

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

## OFFICIAL REPORT

217

## HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 16th February, 1953

*The House met at Two of the Clock.*[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

## • QUESTIONS AND ANSWES

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

## PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

## AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE RAJPRAMUKH OF MYSORE AND THE RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 21A of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, a copy of the Principal and Supplemental Agreements executed between the Rajpramukh of Mysore and the Reserve Bank of India on the 24th December, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No IV. 0.3(38).]

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—*contd.*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will proceed with the further consideration of the motion moved by Prof. Agarwal and seconded by Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah.

Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi (Lucknow Distt.—Central): In supporting the motion before the House, I shall confine myself to foreign policy.

I had an opportunity, a few months ago, of speaking on the same subject in a different context. Much of what I said at that time holds good today, and, in fact, the events of recent months have proved that those views were to a large extent justified. It has been my privilege recently to visit some countries of the Middle East. Everywhere I went the cordiality with which I was received was not merely the courtesy extended to a representative of a foreign Government but was

460 PSD.

218

largely inspired by the growing trust which India's policies have worked in so many nations. I found a new and growing awareness all over the Arab world of the soundness of India's stand and an understanding of the fact that in that stand alone lay the path to security and peace for a harassed world.

It has been said that we have not achieved any material degree of success from the policies that we have followed. I would like to point to the fact that the inspiration that India has given to a large section of the world is no small credit to the policies which we are attempting to follow. I would like here to express my thanks to the Governments and the peoples of Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon for the welcome and the friendship which they extended to me. In going to these countries from the United Nations where India had worked in close co-operation with the members of the Asian Arab world represented there it was of special privilege and, if I may say so, significance to meet the statesmen and peoples of the Middle East as to find that the new levels we were trying to forge within the U.N. also existed outside and had the support of the people. I would like to point out to those who criticise India's foreign policy that there has not been one single instance up to date in which any step that India has taken that has not helped somewhat towards an easing of the existing conditions and strengthened the forces of peace. It is easy enough to pull down something that has been built up brick by brick. But, I would like to remind the House that as tensions increase and armaments are piled up in the two rival blocs all over the world, it is the voice of India that is gaining strength day by day, and that voice is being listened to today with greater respect than ever before in the five years of our Independence. If we have not always succeeded in our attempts to secure peace and understanding, it is no shame to us. We shall try again and again whenever occasion occurs to

[Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi]

create conditions by which peace may be built up and the present tensions lessened. By remaining independent in our thinking and actions we have contributed positively towards world peace.

In the last session of the U.N., India played a significant role not only in the important Political Committee, but also in all the other committees where her voice was listened to and her contribution appreciated and in many instances, accepted as leading towards solutions of the issues before the committee. I would specially like to refer to the role played by the Asian and Arab group in the matter of the *apartheid* in South Africa and on the questions of Tunisia and Morocco. These questions, as hon. Members are aware, were very difficult and delicate ones and they involved a great deal of tactful handling. It is to the credit of this group that in spite of the many difficulties and many harassments they were able to negotiate the kind of resolutions that found acceptance with a very large number of Member Nations. A very real benefit accrued to us through the lining up with one group of a member of other nations including several Latin American countries for whose vote and friendship we are grateful. For the first time in the history of the U.N., the lining up was not either of east or west, or black or white, but of all those who were able to look objectively at the questions before them. I would like to interpret this as indicative of a new role that this group may play through which the forces of peace may be strengthened inside the U.N., and by which the people outside who are fighting for their liberty and for the suppression of unjust conditions may be heartened, strengthened and encouraged to go forward.

I would like now, Sir, with your permission, to say a word about the resolution on Korea which was sponsored by the India delegation. The resolution, I am sure, has been read by all hon. Members. I have listened to some criticism of the resolution itself and of our stand on Korea in the debate which was held here on Friday and I would like to clear some basic misconceptions that seem to exist particularly in the mind of the hon. leader of the Communist Party. The resolution which India moved was motivated by only one desire, the desire to end the killing in Korea. I think hon. Members are aware of the fact that at the time this resolution was moved, the death roll on the allied side amounted to one thousand persons a week. A similar

number of Chinese boys were no doubt dying on the other side. India was motivated therefore by humanitarian reasons and wished to stop this killing and then try to attend to everything else afterwards.

Certain charges have been laid at our door, about India not being able to do first things first. Now, this is one of the points in which I find myself heartily in agreement with the hon. leader of the Communist Party. I do believe that we should tackle first things first, and only in that way can we succeed in fulfilling our objective and in this particular case, that is what we did, we tackled first things first.

I would like to take the House back with me to December, 1950. On the 13th December, 1950, India, together with 13 nations which subsequently became the Arab-Asian bloc, sponsored a resolution asking the President of the General Assembly to constitute a group of three persons including himself to determine the basis on which a satisfactory cease-fire in Korea could be arranged and to make recommendations to the General Assembly as soon as possible. This resolution was passed by the General Assembly by 51 votes to five, and was rejected by the Chinese Government. It was our desire at that time to urge for a cease-fire so that the killing might stop and we could proceed with the greater and more important questions which dealt with the unification of Korea and the problems of the Far East in general. After that failure several other attempts were made, and finally, the armistice talks began. These first took place in Kaseong and later in Pan Mun Jon, and continued from July, 1951 right up to autumn of last year. During these talks every attempt was made to find a formula to end the hostilities, but owing to the suspicions of one side or the other, no result accrued. The death roll kept mounting, and it became imperative that something should be done in the General Assembly to call a halt to this tragic state of affairs.

The manner in which our resolution was moved has already been explained in the Prime Minister's statement to the House in December, 1952. It was difficult for us to move a resolution entirely acceptable to both sides since the powers basically concerned had been changing their position constantly. I have just told the House of the fate of the resolution in December, 1950 and other attempts had also not allayed the suspicion on both sides. I would like to correct error which was made by the hon. leader of the Communist Party when he said the other day that the Indian resolution was in-

roduced to please the Anglo-American bloc in spite of the Chinese Government's rejection of it on November 24th. This is a complete travesty of the facts of the case, and the mere reiteration of it in and out of season is not going to change the facts. The Indian resolution was introduced on November 17th. Immediate opposition to it came from the U.S.A. but the U.K. in the speech made by the Foreign Secretary Mr. Eden in the Political Committee, accepted this resolution as a correct basis by which to end the deadlock in Korea. So, to say that our resolution was "inspired" by the Anglo-American bloc is, to put it mildly, incorrect. It is well-known that for a period there was definite disagreement between the U.K. and the U.S.A., on the resolution moved by India. The Prime Minister, in his speech of December last gave the dates on which various steps were taken by us and the time our resolution was moved. The text of the resolution was sent to the Government of India by our delegation on November 16th and forwarded to the Chinese Government. The resolution itself was presented to the Political Committee on November 17th, and at that time, the U.S.A. spokesman rejected the resolution as not meeting with the principles enunciated by the U.S.A. On the 19th November, the resolution was formally moved by our delegation in the Political Committee, and supported by the United Kingdom and a number of other delegations. There was no reply from the Chinese Government and the Prime Minister says in his statement that there was no indication of the Soviet attitude for a number of days, but I would like just to make a small clarification here, and tell the House that although there was no definite reply from the Soviet or clear indication of the line they intended to adopt they followed their usual policy of allowing their satellite countries to put out feelers and give expression to the views which they were going to express themselves, and all of the Iron Curtain delegations said in the General Committee, with the exception of the Polish delegation which had not spoken until then, that their Governments were giving earnest consideration to the Indian resolution. We were thus under the impression that some serious thought was being given to the resolution. It was, therefore, something of a surprise when Mr. Vyshinsky took the place of the Polish delegate and denounced the Chinese rejection of it. But, although the delegation may have been denounced in language which was not Parliamentary and which may well have been modified. (*An hon. Member:* The language of the gutter.) never-

theless, it is a fact that India's prestige was not affected. The prestige of India remains because, in spite of the language used, in spite of the broadcasts and the newspaper articles about the resolution that were printed, there was a basic understanding that this was a *bona fide* attempt made in all good faith to bring two conflicting points of view together. The very fact that we had tried to sponsor this resolution within the framework of the Geneva Convention which had been accepted by the Chinese Government, which the Soviet delegates themselves had told us was acceptable to them, shows that we began our work under the impression that it was receiving some consideration and thought from the other delegations. The greatest obstacle to an achievement however, has been the fact that there has been fear and suspicion on both sides, fear which has mounted up sometimes to an almost unreasoning degree that if the cease-fire should take place, other and more important questions might perhaps not be solved and that something might happen which would sabotage the interests of one party or the other through the holding of the cease-fire first. Even though we did not lay emphasis on the word cease-fire as was done in some of the other resolutions, this was implied in the very nature of our resolution, because unless a cease-fire took place, nothing else could follow, and the fact that both sides were hesitating—first as I said, in 1950 China, and then the Chinese position being taken by the U.S.A.—left us in the exceedingly difficult situation of trying to bring forward a proposal which would be accepted by both parties. The House is aware that there were several resolutions before the Political Committee. It has been suggested that when the Indian delegation found that its resolution was not likely to win the support of the Chinese Government, we could have withdrawn it; but the resolution had by that time reached a stage when it was the only possible resolution and one through which a ray of hope could be seen. The others that were before the Committee could not serve any useful purpose. If the point of a resolution is not merely to get a show of hands, but to get some implementation, then ours was the only one that met that condition. One of the other resolutions could not have gained more than a few votes, while the other, if passed would have led to no solution at all. Our resolution bridged the gap, and whilst adhering to the international framework of the Geneva Convention, it gave an opportunity to both sides to effect a compromise and to come together in the interest of ending the

[Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi]

killing. A great deal is constantly being said about the loss of lives. But I regret to say that when the subjects come up in the United Nations, or for the matter of that, in this House or any other forum, theoretical arguments are advanced which do not show much desire to end anything but rather to score a victory in words. It becomes a question of who can say the longest words in the most forceful manner. Having been associated with the United Nations for seven years, I confess these gramophone records fail to impress me.

The point at which we tried to take up the matter at the United Nations was the point at which the Pan Mun Jon talks broke off, and even though the Indian resolution has not been accepted by one of the chief powers concerned, I still think that the discussion which took place, and the attempt which was made by fifty-four nations rallying round this resolution is indication enough of the desire of the assembled nations to find an honourable way out with the giving up of any basic principle by either side. What we shall do in the future, it is not for me to say. It is a matter which depends on the Government, and the opposing parties in the United Nations. But I have no doubt that we shall explore every avenue, and try all ways and means to end a situation which is not only dangerous today, but which has in itself the potentialities of something even more serious tomorrow.

The situation regarding the Kashmir issue which came up in the United Nations is still under discussion, and it would be improper for me to discuss it here. But I would like to correct a statement made by this side of the House, to the effect that the Kashmir position had never been clearly stated by us and that attention had not been drawn to certain basic aspects of the case. I would only refer the hon. Members to speeches made in the Security Council on the last occasion in which it will be seen that we clearly stated the basic aspect and explained in clear terms why the matter had been brought up before the Security Council and what our approach was to the whole problem, and what we demanded of the Security Council.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA  
in the Chair]

The point I would like to mention to hon. Members is that in these delicate times, it is not a question of how forcefully or loudly a speech is made, but it is a question of tactics, of adhering to principles rather than abandoning them for expediency,

which will yield better immediate results. By sticking to principles and gradually persuading people by the strength of one's own conviction is the only way in which in this troubled age that we can finally convince others and help to avert the catastrophe of the world moving towards greater and greater dangers.

If our foreign policy is judged from this viewpoint of gradual persuasion and measured by this yardstick, I claim that it is a positive policy, and has done a great deal to strengthen the hands of those nations, which though not militarily strong, are yet strong in the moral sense, and desire peace just as much as the two great giants now opposing each other and threatening us with the shadow of war. If India can continue to give support and strength to other nations, I claim that our foreign policy is well-conceived, and will yield results.

I beg to support the motion before the House, Sir.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani** (New Delhi): The President in his speech has referred to such a vast number of subjects, that it is not possible for me to touch upon very many of them. I shall therefore confine my remarks to a very few points, within the short time at my disposal.

The President referred briefly to the world position, and India's stand. He told us that India stands for peace, and reiterated India's peaceful policy. He also told us that India avoids the taking of any steps that encourage the tendency to war. In that, I am sure, we the people of this country, belonging to any party, would support the Government. We also stand for peace, because we the people of India have gained our freedom after a very hard struggle, and we want to build up our economy. Therefore we cannot afford to think in terms of aggression or of war. We all support the peace policy. But we want a strong dynamic policy of peace. We want a positive policy of peace, a policy of self-assurance. We do not want a hesitant policy. We do not want our policy to be such that at one time we try to satisfy one party, and at another time another party which results in pleasing none.

Recently, or I should say in the last few weeks, events have taken place which have powerfully projected the threat of war. Our Parliament is meeting under this shadow of a threat of war. We were all therefore, looking forward very eagerly to the enunciation of the Government's policy with regard to this matter. The President, in his speech, has made one single cautious remark that—

"Certain statements recently made, and the consequences that might flow from them in extending the war in Korea, have caused considerable apprehension in the minds of people all over the world. My Government has viewed these developments with grave concern."

We wonder why it was necessary for the President to use such circumspect language. Why could he not have condemned it in very clear terms; condemned the raising of the spectre of war by any nation?

Let us analyse the situation, and see how it affects Asia. Take for instance, the new policy of Eisenhower, Eisenhower's decision to release the Seventh Fleet from the Formosa waters is not an isolated act, but has come in pursuance of a policy which he enunciated earlier, the policy of letting Asians fight Asians. It is a very dangerous policy for us. It is a very good policy for the Americans, for, it will save their manpower. If it is a good policy for the Americans, then let the Americans take it to its logical conclusion. Let them leave Asia, so that Asians are either free to kill themselves or live in co-operation. It is no concern of theirs. But I am afraid Americans do not intend to follow that policy to its logical conclusions. They want to remain in the theatre of Asia, and manipulate the war. They want to pull wires, they want to project us into the battlefield, and make us kill one another; they want to keep us on the stage, and pull the strings from behind. They want to tilt the balance in their own interests, material or ideological. For them circumstances alter cases including truth. It had been specifically stated that the Seventh Fleet was there to protect Formosa from Red China. But today they contend that it is there to protect Communist China! Now if it is there to protect Communist China and if Chiang-kai-Shek wants to fight in his own land, let him go and fight by himself. Why should America provide him with technical aid, and give him material and other help? If Asiatics want to fight between themselves, let them fight their battle alone. Let us look after ourselves. We do not want to be exploited in the wars of ambition of the Western world.

Let us go further and analyse a little deeply this policy of theirs. Europe has for centuries been predatory. Europe has been overrunning other countries—old known continents as well as new continents: now their original 'white' colonies, America, Australia, South Africa,—have all become partners in this predatory excursion. The

work of Europe is now being carried on by America. In Asia after years of struggle some of us have attained freedom. We are yet struggling against colonialism. The policy of America and the policy of Europe is now to try to perpetuate colonialism. They are trying to put down the struggling people who are rising. They are trying to maintain the *status quo* and check the revolutionary changes that are occurring. It is Europe's quarrels that led to two world wars with disastrous results. Now it is the quarrels of the Western powers that are leading to a third global war. Even when their quarrels are on ideological ground, the Western mind is so rigid. The Western mind is so exclusive that it cannot see integration of ideas and life. They insist on conformism. They have no tolerance. They cannot think in terms of co-existence. This is leading the world into a third world war. They can only think in terms of black and white, they can only think in terms of heaven and hell of virtue and sin. That is why we see the world today divided into the irreconcilable Communist bloc and the other bloc. They say that the Korean war is a fight between the two parts of Korea, north and south. But who divided Korea, and whose war is being fought on the Korean soil, to the destruction of Korea?

Now in this fight between the Russian way of life and the American way of life, why should we the Asians be exploited? Let them fight their own battles and leave us alone. We shall either fight among ourselves or we shall live in cooperation. We in India are particularly threatened now with this new manoeuvring of the Middle East Defence Organisation. This Middle East Defence Organisation is coming into existence not because that the Middle East wants it, but because the Western countries want it. They want to maintain their hold over the entire world for their own welfare and exploitation. What should India do under this situation? In today's papers I find a report that a new global strategy for the allied nations is being forged—a strategy to make the Asians fight Asians, and the plan has now extended from Korea to Indo-China. It also says very shamelessly what is the American policy. "It is also stated that Eisenhower's regime has now been compelled to accept the policy that a holding war in Asia with the main aggressive defensive potential in Western Europe provides the only answer to the prevailing international situation". If it is Eisenhower's policy to have a 'holding' war in Asia, we do not want

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

to be a party to it, nor do we want to hold their baby. Let them look after their wars and their own clashes of ambitions. What should our Government do in this matter? I want to know if we stand for peace, what steps are we going to take. India is one of the foremost Asiatic countries and what steps are we going to take against this very grave threat of war in Asia? If we believe in the policy of peace, if we are sincere about it, this is the time when our Government should enunciate our policy very clearly and not talk in the circumspect language that the President has chosen to use. We should tell them that it is not only a matter of grave concern to us but that we disapprove of this policy and if need be, India will take a firm stand against the exploitation of Asia by the Western powers.

I sometimes wonder whether the acceptance of American aid clouds our vision. Is it the American aid that is choking our voice? If it is so, we should throw it away. Let us build this nation and this country without it. If Eisenhower expects us to "share in the common task of freedom," the common task of freedom of Eisenhower's conception. I should say let us be rid of the aid. Let us take a longer time in building our nation, but we are not going to mortgage our country to any foreign country's ambitions. I do not say it only with regard to America; I say it also with regard to the other blocs of countries belonging to any other ideology. We are not going to bow down to any foreign country's plans and ambitions.

The President has expressed some sentiments regarding South Africa. We fully associate ourselves with what he has said and we give our whole-hearted support to the stand of our Government and the condemnation of the South African Government.

The President has also expressed some satisfaction regarding the improvement of relations with Pakistan. I shall be very happy if our relations with Pakistan improve. That is one of the greatest needs for us. But unfortunately we do not see very much of improvement. If there is an improvement, it is so very slight that it is hardly perceptible. We have with Pakistan from time to time improvement of relationship, but the improved relationship lasts how long? It lasts only as long as Pakistan chooses. Whenever Pakistan wants to disturb it that improvement is lost. We saw a picture of that only a few months back with the passport agreement and

its disastrous consequences to the people. Today it is very necessary that the tension between Pakistan and India should ease, but with the threat of the creation of the Middle East Defence Organisation, and Pakistan's inclusion in it the tension between Pakistan and India is likely to increase. What is the position of our Government? What steps do you propose to take to prevent an increase of tension as is bound to arise if Pakistan enters the Middle East Defence Organisation?

I want now to come to affairs nearer home. First I take the question of the Jammu and Kashmir agitation. Other friends will speak on it at length, but I want to say a few words on behalf of my party over this question which is agitating the minds of many people. The struggle, whatever be its value, we feel, harms all parties concerned. It is harming Kashmir, it is harming Jammu and it is harming the larger interests of India. Therefore, this state of affairs should be brought to an end as quickly as possible. The attempt to explain it away by saying that outside agitators and outside political parties have created that agitation in Jammu does not hold water. It does not satisfy anyone because no agitation of the dimension that is now existing in Jammu can come into existence unless there is a foundation of discontent, dissatisfaction and misunderstanding in the minds of the people. We were great agitators agitating in the British days. We know that you cannot create an agitation merely by propaganda; there must be discontent, there must be dissatisfaction and there must be some fear on the foundation of which an agitation can grow. That the agitation has some genuine basis the Prime Minister himself has admitted when he said the people of Jammu labour under genuine handicaps. Is it not right then that the Governments—both our Government and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir—should rise to the occasion and try to bring about an amicable settlement?

The question of the fundamental rights and the question of the Supreme Court's jurisdiction over Kashmir are vital constitutional issues. We cannot brush them aside; you have to go deeply into these questions. The other day Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru very ably brought out these issues in the other House. By merely appointing an Official Commission you cannot expect to settle these serious issues. You have to take more serious steps, in order to settle them.

Then there is another matter which has been oppressing many of us. We have heard stories of atrocities. From one side we hear that people have been violent, so many policemen have been injured, etc. From the other side we have been given facts and figures, dates and long reports of how the Government have oppressed the people, how women and children have been tortured and how people have been killed. By saying that all these are lies, they will not become lies. Therefore, it is very necessary that some Members of Parliament should go to Jammu and see what the facts are. How long are we going to tolerate this? How long are we going to stand this kind of mishandling of the situation? I went to Rajkot a few days ago. I saw what was happening with my own eyes. It was a silly affair over which disturbances had taken place. *Satyagraha* was going on for two months. The situation had been mishandled, badly handled. Firing had taken place; so many people had been killed, women had been *lathi*-charged. Do you think that popular agitation can be put down by only bullet and the *lathi*? I would like to remind my friends that by bullet and *lathi* we were not suppressed. We were all agitators. We used to do these things during the British regime. (Interruption). With bullet and *lathi* you will only stiffen the agitation. Therefore at such a time, the Government should rise to the occasion, the Government should become generous and make a gesture. We are told that the Kashmir authorities think it beneath their dignity to negotiate, to talk with the people, the Praja Parishad. If the Praja Parishad has succeeded in organising such a big agitation, then I say there must be some foundation, there must be some just grievance, there must be something behind. Is it then not proper that the Government should call them and ask them what are their grievances and try to settle them by some sort of understanding? There is no use standing on prestige. If the Kashmir authorities cannot call the Praja Parishad people, cannot talk to them, then I am sure there are enough people of goodwill who are non-communal who can be called to mediate in this and bring about some kind of settlement. I think to my mind there is very little difference on the basic principles. The difference is on minor issues and those minor issues can be settled if both the parties are willing to settle. Kashmir is one of our border States, one of the most difficult of our border States. How long can we afford to sit and see this prolonging of the agitation? I think the time has come when our

Government as well as the Government of Kashmir should take matters in their own hands and try to settle it in a statesmanlike way and not in a spirit of anger. Call them and discuss with them—I am sure this trouble can be put an end to. That is how the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi used to do things. He kept to his principle; he adhered to his own principles but he always gave credit of honesty to his opponents, always gave the credit of goodwill to his opponents and that is why he evoked goodwill in the opponents. So, today I appeal to our Prime Minister that the time has come when he should himself try to handle the situation. I have said there are enough people of goodwill who are willing to help him in the matter and try to bring to an end this unfortunate situation that is prevailing in the country. It is doing immense harm to this country. To those who think that they will check communalism by the methods they pursue today I say they will not check communalism but communalism will be on the increase.

