

[Mr. Speaker]

Mutawallis' management of them, in India, be further extended upto Saturday, the 6th March, 1954."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed with the debate on the President's Address, the motion of thanks and the amendments thereto.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ghumsur): Sir, some centuries ago a statesman-General of England who was a great believer in God and religion told his compatriots, "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry". And the words that he spoke centuries back are perhaps true even today. We in India, with the present Pakistan-United States alliance and other problems before us, should also have our trust in so many things: we could have our belief in other nations still we have got to be prepared for any eventuality. We may believe in the *bona fides* of Pakistan. We may believe that our Anglo-American friends will not go against us and that they will stand by us in any contingency. We may believe that the United Nations, which has one of our hon. Members as its Chairman today, will come to our rescue. We may even assume that we have not forgotten the technique of non-violence and that with the old technique we can think of facing any trouble that may come from Pakistan. But yet we have to remember that it is quite possible for Pakistan to take advantage of the arms aid and start trouble for us. That is a possibility, an eventuality, and we will be criminally negligent if we lose sight of it. It is possible that the United Nations may step in at some stage. It is quite possible that public opinion in western countries may try to intervene. But then Pakistan, if only to satisfy its fanatical masses, puts forward the plea that India is going to attack Lahore or some other place,

and create trouble only for a couple of days. Just imagine, if for two or three days there is bombardment of our cities. Of course, it is for the hon. Minister to satisfy us that the country is prepared for it. Suppose there is aerial bombardment or attack with long-range missiles, or suppose there is fifth column activity, attack against our lines of communication, sabotage, infiltration and so on. Then what is the position? I hope it will not be said that we are trying to have war-mongering here or rousing a sort of war psychosis. We would like to know what is the arrangement that Government have made for defending the country, in spite of the fact that we are spending nearly 55 per cent. of our annual revenues on defence, in spite of our President being the Supreme Commander of the Defence Forces, and in spite of our Prime Minister being the Defence Minister of the country. Can we have the assurance from the Government that the country is prepared for a sudden attack, an attack against our cities, against our lines of communication, against our entire life in certain strategic areas? For obvious reasons I would not like to go into detail. As I stated yesterday, on this subject, it is dangerous to speak of our defence weaknesses: the problem for us is what we should not speak, rather than what we speak. Yet let us just imagine the contingency. What is the arrangement you have got? What is the anti-aircraft equipment you have got? And have you got many of those modern types of aircrafts and anti-aircrafts? Our old Ac-Acs, the Oerlicons and Bofors have probably become antiquated. For instance, you have at present the radar equipment in the new types of anti-aircrafts where it keeps the target in view till it comes within the range of your shot. How many of these have we? You need not tell us; but be sure that you have the best weapons.

Apart from these new weapons for which you may have to go to other countries to purchase, have you tried

a much easier way—even after the contingency arose, even after the U.S.-Pak alliance took some shape—to mobilise our manpower? Have you tried to organise your civilian population in the country, to detect and fight saboteurs, to fight fifth column activities, to allay panic in the country, to see that there is no panic or trouble?

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Have you tried to mobilise our people? Have you in any way tried to take the co-operation of the civilian public, to organise them and to take their help to see that they are helpful to you in a war emergency? To organise our manpower, it does not require huge sums of money; it does not require foreign aid; it does not require imports of weapons from outside. It was for you to see if you could utilise your ex-servicemen who are there in thousands and thousands in the country. You do not have to spend money on their equipment or arms, you do not have to pay them anything; but you simply mobilise and organise them; apprise them as to where they are to report of any saboteur, how they are to allay panic in the country-side. Organise them, organise your entire patriotic civilian public. If you do not trust us on this side, you and your other friends on the Treasury Benches could try to organise the country. Give a lead to the country and see that there is a new organisation which can meet any contingency, any attack from outside. Because you know that the attack will not merely be through massed armies, but through fifth columns as well as from the air. Imagine bombardment of some of our cities simultaneously, some of our industrial potential, some of our military installations. I am not trying to create panic or add to your difficulties. But just imagine that contingency and be prepared for it. From that point of view I would like to request Government to see how far they have prepared the country for a real defence in a modern war. If you have not

prepared the country, then there may be hundreds of Kumbh Melas in different parts of the country—people from the cities, out of panic, going into the countryside and people from rural parts trying to crowd the roads, and probably the lines of communication might by then have been completely or partially paralysed. Then there will be so much disruption and it will not be possible to control the situation unless you are previously prepared for it. The main preparation for that is not merely through the army, navy and the air force, but the reserves and the potential reserves of the country, the manpower properly built up, organised, trained and mobilised that will control the situation.

