.

No doubt, our economic situation is unsatisfactory and whatever little has been achieved during the last four years or so is less than sufficient. The Planning Commission has come forward with a comprehensive plan and we can only hope that it would meet with success and that it would help us solve the complicated problems facing the country. After the elections, I had an opportunity of touring many parts of this country and there is no getting away from the fact that I felt rather concerned to find the existence of such parties as are simply causing these obstacles and difficulties to multiply. Shri Gopalan was quite right when he observed that the grievances of labour were many and that there existed at least a section of capitalists in this country that wanted to see the democracy, which we so keenly desire to develop in this country, disrupted and establish a capitalist order instead. But I feel that under the guidance of our great leader we would be able not only to face but face bravely and with success such destructive tendencies.

A friend from the opposition benches, whose name I do not know, probably he hails from some former Indian State—criticising the Government's policy with respect to the integration of States advised the Government that they should discharge properly their duties towards the people. May I humbly submit to him that he is still dreaming of pre-1946 period when the former British Government of India had maintained the princely order in the country in order to deepen its own roots. What I would like to say in this connection is that howsoever little might have been done in other fields by the Government of this country during the last five years, it is, however, certain that at least one thing that they did is very remarkable. It also helped in doing good to people and strengthening the newly-won freedom. It was that they abolished the princely order and laid the foundation of a new political unity.

I was simply amused to hear Shri Gopalan's claim that he too loved this country. I wish it could be true. But the fact remains that the main difference between the principles of his party and our party is that while they do not love their country, we do. May I humbly submit that his claim is wrong. It is a sheer matter of chance that they are born Indians, otherwise their entire ideology from A to Z draws inspiration from Russia and that is the greatest drawback in their policy. They have criticized our foreign policy. It would be recollected in this connection that it is the same party which in 1947, when democracy was introduced in this country for the first time and the reins of the Government were taken over by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, announced from house tops that it was the people's Government. They called it people's Government because probably they thought that our country would become a satellite of Russia in the manner in which certain countries of Eastern Europe had become satellites of Russia. But later when their hopes were falsified, they took to criticising our foreign policy which, according to their point of view is defective. One need not be surprised at this, for those who are well acquainted with the Communist Party quite understand all these tactics of theirs. I claim to be one of those persons who have been keenly and minutely watching the policy of the Communist Party for the last 26 or 27 years. Such persons know quite well what the policy of the Communist Party has been. It was in the year 1927 when the Communist Party took part in the Trade Union's Movement in the form of an organised party, that I came in contact with it for the first time. Since then I have been watching their activities with great interest. My friend said that at a time they too were Congressmen. We all know that before the year 1928 the Communists were generally Congressmen and then it was the policy of the Communist International that the Communists should act as a part and parcel of the nationalist parties in the various colonial countries. But when the Sixth World Congress met, the Communist Party changed their policy and decided to oppose the national movements in the various countries. Then they began burning the national flag and opposed the policy of the nationalist party. We all know how further changes were made in their policy in the Seventh World Conference, how a pact was concluded between Russia and Germany and

how frequently changes have been made in their policy. Now with regard to the suggestions made by them with respect to the foreign policy of our country, I would like to say—as I have also said on previous occasions—that I do admit the criticism of the opposition inasmuch as there are some drawbacks in the democratic policy of our country and I agree that in some States the policy of the State Governments is not in tune with the one our Prime Minister wants to follow. The policy of certain State Governments does not conform to the vision and imagination of our Prime Minister. If the roots of democracy are to be firmly established in this country, it is imperative that there should be a sort of harmony between the policy of the Prime Minister and those of the State Governments. Only then can things be improved. Nevertheless, I may submit that if anything has enabled our country to hold its head high in pride it is our foreign policy and foreign policy alone. I do not see any scope whatsoever for amending our foreign policy.

These are the things that I want to submit, but, before I close, I would like to repeat the fact once again that the economic situation of our country is none too satisfactory, and the capitalist class is committing heinous atrocities on the labour class. I represent a labour movement, which has got the support of a majority of the labourers of this country and which had decided some four years back that for achieving their aims they would resort to peaceful and constitutional means. But the experience gained by me during the last three or four years had led me to conclude that unless the capitalists amend their old approach and conditions altogether change, it would become ever more impossible to continue with the old policy. It is high time that the Government considered as to what steps they should take in order that the atrocities now being committed on the labour are dealt with with an iron hand. If the Government fail to do so there would be no way out for us but to give up the old policy that we have been following so far and take to that of direct action in order to have the grievances of the labour class, which we represent, redressed.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram):
I have been listening to the speeches

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

delivered on the other side. I have been wondering on what conditions and on what terms we are to congratulate the Government on the address that has been delivered by the President. The address covers very many commonplace topics. It does not refer to any questions of policy and leaves questions of policy delightfully vague.