Now, turning to the internal situation, I will just say a few words. I know the time is very limited. The President said that there is all round improvement in the economic situation, and it is at an increasing pace. I wish we could agree with the President. I do not know; when those who run the Government see, they perhaps see the world through rosy glasses. We who have not the rosy glasses, when we go round, we do not see what the President has told us about. We see poverty, we see starvation, we see unemployment, we see fall in the purchasing power of the people.

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):**  
You wear dark glasses.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** It may be we wear dark glasses. But both have to see together to find out if the situation has improved. The food situation has undoubtedly improved. The stock position has improved. The closing stock was 90 lakhs by the end of 1952. But this is off-set by dangerous spots such as the deteriorating economic condition of the people, the unemployment, the loss of purchasing power. Even in the ration shops the off-take has fallen because people have not got the money to buy ration. They are half-starving. If they had the money they would have purchased. On the one side, we have got stocks of food, on the other side we have famine areas in several parts of India. This is a very disturbing situation. This is the rosy picture which the President has brought before us. Even if you

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

take the price of foodgrains, the index of foodgrain prices shows that the prices are still very high. Though the food situation is better than what it was before, it is still difficult, and will have to be watched carefully. The removal of vexatious control has eased the situation in many places. At the same time there are other controls like procurement. Procurement in places is done in such a peculiar way that it creates problems of its own. I was touring Bengal during last December. I travelled extensively in the rural areas of Bardwan and Midnapur. Wherever I went people complained bitterly against the levy system, how faulty assessment was made, how Government officers did not really take into account the actual production. These are the things that take away the incentive from the people to produce more. These things have to be taken into account. Even though the food situation is better than what it was before, we cannot sit complacently over it. The other day the Food Minister prophesied that we will have self-sufficiency of food by 1955-56. Not only self-sufficiency, but he said we could even export. I hope we will be able to do that. But we have seen in assessing the situation often the Food Minister and our Finance Minister do not agree. The Finance Minister is not here—I would have liked to check it with him and ask him whether he agrees with the estimate of the Food Minister. The hon. Prime Minister had told us that we should have self-sufficiency of food by 1952. But it never came about. Therefore, I think it is not very wise to make such high-sounding prophesies.

The President has also said that the general economic condition has improved. In this too I find there is difference of opinion between the President and the Finance Minister. Recently, in Hyderabad he said that "there is perhaps a certain amount of deflation at the moment." He did not say "anti-inflation", he said "deflation." Deflation indicates that the economic condition of the country is not good. Let us look at the index of wholesale prices given in the Reserve Bank Bulletin for December. It shows that after the sharp break in February-March 1952, there was a slight improvement during July and September and then again there is a downward trend from October. This is also testified by the experience of the business people. There is general business depression. Production has had to be cut down, unemployment is on the increase. In some of the industries there is over-production. Take

the figures of unemployment. What figures does one get from the Employment Exchanges? There is an increase in registration and slow movement from the registers. That shows that unemployment is increasing. In our country how few unemployed people go to the Employment Exchanges. So, the unemployment situation in the country is exceedingly serious. I am therefore afraid the rosy picture given by the President is not justified by the facts. The situation is such that it can be righted only if there is some kind of social revolution to establish an equalitarian society. But, I doubt if the ruling party as it is now organised and as it is functioning will have the power and the capacity to cope with this very grave situation and bring about this social revolution.

**Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada):** On a point of submission, I listened with awe to the President's speech—complacent in spirit and letter—and so, with regard to the President's speech, the less said about it the better.

**श्री एच० एन० शास्त्री (जिला कानपुर—मध्य) :** जनाब बाला, श्रीमती विजयलक्ष्मी पंडित की तकरीर के बाद मुझे इस बात की कोई जरूरत अब महसूस नहीं होती कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान की फॉरेन पालिसी (foreign policy) के मुतालिक इस बक्त कुछ और अर्ज करूं। अभी चन्द रोज हुए शायद परसों, एक तकरीर मुखालिफ़ बँच की तरफ से हो रही थी जो कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के डिप्टी लीडर ने दी थी और उस में उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की फॉरेन पालिसी (foreign policy) की नुक्ता चीनी की थी। इस सिलसिले में मैं ज्यादा अर्ज न कर के सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने मुल्क की फॉरेन पालिसी (foreign policy) के मुतालिक मैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से सबक सीखने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। उन का रास्ता जुदा है और हमारा रास्ता जुदा है। अगर उस पालिसी (policy) को हम अस्तियार किए होते जो कि २८ साल से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अस्तियार की हुई है तो इस पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर फ़्री सिटिज़न



(free citizen) की हैसियत से हमें बैठने का मौका न मिलता जो कि आज मिला हुआ है। अगर हम उस नीति के मुताबिक चलते तो सन् १९२९ में आजादी के आन्दोलन का जो हम ने ऐलान किया वह नहीं करते, सन् १९३० में जो सत्याग्रह की लड़ाई हम ने छोड़ी वह छोड़ने की नौबत नहीं आती, सन् १९३२-३३ में जो सामूहिक सत्याग्रह और लगान बन्दी की तहरीक हम ने शुरू की उस को शुरू करने की नौबत नहीं आती, और सन् १९४२ में जो किपूट इंडिया मुवमेंट (Quit India Movement) हिन्दुस्तान में छिड़ा वह भी नहीं छिड़ता और आज मुल्क गुलामी की जंजीरों में जकड़ा हुआ होता। और आजादी मिलने के बाद भी अगर हम उस फोरेन पालिसी को तसलीम करते और उस के मुताबिक चलते तो हम भी आज आइरन करटन (Iron curtain) के एक अंग होते और मुल्क की जनता जो आज आजादी की सांस ले रही है वह सांस न लेती और उसी गुलामी की जंजीरों में जकड़ी रहती जिन में से सदियों के बाद उसे नजात मिली है। हम एक मुट्ठी भर लोगों की सलाह पर अपनी फोरिन पालिसी (foreign policy) को चलाना नहीं चाहते जिन के इंटरैस्ट (interest) हम से कोसों दूर है। हम जानते हैं कि हमारी फोरिन पालिसी (foreign policy) के पीछे हिन्दुस्तान की ९९.९% जनता की आवाज है और अगर किसी चीज ने पिछले पांच साल के अन्दर हमारे दरजे को दुनिया में सब से ऊंचा किया है तो इस में कोई शक नहीं कि वह हमारी फोरिन पालिसी (foreign policy) ही है

काश्मीर के मुताल्लिक श्रीमती सुचेता कृपलानी की तकरीर अभी हुई और अभी बत्स रोज हुए जब कि एक और तकरीर में बैठा सुन रहा था और उस तकरीर को

सुनते हुए मेरे दिल में यह ख्याल उठा कि जो साहब कि काश्मीर के सवाल के ऊपर तकरीर दे रहे थे शायद पार्लियामेंटरियन (Parliamentarian) के रोल (role) को अदा करने के बजाय अगर वह किसी नाटककार का रोल (role) अदा किरते तो शायद उस में ज्यादा कामयाबी मिलती। बदकिस्मती से इस वक्त वह नहीं हैं। उन्होंने एक सवाल पूछा था और वही सवाल आज भी दुहराया गया है, और वह सवाल यह है कि अगर प्रजा परिषद् फुल ऐक्सेशन (full accession) चाहती है तो इस में क्या गुनाह है। और अभी दूसरा सवाल यह किया गया है गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया (Government of India) प्रजा परिषद् के जायज मतालबात पर गौर क्यों नहीं करती है। अभी चन्द रोज हुए मुझे अपने एक दोस्त से गुफ्तगू करने का मौका मिला और मैं ने उन से पूछा कि आखिर प्रजा परिषद् के क्या मतालबात हैं, तो उन्होंने भी यही बात कही कि प्रजा परिषद् यह चाहती है कि काश्मीर का पूरे तौर से ऐक्सेशन (accession) हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हो और अगर वह यह चाहती है तो इस में क्या गुनाह है और इस में क्या गलती है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वक्त आ रहा है और जल्द आयेगा जब कि हो सकता है कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का अभिन्न रूप से और मुकाम्मल तौर से एक अंग हो जाये। हमारी निगाहें तो सिर्फ काश्मीर के दोशालों या काश्मीर के दूसरे सामान के ऊपर नहीं है बल्कि हम तो यह चाहते हैं कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का पूरे तरीके से हिस्सा हो ताकि हमें शेख अब्दुल्ला जैसी अजीममुशान हस्ती मिले जिस का कि दायरा काश्मीर में ही न ही कर सारे हिन्दुस्तान में हो। पर मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मौके पर ऐक्सेशन (accession) के सवाल को उठाना

[ श्री एच० एन० शास्त्री ]

प्रजा परिषद् की जायज मांग नहीं हो सकती। इस सिलसिले में और ज्यादा दलीलों में न जा कर के सिर्फ एक बात में रखना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि देशी रियासतों के ऐक्सेशन (accession) का सवाल किस तरीके का था और किन वजूहात से इस मुल्क के अन्दर उठा। आप को मालूम है कि आज से पांच साल पहले ये देशी रियासतें हमारे मुल्क से अलहदा थीं। आजादी के मिलने के बाद यह फैसला हुआ कि तीन सवालों को ले कर उन का ऐक्सेशन (accession) हो। आगे चल कर कोशिश हुई जिन का नतीजा यह हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी रियासतें थीं वह मुकम्मिल तौर से हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मिल गयीं। यह सोचने की चीज है कि हम ने फुल ऐक्सेशन (full accession) पर क्यों जोर दिया था। उस की वजह यह थी कि हम समझते थे कि जब तक इन देशी रियासतों का जो कि अब तक सदियों से फियूडलिज्म (Feudalism) के अन्दर पली हुई है, और जिन की ज ता बहुत पिछड़ी हुई है और नाकि फुल ऐक्सेशन (full accession) नहीं हो जाता है, और वह हमारे साथ कन्धे से कन्धा मिला कर नहीं चलती है, तब तक उन की तरक्की उस रफ्तार से नहीं हो सकती है जिस रफ्तार से हमारी तरक्की हुई है और यही वजह थी कि हम ने ऐक्सेशन (accession) के लिये खास तौर से जोर दिया। लेकिन काश्मीर की हालत देखिये। काश्मीर की हालत दूसरी देशी रियासतों से बिल्कुल मुख्तलिफ रही है इस माने में कि काश्मीर के अन्दर एक नेशनल कानफ्रेंस (National conference) रही है और उस नेशनल कांफ्रेंस (National Conference) का एक लीडर (leader) रहा है शेख अब्दुल्ला। उस नेशनल कांफ्रेंस (National con-

ference) की और शेख अब्दुल्ला की यह पोलिसी (policy) रही है कि न सिर्फ वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ कन्धे से कन्धा मिला कर चलें बल्कि काश्मीर की जनता जिन दिक्कतों या जिन कठिनाइयों का मुकाबला कर रही है उन को देखते हुए वह हिन्दुस्तान से ज्यादा तेजी से चल सके। यह जाहिर चीज है और इस को तसलीम करना पड़ेगा कि आज काश्मीर में जो लैंड रिफार्म (land reforms) हुए हैं, और काश्मीर की जनता जिस तेजी के साथ तरक्की कर रही है, उस तेजी के साथ तरक्की करना गैरमुमकिन होता अगर काश्मीर उसी फुल ऐक्सेशन (full accession) के साथ बंध कर के चलती जैसे कि दूसरी देशी रियासतें चल रही हैं। अगर वह हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन (constitution) के जाल में फंसी रहती तो यह गैरमुमकिन था कि जिस तेजी के साथ काश्मीर ने तरक्की की है वह उस तेजी से तरक्की न करती और उस तेजी के साथ काश्मीर में लैंड रिफार्म (land reforms) न होते जिस तेजी के साथ हुए हैं। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बक्त आयेगा जब काश्मीर का ऐक्सेशन (accession) होगा लेकिन जिन हालात से हो कर काश्मीर गुजर रहा है उन हालात को देखते हुए मैं समझता हूँ कि समय का यह तकाजा है कि काश्मीर जिस पोलिसी (policy) को ले कर चल रहा है उसी पोलिसी (policy) को ले कर चलता रहे।

4 P. M.

जनाबे सदर, अब मैं सिर्फ एक ही बात के सिलसिले में कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रैसीडेंट साहब ने अपनी तकरीर में मुल्क की माली हालत का हवाला देते हुए इस बात पर खुशी का इजहार किया है कि मुल्क के अन्दर पैदावार बढ़ी है। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि मुल्क के अन्दर पैदावार बढ़ी है। यह खुशी

की बात है। लेकिन फिर भी मैं इस बात पर अपना तरद्दुद और परेशानी जाहिर किये बिना नहीं रह सकता कि मुल्क के अन्दर जो यह पैदावार कुछ हद तक बढ़ी है तो इस पैदावार का बढ़ना मुकम्मिल तौर से मुल्क के या उस के अवाम की खुशहाली का सबूत नहीं कहा जा सकता। जो कपड़े या दूसरी चीजों की बढ़ती आज दिखायी पड़ रही है उस की अगर एकमात्र वजह नहीं तो कम से कम एक वजह यह जरूर है कि जनता की जो परचेजिंग पावर (purchasing power) है, खरीदने की जो शक्ति है, वह कुछ घट गई है। यह परेशानी की चीज है। शहरों में खास कर के मजदूर दरजे के अन्दर और जो शहरों में मिडिल क्लास (Middle class) के लोग हैं उन के अन्दर बेकारी का सवाल पैदा हो रहा है। अभी हाल में ही दो तीन रोज पहले इसी हाउस (House) में बतलाया गया कि चाय इंडस्ट्री (tea industry) के अन्दर करीब ६५ हजार मजदूर बेकार हो चुके हैं, जो जूट इंडस्ट्री (jute industry) है उस के अन्दर भी करीब ४० हजार मजदूर बेकार हो चुके हैं और कोयला, टेक्सटाइल (textile) और इंजीनियरिंग (Engineering) के रोजगारों में भी रैशनलाइजेशन (rationalization) की आड़ में बेकारी का सवाल दिन पर दिन बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। दो साल पेशतर मैं ने इसी पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर गवर्नमेंट (Government) से यह अर्ज किया था कि वक्त आ रहा है कि मुल्क के अन्दर एक क्राइसिस (crisis) आने वाली है और गवर्नमेंट उस क्राइसिस (crisis) को रोकना चाहती है तो वक्त आ गया है कि गवर्नमेंट (Government) देखे कि इस मुल्क में जो इंडस्ट्रियल आरगनाइजेशन्स (Industrial organisations) हैं उन में क्या नुक्स हैं और उन को कैसे ठीक किया जाय। लेकिन इस पर

गौर नहीं हुआ और यह क्राइसिस (crisis) आ गया। फिर भी मुझे खुश है कि आज सरकार इस सवाल पर गौर कर रही है कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर जो खास खा इंडस्ट्रीज (Industries) हैं, उन की हालत पर गौर किया जाय। अभी चन्द रोज हुए जब कि इंडस्ट्री और कामर्स (Industry and Commerce) की मिनिस्ट्र (Ministry) की तरफ से इस बात का ऐलान किया गया कि टै इंडस्ट्री (tea industry) की जांच के लिये एक कमेटी (committee) बिठाई जायेगी। यह खुशी की चीज है हालांकि मुझे उस में भी कुछ तरद्दुद और परेशानी है। वह यह कि जो कमेटी का बिठाने का ऐलान किया गया है उस से या मालूम होता है कि वह कमेटी एक एक्सपर्ट कमेटी (expert committee) का शकल में होगी, एक्सपर्ट कमेटी (expert committee) से मुझे कभी कभी परेशानी होती है, क्यों कि अक्सर इस का मतलब होता है कि ऐसी कमेटी से जिस में कि वे लोग रहें जिन को कि किताबों की लियाकत जरूर हो, लेकिन जिन के पास किसी तरह का तजुर्बा न हो। इस तरह की कमेटी नीम हकीम खतरे जान की तरह होती है। अब भी मैं इस बात को कामर्स और इंडस्ट्री (Commerce and Industry) के मिनिस्टर (Minister) साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस कमेटी के निर्माण के सिलसिले में वह इस बात पर गौर करें कि इस के साथ लेबर और इंडस्ट्री (Labour and Industry) के ऐसे लोग हों जिन को कि इंडस्ट्री (industry) का तजुर्बा हो।

अब मैं अगले दो मिनट के अन्दर सिर्फ एक बात पर और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ और वह है फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five

[श्री एच० एन० शास्त्री]

Year Plan) के बारे में। फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five Year Plan) के सिलसिले में हम ने और उस अंजुमन ने, जिस का कि एक नुमाइन्दा होने का फलर मुख हासिल है उस को सपोर्ट (support) किया है और इस बात को तय किया है कि पूरे तौर से उस को कामयाब बनाने में हर तरह की मदद करें। यह मौका आज तो नहीं है कि फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five Year Plan) के सिलसिले में कोई ज्यादा बातें कहें। लेकिन एक चीज मैं गवर्नमेंट (Government) से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five Year Plan) की कामयाबी के लिये जहाँ बहुत सी और चीजों की जरूरत है वहाँ मुझे एक कमी दिखाई पड़ रही है और एक जरूरत महसूस हो रही है जिस को मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ। वह कमी यह है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (Central Government) और स्टेट्स (States) के अन्दर पोलिसीज (policies) में जो कोऑर्डिनेशन (co-ordination) और जो हारमानी (harmony) होनी चाहिये वह हारमानी (harmony) आज हमें दिखाई नहीं पड़ रही है और जब तक वह हारमानी और कोऑर्डिनेशन (harmony and co-ordination) नहीं होता तब तक फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five Year Plan) का कामयाब होना मुश्किल है। इस सिलसिले में मैं सिर्फ एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (Central Government) की पालिसी (policy) का सवाल है, इस में कोई शक नहीं कि पिछले चुनाव के बाद उस के अन्दर काफी प्रोग्रेस (progress) हुई है और काफी तेजी से वह आगे बढ़ना चाहती है, लेकिन जहाँ पर कई स्टेट्स (States) उस पोलिसी (policy) के साथ चलना चाहती हैं,

वहाँ पर यह देख कर मुझे परेशानी है कि कुछ स्टेट्स (States) इस मुल्क के अन्दर ऐसी हैं कि जो आज भी अपने उसी पुराने तर्जों अमल को कायम रखना चाहती हैं और चलना चाहती हैं। मुझे कम से कम एक स्टेट (State) का पता है जो कि एक पड़ोस की रियासत है। मैं उस का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। वहाँ पर एक लेबर मिनिस्टर (Labour Minister) हैं लेकिन वह लेबर मिनिस्टर (Labour Minister) वहाँ बिल्कुल फिगरहेड (figurehead) हैं, जिन की कोई आवाज नहीं और न उन का कोई असर है। बल्कि उस सूबे में जो इंडस्ट्री (Industry) के मिनिस्टर (Minister) हैं जो वहाँ के एक कैपिटलिस्ट की क्लिक (capitalist clique) से पूरी तौर से मुतासिर हैं, वह लेबर डिसप्यूट (labour dispute) और लेबर पोलिसी (labour policy) को उस स्टेट में चलाते हैं। अगर गवर्नमेंट की यह ख्वाहिश है, कि फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five Year Plan) जिस पर कि मुल्क के मुस्तकबिल का पूरा दारोमदार है, उस प्लान (Plan) को कामयाब बनाया जाय तो उस के लिये जरूरी है कि कम्प्लीट कोऑर्डिनेशन (complete co-ordination) और कम्प्लीट हारमानी (complete harmony) पोलिसी (policy) के अन्दर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (Central Government) और स्टेट्स (States) के दरमियान हो।

इन्हीं चन्द अल्फाज के साथ मैं बड़ी खुशी के साथ प्रेसीडेंट साहब को शुक्रिया अदा करने के सिलसिले में जो तजबीज रखी गई है उस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri U. C. Patnalk (Ghumsur): I rise to speak on the amendment which stands in my name and which is the

only amendment that has been moved relating to the most important subject, namely, defence. The amendment seeks to emphasise upon the fact that the Address of the President has totally ignored the problems concerned with national defence. The President is not only the head of the Executive (Civil) Government under article 53(1) of the Constitution, but he is also under article 53(2), the Supreme Commander of the Defence Forces of the Union. As such, at a time like this, when the international situation is getting more and more tense, we did expect something from the President—particularly as he is the Supreme Commander of our defence forces—as to the repercussions that the international situation may have on our defence, and an assurance from him that our defence organisation is sufficient to enable us to meet the situation.

I will not take up the valuable time of this House with regard to a part of my amendment, namely, the socio-economic use of the defence forces, because I have dealt more than once with that subject on previous occasions. I would only refer to the replies of the late hon. Defence Minister (for whose opinions we have the highest regard) namely, that many of these suggestions are quite possible and that he was going to get them examined. He gave an assurance to this House that what could be done, he was going to do within the shortest possible time. I hope his successor—I believe it is the Prime Minister who has that portfolio now—will respect the assurance given on behalf of Government by his predecessor and get the question thoroughly examined and implemented in the shortest possible time, as per the assurance given by the late lamented Mr. Ayyangar. There were assurances given twice—on the 11th June and 24th July last year.