About civil defence, there was a civil defence organization in this country during the war and in 1945 it was abolished. After that there has been no attempt to organise civil defence units in the country. You have not been trying to take the help and co-operation of the country in order to build up your defence, your civil defence, your home-guard organisation, your territorial army, your auxiliary territorial force and cadet forces.

In fact, there was a proposal to have an auxiliary territorial force last year. There was so much discussion about it and we were told that Government were bringing in a Bill for the purpose. We, Members of Parliament, were asked to give our reactions to the proposals. Some forty of us met together from different parties, mostly from the Treasury Benches. We gave our suggestions but we feel that they have gone into the waste-paper basket. After the Pakistan U.S. trouble loomed large, during the last Session, some Members of Parliament belonging to both the sides of the House, met in the study group and we requested the hon. Ministers for Defence to come and join the discussion. We did not want them to reveal any of the de-

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

ence secrets, army movements and other matters. We simply wanted them to come and join us at the discussions to listen to our views. But, they felt embarrassed and did not join us at that meeting with the result we are now left helpless and are forced to speak about defence matters in the House. Whatever the hon. Minister in charge may think about war conditions, we feel that it is not safe for us in this country, at the present juncture, to talk of our defence weaknesses here in this House, and we feel that Government is unnecessarily trying to drive us to that awkward position of being forced to say something about the attacks that you will get and the way in which you are to be prepared for the same. I hope that the Government will at least now ~~house themselves~~ ^{themselves} out of that complacency. They seem to think that there is no danger at all. There may be no danger—I will not say that there is danger—but in case there is danger, what are the arrangements that you are making in view of the annual expenditure of Rs. 235 crores on Defence? We would like to know whether you are trying to organise the potential reserves of the country, the civilian manpower at least, if not for fighting and defending ourselves, at least for tracing the saboteurs and allaying panic, if and when a situation arises. This is the least that you could do. It is not a question of actual fighting, it is a question of organising the country's reserves, without additional money, without additional equipment, without foreign aid, without running after this country or that to organise our own reserves.

In this connection I would also refer to another matter, namely, ordnance production. We have been feeling that in this country, ordnance production has not been going on properly and we would like to see that such production is accelerated. Though you are trying to make our country independent in all respects

and you have appointed a Committee, we appeal to you to tackle the problem on a sort of war footing to see that ordnance production is accelerated. You have, no doubt, been relying very much upon foreign consultants, both on the defence and civilian side. On the defence side you have got so many British officers, advisers and others in various departments of defence in the Ordnance, Military Engineering and other Services and you have full reliance upon them. But how far can you rely upon them when Pakistan with American aid is attacking this country, Britain being the junior partners of that Anglo-American organisation, it is for you to consider that our country's defence has to depend very largely upon foreign advisers and foreign officers in the M.E.S., Ordnance organisation as well as the three armed services.

Similarly on the civilian side. Of course, America has been giving us help. We are getting steel, locomotives, financial aid etc. from the U.S.A. Along with them we are getting a number of experts and advisers under the Point-Four Programme and various other Schemes. In case Pakistan attacks us, it is quite possible that after two or three days of the attack, the U.N.O. may come to our rescue. It is quite likely that the Anglo-American friends may also intervene. But, if we are getting into trouble and for the first two or three days we have a sort of Kumbh Mela throughout the whole country, then what will be the position? We, therefore, appeal to you, Sir, to see that we are up and doing. Probably tomorrow another Resolution is coming up before this House—that Government should take the aid of Rifle Associations and train the civilian public for building up defence-mindedness in this country and for organising an auxiliary territorial force.

As far as today's discussion is concerned, I would also take this opportunity of pointing out that in the

present juncture you have to think of national defence and you cannot take a complacent attitude. It is no doubt a very good policy to smile over these things and to say that there is no danger, but at the same time it is a very important problem and eternal vigilance should be the price of liberty. This was a golden opportunity, when Government could have rallied the entire country behind it, except, probably, those some who may not see eye to eye with Government on ideological grounds. The entire country could have been mobilised and our Defence Minister could have given a clarion call to the whole country, particularly because he is the Prime Minister as well as the Foreign Minister of the country. He could have given a lead to the whole country to rally round the national banner, civilians as well as military people, officials and non-officials, Members from various political parties who have spoken yesterday and who may be speaking in the course of this Budget Session, all of them would have been roused and brought together. As some friends pointed out yesterday, as a result of this possible danger, national unity is being realised and patriotism is being roused. But, instead of that, when we invited the Ministers, to join us in a discussion, we got the reply that they cannot meet and join us in any discussion on defence. It is really regrettable that you are not availing yourselves of the opportunity and are allowing the chance to go away.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I beg to move:

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

“but regret that the Address—

(a) gives no indication of an effective policy to counteract the dangers inherent in the recent developments in Pakistan-U.S.A. relationships;

(b) makes no reference to the failure of the Neutral Nations

Repatriation Commission (with India as Chairman) and our Custodian Force in Korea to fulfil the hopes reposed in them by our people for a real settlement in Korea:

(c) fails to appreciate properly the character of the tragedy in Kumbh Mela and to reassure the country that such avoidable disasters should not recur;

(d) does not recognise the utter inadequacy of the Boundary Commission, in view of the people's deep desire for linguistic states; and

(e) seriously under-rates the problem of food prices, of unemployment and of economic depression generally all over the country.”

4 P.M.

We discuss the President's Address under the shadow of tragedies and calamities which, as it so often the case in our country, were certainly not unavoidable. I shall not, of course, refer to the Calcutta firing which any amount of homily on the perversity of the people cannot justify. But I cannot help referring to the tragedy at the Kumbh Mela where some one thousand people, principally women and children, were crushed to death.

The President has been pleased, on the advice of his Ministers I am sure, to call this an “accidental mishap”—an expression which appears to my mind just ironic when the facts are remembered. It was *Mauni Amavasya*, the peak day of the Kumbh Mela which this secular Government and its religious pandits had advertised all over the place as “the holiest bathing day of the Holiest Kumbh in a century and a half.” Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's railway was doing a roaring business. Health restrictions like compulsory inoculation were deliberately lifted to get the largest-ever gathering at the Sangam. Government had announced

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

that it expected a crowd of six million people and presumably therefore it was making arrangements for that number. Fewer people came—between four and five million—according to authentic reports, and yet the tragedy happened.

After the tragedy, the President sent a message to the Rajyapal of Uttar Pradesh, of course condoling the tragedy, but adding that "when it comes to panicky action by masses of people congregated in a narrow space, all the arrangements prove ineffective and a tragedy like this occurs." The Prime Minister also who visited the scene of the tragedy later in the evening, after attending Rajyapal Munshi's celebrated 'at home,' advised everybody including grief-stricken pressmen who tried to draw his attention to the magnitude of the disaster that they should look at things "in perspective", implying, I am sure, that where millions congregate the death of a few hundred people is not such a serious affair after all!

The day after the tragedy we find that the Allahabad Bar Association passed a resolution saying that it was entirely a man-made tragedy. The resolution said: "The catastrophe was entirely man-made and it could have been avoided or at least the chances of its occurrence greatly minimised, had the administrative or executive staff of the Kumbh Mela not been unnecessarily called upon to look after the amenities and security of persons styled as VIFs." I do not understand how these new-fangled Harshavardhans behaved in the fashion which they did. Only a handful of policemen were present at the scene of the tragedy when lakhs were moving towards the Sangam and the ordinary rule of one-way traffic was not even imposed, because almost exactly at the same time—according to Press reports—some three thousand policemen were diverted to make way

and stand guard for the President alone who was going for the holy dip.

I do not for a moment grudge the President or any other pilgrim whatever religious consolation he gets by participating in this ceremony, but I have nothing but contempt for an administration which forgets its duty to all but very important persons and that is my charge against the administration, and that is exactly what happened.

I have nothing but disgust for the shameless degradation displayed in holding a sort of banquet the same day in Government House. It seems they kept our omniscient Prime Minister in the dark about it for many hours afterwards. I do not understand how the Prime Minister could tolerate being kept in the dark for hours about this kind of thing. I also do not understand how our Prime Minister could go off the same night or perhaps a few hours after that on an electioneering tour. I cannot understand how these things could happen, because in no other country in circumstances such as these would the head of the administration or the head of the state behave in a manner which, I am constrained to say, the representatives of our administration have done on the occasion of the Kumbh Mela.

We have no confidence in the formal enquiry committee which the Uttar Pradesh Government has appointed, because its terms of reference are very limited and there is no non-official majority which ought to be there. As far as Allahabad reports are concerned, its terms of reference have evoked universal protest in that city.