My learned friend and a former Minister of Madras, who preceded me sometime ago, wanted the Opposition to come out with facts and figures—to deal with facts as they are and not with facts as they ought to be—I take up the challenge.

I start straightaway with the question of food subsidy on which there has been so much controversy and I shall make only one observation on this matter. In order to understand the abolition of the food subsidy, we have to go back to the Finance Minister's speech delivered some two and a half months ago in which he justified the abolition of the food subsidy. I do not know whether any of those and many other complicated factors were taken into account by the Government when they abolished the food subsidy. But this much I maintain that although the food subsidy was abolished and it affected only thirty-two towns, it had a catalytic effect on the economy of our country. For the rise in prices and the urge for increased wages in thickly populated urban areas, affected the countryside and has led to a worsening of the economic situation. It is not a case of agitators feeling that the abolition of the food subsidy is wrong and leading hunger marches; even responsible Ministers—responsible Congress Ministers—have come over to Delhi and made representations to those in authority here that they ought to restore the food subsidy, that conditions have deteriorated in many of the towns and that unless this problem is handled satisfactorily, very serious consequences would emerge. I think, that it ought to be clear to all who have given thought that the abolition of the subsidy was premature. There are many criteria that have to be taken into account and should I obtain an opportunity during the Finance Bill discussion to advert to this particular topic I shall try to elaborate the factors, the economic trends and consequences which ought to be taken into account. But this much will be admitted and

it ought to be admitted in fairness that the moment you abolished the food subsidy, prices shot up and once prices shot up the demand for enhancement of wages on the part of labour increased; and this at once tended to increase the inflationary spurt in the country. I can visualise the plight in which Ministers of State Governments find themselves and I understand as indeed the Government of India must have understood, the force behind the plaintive appeals made by Ministers.

I am surprised to find in the President's address, Mr. Chairman one remark which is rather of a peculiar nature and which seems to cast reflection on various States Governments. Let me quote:—

“The contraction of the food subsidy has contributed in some measure to those high prices, and has caused some distress and discontent in rationed areas... The limitation of food subsidies has induced Governments in various States to make a more realistic appraisal of their need for import of foodgrains, and this has led to a reduction of the demand from various States for food grains, with its consequent result on their import.”

What is the inference that we draw from this last sentence? The inference that we draw is that the States Governments have in the past exaggerated their needs, that they have put forward exaggerated claims for assistance to the Union Ministry and that on every occasion, when they came here they came forward only to extract more and more concessions from the Union Government. Speaking with some knowledge of the States Governments and speaking with some knowledge of the Ministry in my state, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, without any fear of contradiction, that invariably on every occasion the State Ministry particularly in Madras, was most anxious not to approach the Union Administration for any help, but on the other hand was eager to whittle down our demands, underestimate our needs and claim minimum aid and assistance. In fact, I would go so far as to affirm that if Congress has suffered reverses in the State of Madras in the recent elections, it is because of the subservient attitude to the Centre adopted by the Ministers of our State. Therefore, if today the State Ministry has restricted its demand for foodgrains, it is not because they had put forward pre-

viciously exaggerated claims to obtain the benefits of a subsidy but because the exchequer of impoverished States do not give scope for incurring large expenditure inevitable in view of the recent rise in prices. They have had to make a virtue of necessity and minimise their demand for foodgrains. What then follows? The people are left to fend for themselves in many of these areas. As a result of your having abolished the food subsidy you have left the people in the lurch, the people who looked up to you for wise leadership, enlightened statesmanship and guidance in the evolution of a welfare state. I would not be surprised if many strikes and other untoward consequences occur in our urban areas. Therefore, I was looking forward with eagerness to find out whether some constructive lead would be given in the President's address. But I must confess that I was bitterly disappointed, because beyond indulging in one or two strong remarks relating to the abolition of food subsidy and suggesting that Government intended attending to alleviation of the distress, no positive measure has been enunciated. In fact, the ambiguous reference to the food problem in the President's address reminds me—I do not wish to indulge in any reflection on another profession—reminds me of the practice of some of my friends in the journalistic profession who, when they find that they are in two minds content themselves with examining the pros and cons leaving it to the imagination of the reader to draw any inference.