I would, therefore, confine myself today mainly to the defence side of the defence question. Just at a time when dark clouds of war are hanging over the distant horizon and we are also hearing a sort of barking nearer our frontiers, it is absolutely necessary that the country, the Government, and the President, who is the Supreme Commander should think in terms of the defence of the country and should at least give us the assurance that defence is not being ignored, that although we are spending Rs. 226.12 crores on defence, out of a total expenditure of Rs. 405 crores, every rupee thereof is being utilised to ensure the best defence in the modern set-up. We had also expected the President to tell us, if in spite of our best efforts

to avoid a war—as we are trying to—we happen to be dragged into a major conflict, or, be it, into minor conflict with any of our neighbours and if they get aid in the shape of modern arms and ammunition from other countries, whether we are in a position to defend our country properly.

From that point of view we must study the trends of modern warfare, the methods of attack and the methods of defence. We know as a matter of fact that the old methods of defence have changed during recent years since the advent of air power, of new methods of attack, particularly attacks against industrial potential, against lines of communications, through fifth column and other activities. We have got to see whether our defence organisation as it exists is adequate to ensure the best defence in a modern war. From this angle we will have to examine whether our organisation is proper. We are no doubt spending more than 55 per cent. of our annual expenditure under the General Budget on defence. And we are no doubt having large armies, whether or not fully equipped for a modern war. But we have got to see whether this is sufficient to ensure proper defence. The war that may come will be a total war, where it is not merely massed armies that fight against each other but it is the entire national potential, the entire economic, industrial, human and all other resources of the country that have to be so geared that they can be switched on with ease from a peace-time to a war-time economy. The entire nation has to be reorganised on that basis. We have to see whether our defence organisation is properly equipped. As I said, we have no doubt got a very large standing army. We are attempting to have a small navy and a small air force also. We have practically no civil defence organisation. With this machinery will we be able to stand an attack? That is the main question.

My submission is that in modern war permanent standing forces have only what is called an "initial value"; they are there to receive the first shock of an enemy attack; they are shock-absorbers. They cannot stand a regular war for more than a few hours. They are there to receive the first shock; by that time the entire potential reserve, namely the whole country, has to be brought into defence formations. That is the position.

From this point of view I am afraid that the President's Address does not tell us how we are properly equipped for war. We do not know why the President's Address is completely silent

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

about our defence preparedness. Is it because he is one of those who do not believe in the defence organisation—of which he is the supreme commander? I hope not. Or is it because in our defence organisation a tradition has grown up to keep everything secret? If that is so I would respectfully point out that in modern war there is no good confining the defence organisation only to units of standing defence forces. The entire nation has to be taken into confidence and to be mobilised for defence. In every country the whole nation is being so geared and organised for war. I do not say that we should go on war-mongering. But when we are annually spending Rs. 226 crores out of Rs. 405 crores on defence, the least that we expect to be done is to prepare the country for a real defence in a modern set-up. This attitude of secrecy is not proper.

In this connection I would draw your attention to what they call defence budgets in other countries. The defence budget gives a certain idea of the number of defence personnel, the amount to be spent on various items, the methods of training, the method of organisation. I am not referring now to all the countries; I am particularly referring to the U.K. budget estimates. Every year they publish three volumes, the Army, Navy and Air estimates in which you find all these details. We are often told that our army is built on the U.K. model. And we know as a matter of fact that we have got U.K. officers at the head of our Navy and Air Force and also in strategic posts and key positions in the Army itself, as Directors, Advisers and so on. We have been hearing during question hour this morning about a U.K. officer being asked to come here to give advice. The only advice that some of them give is to ask us to purchase U.K. materials. This morning the question related to a certain officer who was asked to advise about the suitability of personnel for our Air Force. And I believe he has asked us to purchase a number of materials or instruments for calculating intelligence standards, which we are to purchase from U.K.!

As early as in 1936 the United Kingdom decided upon a naval policy, what type of ships to have and what type of things not to have. As far as we are concerned, we are not told of their naval and air force policies but asked to purchase their articles, materials that are not required by them.

Hence, as I was saying, I am referring to the U.K. estimates. Everything is treated as a close secret in this country whereas in the United Kingdom, which we treat as our guide and preceptor, we get all details.

**The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra):** I have not been able to make out the point of the hon. Member. We also publish our budgets.

**Shri U. C. Patnaik:** We publish our budgets, but with very meagre details. I would request the hon. Deputy Defence Minister who has just now interrupted me, to look into the three defence budget estimates that are published every year in the United Kingdom. They are called the Army, Navy and Air estimates, where they give the number of personnel, the number of officers, the number of men, how the territorial army is organised, how the cadet corps is organised, how county associations and auxiliary force associations are organised, how education in the Defence Services is organised—not only general education but education for rehabilitation and resettlement in civil life. All these you will find in their estimates. Unfortunately in our estimates all these are treated as a close secret.

As regards figures, I would point out only one or two details, not many. In the first place I would point out how other countries maintain a balance in the defence services. The comparative figures of U.K. for 1951-52 were:—

Army Officers and O.Rs. 527,000  
(including garrisons outside Europe):

Expenditure £466,520,000.

Air Force: Personnel 270,000.

Expenditure £370,489,100.

Navy: Personnel 143,000

Expenditure £299,200,000.

You will thus see how their defence organisation is balanced, whereas here in India they do not publish the figures, the numbers of officers, O.R's., air men, air women and naval ratings. They only publish the figures of expenditure, because we have to sanction the same.

You will find from our budget allotments for the current year: Defence Services effective plus Capital Outlay on Defence—

Army nearly Rs. 169 crores.  
Air Force Rs. 28 crores, and  
Navy Rs. 15 crores and odd.

It is clear that the Air Force, which is treated now-a-days as the bulwark of attack or defence, is the most starved and neglected service and that the Army expenditure is out of all proportion to that on the other two services. And there again there is the question of the period of service. In other countries they have periods of service ranging from two years or thereabouts. Here we have got not merely the long service system but we are finding it difficult to make arrangements for absorption of the Emergency Commissioned Officers, Temporary Commissioned Officers, Short Service Reserve Officers who are now serving beyond schedule. We find it difficult to absorb them in civilian life.

There is yet another difference: in all other countries, the Defence machinery is well organised. There they give education, general as well as technical, vocational education, education to enable the defence personnel for their subsequent absorption in civil life after a couple of years in defence services. Here in India, our educational system under Defence is most neglected.

Then again, in the matter of civil and military co-ordination, in every other country, there is the fullest co-ordination of civilian and military personnel for mobilisation of manpower, for training of defence personnel, for raising second lines of defence, for organising cadet corps, joint cadet corps, territorial forces, auxiliary forces and so on. There is, in fact, the closest co-ordination. Under the National Service Act of England as well as under the National Security Act of America, you have got the closest co-ordination through their manpower organisation Boards. Also it was so with Russia and China as well. Whatever may be the system of administration, whatever may be the form of Government, you notice everywhere close co-ordination between the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Labour for mobilising the entire man-power of a country under different categories—under personnel fit for Defence Services, for Defence Industries and for civilian industries. In India we have no such tabulation of statistics whatsoever.

Then also, as I submitted, they have got county, joint county and similar associations built up by civilian Secretaries of War and those Associations establish a liaison between the civil and military wings regarding the training of these second lines of defence.

Then another vital point of difference is with regard to Civil Defence.

Civil defence in modern war is given the highest priority. In every country it is best organised, whereas in India, you had a Civil Defence Organisation during the British regime. Till 1944-45 we had a Civil Defence Organisation, though confined to urban areas and limited in scope. You had the A.R.P., the fire brigades, the Civic Guard, the first aid, and the Railway Protection Force service, etc. These were there from 1939 to 1945. They were discontinued in England under the Civil Defence Suspension Act of 1945 and also discontinued in India. But in anticipation of the third world war, they have started a Civil Defence Organisation in right earnest in the United Kingdom since 1948, and their civil defence is being thoroughly re-organised; whereas in this country, since we attained freedom there is no talk of re-organising our civil defence. Further, in other countries you have semi-military organisations which are getting the fullest backing and training facilities from the Ministry of Defence: rifle clubs, riding clubs, aviation clubs and so on. Here these organisations are not having the same support nor do they have any financial and other aid.

From all these points of view, my submission is that our defence machinery is not being organised on modern lines. I have the highest regard for our defence personnel. They have done good work but we cannot deny that our defence machinery, as an organisation, is not fully adapted to modern requirements. We hope that the President who is the Supreme Commander of the Defence Forces would also make it a point to inform himself about the Defence Organisation and to assure the country that it is adequate to meet the requirements of modern war.

**Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak):** When I read the President's Address, I felt like repeating Robert Burns poem "O, would some god give us the power to see ourselves as others see us." It is not so important that we should see the Treasury Benches as they themselves see but they should attach importance to see themselves as we see them. Of course, in this heart break House—I did not want to say "House of the Dead"—it makes no difference however much logic we may put forward, however fine the arguments may be; even if the Lord Almighty came here and spoke on behalf of the opposition benches, he would be clean outvoted by 220 votes. So, what difference does it make?

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

I am coming to the President's Address. Mr. Raghuramiah called it a complacent speech. Exactly, very complacent. I had hoped that it would be shot through "with mystic gleams like fragments of forgotten dreams", that it would give some message for us—even the unbelievers like ourselves; but, unfortunately, with the best of intentions, it reminded me of a nursery rhyme that I learnt nearly 50 years ago—

"There was an old woman who  
lived in a shoe,

She had so many children, she did  
not know what to do,

She gave them some broth, she  
gave them some bread,

And she gave them a whipping and  
put them to bed."

That is the position today in India. Poor mother India is not able to feed her children. She does not know what to do. That is the position of the Government today.

Now about the Address itself. It is divided into two parts. So far as I can see, one refers to Mary's little lamb. That is our foreign policy. It is certainly a very peaceful little lamb. Its fleece is as white as snow and wherever Mary goes, the lamb is sure to go. Naturally, the lamb has to be peaceful and I will object to anybody saying that our lamb is not peaceful. Only the little lamb does not sometimes recognise who is a friend and who is not. For instance we were in good, very good faith when we were wrongly advised that North Korea was the aggressor. We also half-heartedly declared North Korea as an aggressor and very half-heartedly we sent a military ambulance. But after having come to know, after proper documentation that North Korea was not the aggressor, the little lamb did not have the guts to say that we have made a mistake, that North Korea is not an aggressor. Now, I was rather surprised that our lady representative in the U.N.O. used words like iron curtain, Soviet satellites—very neutral words of our very neutral representative of our very neutral country. I am rather surprised. Now I do believe, I am convinced, that our Government wants neutrality. But, I am going to read out and ask you, and ask this House how you expect to be neutral. For instance, I am here reading from *New York Times* of 1st December, 1951,

describing the Standard-Vacuum agreement as—

"combining the strategic dispersal of the non-communist oil refining facilities east of the Persian Gulf with the opening of the first avenue for the entry of United States private capital into India, on a major scale".

Then, it goes on to say:

"Granting that India would eventually be on the United States' side in the event of another World War, as all western observers here do, and this agreement is another evidence of it, refineries in India would mean an immense saving in construction, maintenance and man power for refining facilities that otherwise would have to be established elsewhere farther from the probable scene of conflict."

Having said that, on 3rd January, the same *New York Times* says that the terms of the Standard-Vacuum agreement "are expected to set the pattern for future investments in India". One Mr. G. D. Birla.—I think I have heard his name as there is supposed to be a Birla lobby, a rather influential lobby in this House—Mr. Birla suggested,—I am quoting from *Hindustan Times* of 5th November, 1951—"the formation of an Indo-American Development Corporation consisting of businessmen and officials of both countries similar to an existing United States-Brazil organisation. The Corporation should be a super-trust directing the future economy of India." And we talk of developing a public sector; and is this how we are going to do it?

One Mr. B. R. Sen, I think he was our Ambassador, recommended thus,—this is from the *New York Times* of 30th January, 1952—

"He recommended Indian Government participation as a guarantee of confidence in such enterprises."

And further—

"He also recommended an investment company in which both American and Indian private capital would participate initially on a 70-30 basis."

This is called a Welfare State!

An Hon. Member: Favoured State.

Dr. Jaisoorya: To crown it all, Mr. Chester Bowles with his Cheshire cat smile, welcomed it. Addressing the



Indian Merchants' Chamber of Commerce.—I am quoting from the *Hindu* of the 26th February, 1952—Mr. Chester Bowles said:

"It would be a happy thing if American and Indian companies formed partnerships for mutual benefit."

Mr. Chester Bowles said:

"Ere long an officer to explore such a possibility would be included in his staff at Delhi and a similar post created in Washington."

We talk of neutrality I want an assurance from the Prime Minister here and now that in the event of a war, not one drop of oil refined in India will go to those countries that are at war. Otherwise, where is your neutrality? Is it worth while?

I am now talking of the second part. A very important event happened. A baby was born. After two and a half years of conception, inception and hard labour, a baby known as the Five Year Plan was born. So many learned papas and one mamma. What a baby, Sir, what a baby! At the christening ceremony, proud young papa Mr. Deshmukh said, do not pass rude remarks, do not say that the baby has squint eyes, do not say that his nose is just a blob, do not say that he is chicken-breasted, pot-bellied, bow-legged; you have got to say, "Oh, what a leeny weeny cute little baby". You are asking us, the people of India, to hold the baby, to feed it, to bring it up to manhood. In my private life,—I have not much of a private life left now,—I am supposed to be a specialist in the constitutional diseases of infants and partly women. Let me tell you, if that baby had the ghost of a chance to grow up, to go to college, making a man of himself, the people of India shall bear the burden. But, with the best of intentions, I tell you that the baby will not even reach the second standard; it will die of water on the brain. (An Hon. Member: Has it a brain?) I should say the Five Year Plan will not succeed. You will be surprised to see that the President has said that it was received with great enthusiasm throughout the country. Against that, I am quoting from the Delhi gallop poll in which it was found that most of the people round about Delhi, in the Delhi province said that it was not going to succeed. I hope the Treasury Benches have not forgotten the law of physics that the intensity of light is inversely proportionate to the square of the distance. If in Delhi people do not believe in your Five Year Plan, I do not know how people elsewhere are going to believe it. Anyway, that is not the point.

460 PSD.

What is this Plan? It is built on three pre-suppositions. A Plan built on pre-suppositions remains only on paper. What does it say? It says:

"The successful implementation of the Plan pre-supposes effective power in the hands of the State for determining policy and directing action along defined lines and there must be an efficient administrative machinery with personnel of requisite capacity and quality to administer policy."

Pre-supposition means 'nadarad'—not there. The second pre-supposition is:

"For democratic planning to succeed, it will have to energise the entire community and to place before it a goal of endeavour which will call forth all its latent creative urges. The crucial factor here is leadership, not merely leadership at the top but at all levels."

It is a pre-supposition. It means, it is not there, 'nadarad'. The third pre-supposition is, leadership again.

"Leadership will be needed in every field of activity if rapid economic and social development is to be achieved through the democratic process."

Again it is 'nadarad'.

Now, I come to another point. I must tell you, I do not know whether Sardar Hukam Singh had prophetic vision when he placed his non-official resolution about the integrity of the officials. Sardar Hukam Singh suggested that the public servants should be required to furnish a return each year concerning not only immovable properties, but that the movable assets acquired by them and by their near relations should be examined. At that time, to the best of my knowledge, a whip was issued by the Treasury Benches that this resolution should be cold-shouldered. But, it is here. Are you going to cold-shoulder this? I should think that the Treasury Benches should get up as one man and hail: Viva Hukam Singh!

Is this a Plan? A Plan cannot be built upon pre-suppositions. Is this a Plan? I beg to submit it is not. What is it then? This is nothing but thinking aloud, while communing in a streetcar named desire.

The President said there is all-round improvement. I wish it was so. But it reminds me that from time immemorial the largest river in North China, the Wuting which literally

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

means "the never settled", had victimised the inhabitants for centuries. It caused so much trouble that the Manchu Emperor, Chien Lung, like all his predecessors, incapable of effectively controlling it, tried to do so—how?—by the simple expedient of changing its name to Yungting, which means "the forever settled". So also, our President has said "Everything is all right, everything is improving".

Take for instance, food. You know, Sir, the trouble with statistics is that there are three degrees of lies: lies, damned lies and statistics. And another trouble with these statistics is that it is like a Bikini bathing suit. That which it reveals is very alluring. What it hides is vital. I must confess, looking at the well-nourished condition of brother Rafi as compared with last year, there must be some improvement, but, unfortunately, I have some statistics of the food imports. In 1951, we spent Rs. 216.35 crores. The budgeted estimate for this year is Rs. 226.7 crores. Whether it is to store up—God knows for what purpose—but when the food situation is improving, it is difficult to explain these figures.

I am coming to the loans. As I told you, nobody is so deaf as one who will not hear, does not wish to hear. Nobody is so blind as one who does not wish to see. Here is a book, "American Shadow Over India". I do not know whether my friend the Commerce Minister and the other Members of the Treasury Benches have read it.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** No.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** If you have read it, then come over and argue with me.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** No, I have not read it.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** But, my dear Sir, I have a better knowledge of the psychology of women.....

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I have no doubt.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** .....since I am a bachelor. And, Sir, let me tell you once a woman has made up her mind to go with a man, nothing in the world, no ordinance, no advice will be of any use. You may talk to her and say: "Darling kid, mind your step. Today, American gentlemen do not prefer blondes any more. They are specializing in oriental beauties. Mind your step. If you read Kinsey's monumental work 'Sexual life of the American Male', it is terrible. It is

appalling." But, poor, innocent Miss India will say: "No. My gentleman friend has given me a luxury flat. He has given me a beautiful Cadillac car. He takes me to dinner to the Ritz. He takes me to the races, and when he brings me back home, he merely kisses my hand." Sir, you and I are elderly men, and we know it always begins like that. What am I to say to these mid-Victorian fuddle-headed old wet nurses that are guiding Miss India, our country?

**Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan (Dindigul):** On a point of order, Sir, I wonder if it is necessary to bring up such similes about Indian women and American males. Is that in keeping with the dignity of the House? I do not think it is very nice to speak about our sisters, mothers and nieces in this manner, even though it may be a simile and a joke.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** I used the word "Miss India", and it was a symbol for the Government.

**Mr. Chairman:** These words were used in a simile, likened to an allegory, but at the same time, the hon. Member will realize that when he uses the word "Indian women" and just says that the Americans are behaving like this, it is not in very good taste.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** I said "Miss India". I said it was a symbol.

**Mr. Chairman:** Has the hon. Member finished?

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** I have finished. But, if my dear sisters cannot make out the difference between a symbol and "Miss India", they are not "Miss Indias".

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):** After this very interesting speech by the learned doctor, I have got to take the House to a serious matter which should engage the serious attention of my hon. friends.

The President, in his Address, has dubbed the agitation which is now going on in Jammu and Kashmir as a "misguided" agitation. I am afraid the President has been himself misguided by his Council of Ministers.

Ten weeks have passed since the Jammu agitation has started, and whatever view you may take of that agitation, the facts stare you in the face, that, in spite of lathi-charges, shooting, firing, various forms of torture and cruel repression, the movement has spread and is spreading. The situation is serious, and I implore this House to

take an objective view of the realities of the situation. It is no good simply saying that it is an artificial agitation of a sporadic nature which has sprung into existence, engineered by people from outside. It is not so. It is fairly clear as Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani pointed out, it was a spontaneous agitation. It is an organic movement. Otherwise, in spite of lathi-charges, firing etc., how do you expect 1,800 men to court arrest? Men and women, not merely landless people, all sorts of people, labourers, peasants, and men of both communities—a total of 1,800 have courted arrest. About 1,000 are still in jails. I think 30 or a little more of them are women. Therefore, it is a serious situation, and I beg of this House to realise the position. It will not do simply to malign them. It will not do simply to say that this movement is communal. It is a huge joke—this charge of communalism. I am afraid it is becoming a stale joke. I wish somebody had invented something else. Give a dog a bad name, and then hang it. That is why the men in power are continually saying that they are guilty of communalism. What is communal in that movement? I want hon. Members of this House to understand and appreciate the position. Now, what is the first demand of the Praja Parishad? Their first demand is that the Constitution of India should be made applicable to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Is it communal? Is it not fantastic to say that the citizens of Jammu, who demand the application of the Constitution of India to that State, are communal?

Their next demand is the application of the Fundamental Rights Chapter to the citizens of that State. Is that communal? I ask you to pause and consider. It is quite senseless to say that the demand of any citizen of Jammu or Kashmir, for the application of the fundamental rights to themselves, and to that State, is a communal one. I earnestly implore this House to remember that it is not a mere demand for legalism or constitutionalism, but they are fighting for the vindication of the basic rights of humanity. The Jammu people have been repeatedly crying that civil liberties have been cruelly denied in that State. They point out time and again that the Defence of Kashmir Rules, which have been in operation, and which have been ruthlessly applied in that State, are more barbarous and retrograde than even our Preventive Detention Act, and are something analogous to the Defence of India Rules, particularly Section 26. They are saying that practically freedom of speech had been suppressed,

freedom of expression had been suppressed, and there had been a continual denial of civil liberties. Important Indian papers which had a big circulation there had been banned, like the *Milap*, the *Pratap*, and other papers, the names of which I need not mention now. They have all been banned, and the ban has not been lifted. What crime have the people of Jammu committed, that you should deny them the fundamental liberties which you had guaranteed to 320 millions of Indian citizens? In article 19, the first clause is that every citizen of India shall have the fundamental right to freedom of speech and freedom of expression. When the *Organiser* was banned, when *Cross roads* was banned, and when pre-censorship was imposed on some papers, you know as a great lawyer, that the Supreme Court declared that this was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court declared that the guaranteed right to freedom makes impossible the imposition of pre-censorship, that these are not copybook maxims, but they are basic rights of citizenship in a democratic State, and if you have pre-censorship or banning of papers, then you destroy the very foundation of democracy. Now, what is it that the people of Jammu are saying? They are saying 'Why can't we get the same right of going to the Supreme Court of India, and stand up there for the vindication of the elementary rights which are enjoyed by 320 millions of fellow Indian citizens?'