Let me analyse the Government's policy a step further. It has been said in the very President's address—and I am going according to the facts as given in the President's address—"My Government is giving the most careful attention to these matters. It has to balance immediate with future advantages". Now, I ask what are the implications of the last sentence, and what are its implications in terms of policy? Because, after all, when we are examining the President's address we have to analyse the policies that emerge and not the expressions of noble and lofty sentiments that may be found in profusion. To understand the significance of this sentence, you have to realise that in the previous paragraph it has been stated that in Rayalaseema and in many other areas we have had five successive years of drought. It is in this context we are asked to balance "immediate with future advantages". Is this the time to enunciate such a policy? I should have thought that

any Government which took its responsibilities seriously would emphasise immediate advantages and not the future advantages in the present context of famine and scarcity.

Many things have been said about Rayalaseema. While acknowledging with gratitude the assistance furnished by the army, I must point out that such aid is not sufficient and that it only touches the fringe of the problem. We have, no doubt, opened a few gruel centres—a policy of doubtful value—in Rayalaseema, but those of us who have travelled in those areas, those of us who have had contacts with numerous people in that region, realize it is in the grip of famine and that it ought to be treated as first priority. Therefore, I think there is a great deal of force in the observation made by us of Opposition that it ought to be declared a "famine area"; because when Governments declare certain areas to be "famine areas" they are forced by the compulsive nature of their declaration to undertake emergency measures. Besides, when once you have declared an area to be a famine area, more spot-light is directed on that area.

A great deal has been said about community projects. I have not the time to go into the merits of community projects. But it seems to be agreed that community projects can be worked only with the co-operation of people. Here are famine areas where people are ready to co-operate with you, provided you put those areas on a "priority basis" and provided you make the necessary genuine effort and have the willingness to implement schemes of reconstruction. There are many schemes already awaiting implementation in Rayalaseema which have not been put through as a result of neglect and indifference displayed by the Government of India. I would, therefore, request my friends on the other side to pay some attention to this problem and to push through some of these measures quickly so that it might be possible for Rayalaseema to get over the present crisis so that her misfortunes may be a thing of the past. For over 120 years that area has been subject to misfortune and successive Governments have been only tinkering with the problem. The time has arrived when we should consider whether it is not advisable to spend large and to spend with speed so that famine may be a thing of the past and so that this desert may be transformed into a garden. That is what ought to be done and that can be done provided there is sufficient

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

help given on a large-scale and provided all these areas are brought under what I would call the emergency protection clause which is what should happen particularly when we have famine areas in consideration.

There are in the President's address copious references to foreign affairs, but strangely enough perfunctory mention is made of the Government's foreign policy. I cannot deal with foreign policy at length on this occasion. When we consider foreign policy we cannot afford to be captious critics: we have to take into account the far reaching implications of the suggestions we are making and although the Government might not have treated us, of the Opposition properly, we have nevertheless to exercise a restraint and consider problems from an angle different from that from which we consider domestic issues. I say that in foreign policy, unless and until you have frequent consultations with different sections of our people, unless and until you take us into your confidence, there is not that possibility of our understanding and appreciating your policy. If consulted we may probably prevent certain errors being committed. I say this with a full sense of responsibility. You might feel that your equipment is of the best, but in a democracy, however eminent you are, unless and until there is frequent consultation with other sections of opinion it is not possible for you to build up a sound foreign policy in any sense of the term. That is what ought to be done, that is what is being done in other democracies. Because, unless and until there is that consciousness of consent or of participation, it would not be possible for you to imbue our State with that feeling that the people and the Government are one.

A reference has been made to the treatment of South Indians in Ceylon. Now, Sir, it is very deplorable that during the past two or three years we seem to be treated badly in almost every part of the world. I do not know how it is, whether it is by accident or design that we are today being harassed in different parts of the world. I want the Government to introspect: to turn the searchlight inwards and to examine the course of the said decline in our prestige. May be, perhaps, in the words of Cromwell "they are mistaken". I have a feeling that many aspects of our foreign policy require to be changed.