Now take the case of cultural rights, the right to equality, the right to land-holding, and the right to ownership and the right to constitutional safeguards. You know, Sir, as a distinguished member of the legal profession, that our Constitution not merely formulates the rights in the Fundamental Rights Chapter, but sees that there is the highest tribunal of the country, of unimpeachable integrity, which can enforce and vindicate those rights. If anybody is deprived of his liberty, he can go to the Supreme Court and ask for a writ of *habeas corpus* or a writ of *mandamus*. In hundreds of cases, the Supreme Court has set aside the orders of detention as being illegal or *mala fide*. The people of Jammu say that Pandit Prem Nath Dogra, the President of the Praja Parishad, had been kept in jail for months without trial, without the formulation of any charges. They say, 'What crime have we committed that we cannot approach the Supreme Court, for the vindication of those fundamental rights and liberties which all of our fellow citizens in India are enjoying?' It is no good Sheikh Abdullah saying that Kashmir

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

is one with India. It is no use Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru saying that Kashmir is one with India or that India is one with Kashmir. Kashmir is with India for many purposes. It is one with India, for we are defending Kashmir. But in fact, Kashmir is not one with India, so far as the Supreme Court is concerned, so far as the fundamental rights go, so far as financial integration goes. The people of Jammu have been bitterly complaining that not merely have civil liberties been suppressed, but even cultural rights have been suppressed. Take for instance, the Hindi-Urdu controversy. Before the present regime came into power, Hindi had an honourable place, and the people of Jammu have been continually saying that Hindi has now been relegated to the background and that Urdu has been made the official language. They are complaining that their cultural aspirations are not being satisfied. They are also complaining that in the Textbook Committee which has been set up by the Sheikh Abdullah Government, there is not one representative of Jammu, and not one representative of the minority community. With regard to administrative matters also, they have many grievances. There have been charges of communalism, charges of discrimination against the Jammu people. What they are saying is only this: "We are quite satisfied, if you apply the Indian Constitution to our State". But that issue has been evaded. Up till now, that has not been done. On the other hand, day after day, Sheikh Abdullah has gone on condemning the Praja Parishad movement. Vituperation and recrimination will take us nowhere. When I had the privilege of discussing the Jammu situation with Sheikh Abdullah, I appealed to him to have a Round Table Conference, of the representatives of the Praja Parishad, and also his own men, so that the whole thing could be thrashed out. That is exactly what I am saying today also. 'If you say that Kashmir is one with India, in all genuineness, then what is wrong with the Praja Parishad movement? What is wrong with their demands? Why cannot you accept the Indian Constitution? Why cannot you accept the Fundamental Rights Chapter? Why cannot you accept the Supreme Court of India as the final tribunal for the vindication of the basic rights of humanity? Why cannot you accept financial integration? Now, we are not saying anything against the declared will of Parliament here. Insidious campaign of whispering is going on that when we are supporting

the people of Jammu and the Praja Parishad movement, we are doing something against the will of Parliament. Where has this Parliament declared that every one of the thirty-two crores of human beings in India will get the fundamental rights, but not the poor people of Jammu? Where and when has Parliament declared that the Supreme Court of India shall be the final tribunal for 32 crores of human beings in India, but not for the unhappy people of Jammu and Kashmir? Where has this Parliament declared that there would be no financial integration? Nowhere has it declared like that. We are told that a Commission has now been appointed to go into these things. It seems to be a huge joke, for, no Commission can really tackle this matter.

Take for instance, their grumbling about the customs barriers. They are saying that a thing which is sold for one rupee at Pathankot, is sold for Rs. three or more at Jammu. They want that there should be the same facility for trade and commercial intercourse as subsists between the other States. They are saying therefore that the customs barriers should be lifted, and that there should be financial integration.

Their economic, administrative and other grievances, are bound up with the constitutional issue. How can a Commission with restricted terms of reference possibly tackle all this? It just passes my comprehension. How can it do it?

There has been also a lot of disturbance over the way the Jammu Province has been split up. Possibly hon. Members here do not know how that Province has been split up.

5 P.M.

There has been a systematic attempt made for the purpose of creating Hindu zones and Muslim zones there, and they are terribly perturbed over it. Territorial limits of the various administrative units of the province of Jammu have been altered with a view to the eventual partition of the Province into different communal zones—Hindu and Muslim. The Udhampur district which had a large and clear Hindu majority and acted as a direct link between Jammu and Ladakh, has been split up into two units. Its northern areas like Bhaderwah, Kishtwar and Ramban, which contain most of the mineral and forest wealth of the State, have been constituted into a separate Muslim majority District

of Doda, which is possibly intended to be amalgamated with Kashmir. The minorities in this zone are unhappy. This district besides destroying the natural cohesion of the Jammu Province, has threatened to become a wedge separating Jammu from Ladakh. Similarly, Reasi district has been split up and a new district of Rajouri Poonch created. Therefore they are deeply perturbed. It is no good saying that you are thinking of giving regional autonomy. Regional autonomy to what? Regional autonomy to the old province of Jammu or regional autonomy to the different Hindu zones and Muslim zones and so on? Therefore they are saying: 'We are fighting separatism, we are fighting communalism and we are fighting something which goes against cohesion.'

Now, Mr. Bhimsen Sachar, Chief Minister of the State of Punjab, has even out-heroded Herod. He has even excelled the performances of Sheikh Abdullah. He has called the Praja Parishad leaders—'traitors'. These provincial satraps are trying to do their best to carry favour by placating Sheikh Abdullah in order to be in the good books of the big bosses of the Congress. What is the position? It is very sad, very tragic—a responsible politician occupying the position of the Chief Minister of a State using this language, that their political opponents are traitors. Traitors! What is the treachery they have done? Is it treason or treachery to demand that the Constitution of India should be applicable to them? Is that treason or treachery to India? Treachery to whom? To demand for the fundamental rights guaranteed—to whom is that treason? Has not our Constitution in its very preamble said that we are framing this Constitution for the purpose of establishing social justice, economic justice, guaranteeing to all our citizens freedom of thought and expression? Is invocation of that an act of treason? These little men vested with little, brief authority are imitating the British imperialists.

One time the Britishers in their power and authority declared Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the fighters for India's freedom as traitors—and declared them to be guilty of treason. Ultimately they had to come down from their giddy heights and had to sit in parleys and conclaves and conferences with them. We have appealed to Sheikh Abdullah to send for the Praja Parishad leaders, come down from the giddy heights and thrash out something honourable and agreeable to both sides. If he is genuinely anxious for cohesion and

unity with India, then where is the difficulty? He wants certain safeguards with regard to fundamental rights. He pointed out to me that he wanted certain safeguards with regard to landholding and with regard also to financial integration. That is a matter capable of adjustment. That is a matter which is not beyond the bounds of reasonable statesmanship. In this crisis, therefore, my appeal is: let not this House be misled by the malignant misrepresentation and vituperation indulged in by the Punjab Chief Minister. I repudiate every one of his charges and say that they are unfounded. The Home Minister standing in this very House said: 'I will never apply the Preventive Detention Act for political purposes'. This Preventive Detention Act has been used by the Punjab Government for political purposes. I further say that this charge that they have been collecting arms to indulge in violence is absolutely unfounded. Why then resort to the convenient course of this Preventive Detention Act? Why don't you arrest men of the Hindu Manasabha and the Jan Sangh and openly prosecute them in a court of law? Let them have a chance of defending themselves. Instead of that, you clap them behind prison bars. You do not give them the chance which an ordinary decent citizen should have of vindicating their character and proving their innocence. You go on blackguarding and maligning them. Is this justice? Is this democracy? Is not this Punjab Government making a mockery of democracy? This is a matter I ask this Parliament seriously to consider. They have banned all public meetings throughout the Punjab. They are not allowing those men to criticise Sheikh Abdullah's policy or support the Jammu Parishad's stand and to have their say openly. They have gagged all freedom of speech. What kind of tyranny is this?—this kind of enforced silence imposed by the tyranny of governmental authority? And Mr. Sachar and his colleagues are inviting Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues, and what should I say, his emissaries, to come and tour the Punjab for the purpose of propagating their views against the Praja Parishad! Is this democracy or is it a mockery of democracy? I ask this House seriously to consider the situation. My appeal has been to Pandit Nehru—that he should rise to the occasion. He is the one man in India who can make Sheikh Abdullah see reason. If Sheikh Abdullah is haunted by prestige, by notions akin to power-intoxication or egoism, then it is for Pandit Nehru to send for him and send for the Parishad leaders and hammer out some kind of settlement. I think it is still feasible and possible.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

The sands of time are running fast. Along a distance of 200 miles the movement has spread—from village to village. It has gone to the remotest part of Jammu. You cannot suppress it. You have not been able to crush it. Therefore, there is genuine discontent. Face that situation. With the fullest sense of responsibility I am saying that this is the time when the Prime Minister of India should intervene. They have got something to hide from us. Otherwise, why do they ban entry of fact-finding Commissions appointed by political parties of India who are in the Opposition? But they allow Congressmen to go and to make pro-Abdullah propaganda. But they do not allow our men to go. Therefore, they have got something to hide. Let a Supreme Court Judge be appointed and let him make a report as to what the situation is. There is a long list of charges of ruthless repression—molestation of both men and women. Certain things have been done which do not reflect any credit on any civilised Government.

I want to conclude by appealing to the House to make the Prime Minister of India intervene in this crisis. Send for both sides, make them sit together. (*Interruption*). My friend seems to be amused. We do not want here in this House nominees of Sheikh Abdullah. They want, the Jammu people want, real representatives elected by the general suffrage, elected by popular wish, and not merely nominees of Sheikh Abdullah.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):** *Hear, hear. (Interruptions).*

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. The hon. Member should not stand up like that and shout.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** He spoke like that.

**Mr. Chairman:** That is no reason why the hon. Member should shout. He should bring the matter to the notice of the Chair. After all this is not a public platform. This is Parliament.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Sir, my final appeal is that it is for Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to rise to greater heights. He can still effectively intervene and promote a settlement which will be honourable to both and which will be for the lasting good of both Kashmir and Jammu and for India.

**Prof. S. N. Mishra (Darbhanga North):** I do not propose to traverse the wide ground covered by the President in his Address, from the climax

of world peace to the bathos of groundnut. I simply intend to confine myself to his references to the Plan and its implementation, because I think that the working of the Plan is the highest national priority at the present moment. But before I make some observations about the implementation of the Plan, I want to say a few words about the criticism of our foreign policy made by our friends on the opposite side. Sir, you must be familiar by now with a set of jargons that have been introduced into the deliberations of this House by our friends of the Communist party. It is indeed, very annoying at moments that the same set of phraseology, the same set of words and jargons should be introduced over and over again and it is really a pity that even a person of the intellectual stature of the hon. Member, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee, who is certainly capable of greater range of thought and modulations of expression should indulge in the same set of ideas, in the same vituperative language as he has been doing for some time while discussing foreign policy of India. Hon. friends of the Communist party are never tired of telling us that we are attached to the apron strings of American capitalism and Anglo-American imperialism. They are never tired of telling us that our foreign policy is subordinated to the foreign policy of the Anglo-American bloc. This charge, in my opinion, is so utterly baseless that to direct any attention to it would be to give it a respectability and status which it does not deserve. Sir, I need not tell you that public opinion in this country and the majority opinion in the world has shown that this charge is utterly untenable. Strongly enough in regard to the Korea resolution it was said that India at that particular moment in the U.N.O. played a 'Sikhandi' role. We have nothing but pity for those who cannot distinguish between a 'Sikhandi' role and a 'Shri Krishna' role in the international sphere and particularly for those who, as you are aware, during 1942 movement, when the country was going through the baptism of fire and sacrifice as never before in history, had played a 'Sikhandi' role and now are at a gallop as the Trojan horses of Russia. For them, therefore, it is nothing but surprising to hurl that charge against others over and over again. Sir, I want to submit to you that it is clear even to the meanest intelligence that India so far has played in the international sphere a 'Shri Krishna' role, trying her utmost for the preservation of peace, for the prevention of war and extension of the area of conflict.

And if any great war breaks out, the Third World War or *Mahabharata*, in the same allegory, I am sure, India like Shri Krishna will again try to refuse to take arms and identify with any group. She may give her moral support to any cause she may think right but she would not be militarily identifying herself with any group.

Having said that, I am reminded of what happened in the life of a great philosopher of the day, Bertrand Russell. He has said somewhere, one man seemingly interested in philosophy came to him with a request to recommend some of his books on philosophy. He went away with the recommendation of Bertrand Russell. But quick came he the next day saying, 'I have been reading one of your books and the only statement I could understand is false.' He pointed out, 'You have made a statement in your book that Julius Caesar is dead, but I am Julius Ceasar and I am not dead.' So, whenever the hon. Members of the Communist party stand up and say that India is tied to the apron strings of a particular bloc, they probably fully recognise that we are not attached to this group or that group but straining after something uncommon to suit their set design they say that 'we are India and we are attached to a particular bloc, the Russian bloc, the Cominform, so how is your claim correct?' Also many friends of the Opposition, like the great Aristotle, would never count the teeth of their wives to get rid of their wrong notion that women have fewer teeth than men. They would not read recent history that India has made in the international sphere, the history which is full of clear examples of independence of judgment, thought and action and the lead which India has given, which has lit up the eyes of millions all over the world with a new hope, faith and confidence in the prospects of peace.

Now, I would come to the implementation of the Plan. We deeply regret that the President is so grossly mis-informed about the implementation of the Plan. The complacency inherent in his remarks about the working of the Five Year Plan is probably based on certain amount of mis-information produced before him by his Government. So far as this Plan is concerned, I have the greatest admiration for it and I have no doubt that it is the greatest contribution India has made to the democratic planning in the world. But, is the Plan being implemented, is it being worked? That is the question I ask. And, if the Plan is being worked, where is it being worked, for whom is it being worked, who knows about it? I my-

self must have contacted, since the Plan was finally approved by this House, at least 20 to 25 thousand people in my constituency. I found nobody knowing anything about the Plan. There may be a few purple patches all over the country in the shape of community projects but even in these community project areas, so far as my inquiry goes, people are left completely cold and they are not given to know anything about the work for which their co-operation is needed. Even the Members of the State Legislatures, the Members of Parliament coming from that area have absolutely no information about how the work is being done in that area. So, regarding the implementation of the Plan, I would humbly submit that this undue belief that something is being done is somewhat unfounded. And, I would like to draw your attention to a few aspects of its working during the course of the last two years. I must confess that the working during the course of the last two years has not given us a very happy experience. Take the example of the projects that are under the Central Government at the present moment. What do the stories of the Kandla Port project, the Machine Tools Factory, of the Hindustan Shipyard Ltd. tell us? Their stories are quite eloquent of the lassitude of the Government in the matter of implementation. Even where funds are provided, the rate of expenditure is quite behind the schedule. You know what serious implications this expenditure behind the schedule has. It means less employment, not only delaying the execution of the projects but, mind it, less employment in the present acute phase of growing unemployment in the country. So, I would very strongly urge upon the Government to make an enquiry and find out the bottlenecks and to gear up the machinery to remove the causes of delay in execution and this behind-the-schedule rate of expenditure.

Regarding Part B and C States, what is being done? The administrative hurdle is still there impeding the implementation of the Plan. Many plans and programmes have been submitted by the Governments of these States to the Central Government, and they are pending before it for months together. Because of the delay in approval and sanction, no programme is kept up to the schedule. This is not the way to implement the Plan. Another difficulty with regard to Part B and C States is the lack of technical personnel. I am told that no good engineer or planner wants to go there. States like Coorg, Rajasthan and PEPSU therefore, suffer. What has

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

Government done in regard to the recommendation of the Planning Commission about a joint services pool for removing this difficulty? Absolutely nothing.

Then there is the sad story of the assistance granted by the Centre to the States under the Five Year Plan. The Centre has made certain commitments, but if you make enquiries you find that there is gross discrimination exercised. Some States have been given assistance at a higher annual rate and some sadly lag behind. My own State of Bihar is a case in point. So also Bengal, and probably U.P. (*An Hon. Member*: Assam also). The assistance is not kept up at an average rate. If the Central Government has not got the requisite amount of money, then it should either explore fresh avenues of revenue, or adopt deficit financing. In the ultimate analysis, if it cannot do either of these things, it should come forward and express its inability to stand by its former commitments, so that the States may know the position in advance and frame their budgets accordingly. They should know where they stand financially. Otherwise, everything would be upset. Particularly after the submission of the Finance Commission's recommendations, it is imperative for the Central Government to find out whether it would be able to stand by its former commitments, or in view of the increased grants to some States in accordance with the recommendations of that body it would like the assistance to be whittled down correspondingly. This is a very important thing which should receive the consideration of the Central Government.

Before I resume my seat, I should like to tell you that in regard to the method of implementation of the Plan there is a very serious defect. There is no Central Information Service with the Planning Commission. If you distribute the information in places like Hyderabad or Delhi, it would be like carrying coal to New Castle. My submission is that the President's Government has done absolutely nothing to popularise the Plan in the countryside. If it is to be carried to the remotest hovels, it will have to be presented to the people in simple, clear and convincing language, and in terms of their needs and their satisfaction. You will be surprised to learn that so far the Plan has not been broken up at the district level, or the sub-divisional level, not to talk of the *thana* or the village level. The villager does not know what the Plan means to him. My submission is that Govern-

ment should have adopted a strategy both of education and campaign. Had this been done, the Plan would by now have resounded in every hut and hovel in the countryside, and thousands of youngmen from the villages and the schools and colleges would have come out and formed brigades for national reconstruction. But the Government has done nothing in this direction. The efforts of the Government so far as the implementation of the Plan is concerned have been anaemic. Government have not been able to create the proper atmosphere in which community action and community participation in the implementation of the Plan may be possible. Let Government inaugurate a ruthless clean-up drive against corruption. Let them inaugurate a national austerity drive, involving a drastic cut in the import of luxury goods consistent with our trade obligations, a drastic control of salaries in the private sector, so that a corresponding policy may be effectively pursued in the public sector. Let Government close the schools and colleges and even this Parliament and the State Legislatures for a month, and ask the teachers, professors, legislators and students to go to the countryside and saturate the atmosphere with the message of the Five Year Plan. This is the way in which the National Plan can be worked, and not in the happy-go-lucky manner, not in the lethargic manner, in which the Government are working the Plan now. If the Government do not shake off their present lethargy and complacency, it would bring disaster to the nation. If the Plan fails, people will face a peril and the Government a defeat, and as the Prime Minister has said, like a General defeated in the battlefield we shall have to face a situation in which no amount of argument on our part to explain our defeat will be of any avail. Therefore, let Government take up the implementation of the Plan with the sense of urgency with which the nation wants it to be taken up. There is ample enthusiasm in the countryside if only we have got a programme for tapping it. I have been responsible for evoking considerable quantum of public enthusiasm for the erection of some dams, canals and roads, and I know that the Indian people are not as dead and inert as they are made out to be. Our experience so far as the implementation of the Plan goes is that it has not been made a people's job. It is still a bureaucrats' job. The Government has to make it a people's job. If it does not do so, it will not be a National Plan. It will not be a Plan worth the name. Imple-



mentation of the Plan does not mean merely the performance of the tasks enumerated in it, but it means also the creation of a new psychology, a new society based upon the new conception of planned economy as against the conception of *laissez faire* which has been in vogue for so long. With these words, I support the motion of thanks.

**Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla):** I rise to support the motion. The President, in his Address, has touched upon a number of important and urgent problems engaging the attention of the Government, but I shall deal with just a few of them. The matter on which I wish to join issue is the one which had been dealt with just now by my learned colleague, Shri Chatterjee, namely, the Kashmir agitation. So far as that matter is concerned, I wish the facts were better known and that they could be disseminated and the truth discovered. Shri Chatterjee said that we should not malign one party, that we should not use vituperatives and that we should find out the real things that matter. On this point, I am in complete agreement with him. But whereas Mr. Chatterjee has used certain truisms, he appears to be farthest from facts as they are. This Praja Parishad agitation is by no means concentrated or localised to Jammu, as it seemingly appears. Ostensibly it might be an issue of the Jammu people, but actually its tentacles have been spread far into the various corners of the country and this agitation has a history behind it which one cannot really forget.

At the General Elections last year a certain party was not merely defeated—it was not only defeated—it was absolutely routed. Even since the last twelve months it has been licking its wounds. What happened? It started championing the cause of cow protection and one fine morning in every town and village of the country we discovered walls had been spoilt by the slogan: "Ban cow slaughter". It turned out to be a damp squib. It turned out to be an empty thunder. Then they expounded the cause of and they discovered themselves to be the supporters of the refugees. The refugees would not be easily gulled. The refugees understood the difficulties of the Government, the difficulties of the nation and the efforts made to rehabilitate them. They might not have been adequate, but the fact that the efforts were sincere admitted of no doubt and the refugees' support was lacking to their cause.