Let me incidentally refer to Kashmir. It is a very delicate matter and I do

not wish to say anything which might complicate the whole issue. Having said this, let me point out that some weeks ago a very distinguished man, the Chief Minister of Kashmir in the course of a speech stated that he did not feel that he had any confidence in our sense of fairness and justice and that he had confidence only in one particular individual the Prime Minister of India. We must be thankful to him for atleast having confidence in the Prime Minister of India. But such a statement portends serious consequences, consequences which we cannot afford to ignore. After all, we have been very liberal in the matter of aid and grants being given to Kashmir, and we should certainly wish to bring together all our neighbours together so that we might have an opportunity of building up a common fabric based on community of purpose and unity of vision. But I should like the Government to re-examine its foreign policy to determine what exactly we should do that such speeches are not delivered so that we may have a feeling that, after all, what has been done the people of India do not count for anything. So far as Kashmir is concerned, it has been decided, according to an authoritative statement, to accede in respect of three subjects, namely Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications. Even if the other States had been allowed according to the old Mounbatten plan to accede in respect of these three subjects, I maintain without any fear of contradiction that Kashmir would have been more advantageously situated than any other State. For, in the present circumstances and taking into account the present political context, it is India that has to foot the bill for defence and communications as any one who has read a good portion of the Planning Commission's Report will realize.

I would therefore, tell my friends that in all matters where there has been friction between good neighbours, where our expectations of association have not materialised, there has necessarily resulted a misunderstanding of our strength and purpose and a feeling that if our foreign policy is to be determined on the sole initiative of the Government without taking into account the various other shades of opinion, then unless and until the Government has its attention concentrated on a particular matter, it would not be necessary to respect the Indian view point. It is from this point of view that I suggest in all humility that we should have a revision of our

foreign policy. We need also a revision of many of the other policies relating to food subsidies and inter-related matters. I hope and trust that in spite of the fact of the President's address being devoid—I say with the greatest respect—of constructive ideas, we yet may have a period of useful work and association in this Parliament and that the Government may yet introduce useful legislation in which it can obtain even from the Opposition a large measure of desirable co-operation.

Shri R. N. Reddy (Nalgonda) : I was very much disappointed not to read in the Presidential address a declaration of general amnesty. Today in India in different jails in different provinces persons belonging to different parties and especially of the Communist Party are still rotting in jail. I come from the Hyderabad State and I also belong to Telangana where the people have been fighting for the last 4 or 5 years for land and liberty. Still in spite of the fact that for the last 7 months peace has prevailed in Telangana 1,000 political prisoners belonging to the Communist Party are still in the jails of Hyderabad State. There are about 250 detenues still in jail and about 250 convicts and about 500 under trials, in spite of the fact that the people have given a clear verdict against the policy of the Congress Government which has been followed in Telangana for the last four years, especially after the Police Action. There are still 500 underground comrades of the Communist party and their sympathisers who are still forced to live in jungles, in mountains and are constantly being hunted by the police camps that still exist in the villages. Much has been said about Telangana. Much slander has been spread against Telangana. For the last 3 or 4 years it is said that we of the Communist Party in Telangana were nothing but robbers and dacoits, nothing but murderers and what not. I am sure the Telangana people have proved the falsehood of this slander by returning 35 out of 40 that we have contested. To the State Assembly from Telangana area 40 seats were contested out of which 35 were returned to the State Assembly and 7 Members of the Parliament have been returned from Telangana area. It is said that this election has been fair and free. (*An Hon. Member: No.*) It is said so. It is propagated so.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East) : Was that the method by which my hon. friends have been returned here?

Shri R. N. Reddy : I also say 'No' because when the nominations were

taking place, when the elections were being held in Hyderabad State about 2,000 of our comrades, the best peoples' leaders were put in jail. The Communist Party was declared illegal and this party and the Andhra Mahasabha, the peoples' organizations of Hyderabad State—the entire leadership which was conducting this struggle for the last 4 or 5 years was forced to live either in forests or in jungles. If there have been really free and fair elections, if the ban on the Communist Party and Andhra Mahasabha had been removed, if our comrades were allowed to contest the elections freely, probably the things in Hyderabad State would have been something different from what they are today, and Shri Ramakrishna Rao would not have been able to form the Government in Hyderabad State, because at the time of nominations, there was terror in the villages. Police camps still existed. People did not come forward even to stand as candidates on behalf of the Peoples Democratic Front. I was in jail. Even we were not released at the time of nominations. The conditions were such that we could not even get candidates to come forward to contest the elections. One candidate had to be put for 4 constituencies, that is my friend, Shri P. Raghava Rao who contested 4 constituencies and succeeded in 3. Dr. Jasorriah had to contest 2 seats and won in both the constituencies and many other persons there. So, if the elections had been held in a free and fair manner, the things in Hyderabad would have been different and as I told you we could only contest 40 seats in Telangana and were successful in 35 seats and there were 95 seats in Telangana and if we were in a position to contest all the 95 seats, then probably we would have been in a position to form the Government in Hyderabad. Even today the opposition is 82 and the Peoples' Democratic Front of which the Communist Party is also a constituent contains 42 members elected to the Assembly.