Then there have been cases, sporadic attempts to take shelter behind the Hindu Code Bill. But the latest we have got is the Praja Parishad agitation in Kashmir. Mr. Chatterjee,—I wish when he threw certain challenges he had the grace to hear this side as well,—said: "What do they want? They want fundamental rights—why not give them? They want certain liberties—why withhold them from the people? They want the application of this Constitution—why deny it?" I make bold to say in this House that all their legitimate demands, all their legitimate complaints, all their lawful grievances need redress. They have to be examined closely and whatever is legitimate has to be fully given redress to. But let us see what these docile, soft-spoken people for whom he had so many buckets of tears to shed, did, what they have said and what has been the form of their agitation. Mr. Chatterjee a short while ago said: "Oh, poor Pandit Premnath Dogra; he has been behind bars without trial. How shocking." Yes, anybody who is behind the bars without trial deserves sympathy. But this is what the great Pandit Dogra said in his speech on the 7th of November, 1952:

"I have told the people of India that we have so far struggled constitutionally, but are taking other steps now. People from outside also assure us of their support."

What does it mean? It means "we are no longer wedded to peaceful technique; we propose to resort to violence and not only do we hope to get success, but people from outside have also assured us of their support regarding the other steps that we are taking now." Is there any Government that can tolerate this? And the Government of Kashmir has waited and waited quite a long time. Now what has been done?

Let me tell you the example of another leader, Shri Rishi Kumar. This is his language:

"We would put an end to Sheikh Abdullah and other workers of the National Conference. We will suck their blood."

I would challenge Mr. Chatterjee if he could paraphrase this sentence and let us see how his erudition could make this utterance into something very soft, something sweet, something absolutely inoffensive.

Not only that, look at another sample. I have got a third one and this is what one of their leaders said:

[Shri Tek Chand]

He is Chaudhuri Prithi Pal Singh, member of the Working Committee.

"The opportunity has come to shake Sheikh's Government and Nehru's Government. We intend to shake it. We are not fighting against Sheikh Abdullah alone, but also against Jawaharlal."

These are their speeches. This is the manner in which they want to seek the great rights, the Fundamental Rights, which have been safeguarded and guaranteed by our Constitution.

Then, what has happened is not without interest. There have been a large number of raids, followed by violence, pelting of brickbats and stones and also firing. But where? Look at the location. This agitation by those people, who lose their temper when somebody styles them as traitors, this agitation has been going on, virtually at every place which is within a radius of three miles of the Cease-fire line. Chumb—one mile; Sunderbani—a mile and a half; Joria—two miles and Hiranagar, two miles and a-half. No place where this agitation has been going on is beyond a distance of three miles from the Cease-fire line. In the day time Parishad violence continues—there is firing as well. At night Pakistan troops take the cue. They say: "Please don't call us traitors—we are sensitive about it." What else can you style them?

Not only that but look at the public institutions that have been damaged. They have raided police stations in Sunderbani and Joria which I say are almost within a hailing distance of the Cease-fire line. *Tahsil* offices have been raided and damaged; the sub-jail at Kathua has been raided. The Deputy Commissioner's office has also been raided. So far as inoffensive public institutions are concerned, no less than nine schools have been raided and their property damaged. Among them there were two girls' schools at Kathua. Kathua is again within a short distance of the Cease-fire line. Not only that: there have been serious, grievous injuries,—it is the language of lawyers,—inflicted by these peace-loving, fundamental rights seeking people. The District Magistrate at Sunderbani received grievous injury. The Additional District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police at Udhampur received serious injuries. Similar injuries have been caused to the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Police Inspectors and Sub-inspectors, and the number of injured constables and head constables grouped together will be nearly a hundred. This is what

has happened. Is this the way that they intend to espouse their cause for the civil liberties? Is this the way they want that their fundamental rights should be guaranteed by pelting stones? But the incidents I have narrated are nothing and will pale into insignificance before another of a most revolting character which I am about to cite. On the 26th January, 1953, India's Republic Day, our National Day, not any particular party's day but the day of every citizen of this country, at the occasion of the flag-hoisting ceremony, when the Deputy Prime Minister and the Revenue Minister were going to salute the flag, speeches were being delivered—it was at that moment that these gentlemen chose to disturb the meeting, pelt stones and otherwise create trouble. And not satisfied with their achievement on that day, they smashed the portrait of Mahatmaji. Can anybody deny or question it? Is this the way they want to advocate their cause? Then a number of innocent persons who had nothing whatever to do with the meeting were assaulted. And in this category can be included the headmaster of a school who was assaulted; his face was tarred because he would not close the school. B.C.G. vaccinators were manhandled; also medical officers, doctors and others. And on the 11th January, while the Deputy Prime Minister was addressing a public meeting he was fired upon. These are the facts. And with these facts happening, can they with any grace say "we are not traitors to India"? The time at my disposal is so short, for I wish I could cite more juicy bits from the comments of Pakistan Radio.

On the one hand they want the solidarity of India, and on the other they are doing their best to see that that solidarity is not achieved. On the one hand they want that the whole of Jammu and Kashmir should form part and parcel of this country, not only with respect to the three matters but with respect to all matters; and at the same time what is their battle-cry? Their battle-cry is: *Jammu-ko-alag karo*, separate Jammu. Well, if Jammu is to be separated by being integrated with India, what remains of Kashmir? The only conclusion is that Kashmir remains away. If you examine it closely you will discover that this movement in conception is mischievous, in execution it is dangerous, and in consequences it is going to be suicidal. Whatever the just claims are, they have to be met. They have to be examined with sympathy, but not at a pistol point being shown. And where? Under the very nose of the

Pakistani troops who are on the hill up, and Joria is down below.

I would just take a couple of minutes more. My attention has been particularly drawn to the amendment of Sardar Hukam Singh who wants a Punjabi-speaking province in North India. So far as a Punjabi-speaking province in North India is concerned—espoused by my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh—if those words have no other meaning than their dictionary meaning, I happen to agree. All that I say is this that whatever may be the linguistic policy of this country, whether there should be linguistic divisions or not, I for one am in favour of cohesion, consolidation of the country. But it is a regrettable fact, and I do hope that Sardar Sahib will agree with me, that today there is not one or two or three but as many as four Punjabi-speaking provinces, which can be integrated into one. They are PEPSU, Punjab Himachal Pradesh and Delhi. The majority in Delhi are Punjabi-speaking. Today what we want is one big province, particularly when the Five Year Plan has to be put through, and when, as a learned speaker said a few minutes ago, we have to save money. We can do without these scores of Ministers and Deputy Ministers and Inspector-Generals of Hospitals and Prisons and Directors and so on for every little thing in a State. In that way you can save so much and at the same time realize the dream of Sardar Hukam Singh. I hope he means it.

**Sardar Hukam Singh** (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I have no objection if that is accepted and if all those provinces are added on to it!

**Shri Tek Chand:** But if Punjabi-speaking province means a further cutting of the Punjab as it is, well the cat is out of the bag.

**Sardar Hukam Singh:** You have put a proposal and I have accepted it!

**Shri Tek Chand:** Then Government ought to consider from the linguistic point of view that there should be bigger States which will mean less expenditure and better administration.

Then there is one little point. Something was said against the Five Year Plan. We heard a number of speeches of a scoffing character, just scoffing at the Plan, jibing, making grimaces. If it were an exhibition of a pantomime or a burlesque it was most entertaining; but if it is a serious criticism of the Plan it was devoid of any constructive suggestions. I wish I could invite those who have scoffed at the Plan to a place not very far away,

Bhakra-Nangal where I have recently been and where that great river is being harnessed. I wish some of these critics were to go there and see with their own eyes what is taking place. Then they will not be pessimists but optimists. (*Shri Nambiar:* We have seen.) They should see them not with a pair of glasses of a darkened hue.

With these words I whole-heartedly support the motion.

**Shri C. C. Shah** (Gohilwad-Sorath): In criticising the President's Address some of the Members have characterised it as being complacent. There is no doubt that the Presidential Address strikes a note of optimism, and there is a message of hope and promise in that Address. There is no doubt that in that Address there is a certain sense of satisfaction expressed at the progress that we have made so far. But I beg to submit that it is wrong to say that there is anything complacent or unduly rosy about this Address. If we consider the tremendous odds against which we had to work for these five years and the progress that we have made, I think it would be unjust to say that what the President has said about the overall picture of the situation, that there is an all-round progress, is wrong. It will be entirely wrong to say that this statement is anything but a statement of sober realism and of restrained optimism. It has somewhat become a fashion amongst many people to create a sense of defeatism amongst us and to go on saying that we are worse off than what we were five years ago, to go on telling the people that the British *raj* was much better than what it is today, or to go on telling the people of the former States that the Rulers' *raj* was better than what it is today. Nothing can be farther from the truth. Nobody suggests that we have solved the problem of poverty and unemployment; nobody in his senses would suggest that. But I do submit that we are on the way to it and that we have now started on our journey. All our problems that now remain are mainly economic. We have made considerable progress in that direction and we are on the way to solving them.

Some people complained that there is not enthusiasm in the people and that the Five Year Plan has not created enthusiasm and so on. I do ask those friends seriously: Is there enthusiasm in yourself? How can you find enthusiasm among the people when you yourself lack that faith which alone can lead us to progress? There is enough to complain. I can give a long list of complaints that I can legitimately make.

[Shri C. C. Shah]

There is great delay, for example, in Government action. There is considerable inefficiency. There is corruption and waste. All these things I do not dispute and yet, we must admit that if you want to take a realistic view of things, in spite of defects and shortcomings, we are making progress. Our opponents are interested in creating a defeatist mentality and we should be careful that we do not succumb to that. For that purpose we need all the courage which we can gather among ourselves. Then alone we can go on the path on which we have already begun our journey.

The President has given statistics and figures. The Address is only a broad general review of the state of the nation at present and it is not a sort of a report; yet there are figures enough which show that in all directions, industrially and economically, we are making progress. I can certainly cite 101 instances where, I think, any Congressman will feel that the Government is not acting rightly, that they ought to have done this or that. Nobody disputes that we have not made mistakes. At times we have committed blunders. Yet, it will be wrong to believe that we have become worse than what we were five years ago.

Now, what are the dangers that face us in the progress that we wish to make all round? I will give you some idea of what happened in Saurashtra and you will find that the same forces which are working in Saurashtra are working elsewhere in the country. The Leader of the Praja Socialist Party referred to the situation in Saurashtra and said that the Government there was ruling by bullets and lathis. Nothing can be farther from truth than that statement. I regret that she has told us something which is untruth. She had been there. All the facilities were placed at her disposal. She was taken into the fullest confidence. Probably, she wanted to become a peacemaker or probably the exigencies of party considerations compelled her to make statements which are untrue. What was the situation in Saurashtra? It was supposed to be an agitation against sales tax and who were the people who started that agitation? The people who started and kept up that agitation there were the Communists, the Socialists, the Hindu Mahasabhis, the R.S.S. and certain vested interests. The Sales Tax Act was passed by the Legislative Assembly of Saurashtra almost unanimously in September. Nobody opposed it. Nobody heard any objection about it. The President gave his assent to the Sales Tax Act on 1st November. Nobody objected to it. It

was to come into force on 1st December and then these political parties who were defeated at the polls crushingly thought that they must find some weapon to fight the Government and the weapon they thought of was the sales tax. It began in a small manner with meetings, with a procession and a day's *hartal*. It went on for three days. It was extended to seven days. Agitation continued and there is enough discontent amongst the people to arouse them against the Government. The agitation gathered strength and what happened? These people thought that the time had now come to overthrow the Government and it took a violent turn. Violence began and they called it *Satyagraha*. Now it has become a fashion to call anything *Satyagraha*. Law breaking activity began and they had to be arrested. Then there had to be *lathi-charge*. In one place there was firing. They began a campaign of vilification with a degree of falsehood which it will be amazing to find that any political party can stoop to. I will give you only a few instances. A mild *lathi charge* takes place.

An Hon. Member: Mild?

Shri C. C. Shah: Yes, mild. I know it and the story goes round that 20 women have been injured, two children have been killed and the people are excited. Firing takes place and unfortunately one boy dies. The story goes round that five students have died. A woman who offered *Satyagraha* is arrested on 7th January and released on 11th January. Only for four days she was in jail. She comes out, goes back to her home. She becomes ill. She is removed to the hospital and after a few days, on the 26th January, she dies and what is the story? That she was fasting against sales tax for 56 days from the 1st December when the movement began. Nobody ever heard of her fast, not even the Praja Parishad people mentioned it, not even their papers mentioned it. Then they began to collect and gather statistics as to who is fasting for one reason or another. One would be surprised that such things happen yet it was published that so many people are fasting against sales tax. Violence takes place, all round, schools are attacked, police chowkies are burnt, police constables are attacked, their uniforms are removed and even a social and constructive worker, a religious man is attacked. Congress workers are attacked and mercilessly beaten. Members of the Legislative Assembly of Saurashtra, at places where they dare to come out, are attacked. This has been the movement in Saurashtra, and you would be

surprised that the Government acted. I should say, in a most generous manner but the people who started this agitation were trying to take advantage of it.

I am referring to this for 'his reason that the internal dangers from the parties who have been defeated in the last elections are facing us. We have got to be aware of them. They take hold of any opportunity. Mr. Chatterjee, for example, eloquently referred to the Jammu agitation. The parties which lead the movement there are the Hindu Mahasabites, the R.S.S.—all these people want to masquerade under a national name. In Jammu they call the party Praja Parishad as in Saurashtra. What they do is being called *Satyagraha*. We know what kind of *Satyagraha* it is. It is full of falsehood, intimidation, violence and that is the kind of *Satyagraha* which we saw in Saurashtra and which probably is going on in Jammu also. Mr. Chatterjee eloquently said what they want. He said they want closer integration of Jammu with India. Who does not want it? Is there anyone on this side of the House who does not want it? But there are commitments and we have pledged ourselves to the people of Kashmir that they shall decide their future. We do not want to coerce them. The President has referred to this in his Address, and these are the words which we must ponder over.

6 P.M.

He says:

"This movement though aiming at a closer union with India is likely to have exactly the opposite effect."

But the fact is, they do not care—I say that with responsibility—those who are encouraging this movement do not care what happens to the people of Jammu. Their object is agitation against the Government of India itself. In Saurashtra, Sales-tax was only an excuse.

These people elsewhere make famine an excuse and exploit that for their purpose. One hon. Member referred to famine conditions in his part of the country and said that the Government was not doing anything. I hold no brief for the Government of Bombay; it is capable of defending itself. The President's Address says that the State Government is doing its utmost to bring relief to the suffering people. It suits these people to exploit the situations as they arise. That is the danger which we have to face in the way of our progress. If we want progress, we on this side of the House have got to

be extremely vigilant of those political parties who do not desire that we should make progress.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कुश्तमी) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमने जो क्विट इंडिया मूवमेंट (Quit India Movement) शुरू किया था उस के जरिये अंग्रेजों को दूर भेज दिया और पांच सौ से ज्यादा रियासतों की समस्या को हल कर दिया। इस के बाद हमारा ऐन मकसद यह था कि हम अपनी जनता को शान्ति और सुख पहुंचायें। लेकिन अगर हम अपना रिजल्ट (result) देखें तो मालूम होगा कि मुल्क में अशान्ति फैली हुई है और उस की तरदीद नहीं हो रही है। मैं हाउस का ज्यादा वक्त न लेते हुए अपने अमेंडमेंट (amendment) पर कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। भाषावार प्रान्तों का वचन कांग्रेस ने लोगों को कदीम जमाने से दिया है। इस वक्त हम को दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि मुल्क में कितनी बुरी हालत पैदा हो रही है और प्रजातन्त्र को कायम रखने के बुनियादी उसूल को ही हमारे नेतागण भूल रहे हैं। गवर्नमेंट को जनता की मर्जी से हकूमत करना चाहिये। भाषावार प्रान्त १२ या तेरह से ज्यादा नहीं होंगे और इस तरह से मुल्क का डिसेइटीग्रेशन (dis-integration) नहीं हो सकता। हम पाकिस्तान की तरह आजाद प्रान्त नहीं चाहते। लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि भाषावार प्रान्त के तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान का बटवारा जरूर हो जाय। इस का ज्यादातर जरूरत साउथ इंडिया (South India) में है। मेरी अमेंडमेंट (amendment) का जो पहला हिस्सा है वह यह है :

"(1) that though the Address lays stress upon the importance of language and culture in the formation of States, it does not indicate any definite steps to reconstitute the States linguistically for which the people of South India have been agitating since so long;"

और दूसरा यह है :

“(2) that though the Address has expressed pleasure over the formation of new Andhra State, it does not say anything about united Karnataka which is suffering linguistically and economically from a long time and the people of which have given their consent to the J.V.P. Report;”

तीसरा यह है :

“(3) that the Address does not mention anything regarding the burning problem of disintegration of Hyderabad regarding which all parties have openly resolved and consented to distribute the same among adjoining linguistic areas.”

मैं स्वागत करता हूँ और मुझे खुशी है कि आंध्र स्टेट को तो इंडिया गवर्नमेंट (India Government) ने मान लिया और श्री बांचू को अपोइंट (appoint) कर के रिपोर्ट (report) भी पेश हो गई है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह अपवाद जरूर है कि दूसरा एक और प्रांविंस (province) कर्नाटक नहीं बना है जिस को कि आसानी और सुलभता से बनाया जा सकता है। यह प्रांविंस (province) पांच प्रांविसेज (provinces) में तकसीम हो गया है। इकानामिकली (economically) और लिंग्विस्टिकली (linguistically) वे सब हर प्रान्त के इस कर्नाटक प्रान्त में मिलना चाहते हैं जो कि कन्नड़ भाषा बोलने वाले हैं। मैं अभी इस की ज्यादातर तकसील में नहीं जाता। आप ने अभी सिर्फ आन्ध्र स्टेट को दिया है, उस का हम स्वागत करते हैं। यह बहुत खुशी की बात है। लेकिन कर्नाटक के लिये भी अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि श्री रागुलू जैसे व्यक्ति पैदा हों और वहां पर भी मूवमेंट (movement) के जैसा स्वरूप आये तो यह बर्दकिस्मती है, क्योंकि आप अखबारों से या दीगर तरीके से जान गय होंगे कि कर्नाटक में भी मूवमेंट (movement) शुरू हो गया है। इस

हाउस में ही कांग्रेस के वह नुमायन्दे जो कर्नाटक के नुमाइन्दे हैं उन से ही पूछिये कि लोगों का तक्राजा क्या है। आप इस को कम्युनल (communal) या हिन्दुस्तान की बहबूदी के खिलाफ नहीं कह सकते। जो इस लिंग्विस्टिक प्रांविन्स (linguistic province) के लिये कहते हैं कि यह हिन्दुस्तान के कल्चर और बहबूदी के खिलाफ है वह इस को ठीक तरीके से नहीं समझ रहे हैं। आज जो कांग्रेस की तरफ से चुन कर आये हुए एम० पी० हैं और जो आप के सामने ही बैठे हुए हैं, श्री टी० आर० नैसवी, वह सात दिन का उपवास कर के आये हैं और दूसरे एक एम० एल० एज० (M.L. As.) देड़मेटी और वी० वी० पाटिल (Shris Doddmeti and V. V. Patil) १४ दिन का उपवास कर चुके हैं। तो यह मूवमेंट (movement) शुरू हो गया है और आप अगर इस स्वरूप को ठीक तरह से हैंडल (handle) नहीं करेंगे और कर्नाटक प्रान्त को नहीं देंगे तो यह मूवमेंट जरूर हो कर ही रहेगा। जनता जो चाहती है वह अपना मकसद हल करने के लिये जरूर कांस्टीट्यूशनल फाइट (Constitutional fight) शुरू करेगी।

इस बारे में मैं जो आप के कर्नाटक कांग्रेस के उपाध्यक्ष (Vice-President) थे और जो पालियामेंट के मेम्बर चुन कर आये हैं उन्हीं की दो चार लाइन्स (lines) आप के सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ कि जनता की आवाज क्या है यह आप को मालूम हो जाये।

“Shri T. R. Neswi's stand on Unification of Karnatak.”

“The stand taken by the Congress at Nanal Nagar regarding linguistic States has done colossal

wrong to Karnatak and is contrary to all its past assurances and pledges given to the people. The speeches of some of the leaders, particularly of Maulana Azad betray an autocratic mentality and complete ignorance of the realities of the situation. Such a mentality ill becomes or advocates democratic freedom."

दूसरे पैरा में वह यह कहते हैं। मैं इस में से छोड़ता जाता हूँ, जिसकी जरूरत नहीं है उस को नहीं पढ़ता हूँ।

"Shri Nehru's statement saying that he had decided about formation of Andhra State long before Shri Shriramulu's death is revealing."

तीसरे पैरा में वह और कहते हैं :

"It is difficult to explain otherwise the reasons for their opposition. I do not share the view that implementation of the Five Year Plan would in any way be affected by joining Kannada districts of Madras and Bombay to Mysore."

"It is difficult to understand also the opposition of Shri Nehru who had expressed his sympathy for Karnatak demand and promised to support it if only we could get Mysore to fall in. Was it all mere lip sympathy and eye wash? Such an attitude does little credit to a national leader of the stature of Shri Nehru."

आखिर में वह कहते हैं :

"Only two alternatives now lie before Kannadigas either to submit meekly to the dictates of the High Command or to chalk out other course of action to achieve the long cherished goal."

फिर अन्त में कहते हैं :

"The Hyderabad resolution is a serious challenge to Kannadigas and to the Pradesh Congress in particular, which fought and won the last elections on the issue of the formation of a Karnatak State. It is high time that the KPCC devised a positive and bold plan of action in this behalf. Mahatma Gandhi's 'Mantra' 'Do or Die' seems to be the only remedy through the weapon of Satyagraha."

यह अफसोस की बात है कि कर्नाटक की तरफ से जो के० पी० सी० सी० के

उपाध्यक्ष हैं और, पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं और जो आप के सामने बैठे हुए हैं, वह भी इस के पक्ष में हैं, फिर भी इस के ऊपर ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है। मैं यह इसलिये बताना चाहता था कि जब कभी हम विरोधी पक्ष के लोग इस बारे में बोलते हैं तो कहा जाता है कि यह जनता को रिप्रेजेंट (represent) नहीं करते बल्कि अपवाद स्वरूप कर्नाटक की मांग करते हैं। आप याद रखिये कि यदि आप आन्ध्र के साथ ही कर्नाटक नहीं बनायेंगे तो जन मत के आगे ठहर नहीं सकेंगे। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हैदराबाद का डिस्इन्टिग्रेशन (disintegration) करने में, उस को तकसीम करने में क्यों हिचकिचाया जाता है। क्या आप वहाँ के लोगों की आवाज नहीं सुनेंगे? क्या आप जानते नहीं हैं कि जनता हैदराबाद का डिस्इन्टिग्रेशन (disintegration) चाहती है? अगर आप हैदराबाद की डिस्इन्टिग्रेशन समस्या को हल (حل) नहीं करेंगे तो कांग्रेस को हैदराबाद की स्वायत्त (soil) से हट जाना होगा। दूर हो जाना होगा। और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को, सेन्ट्रल (Central) गवर्नमेंट को जनता की हमदर्दी से दूर हो जाना होगा। हैदराबाद की प्रोब्लेम (problem) को अलग तरीके से नहीं सोचना चाहिये। इस को पीपल्स प्रोब्लेम (people's problem) की तरह से देखना चाहिये, अगर इस को आप टालते जायेंगे तो साउथ इंडिया (South India) के लोग जो आज तक आप के बल पर रूके रहे, जो आप के ऊपर अब तक विश्वास करते रहे, वह अब ज्यादा रुकने वाले नहीं हैं। आप जल्दी से जल्दी एक बाउन्डरी कमीशन (Boundary Commission) भाषावार प्रान्त के सम्बन्ध में कायम करें। दक्षिण भारत में जो आन्दोलन चल रहा है उस की ओर आप को ध्यान देना चाहिये और जो

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

कर्नाटक प्रान्त की डिमाण्ड (demand) है उस को आप तुरन्त हाथ में लें। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि यह आर्थिक दृष्टि से स्वयं पूर्ण होगा। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में ज्यादा न कहता हुआ आप से सिर्फ एक अपील (appeal) करना चाहता हूँ। और वह अपील यह है कि आप अपनी पालिसी (policy) का साफ तौर पर एलान कर दीजिये कि हमारी पालिया-मेन्ट का यह उन्वान होगा या नहीं कि भारत में भाषावार प्रान्त बनाये जायें। जिस तरह उत्तर हिन्दुस्तान में पंजाबी बोलने वाला पंजाबी प्रान्त है, बंगाली बोलने वाला प्रान्त बंगाल है और उत्तर प्रदेश हिन्दी बोलने वालों का अलग प्रान्त है, लेकिन दक्षिण भारत में बृटिशों ने अपने नुक्ते नज़र से तोड़ तोड़ कर कई हेटरोजिनस प्राविन्सेज़ (heterogeneous provinces) बनाये हैं। आपको उन प्राविन्सेज़ (provinces) को तोड़ कर होमोजिनियस (homogeneous) प्रान्त बनाना चाहिये। अगर आप भारत को खंड खंड होने से बचाना चाहते हैं, भारत की अखंडता को कायम रखना चाहते हैं तो जनता के नुक्ते नज़र से प्रान्तों को बनायें। अगर आप प्राविन्सेज़ (provinces) को आर्थिक दृष्टि से स्वयं पूर्ण देखना चाहते हैं तो इस के यह माने नहीं हैं कि आप लिंग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज़ (linguistic provinces) को मुखालिफत की दृष्टि से देखें। आप को इस प्रश्न को जनता के नुक्ते नज़र से देखना चाहिये। आप आन्ध्र प्रान्त को तो पहले से ही बनाना चाहते थे लेकिन श्री रामुलु की डेथ (death) हमेशा के लिये कांग्रेस हकूमत पर धम्बा है। अगर आप इस धम्बे को दूर करना चाहते हैं तो दूसरे प्रान्तों के लिये भी आप को विचार करना चाहिये और दूसरे प्रान्तों के साथ न्याय के तरीके से व्यवहार कीजिये। यही न्यायोचित होगा। लिहाज़ा मैं इतनी ही

पुरज़ोर अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि फौरन आप बांचू रिपोर्ट को बिना देखे एक बाउन्डरी कमीशन (Boundary Commission) बैठाइये जो तमाम सवालों में जाये और बाउन्डरी कमीशन (Boundary Commission) के सामने जो लोग रिप्रेज़ेंटेशन (representation) करें उस को ध्यान में रख कर काम किया जाय। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि सिर्फ लिंग्विस्टिक (linguistic) बात का ही ख्याल किया जाय। ऐकोनामी (economy) का भी पूर्ण ध्यान रखना होगा कि हमारा प्रान्त स्वयं पूर्ण होते हैं या नहीं।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

बृटिशों ने जो दक्षिण भारत के टुकड़े बनाये और उनमें से हर एक को प्रान्त का नाम दे कर प्राविन्सेज़ (provinces) कायम किये उन को तोड़ते हुए फौरन ही कर्नाटक कैरेंल, महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात प्रान्त बनाये जायें। आप के कांग्रेस के लोग भी इस के लिये कहते हैं, गुजरात कांग्रेस कहती है, महाराष्ट्र कांग्रेस कहती है, और आन्ध्र कांग्रेस कहती है। अगर आप इस तरह से करेंगे और उस के बाद आप जनता की ज़बान में जो कुछ हकूमत करेंगे, जो कुछ प्रचार करेंगे, उस में आसानी होगी। आप का फाइव इअर प्लान (Five Year Plan) भी इसी तरह से जनता तक पहुंचने में ज्यादा सक्सेसफुल (successful) रहेगा। इस के बिना आप को जनता की सहानुभूति मिलने वाली नहीं है।

इस के बाद मैं पंचवर्षीय योजना के बारे में ज्यादा न कह कर इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारतीय राष्ट्रपति माननीय राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने जो यह बात कही है कि देश में बहुत एन्थुजिआज़्म (enthusiasm) पैदा हो गया है, जोश पैदा हो गया है, वह जोश



में तो ज्यादा पाता नहीं क्योंकि उस को जनता तक पहुंचाने के लिये कोई मैशिनरी (machinery) आप के पास तैयार नहीं है। अगर हम उस को फौरन सारी पार्टियों की मदद से तैयार करें तो हम जरूर जनता तक पहुंच सकते हैं। आज जनता में तो तमाम दुःख फैला हुआ है उस को दूर करने वाले अफसर भी हमारे पास नहीं हैं। मामूली अफसर से ले कर मुलक के चन्द मिनिस्ट्रों तक में करप्शन (corruption) फैला हुआ है। पहले उस को दूर करना जरूरी है।

जहां तक हमारी फारेन पालिसी (foreign policy) का सवाल है, वह ठीक है, मैं उस से सहमत हूँ और उस को सपोर्ट (support) करता हूँ। न हम एंग्लो अमेरिकन ब्लॉक (Anglo American Block) में रहें न हम रशियन ब्लॉक (Russian Block) में मिलें। हमारा अमल इस तरह का रहे कि हम न्यूट्रल (neutral) माने जायें। लेकिन न्यूट्रल (neutral) रहते हुए भी अगर हम कर्ज या दूसरी सहायता एक ही ब्लॉक (Block) से लेते रहे तो प्रेशर (pressure) जरूर आता है। लिहाजा हमें उस को भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। हमें मुलक को कर्ज के लिये दूसरों को मार्टगेज (mortgage) नहीं करना चाहिये। हम को चाहिये कि हम अपनी प्लान (plan) को अपने मुलक के ही रिसोर्स (resources) से सक्सेसफुल (successful) बनाने की कोशिश करें। जो उसूल हम को महात्मा गांधी ने बताये हैं उन उसूलों की तहत मैं ही हम अपने सेन्टर्स (centres) को प्रारम्भ करें तो यह प्लान (plan) ज्यादा एफेक्टिव (effective) होगा। जो कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट (community project) आज तमाम मुलक में चलने वाले हैं उन को छोड़ कर हम को ग्राम सुधार और महात्मा गांधी के बताये हुए सुधार के नियमों पर

केन्द्रों को खोलना चाहिये। तभी हम में जोश पैदा होगा। गांधी जी के नाम से जो जोश लोगों के दिलों में पैदा हो सकता है उस बात को हम ने छोड़ दिया है। कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स (community projects) तो अमेरिकन इन्स्पिरेशन (American inspiration) है उन को अमल में लाने से पैसा बहुत ज्यादा बरबाद होगा। हम लोग आज महात्मा गांधी के उसूलों से दूर होते जा रहे हैं। उन उसूलों के करीब आ कर हम अपने कार्य में ज्यादा सफलता प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। जो उसूल हमारे लिये महात्मा गांधी ने रक्खे हैं उन उसूलों पर अपना कदम रख कर ही हम को मुलक का उद्धार करना है।

इतनी ही मेरी प्रार्थना है और मैं फिर अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि कर्नाटक प्रान्त के लिये तुरन्त एक बाउन्डरी कमीशन (Boundary Commission) बनाना चाहिये जबतक यह काम नहीं होता है तब तक लोगों में बड़ी बेचैनी फैली रहती है। जो लोग इस को टालना चाहते हैं वह नहीं जानते हैं कि कोई भी ऐसी ताकत नहीं है जो कि जनता की मांग को टाल सके। जो लोग देखी करना चाहते हैं वह भूल कर रहे हैं। अब अवसर आ गया है कि हम इस ओर ध्यान दें। मैं फिर प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि कर्नाटक, महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात प्रान्त को शीघ्र से शीघ्र बनाया जाय।

इतना कहते हुए और माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय का आभार मान कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): I am glad I have come in on this debate immediately after my hon. friend Shri Shivamurthi Swamy has completed his speech for, one of the three amendments which stand in my name on the Order Paper deal with the problem of linguistic States concerning which Mr. Shivamurthi Swamy has spoken with such eloquence. I do not wish to repeat the arguments he has advanced in support

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

of the thesis which, in the language of my amendment, runs as follows:

"but regret that the lack of a sound policy for the re-distribution of the country on a predominantly linguistic basis, has created a dangerous internal situation."

Before I take up the other two amendments standing in my name, I would like to state, as I have stated on a previous occasion in this House last year, that as yet the Government of India are unable to appreciate the gravity of the situation, particularly in the South, with the result that they are adopting an ostrichlike policy, a policy which is bound to exacerbate feelings as between one particular linguistic group and another, south of the Vindhyas, eventually leading on to chaos. I am an unashamed advocate of the redistribution of this country on a predominantly linguistic basis, having due regard to administrative, financial and other considerations, with the result that I have agreed, despite my previous career of an internationalist, to become the Chairman of the All-India Linguistic States Conference. I have done so in the conviction that unless we deal with this dangerous problem, now, instead of postponing the day of reckoning, the unity and future of this great country would be greatly imperilled. I would like to put one simple question to my hon. friend the Home Minister, with whom I had the privilege of a clash on a previous occasion, with reference to this particular problem. I would like to know whether any secret or other assurances have been given by Mr. Munshi, to His Exalted Highness the Nizam, who is now the Rajpramukh of that State. The Government which before and after the elections have declared from the house-tops, that they would leave everything to the Hyderabad Constituent Assembly, have not been in a position to help that Assembly to come to proper decisions, despite repeated declarations of responsible public men both Congress and non-Congress alike in that State. I have got a suspicion that there is something more than meets the eye as regards the Hyderabad problem, that for the sake of keeping a few people belonging to the party in power in high office in that State, the future of this great country is being imperilled. That is why I am glad that I came in on the debate immediately after my hon. friend Mr. Sivamurti Swami who hails from that State. I do sincerely hope that the Government, in the light of the decisions launched with reference to the creation of the Andhra State, would not

tarry any further, in order that the freedom of this country is not endangered.

Having said this, I would now like to go on to the remaining two of my other amendments. This is the second time in the history of this great Parliament that the red carpet has been rolled out for the President with the customary fanfare of trumpets. Last year, you will recall that the fanfare of trumpets was inside the precincts of this great building, but this time the fanfare was only outside, with the result that not even a muffled note of exaltation which was present on the last occasion when the President gave us his Address, could be audible in the chamber where both the Houses met last Wednesday. I make a reference to this in order to carry on the debate in the manner in which, at any rate, the seconder of the motion of thanks to the President sought to carry it on. I have got with me here one of the exquisite phrases used by my hon. friend from Tenali, who seconded the motion of thanks. He said that there was a ring of placidity in the Address of the President. I heartily agree with him. I shall give this House, with your permission, just one great example as to the manner in which this ring of placidity goes through the entire Address. In paragraph 25 of his Address, the President stated:

"Steps are being taken to improve the efficiency of the Hindustan Shipyard at Vizagapatam."

Vizagapatam is the place which I represent. I am quoting this not because I come from that place, but because I am convinced that a tremendous amount of harm is being done by the advisers of the President, who have suppressed truth, the truth of the problem relating to the Shipyard. It is now at least one year since the Government took over this concern, in the sense that they became financially the predominant partner, and even administratively, in this enterprise of shipbuilding. But what is the position? The Planning Commission has provided more than Rs. 14 crores for the modernisation of the Shipyard. I have got the figures with me here, that since 1946, when the hon. Prime Minister first assumed office in undivided India, more than Rs. 1,000 crores have been spent on the import of foodgrains, of which nearly Rs. 150 crores have been spent on freight for the foreign ships, to bring more than 20 million tons into this country since 1946. I would like to stress one particular point here. If Rs. 150 crores are made available to me, I would build 40 shipyards of the size of the Vizaga-

patnam Shipyard, and not one less—on the capital cost which is the basis for the creation of the Hindusthan Shipyard. I shall go a step further. I am glad my hon. friend Mr. Jaipal Singh referred to the acquisition of the ships. A ship today costs, according to the cost accounts at the Visakhapatnam shipyard, something like Rs. 60 to Rs. 65 lakhs, for 8,000 tons deadweight. If the money that has been spent on shipping freights had been even partly diverted at least on the ship-buying, these Rs. 150 crores would have given us about 250 ships. And I am here to declare without any fear of contradiction, that in the coming year from the first of April right till the end of the planning period, not less than nine million tons of foodgrains have got to be imported, and we have not the shipping tonnage to bring that food to our country.

I would not like to labour the point any further, but I would only make one final observation, namely that the advisers of the President have clearly put into this Address, that steps are being taken to improve the efficiency of the shipyard. But let me tell you that since 28th September last, till to date, anything between 45 and 52 per cent. of the total skilled and unskilled labour employed in this Shipyard is laid up without any allocation of work. No work has been provided, and there is the threat of retrenchment also visited upon that particular labour force; I happen to be the President of that labour union, with the result that I know what I am talking. The point here is not that the labour and the Government should not fight as between employer and employees. I am talking here of the statement which has been allowed to creep into the President's Address, of the efficiency of the Shipyard, in the light of the fact that Rs. 14 crores and more have been provided by the Planning Commission for the modernisation of plant. And yet Rs. 150 crores have been spent on freight on foreign ships alone, for bringing food into this country. This is the type of placidity, which my hon. friend Mr. Raghuramaiah was good enough to use as an expression to characterise the President's Address.

I would like to go on to the food position proper. As I have stated already, nearly 20 million tons of foodgrains have been imported into this country since 1946, and nearly Rs. 1,000 crores have been spent on this food front alone. And not less than four to five hundred crores have got to be spent on the present estimates, for the import of food for the remaining part of the planning period, i.e. till April

1956. The question must necessarily be asked 'What is the policy of the Government of India in this matter?' The President in his Address, in paragraphs 15 and 16 has made a reference to the record of sugar production, to the tune of 15 lakhs of tons, and he has also made a reference to the cotton and jute production to the tune of 31.3 lakhs of bales, and 46.8 lakhs of bales respectively. What do these figures indicate? They indicate that every step is being taken in this country for ensuring that more commercial and cash crops are grown so that we could get foreign exchange. But at what expense? At the expense of the food front. I shall suggest very seriously, and I say that with all sense of responsibility, that because the party in power is not able to deal with their own supporters at the *taluk* level, that this transformation of food crops into commercial crops is going on in our midst, for the past several years. I am not here making any political speech on this ground. I certainly suggest that they are unable to tackle this menace of the cash crops. It is simply because the people who support the party in power will not submit to any legislation which will be restrictive in character, for fear that the money profits may not be available to them. As Prof. Mishra stated, there has been no attempt made to mobilise public opinion, and to mobilise the manpower of this country, in the food front. I know my hon. friend, the Food Minister—I am sorry he is not here at the moment the irrepressible cherub he is—will go on telling us in season and out of season that very soon, in three years, in four years—I think the latest statement of his is four years hence—we will not only be self-sufficient but will be able to have an export surplus also. I suggest very seriously to this House that this country cannot wait for four years to be self-sufficient in food. With the result that the battle on the food front, as I said on the last occasion when opening the debate on the Planning Commission's Report, that no attempts have been made so far to mobilise the manpower of this country. Some of my hon. friends laughed when I made an appeal to the Prime Minister that he should rise above the occasion and rally all parties and people behind the food battle, that otherwise we were going to perish. I do not think that we can afford to wait for three or four years for the country to be self-sufficient in food, and I do not think that the dollar-earning capacity of the cash crop position of country would save us from disaster.

Having said that I will come back to the first of the amendments that I tabled, namely, that on foreign policy

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

I was very glad to listen to my hon. friend, Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit this morning—I myself had the privilege of collaborating with her on one occasion in the United Nations—and the ringing, silvery voice with which she was able to explain to us as to what has been happening during the past few months, in regard to foreign policy. That certainly is something which I do not wish to controvert. But I have written down one of the very important statements that she made. It is this—that if we have not succeeded in becoming peace-makers, there can be no shame to us. I agree—heartily agree—with her. In fact she almost paraphrased some statements made by the President in his Address regarding foreign policy. Why do I agree with her on this question? Simply because we have been making attempts. But what are the basic foundations of our foreign policy? I suggest, very seriously that they are vitiated at the very fountain source. We belong to the Commonwealth. We recognise the Queen. We are completely under the economic thralldom of the pound sterling. Our defence system is completely integrated with that of Britain and her supporters. With the result that the 'cold' war which is now deepening, and may threaten to become a hot war, is approaching us. Very soon we are going to attend not only the Coronation in a representative capacity, but we are also attending the Commonwealth Defence Conference. Actually, if I am not revealing any official secrets, I am sure that our entire defensive equipment is so standardized as to be interlocked with that of Britain and her supporters in the overseas countries.

The point I am making is this. Are we really innocent of partisanship? I want my country to remain neutral. Let there be no mistake. I hate to draw upon a very ugly parallel, but Spain was neutral in the last war. I am not comparing the administration of this country with that of Spain in the last war. But I do seriously ask: are we really innocent of partisanship in our foreign policy? Can we seriously tell the world that we are neutral? I am not satisfied with the way in which our armaments and defence equipment are tied up with those of Britain. The Five Year Plan has got a gap of Rs. 655 crores. Most of it would have to come from foreign sources. This morning questions were answered by the Finance Minister about the manner in which foreign aid in respect of the Technical Co-operation Agreement is sought to be accepted. I am only making a brief

reference to this question. We are not neutral and we cannot convince the world that we are neutral. We cannot afford to indulge in this self-deception. I agree that we have broken a lance more than once in respect of our cherished ideals in the realm of foreign policy. My heart gladdens when I recall the attitude we adopted with regard to the Japanese Treaty. We have also made a beginning in respect of Korea, though it misfired for reasons I need not go into at the moment. But I seriously ask: what is the peace about which the President in his Address has said so many things? Is it the peace of the sepulchre, the peace of inequity, the peace of a fundamental imbalance between right and wrong of the Metropolitan powers and colonial powers? What have we done with respect to the fighting Malays and Indo-Chinese? What is our record regarding our own nationals in Ceylon? Everywhere there is a deepening shadow of the Metropolitan powers in the councils of the Government of India. I deplore it. We still belong to the old Club, the old school tie. Sir, I believe in neutrality. Let there be no mistake about it. But to say that we are free, to say that our policy is neutral, to say that we are pursuing an independent policy, does not convince us, much less the world at large, for the reason that we are entirely dependent in strategic, economic and political spheres upon one of the world blocs. Let there be no mistake that I am asking for a swing of the pendulum to the other side. But what I am saying is that, let us be honest to ourselves. Our foreign policy is not neutral. What have we done with respect to the countless millions of oppressed people all over the world who are now struggling to be free?