Only one point, and I will finish my speech. It is said that after the Police Action, the Communist party has done a mistake in continuing the struggle. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to certain facts. Before the Police Action, we fought the Nizam and the Razakar hordes. Lakhs of acres of land were distributed. In fact, we showed the way out of this agrarian problem in India in Telangana. We expected that the Congress armies would come and help the people to destroy the feudalism that existed in the shape of the Nizam and the feudal landlords in

[Shri R. N. Reddy]

Hyderabad. Instead of that, the Congress armies entered the Hyderabad State and began to hunt the communist party and its leadership. It was a plan to destroy the entire peoples movement that was built up after an effort of 20 years or so. The communist party and the Andhra Mahasabha in the Hyderabad State have toiled and shed their blood even during the Nizam's period to construct the peoples' movement and they distributed the land and destroyed the Nizam's rule in 2000 villages and the people had also elected their representatives. The Congress armies came and wanted to destroy the peoples' movement and also the communist party physically. This I say from the facts. Even eminent Congress leaders who visited the Hyderabad State after the police action declared openly that they are there to destroy the communist party physically. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel himself in a speech in Hyderabad held at Fateh Maidan said that he would kill every communist in Hyderabad State. These are the facts. Under such circumstances, what can we do? No breathing space was given to us, no opportunity was given to us to re-think the entire problem. The armies were set on villages to commit arson, loot and kill. Under these circumstances, the communist party had to take a decision to fight, and that we did. I feel that we did it correctly. Now to say that the communist party did a mistake is absolutely incorrect. I feel that the time has come now when the peoples' verdict should be respected and a general amnesty declared immediately. I beg to move:

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

"but regret to note that even while recognising the fact the distress has been caused by raising of the prices of the food grains consequent on the withdrawal of food subsidy no assurance has been given for reducing the prices."

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

"but regret to note that even while recognising the fact the distress has been caused by raising of the prices of the food grains consequent on the withdrawal of food subsidy no assurance has been given for reducing the prices."

Shri G. D. Somani (Nagaur-Pali): I just want to say a few words from the industries point of view. I am glad that there is a reference in the President's address that the sharp fall in prices has brought difficulties to trade and industry, especially to the textile industry with which I am connected. Therefore, I should like to take this opportunity to say a few words before this House about the difficulties under which this industry is suffering.

The slump or price recession in February and March disorganised the conditions in such a way that the Government had to take a series of measures by way of relaxation of control over distribution and to a certain extent those measures helped the industry and due to some improvement from April onwards, the threatened closure of certain units in certain sections of the industry has been fortunately avoided. Suggestions have been made both inside and outside the House that this enforced closure of certain units had something to do with the bolstering up of the prices of textile goods, and to increase the profits to the industry. I can say without any fear of contradiction that these suggestions will not stand a moment's scrutiny. Even if the mill-owners wanted to deliberately close down certain units, so far as the textile industry is concerned, I think it is absolutely impracticable. Unlike the jute industry, the textile industry is scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country. I am aware of the efforts that were made in the pre-war period when the industry wanted to curtail production or take some concerted move in the matter. Those efforts were not successful. Will anybody seriously believe that these units who will be forced to close down, who will themselves be making great sacrifices by closing down, will make that sacrifice for the benefit of the other units which will be working? To a man of commonsense it will be quite clear that a few mills in Bombay and Ahmedabad will not try to make sacrifices for other working-units, who will take the benefit of the closure. If the market is stabilised by the closing of these units, certain units that will close down will make the sacrifices and the units that will work will take the benefit. From the practical point of view, therefore this suggestion is untenable. The charge that any section of the industry or any responsible Association in the country is thinking of any deliberate move to bolster up prices by closure is absolutely unjustified and cannot

be substantiated by any logical argument.

I am thankful to the Government for what they have done so far to relieve the situation. But, the fact remains that with a slack season ahead, there is a genuine fear of a certain surplus production against forcing the mills to curtail their production, or certain undesirable conditions again appearing in the industry. I am glad that the Government have announced the other day about the free export of coarse and medium cloth. This is good so far as it goes. But, with all respect, I submit that with a heavy 25 per cent. duty on the export of coarse and medium goods, it is hardly likely that this would mean any substantial relief. Even from the figures given in the Government communicate itself, it is clear that while the Government had allocated 100 million yards of export of coarse and medium cloth during January to June, and there were 75 million yards carry-over from the last year, out of this permissible quota of 175 million yards, only 45 million yards of coarse and medium cloth could be exported in the four months from January to April. Now I respectfully submit that if the export duty had been reduced from 25 per cent. to 10 per cent. in the beginning of the year, perhaps, this export could have been doubled and while our national exchequer would not have suffered in the least by export of double the quantity that we have now exported, that would have helped our foreign exchange position and would also have eased the glut which at one time seriously threatened the industry. Even today, if the purpose of the Government is to encourage exports and to see that the free concessions that have been allowed to the industry materialise, it is necessary that this duty should be re-adjusted. After all, so far as the export markets are concerned, it is not the Indian textiles alone that are in the picture. It is an international question. As the House is aware, the conditions in the international textile industry are even more difficult than what they are in India. It is true that because of the cheap Indian cotton, the industry is in a position to compete so far as the coarse and medium goods are concerned in the export market. But, that advantage is more than neutralised by the heavy export duty, and if the Indian industry is to compete in those export markets, it is highly essential that the question of export duty should be seriously examined by our Finance Minister.

26 P.S.D.

5 P.M.

Then, there is another important matter. There has been relaxation over distribution control. At present, the mills are at liberty to sell all their fine and superfine goods to any merchant of their choice. Similarly 80 per cent. of the coarse and medium goods are free. In other words, it means that about 10 per cent. of the production only is under distribution control. But, what is the position, about the control over production? Even today mills are not allowed to manufacture what they like, what they by their long experience feel would be marketable in the country and what would be required by the different tastes in the different States. There are restrictions about quality, about printing, about dyeing and about so many other things into the details of which I need not enter now. When the Government nominees do not want to lift the stocks, when the Government have given the liberty to the mills to sell 90 per cent. of their production to the nominees of their choice, there is no reason why these restrictions on production should continue, and why the Government should not allow the mills, who, by their own experience have built up a trade, to manufacture the qualities which they think will be saleable in the country. This is really a very important aspect about production which should be seriously looked into by the Ministry concerned at an early date. The position is the same with regard to the excise duties. The export and excise duties may have been justified in abnormal circumstances but when the Government themselves admit that there has been a sharp fall and Government may have to take measures to bring about stability in prices, it naturally follows that these duties have now no place in the present economic condition of the country. Superfine goods are not at present saleable 20 to 25 per cent. below the ex-mill price. This means that the 20 per cent. duty on superfine goods is absolutely unjustified. As has been said in the statement, if production and employment are not to be adversely affected, industry has to be given assistance in the form of adjustment of export and excise duties and in the shape of relaxation of production control, so that industry may keep up its production. This misapprehension must be cleared that there is any intention anywhere deliberately to curtail production. Even if some people want to do it it is not a practical proposition. Therefore I submit with all earnestness at my

[Shri G. D. Somani]

command that so far as maintaining production is concerned both labour and industry are in absolute agreement, as also Government. Therefore it is only a question of finding ways and means by which production can be maintained. Here I submit that in economic matters one has to intelligently pre-assess the forces of coming events both in the national and international fields. I can say from experience that in the ten years of control under which the industry has been functioning there have been many instances when Government action was too late and when injury had already been done. If any action or measures are to be effective, then it is necessary that they should be taken well in time on an intelligent pre-assessment of the coming factors. With the slack season ahead

and the present international situation—in the textile industry, it is highly essential that Government should apply their mind to find out whether the industry is going to be faced with serious difficulties in the coming months for the disposal of goods in the circumstances in which the industry is functioning today. If they are satisfied on an impartial review, they should take some further measures which will allow the industry to keep up its production, which is in the country's best interests.

With these few words I put before the Government certain constructive suggestions which I hope they will take in the spirit in which I have offered them.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter to Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 20th May, 1952.