Finally, I would like to request that the three amendments standing in my name, which I have tried to explain in the short time available to me, may be pressed to a division.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुडगांव) :

जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं दो तीन दिन से जो बहस सुनता रहा हूँ तो मुझ को ताज्जुब होता है कि यह जो बहस इतने जोर शोर से प्रेसीडेंट साहब के भाषण पर हो रही है उस में प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने कौन सी ऐसी बात कह दी है कि जिस की वजह से इतनी हुज्जत की जाती है। जब मैं श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी की

स्पीच सुनता हूँ तो वह फरमाते हैं कि प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने ठीक नहीं कहा। जो उन्होंने ने अपने ऐड्रेस (address) में फरमाया वह ठीक नहीं है। अगर मैं श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी को सुनता हूँ तो वह भी नाराज हैं। अगर मिस्टर नम्बियार की स्पीच सुनता हूँ तो वह भी नाराज हैं। क्यों नाराज हैं? क्या गलती हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने कर दी कि जिस की वजह से लोग इतनी हुज्जत करते हैं? अगर आप सच्चे दिल से पूछिये तो मैं कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि यह ऐड्रेस (address) जो प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने दिया है वह हरकत ब हरकत सचाई पर निर्भर है। इस में कोई एक भी ऐसी बात नहीं कही गई जो गलत हो या किसी बात को छिपाया गया हो। जब प्रेसीडेंट साहब फरमाते हैं कि दुनिया में शान्ति नहीं है और हमारी कोशिश शान्ति के लिये है और हम देखते हैं कि दुनिया के पोलिटिशियन्स (politicians) जिस तरह बातें करते हैं उस से अन्देश है कि लड़ाई बढ़ जायेगी और हम ग्रेव कनसर्न (grave concern) इन सब अमूर को देखते हैं, तो मैं सोचता हूँ कि प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने कौन सी गलत बात कही। जहाँ तक सही, जबान के इस्तेमाल का सवाल है और जहाँ तक किसी बात की संजीदगी और सचाई से कहने का ताल्लुक है, वहाँ वह बहुत सही तरीके से जुबान को इस्तेमाल करते हैं। हमारे प्रेसीडेंट यह नहीं कर सकते कि हम फौरन वार डिक्लेयर (war declare) करते हैं, क्योंकि यू. एस. ए. (U.S.A.) के प्रेसीडेंट ने ऐसा कहा है। वह यह भी नहीं कह सकते कि हम रशिया (Russia) से झगड़ते हैं, क्योंकि रशिया (Russia) यह कहता है। यह इंडिया (India) की आदत नहीं है। मैं निहायत अदब से अग्र करना चाहता हूँ कि इस ऐड्रेस (address) में वह सब चीजें मौजूद हैं कि जिन के वास्ते मेरे दोस्त इतनी जबरदस्त

बातें कहते रहे हैं। यह हर तरह से जस्टीफाइड ऐड्रेस (justified address) है। मेरे दोस्तों ने लिग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज (linguistic provinces) के बारे में फरमाया तो मैं कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि जहाँ पर आन्ध्र का जिक्र है वहाँ हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने जिस लहजे और जिस जुबान में इस को अदा किया है वह यह है कि और जगह नाउम्मेदी होने की बात नहीं है। लेकिन वह चाहते हैं कि उस के पहले फाइनेन्शियल डिफिकल्टीज (financial difficulties) ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव डिफिकल्टीज (administrative difficulties) और और तरह की जो मुश्किलत हैं वह सब की सब अबूर हो जायें। क्या मेरे दोस्त चाहते हैं कि लिग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज (linguistic provinces) के फार्मेशन (formation) में इन चीजों को नजर अन्दाज कर के एक ऐसा कदम उठाया जाय कि जिससे देश में अबतरी फँल जाये? मैं नहीं समझता कि वह ऐसा चाहते हैं। तो मैं हैरान होता हूँ कि इस ऐड्रेस (address) में क्या बात थी कि जिस के लिये बार बार अमेंडमेंट (amendment) पेश की जाती है। श्री नम्बियार साहब ने फरमाया कि प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने यह फरमाया कि प्रोडक्शन (production) बढ़ा है, लेकिन हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री (handloom industry) को काफी तबज्जह नहीं दी गई। हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री (handloom industry) में हालत ऐसी है कि लोग एम्प्लायड (employed) नहीं हैं। लेकिन हमारे दोस्त अगर मुलाहजा फरमायें तो इस ऐड्रेस (Address) में हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने भी कहा है कि गो कि पैदावार इतनी हुई, लेकिन जहाँ तक हैंडलूम (handloom) का सवाल है वहाँ पर पोजीशन (position) ऐसी है कि जो अफसोसनाक है। मैं अदब से अब

[पंडित ठाकुरदास भार्गव]

करना चाहता हूँ कि इस में कोई चीज ऐसी नहीं है कि जिस के बारे में ऐतराज हो। मेरे दोस्तों ने जो शिकायत की है अगर वह उस का जवाब चाहें तो उन को इसी ऐड्रेस (address) में सही माने में मिल जायेगा। कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है कि जिस का जवाब इस ऐड्रेस (address) में मौजूद न हो। इस वास्ते में अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह ऐड्रेस (address) ऐसा है कि जिस को अगर इन्साफ से देखा जाय तो किसी पार्टी (party) को और किसी मंम्बर (member) को ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिये।

लेकिन जब मैं यह कहता हूँ तो मैं जनाब की खिदमत में निहायत अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह नहीं मानना चाहिये कि इस ऐड्रेस (address) में सारी बातों की पोजीशन (position) साफ कर दी गई है जिस से कि हर मंम्बर मुतमईन हो जाय। मैं तो यह अर्ज करूँगा कि कई ऐसी चीजें हैं कि जो दर्ज नहीं हैं। इस के अन्दर कई चीजें इस तरह से दर्ज हैं कि जिस तरह से और लोग चाहते हैं उस तरह से नहीं हैं। आप की इजाजत से मैं चन्द बातें अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ जो कि इस में दर्ज नहीं हैं। पहला सवाल जिस के बारे में मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन्स (displaced persons) के कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) के बारे में है। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस में कोई शक नहीं कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट (government) ने डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन्स (displaced persons) के बारे में जो शानदार काम किया वह इसी गवर्नमेंट का हिस्सा था। इस काम के बारे में दुनिया की कोई गवर्नमेंट हमारे मुकाबले में अपना सिर ऊंचा नहीं कर सकती।

जब हम अपनी हिस्ट्री (history) की तरफ देखते हैं तो कहते हैं कि किसी गवर्नमेंट ने ऐसा शानदार काम कभी रिफ्यूजीज (refugees) के लिये नहीं किया, मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे यह सुन कर हैरानी होती है कि जब हम अखबार में देखते हैं तो फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री (Finance Ministry) कहती है कि हमारा कोई कमिटमेन्ट (commitment) कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) के वास्ते नहीं है यह कतई गलत है। कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) का कमिटमेन्ट (commitment) या किसी आनरेबल मिनिस्टर का स्टेटमेंट (statement) अगर कोई मानी रखता है तो डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन्स (displaced persons) के हाथ में ऐसा हथियार मौजूद है कि वह अपनी गवर्नमेंट की खिदमत में जा कर जोर से अर्ज कर सकते हैं कि उन को कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) दिया जाय। मैं निहायत अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस गवर्नमेंट ने एक अरब ४६ करोड़ रुपया डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन्स (displaced persons) के वास्ते खर्च कर दिया जिस में से ६६ करोड़ खर्च किया गया रिलीफ (relief) के वास्ते और ८० करोड़ खर्च किया गया मकानात और लोन्स (loans) के वास्ते तो क्या इस के वास्ते उन की कोई जिम्मेदारी थी? किस कानून की रू से हमारी गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि इवैक्वी प्रापर्टी (evacuee property) के पूल (pool) में से रुपया दे दिया जाये? कौन सा ऐसा इन्टर्नेशनल (International) कानून है? कोई ऐसा कानून नहीं है। लेकिन बावजूद इस के हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने यह कमिटमेन्ट (commitment) किया कि इवैक्वी प्रापर्टी (evacuee property) के पूल (pool) में से गवर्नमेंट देगी। चूँकि मुझे जनाब की

खिदमत में कई बातें अर्ज करनी हैं इसलिये मैं इस के मुताल्लिक ज्यादा वक्त नहीं दे सकता, लेकिन जनाब की इजाजत से सिर्फ वह हिस्सा पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जब कि श्री गोपालस्वामी आयंगर मरहूम ने हमारे सामने एक कान्फ़ेन्स (conference) में जा कर कहा था। इस के बारे में मैं सफह ६ से पढ़ रहा हूँ। उस के अन्दर इस तरह से दर्ज है :

"The hon. Shri Gopaldaswamy Ayyangar winding up the Conference proceedings, assured the displaced persons that at no time had he felt any doubts about the right to compensation to those who had left their properties on the other side. The compensation may not be in the form the displaced persons wanted. It might be partly in land, partly in house property, partly in cash and very probably partly in the shape of some kind of bonds. Some compensation might be given to mitigate the present hardship pending realisation of compensation from Pakistan.

It was very clear that the Government not only had accepted the principle of compensation but also had definite views on finding the needed funds. As late as July, 1950, Shri Gopaldaswamy Ayyangar was still more explicit when at a small Conference he defined the definite sources out of which compensation could be provided. He named three:—

- (a) Evacuee Property in India;
- (b) Recoveries from Pakistan;
- (c) Contribution from Government."

मैं जनाब वाला की खिदमत में अर्ज करता हूँ कि श्री गोपालस्वामी आयंगर न ही नहीं बल्कि श्री अजीत प्रसाद जी ने भी बार बार हम को यकीन दिलाया कि दर अस्ल यही तीन सोर्स (sources) हैं जिन से कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) दिया जायगा। इस के अलावा मुझे याद है कि श्री अचिन्त राम जी के एक सवाल पर प्राइम मिनिस्टर (Prime Minister)

साहब ने हाउस में फरमाया था कि गवर्नमेंट कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) देगी जितना दे सकेगी। यह अलग चीज है कि हमारी फाइनेन्शियल कंडीशन (financial condition) कितना देने की इजाजत देती है। लेकिन चन्द बरस के बाद, हम को यकीन दिला कर मिनिस्टर के बाद मिनिस्टर के इकरार करने के बाद भी कह देना कि गवर्नमेंट का कमिटमेंट (commitment) नहीं है, यह दुरुस्त नहीं है। कभी मिनिस्ट्री (Ministry) को ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहिये। मैं नहीं जानता कि किस बेसिस (basis) पर यह बात कही जा रही है जब कि श्री गोपालस्वामी आयंगर ने सब के सामने स्पीच (speech) दी। जिस वक्त सरदार हुक्म सिंह ने रेजोल्यूशन (resolution) पेश किया और मैं ने उस पर ऐमेन्डमेंट (amendment) पेश किया, उस वक्त भी श्री गोपालस्वामी आयंगर ने जो बात यहां पर कही थी वह मैं ने दोहराई थी। जब श्री गोपालस्वामी आयंगर हाउस में मौजूद थे उन्होंने ने कभी नहीं कहा कि हम ने कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) का वादा नहीं किया। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस के बारे में गवर्नमेंट को थोड़ी फीयाजी से काम लेना चाहिये। जिस गवर्नमेंट ने इतना लम्बा चौड़ा खर्च किया, जिस गवर्नमेंट ने इतनी आसाइश और आराम डिस्प्लेस्ड पर्सन्स (displaced persons) को पहुंचाया, मैं जानता हूँ कि उन दिनों में हमारे श्री नेहरू जी और पटेल साहब का क्या हाल था, वह पांच पांच सौ आदमियों से रोज मुलाकात करते थे। उस कड़े वक्त में श्री नेहरू जी ने हमारे लिये यह उमूल रक्खा है कि किसी डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन (displaced person) को किसी जगह से नहीं निकाला जायगा जब तक उस को अल्टर्नेटिव ऐकॉमोडेशन (alternative accommodation) नहीं दी जायेगी। मैं अर्ज करना

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

चाहता हूँ कि जो ८० करोड़ रुपये मकानात व कर्जों की शकल में दिया जा चुका है उस के साथ कोई ऐसी रकम मिला दी जाय जो गवर्नमेंट की प्रेस्टिज (prestige) के कन्सिस्टेंट (consistent) हो और माकूल रिलीफ (relief) भी पहुंच सके, बतौर मुआवजा दी जावे। जब तक हम कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) के सवाल को तय नहीं करेंगे उस वक्त तक हिन्दुस्तान की सोल (soul) को, डिस्प्लेस्ड परसन्स (displaced persons) की सोल (soul) को शान्ति नहीं होगी, और ऐसा करना हमारा फर्ज है। उन लोगों की कर्जों पर हम ने आजादी हासिल की है। यह लोग अपना सब कुछ मिटा कर यहां चले आये, एक आदमी का दस बीस हजार रुपये का नुकसान हो जाय तो उस को नींद नहीं आती, इन लोगों ने तो जायदाद माल सब कुछ तबाह करा दिया। अब इन लोगों से पांच बरस के बाद आप को ऐसा कहने का कोई हक नहीं है। यह बिल्कुल नाजायज है और हमारी आनरेबल गवर्नमेंट के शान में नहीं है।

मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस बारे में गवर्नमेंट कैबिनेट (Cabinet) डिसीजन (decision) करे और फिर इस मामले को तय करे कि उनको कम्पेन्सेशन (compensation) दिया जाये।

दूसरी बात जिस के बारे में मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह पंजाबी स्पीकिंग प्राविन्स (speaking province) के बारे में है। जब यह मामला आया तो हमारे मोहतरम दोस्त सरदार हुक्म सिंह ने एक ऐमेन्डमेंट (amendment) पेश किया। मैं इस के बारे में ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहता। लिग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज (linguistic provinces)

का मैं असूलन विरोधी नहीं हूँ। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में लिग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज (linguistic provinces) का जल्दी में बनाना बड़ी भारी गलती होगी। हम को सब से पहले अपने डिफेंस (defence) को देखना चाहिये। मैं जिस इलाके का रहने वाला हूँ वहां पर, जनाब वाला, जब सन् १८५७ में गदर हुआ तो उस वक्त सजा के तौर पर हिम्पार, गुडगांवा, रोहतक और कर्नाल को यू. पी. में निकाल कर पंजाब में दाखिल कर दिया गया। यह सिर्फ सजा देने की खातिर हुआ था। उस के बाद इस इलाके के साथ जो मुलूक हुआ उसकी दुखदायी कहानी बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी है। उस पर जितने जुल्म हुए उस की इन्तहा नहीं क्योंकि यह हिन्दू इलाका था और पंजाब से अलग था। हमारे साथ सीतेली मां का सा व्यवहार हुआ। जब यहां कैबिनेट मिशन (Cabinet mission) आया तो हम ने झगड़ा किया कि अम्बाला, मेरठ डिवीजन्स (divisions), देहली और हमारे चार जिलों को मिला कर एक प्राविन्स (province) बना दिया जाय, लेकिन उस के फौरन बाद पंजाब का पार्टीशन (partition) हो गया। पार्टीशन (partition) के बाद हम ने कभी यह आवाज नहीं उठाई कि हमारे चार जिलों को पंजाब से अलग कर दिया जाय। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह प्रैक्टिकल पालिटिक्स (practical politics) नहीं है, इस के अलावा यह चीज बिल्कुल ऐसी है जो कौमी मफाद के खिलाफ है। हम पंजाब के साथ रहे हैं, मैं जानता हूँ कि हम पंजाबी स्पीकिंग (speaking) नहीं हैं और माइनारिटी (minority) में हैं, लेकिन फिर भी हम इस की परवाह नहीं करते। यह नेशनल इन्टरेस्ट (national interest)



में नहीं है कि हम मुल्क के टुकड़े टुकड़े कर डालें। आज जब मैं पंजाबी स्पीकिंग प्राविन्स (speaking province) की बात सुनता हूँ तो मेरे रोंगटे खड़े हो जाते हैं। क्या चीज ई उन के दिमाग में, मास्टर तारा सिंह के दिमाग में क्या चीज है। वह चाहते हैं कि ज़िला हिसार, गुड़गाँवा और रोहतक को यहाँ से निकाल दिया जाय और पंजाबी स्पीकिंग प्राविन्स (speaking province) बना लिया जाय। मैं निहायत अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह सारी स्कीम (scheme) गलत उसूल पर बेस्ड (based) है और अननैशनल (Un-national) है। इसलिये मैं इस तजवीज की सख्त मुखालिफत करता हूँ और वह हर्गिज नहीं होना चाहिये।

आज मैं ने श्री ऐन. सी. चटर्जी की तकरीर सुनी जो काश्मीर के वास्ते फंडामेंटल राइट्स (Fundamental Rights) का जिक्र करते हैं। यहाँ पर एक गवर्नमेंट के मातहत रहते हुए, एक मुल्क के मातहत रहते हुए इस तरह की टेन्डेन्सी (tendency) का इजहार करना इस बात को बताता है कि हम चाहते हैं कि इस देश में इस बात को ले कर और छोटे छोटे टुकड़े हो जायें। मेरा यह कहना है कि इस बारे में जो भी तजवीज रखी जाय जिस से देश में झगड़े बढ़ें उस को किसी भी तरह से चलने नहीं देना चाहिये।

मैं जनाब की इजाजत से दो तीन बातें और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। अब्बल तो मैं कंट्रोल (Control) के बारे में कुछ थोड़ा सा अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। जनाब वाला, मैं ने एलेक्शन टूर (Election tour) किया और अभी मैं अपनी कान्स्टिट्यून्सी (Constituency) में घूम कर आया हूँ। मैं ने सिवा इस के और कोई शिकायत नहीं सुनी कि पब्लिक (Public) कायिद

गवर्नमेंट के सामने बेजारी से हाथ जोड़ती है जो एक गांव से दूसरे गांव को पांच सेर अनाज ले जाने की इजाजत नहीं देती। घासेडा ग्राम में गुड़गाँवा से कुछ दूर पर लोग रहते हैं। वह कहते हैं कि हम पंजाब में रहते हैं लेकिन हम अपने गांव में पांच सेर गेहूँ नहीं ला कर खा सकते। जनाब वाला मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जब तक इंटर डिस्ट्रिक्ट रेस्ट्रिक्शन्स (Inter-district restrictions) मौजूद हैं हम महसूस नहीं करते कि हम ऐसे आजाद आदमी हैं कि जो चाहें खा सकें या जो चाहें खरीद सकें। खैर, इस सारे झगड़े में मैं नहीं पड़ना चाहता।

जनाब वाला, मैं इस हाउस में कितने ही बरसों से यह कहता आ रहा हूँ कि हमारे देश में कोर्स ग्रेन (Coarse Grain) की कमी नहीं है। हाँ, राइस (Rice) की कमी है। राइस आप बाहर से मंगा लें। इस के अलावा अगर एक ग्रेन (Grain) भी हिन्दुस्तान में गल्ले का आता है तो वह हम को इतना नुकसान पहुंचाता है कि जिस का अन्दाजा नहीं लगाया जा सकता। अभी मैं ने श्री लंका सुन्दरम् की तकरीर सुनी। जब मैं इन आदाद शुमार को देखता हूँ तो हैरान रह जाता हूँ कि एक अरब ४७ करोड़ रुपया चार साल में महज गैरमुल्की जहाजों के फ्रेट (Freight) को दिया गया। यह देख कर मेरी छाती पर सांप लोटने लगता है। मैं इस को बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकता कि एक अरब ४७ करोड़ रुपया इस मुल्क से महज फ्रेट (Freight) का दे दिया जाय।

हमारे देश का १२ सौ करोड़ जिस में से काफी रुपया स्टर्लिंग बैलेंससेज (Sterling Balances) का था वह सब का सब खुराक के लिये खत्म कर दिया गया। आप के फिगर्स (Figures) गलत हैं। क्या मसाला है आप के पास जिस से आप कहते हैं कि

[पंडित ठाकुरदास भार्गव]

यहां अनाज (cereals) की शोर्टेज (shortage) है। कहते हैं कि हमारे यहां प्रोक्योरमेंट (Procurement) नहीं होता। सारी गलती यह हुई कि आप प्रोक्योरमेंट (Procurement) नहीं कर सकते। आप के स्टेट मिनिस्टर ऐसा करना नहीं चाहते। रोज स्टेट मिनिस्टर आप को गलत फिगर्स (Figures) देते हैं। अब गवर्नमेंट मानती है कि लोकल (Local) गवर्नमेंट्स गलत फिगर्स (Figures) देती हैं। आप की लोकल (Local) गवर्नमेंट्स के और पटवारियों के फिगर्स (Figures) झूठे हैं। मैं आप से पूछता हूँ कि आप के पास क्या मसाला है इस बात के लिये कि पैदावार कम हुई है? मैं ने ग्रो मोर फूड इन्क्वायरी कमेटी (Grow More Food Enquiry Committee) की रिपोर्ट में लिखा था कि गुड़गांव जिले में एक बीघे में पचास मन जौ पैदा हुआ जिस को सुन कर सब के कान खड़े हो गये। फिर अफसरान ने गुड़गांव में जा कर तहकीकात की तो गांव वालों ने कहा कि हम इतना पैदा कर के दिखा सकते हैं। जहां तक कोर्स ग्रेन्स (Coarse Grains) का सवाल है वह इस देश में काफी है। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि चावल यहां कम है। उसे आप ब्रह्मा से मंगालें तो ज्यादा नुकसान नहीं है। लेकिन मैं नहीं चाहता कि आप अमरीका से गल्ला मंगायें। जो आप ने इस के लिये ४० करोड़ रुपया पिछले साल में महज फ्रेट (Freight) पर खर्च किया अगर इस का आधा यानी २० करोड़ भी किसानों और जमींदारों में बांट दें तो जो आप दस या पन्द्रह फी सदी की कमी बतलाते हैं वह सारी दूर हो जाती। मैं यह बात कई बार कह चुका हूँ। हमारे राजा जी ने मद्रास से कंट्रोल हटा दिया जो कि डेफिसिट एरिया (Deficit Area) है। लेकिन पंजाब

में जो कि दूसरे सूबों को भी सरप्लस (surplus) गल्ला देता है, एक गांव से दूसरे गांव में हम गल्ला नहीं ले जा सकते। एक जिले से दूसरे जिले में गल्ला नहीं ले जा सकते। मैं निहायत अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि जब तक यह कंट्रोल नहीं हटाया जायगा तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में फ्रीडम (Freedom) का ग्लो (Glow) नहीं आ सकता, हिन्दुस्तान अपने को एक नहीं समझ सकता, हम अपने खन में गरमी नहीं महसूस कर सकते। जितनी बातें कंट्रोल वाले कहते हैं उन को मैं सुनता हूँ और जो वह रीजन्स (Reasons) देते हैं उन को भी समझता हूँ। लेकिन अब तो आप के पास १९ लाख टन गल्ला मौजूद है और जहां तकलीफ हो आप वहां उस को भेज सकते हैं। फिर कोई तकलीफ है भी नहीं। मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि सारे देश में यह आवाज है कि कंट्रोल हटाया जाना चाहिये। अब इस में देर करना वाजिब नहीं होगा। लेकिन बदकिस्मती है जब मिनिस्टर की राय को भी हम ठीक कर लेते हैं तो भी काम नहीं होने पाता। श्री मुन्शी जी कंट्रोल कंट्रोल करते आये थे। आखिर में वह श्री देशमुख साहब के पास चालीस सफे का पोथा ले कर पहुंचे। वह प्राइवेटली (Privately) तो कहते थे कि तुम्हारा बगान सही है लेकिन उन की इतनी हिम्मत नहीं हुई कि वह कंट्रोल हटा दें। अब किदवाई साहब तशरीफ लाये हैं। इन के आने से कोई पानी नहीं बरस गया लेकिन हालत सुधर रही है। मैं अदब से अर्ज करता हूँ कि किदवाई साहब को अपनी पालिसी (Policy) पर चलने दीजिये अगर आप देश का कल्याण चाहते ह। वह ऐग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर (Agriculture Minister) हैं। हमारी कैबिनेट (Cabinet) में चाहे जिस तरीके से भी काम होता हो लेकिन फूड (Food) के मामले में फूड

मिनिस्टर (Food Minister) की आखिरी वाइस (voice) होनी चाहिये । और अगर उस की पालिसी (Policy) न मानी जाय तो उस को इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये । हम देखते हैं कि हमारे मिनिस्टर कैबिनेट (Cabinet) में और इकानमी कमेटी (Economy Committee) के सामने अपनी ज़बान नहीं खोलते हैं । मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि डिमोक्रेसी (Democracy) के मानी यह है कि जो चीज़ हमारे दिल में है वह आप के सम्मने रख दें और अगर उन की बात न मानी जाय तो असूल और देश के लिये हितकारी पालिसी की बिना पर इस्तीफा दे दें । हमारे यहां मँटर आफ प्रिंसिपल (matter of principle) पर बहुत कम इस्तीफे हुए हैं । मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मिनिस्टर बिल्कुल अकड़ कर चले । जो उन के असूल हों उन के मुताबिक चले । जिस बात का वह दावा करते हैं उस पर चले और अगर उन का असूली इखतलाफ हो तो इस्तीफा दे दें । मुझे अफसोस है कि मुझ जैसे इर्रिस्पॉन्सिबिल (irresponsible) आदमी की बात कोई सुनना नहीं चाहता । मैं चाहता हूँ कि कंट्रोल (control) के मामले पर फिर तबज़्जह दी जाये । मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि यह बिल्कुल खत्म हो जाये । लेकिन इस हद तक इस को न माना जाय जिस से देश में अशान्ति व अबतरी हो ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no control over time! I want to finish with two more speakers. We shall sit till 7.30.

वंडित ठाकुर राम भागवत : मैं खत्म करता हूँ ।

**Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner-Churu):** I would like to confine myself to the severe famine conditions in northern Rajasthan. At the moment I have two press cuttings from the *Hindustan Times* in my hands. They make very heavy reading. The first one dated the 4th of this month reads:

"Famine hits two lakhs of people in Bikaner. Relief works started

in many villages..." and it goes on.

The second one is dated the 13th of this month is worse and reads:

"The Patwari of Champasar village, 80 miles from here (Jodhpur) has reported to the Collector in Jodhpur that a peasant family of four died of starvation."

I hope that this is not true but if this is true, it is something we have to be ashamed of. In this Republic we thought that death by starvation was a thing of the past and if this has occurred, I hope that not only the Government of Rajasthan but the Government of India also will hurry up and do something about it.

Conditions in Rajasthan as regards famine are almost unprecedented. This year has been the second year in succession that northern Rajasthan has been gripped by famine. The locust invasion has been so much that at least I have not seen anything of that sort in my lifetime. The *Hindustan Times* has dealt with this thing in detail and I should not like to waste the time of the House in repeating it. The areas affected by famine this year are the major portion of Bikaner Division, a large portion of the Jodhpur Division where these deaths have occurred and a large portion of the Jaisalmer District of Rajasthan. Now the question arises as to why the Government of Rajasthan has been so inefficient in combating the famine. I need hardly add that there is always one answer as far as Rajasthan is concerned and that is "no funds". At the time of integration—I say this with no intention of offering criticism—the former States of Rajasthan contributed about Rs. 16 crores, the former State of Bikaner contributing nearly one-third. It took about two years to completely go through these funds and today unfortunately, the State of Rajasthan is deficit and according to the present rate, in another five years, Rajasthan will be ten crores deficit. This is the only phenomenon where you will see two pluses making one big minus, but I do not say this with any intention of offering criticism. We want to try and fight this problem. We want to save the millions of people who are going to be affected by famine when the hot weather starts in seriousness.

The question then arises as to who is responsible for this squandering of public finance. The fault certainly does not lie with the people of Rajasthan. It is, I think, the Government of Rajasthan which is to blame and I stress that point because we have had four changes in Ministries in three

[Shri Karni Singhji]

years which is almost something like a French Government. Perhaps, the Government of India also have to assume the responsibility for allowing Rajasthan to go through that 16 crores which alone is almost equal to the amount that has been allotted to Rajasthan in the Five Year Plan. Just imagine what it would have been for Rajasthan if we had 32 crores instead of 16 crores in the Five Year Plan.

7 P.M.

There is one point which I would like to illustrate. At the time of the integration of Rajasthan, the States of Jodhpur, Bikaner, Udaipur and Jaipur handed over to the Government of India Railways, rolling stock, etc., valued at nothing less than Rs. 16 to 20 crores. That amount has not been taken into consideration for purposes of payment of compensation. At least compensation for the capital cost of that should be paid to the Rajasthan Government so that they may tide over their difficult problems, and bring the State of Rajasthan on par with the other Part B States. I would further suggest that the Government of India should consider the question of payment of compensation to Rajasthan for the capital expenditure in respect of Railways and the like. That would include the telephone system the capitalised value of which again will run into several crores. Rajasthan is a backward State as I have said once before and therefore requires Central aid more than other States. Since the Government of India are responsible for Rajasthan as it is today, it is their responsibility to see that the people of this area do not die of starvation, or do not suffer beyond what is humanly possible.

Briefly I would like to enumerate a few things which the people of Rajasthan, in my humble opinion, would like to have from the Government of India. Firstly, the amount of expenditure incurred on famine areas this time should, under no circumstances, be less than what it was during the pre-integration period. I shall illustrate the point in question. There was a famine in the Bikaner and Jodhpur in 1939-40, that is over ten years ago, at that time, the State of Bikaner alone spent 45 lakhs on famine relief. This year, I believe the expenditure of the Rajasthan Government on the Bikaner division is just over one lakh. Secondly, the people of Rajasthan are now getting fed up with this 'No money' answer. We can wait for a few years; may be three or four years. At least we want to see a silver lining; we want to see a ray of hope so that our clock of progress is not put back for good and so that we may be given

a chance to march forward and rise with the other people of India. I would also request the Government of India to whom a few paltry crores would not matter much, to give Rajasthan at least ten or fifteen crores to help them to stand on their own legs. Whosoever's fault it may be for the present financial conditions, the fact remains that Rajasthan is a part of India and as such it is the right of the people of Rajasthan to demand a square deal.

Thirdly, the people of Rajasthan would like to have more roads, more railways, so that their vast desert tracts may have better communications thereby bringing foodstuffs, fodder and everything to the doorsteps of the famine stricken people besides providing employment to them. Fourthly, I am sure the Government of India are fully aware that Rajasthan is a province where famine visits nearly once in every three years. The only way we can fight this problem is by extending the system of irrigation canals. For that purpose, I would like to stress that the Bhakra canal which is coming into northern Rajasthan of Bikaner division, should go right down to Bikaner city and to Bikaner District and Jaisalmer which are very dry areas. In this way, we may be able to solve the problem of famine once for all. (An Hon. Member: Chambal Plan) The Chambal Plan as my hon. friend says would likewise help to solve this problem, particularly food scarcity.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the people of Rajasthan want something definite, and I hope that the Prime Minister, to whom we all look up as the Father of the Nation now, will adopt a strong policy and give Rajasthan sufficient finance to put it on its own feet, so that we Rajasthanis do not have to look up at other provinces and feel that we are really far back. Rajasthan has got a great tradition, and we shall march forward in the new India, but give us a chance and give us the money.

**Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada):** At the outset I want to refer to the boasted position of our country in international affairs. I only refer to my amendment. We have made much of it. If we want to be neutral, let us be honest about it. I want to remind hon. Members—I do not know whether they remember—that we are a party in the Korean war, that we are taking part in the Korean war. Our ambulance is there. There is some misunderstanding. Of course, the Government never said it, but several Congress Members said it elsewhere, not in this House, that after

all, it is something like a Red Cross unit. It is not. It is part and parcel of the military campaign, a field ambulance unit. So, how can we claim that we are absolutely neutral? If we want to be neutral as we ought to, withdraw that ambulance unit at least now, at least as a protest against the present war-mongering of the U.S.A.

Next, I want to warn my Congress friends...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. From tomorrow I propose noting down hon. Members who want to speak, and unless I am assured they will continue to hear others also speak, I will not call upon them to speak. I find as soon as an hon. Member speaks he thinks it is the duty of other people to hear him, and the moment he finishes his speech, it is his duty to go out of the House. It seems to be injustice to the House.

**An Hon. Member:** Ministers included.

**Another Hon. Member:** From today itself.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am noting it down.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Let not anti-Communism make them blind to several factors which are endangering our security. This anti-Communism is a very convenient cloak for these imperialists. Their imperialist and colonial war in Malaya, in Indo-China, their actions in Kenya and South Africa—everything is done under anti-Communism. You know, Sir, the Suppression of Communism Act in South Africa is being used to suppress the elementary rights of coloured people. So, I request our Congress friends to remember, and not to be deceived by this anti-Communism cloak of Anglo-American imperialists. Now, the danger is brought very close to us. These carpet merchants and sightseers go about and scheme against our country. It is not a secret. Everybody knows it. And when they come to our country, they receive a royal reception. I want to register my protest and ask my friends to take good care.

I want to refer to the passage about linguistic States in the President's Address. It is sublimely vague. It is negative almost. It says—the advisers have made him say:

“There is no reason why the question of the reorganization of States should not be considered fully and dispassionately so as to meet the wishes of the people...”

Of course, as far as it goes, it is an advance on the position taken by the

Congress leaders at Hyderabad. I think the voice of the people has secured a victory to that limited extent. Unless the people unite and make their voice heard even by deaf people, by those who are indifferent to the people's problems, unless we unite and combine and compel the Government, the Government of India are not going to form these linguistic States. We Andhras know it. During the first session when there was a resolution on linguistic States, the Government stood dead against it, although they said that on principle, they accepted the formation of linguistic provinces. When I went to my constituency, I told my Andhra audiences that as far as the Government of India were concerned, unless the Andhra people took positive action and compelled the Government to form an Andhra State, the Government were in no mood to form that State. After the great sacrifice of the great patriot Potti Sriramulu and the great and unbelievable upsurge of all classes of the Andhra people, the Government have come down and have agreed to the formation of the Andhra State, at least in part. I want to point out that this State is only a part, of the entire Andhra State. I am here referring to the Andhra area of Hyderabad, as forming the other part, for the whole is one. History will show that the original Andhra State was parcelled off into several pieces; one portion was given almost for a song to the East India Company; another portion was ceded to them for some money, thus the Andhra State was divided. All that now we want is reunification. There are friends who talk of division. One friend even used the word 'butchery'. I admit the word. But I would only point out that butcheries took place long ago. Now we want to correct those butcheries, to reunite that State, and by a master surgery to stitch them up and make them viable units. I want to say this particularly to those from Uttar Pradesh, who do not really realise the problem, and simply view this as one of division, and not as reunification. Some very intelligent politician has characterised this desire for linguistic States as tribal. I am not ashamed of the word 'tribal'. In fact, Pandit Nehru himself has answered this point. Being a biologist, I would go even a step further and say that it is an animal instinct. (*Interruption*). As many of my friends here know, the first and most important demarcation between man and animal in evolution has been speech, and it is speech that has helped the animal to evolve into man, and to evolve civilisation. And speech is most intimately associated with language. So, language is fundamental, and basic. So, these tribal ideas or animal instincts are:

[Dr. Rama Rao]

basic, and we may not be conscious of them, but even today they govern several basic factors of our lives. So they cannot be brushed aside, and we cannot be told that this desire for linguistic States is a tribal idea, and that it affects the unity of the State or the defence of the State. These are all just lame excuses. Only a united Karnataka, or a United Maharashtra or a united Andhra can go to make a strong unit and a strong State, not the disunited, disgruntled, and frustrated portions. Defence is just another lame excuse advanced for this purpose. Who stands against the security of the State? We all stand for the security of the State. So, this argument is wholly irrelevant. People talk of Balkanisation and all sorts of things. But there is no Balkanisation at all involved. As my hon. friend Mr. Tek Chand stated a little while ago, even if his advice is followed and four States are merged into one, there will still be one State left extra. So the desire for this unification is strong and just and whatever the Government of India think or say it is inevitable. We the people will compel the Government to yield and I tell my friends, Mr. Sivamurthy Swami and others not to expect the formation of linguistic States as a morning gift or a New Year gift. We have to fight for. As far as we understand the psychology and mentality of the Government of India, it was disclosed by Maulana Azad in a speech at Hyderabad. If that is an indication of the mentality of the Government of India, you must realise that we have to fight for it, and achieve it. The people are not going to yield on this.

Now the Government asks for expression of enthusiasm from the people. By all means, for new things we must be enthusiastic. How are you going to create enthusiasm if in a simple matter like this, where you do not spend crores and crores of money, you do not agree. If you agree to this just and inevitable formation of linguistic States, you will create ample enthusiasm. On the other hand, you are creating a feeling of frustration, disappointment and you are compelling people to use all their energies and enthusiasm to fight and achieve this legitimate desire for linguistic States.

Now I come to Hyderabad.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Two minutes more.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** The formation of Andhra State, we welcome—as far as it goes. But it is not complete. The

Government, according to Pandit Nehru, stands almost dead against the formation of 'Vishala Andhra', the formation of 'Samyukta Karnataka' or 'Samyukta Maharashtra'. Why? Because the interest of one individual, the Nizam of Hyderabad, stands against the interests of millions of people. Here is a strange case. Hard facts; of course they may not admit them: that the hon. the Prime Minister now is the staunchest supporter and upholder of the feudal order. To please the Nizam and to keep him in that position, you are denying the basic right of the people of the unit. The people will not keep quiet. We will snatch it away and we will not yield on this issue. The Mahahrashtrians are not imbecile, the Kannadigas, will not keep quiet and the Andhras will take it up.

I want to draw the attention of the House to one aspect. There is a talk—not on the floor of this House—of formation of Chief Commissioner's Provinces for Bombay and Hyderabad. I know there are vested interests and capitalist exploiters.

**Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar):** Madras also.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Others also. Vested interests, Indian and foreign, will also like to keep Bombay away from Maharashtra to which it rightly belongs. The vested interests and the feudal order of Hyderabad want to keep Hyderabad away from Andhra to which it legitimately belongs. Not only the east, north and south of Hyderabad, but the west upto 50 or 70 miles is pure Telugu country. Hyderabad belongs to Andhra; there is no question about it.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad):** Hyderabad City.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** I am referring to Hyderabad City. I do not think our Maharashtra friends will question that statement. But there are other interests. But if the Government use their authority in support of these reactionary forces, the people will not keep quiet. The people will take it up. Therefore, do not take this reactionary step of forming Chief Commissioner's Provinces of the States. In fact, I suggest that the present Part C States should be merged with the neighbouring linguistic areas. In cases like Manipur and Tripura, probably, where there are special circumstances, continue them but give them representative Government. They must have legislative Assemblies and people must be associated with the administration. If you merge the Part C States into the

neighbouring linguistic States, a lot of expenses will be saved as our hon. friend Shri Tek Chand has pointed out, and a lot of progress can be achieved. But, I do not want to elaborate on this issue. I want to point out that the economy of the countryside and the city are complementary. The one supplies the other. You cannot deprive the Maharashtra of the big industrial and other things of Bombay. So also of Hyderabad. This reactionary step, if taken, will be fought out by the people and they will not take it lying down.

**Shri M. R. Krishna** (Karimnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): At last I am fortunate enough that I have caught your eye, Sir. I was anxiously waiting for a chance to speak in this august House and fortunately I am the last person to have the last chance today. I was anxiously looking forward to the speech of our worthy President, thinking that he would give us a ray of hope, expecting that he would give us some assurance as to how his Government is going to tackle the gigantic problems that are facing the scheduled castes, backward classes and the scheduled tribes today in our country. But, unfortunately, our President had been very economic even in his words. He has touched the problems of the scheduled castes in one short sentence.

The appointment of the Planning Commission in the year 1950 held out high hopes for these communities. We thought that the Planning Commission would really do something concrete and constructive to eradicate the poverty, hunger, squalour, disease and illiteracy prevailing in this section of the population. The Planning Commission has, as usual, brought out a voluminous and bulky report containing hundreds of pages but dealing with the problem of the scheduled castes in twelve pages, without any definite plan for their improvement. The Planning Commission has set apart a meagre sum of 41 crores of rupees for improving the conditions of 16 millions of scheduled tribes, five millions of backward classes and 50 millions of scheduled castes. Out of this sum, the Planning Commission is going to spend about 14 crores of rupees for the improvement of the scheduled castes. This would mean that the Planning Commission is going to solve the long neglected problems of these communities within three rupees per head for the five year period. That is to say, in simple arithmetic, the Government is going to spend one anna per head per month for the scheduled castes. It is really surprising as how the Government is going to bring improve-

ment in this community by spending this paltry sum of one anna. There are so many problems facing these communities. For instance, nearly 80 per cent. of them are still living in the most pathetic conditions. The sanitary conditions in which they live are so horrible that even some of us would not like to pay a visit to the villages where they are living. The lands on which they have erected their tiny huts are such that not even animals will be comfortable there. What is more, these lands do not belong to them. They belong to some private landlord and the harassment of these landlords, in spite of the enormous rent being paid, is simply inexpressible. Therefore, I would appeal to this Government, as a first step towards ameliorating the conditions of these communities, to free them at least from the tyranny of the landlords by providing them with house sites in which they can live peacefully. This can be done by the Central Government, but it has made it a practice to shove the responsibility of helping these communities on the State Governments, and when we approach the State Governments for help, they shove the responsibility on the Central Government. They explain that the Central Government has got vast resources; that it is spending enormous amounts in Kashmir, on defence, etc. and therefore we may approach the Central Government. These excuses are not going to solve the problems of the scheduled castes. Of course, we know that some changes have been effected, but they are not sufficient. We are aiming at establishing a welfare State, and if this section of the population is neglected and allowed to live like animals and sub-human beings, it would be a mockery to claim that we are living in a democracy today. The Central Government can help these communities by levying a cess on the most privileged classes, as they have done in the case of encouragement to khadi. (An Hon. Member: So you suggest a penalty). You may call it a penalty. If the scheduled castes are suffering today, it is not because they think that it is a pleasure for them to suffer, but it is because the privileged classes have made them to suffer. They have never allowed them to enjoy the facilities of life. So, it should be a penalty on the privileged classes. They should pay it for getting rid of their sins. With the amount they can collect by levying this cess, the Central Government can provide these communities with materials for the construction of houses. The scheduled castes can then easily build houses and live peacefully in them. This would be really a great step if this Government can take it.

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

Then, as regards education, I am told that the Madras Government has come forward to help these down-trodden communities in the matter of education and other matters in past. A lot of praise has been showered on the Madras Government, but let me tell you that the same Madras Government is now trying to stop the scholarships. They are not going to give fresh scholarships to scheduled castes, and I am told that they have passed orders to the Collectors not to let any new hostels to be opened. If this is going to be the case, I am sure the scheduled castes will not have any respect or regard for this Government. The scheduled castes form a big portion of India's population and they would be able to do bad as well as good if they only take it into their heads. There is one amendment by which we want to have compulsory primary education for the scheduled castes. Here I would like to say that this system of free primary education has been tried in Hyderabad State. The Government of Hyderabad have opened a number of schools for depressed classes, for educating the children of the scheduled castes and other backward classes. But for quite a number of days these schools have nearly remained empty because children of these communities are usually employed in gainful occupations and the parents of these children not knowing the value of education generally send their children to get an additional income for their families by working under somebody. Thereafter the Government of Hyderabad had to give special stipends to every child that attends the school from this community. The Central Government can also insist on the State Governments to follow the same practice till such time the children of these communities are made school-minded.

In a country of agriculturists, the Scheduled Castes and the backward classes are landless peasants. They are

noble tillers of the soil without any soil of their own; even in a few isolated cases where the members of these communities own lands, they are being harassed by the rich landlords and those people who have no money to appeal in a court of law, have to simply keep quiet by sacrificing their land to somebody else. Further, the scheduled castes and the backward classes being very poor they always fall a prey to the moneylenders and therefore Government should set apart a separate fund to give them *taccavi* loans through which they can improve their lands also. Now the Planning Commission has set apart an enormous sum to develop the river valley projects. But again the Scheduled Castes are left out. I am not saying that the scheduled castes should be taken to those parts and given land. But what I would like to point out is that whenever such development schemes take place, whenever projects are chalked out to change the face of this vast country, these communities' interests should also be considered, because these people have remained without any facilities for all these centuries. So whatever development schemes that are taken up in the country, some consideration should be given to these communities. This is how I feel this Government would be able to solve the problems of these long-neglected communities.

I do not want to take much of the time of the House. We do not want to be political beggars. We do not want to have generosity or charity. But we demand justice—justice pure and proper. We want that we should be treated as proud Indians in free *Bharat*. If you do not give us the justice that we deserve, these long neglected communities, these down-trodden untouchables may rise in revolt.

*The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Tuesday, the 17th February, 1953.*