The Kumbh tragedy is to my mind, therefore, something which has given us a shake-up. It has been a stark demonstration of the callousness of the government of the day—its callousness towards the fate of ordinary

citizens. This tragedy highlights to-day that like the holy Roman Empire which was neither holy nor Roman nor an empire this Government which boasts of being a sort of stable, democratic and secular government is neither stable nor democratic nor secular. That is a lesson which we ought to draw from what has happened in the Kumbh Mela, and I am sure we have a right to demand of Government that it comes forward categorically with assurance, to this House that steps are being taken to bring to book whoever was responsible for the failure of the arrangements for the Kumbh Mela and that steps are being taken even at this stage to compensate the members of those families which have been bereaved on account of what has happened in the Kumbh Mela.

This mention of secularity reminds me of the President's reference to the general elections in Travancore-Cochin. The Prime Minister had assured us several times—actually I had occasion to write to him and he wrote back to me—that he disapproved generally of intervention by religious organisations in political campaigning. He also wrote to me a letter in which he informed me that the Chief Minister of Travancore-Cochin had told him that all the accusations of ecclesiastical intervention in the elections were unfounded and that the Church knew very well that such intervention on its part would be improper. After that, what happened was that we sent to the Prime Minister certain copies of a Church Gazette published in Travancore-Cochin, wherein in the name of God,—the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost,—Church circulars were published under the signature of the Archbishop of Varapuzha, a place somewhere in Travancore-Cochin, asking or advising the Catholic citizens to vote against the Communist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Kerala Socialist Party and also the Praja Socialist Party whose only crime was that it had come into a kind of understanding with the other three parties.

713 P.S.D.

I have here with me these papers and when necessary I shall lay them on the Table of the House. These are photostat copies of the ecclesiastical circular issued under the signature of the Very Rev. Joseph Attipetti in the name of the Trinity, advising the Catholic citizens to vote against the representatives of the United Front of Leftists in Travancore-Cochin. This is the kind of thing that is going on. Advice is given to the faithful not only by this kind of circular which is published in the Church Gazette, but advice is also circulated by pastoral letters. This Church Gazette notification was to be read from the pulpits. The Prime Minister said in Travancore-Cochin that he could not stop these reverend gentlemen from exercising their fundamental, individual right even though these worthy dignitaries were using the pulpits and Church Gazettes for their work. I attach very great importance to this sort of thing.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): What action did my hon. friend expect from the Government in this connection?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not know what action could be taken, but I am sure that if we have a conception of secularity then we must abide by it, and there are provisions in the Representation of the People Act which could have been brought into operation. As regards this neo-secularity, I hope that the Prime Minister—I am sorry he is not here—will not turn a hair when my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee—I am sorry he is also not here.....

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): No, I am here.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg your pardon. I hope the Prime Minister will not turn a hair when my hon. friend addresses a Hindu audience, shows his sacred thread and threatens to tear it to pieces if a Hindu votes for any but Mahasabha candidates.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I never do that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Prime Minister should not similarly raise any objections on the score of secularity if Maulana Hifz-ur-Rahman addresses a Muslim audience, quotes what the Ulemas say and exhorts his audience to follow that course or go to hell. That is the kind of thing which is going to happen. These Christian gentlemen are using their Church Gazettes and issuing Church circulars and sending round pastoral letters which have to be read from the pulpits, asking the faithful at Confessional to do God knows what. Yet we say we are a secular state. That is the ridiculous pass to which the Government's political exigency, its necessity of relying upon the Catholic votes in Travancore-Cochin has reduced it and this is eloquent of its weakness, its tottering hold on the people and its desperation in search of props for power which it somehow wants to enjoy in this country.

I turn now to the menace, which Government either does not see or wish to admit, which is flowing very spectacularly from the recent developments in the relations between the United States and Pakistan. Whatever be the prevarications and verbal jugglery in diplomatic circles over this, it is necessary to remember the Pakistan Prime Minister's recent categorical assurance to the *United States News and World Report* that 'in an emergency, there should be nothing to prevent us from inviting any friendly Power, including America, to use Pakistan bases to help defend this region'. I am happy that the Prime Minister said in Bangalore last month:—

"This military aid to Pakistan by America is a step towards war, not peace; not only towards world war, but a step which will bring war right to our frontiers.

It is (he added) an anti-Asian step."

But there is a tendency, as in the resolution of the Kalyani Congress

on this subject, which even some Congressmen found too much of a bitter pill to swallow, to look upon the U.S.-Pakistan pact as some sort of an accidental or unfortunate development and a kind of unwise step on the part of America, which is supposed to blemish her so-called democratic reputation and which should, therefore, be rectified. It is because of this feeling in Congress circles that Shri N. C. Chatterjee got up in the House yesterday, and pleaded for acceptance of American military aid which as far as I could make out from the newspaper reports, he says, the U.S. Vice President came to offer us on a glittering platter. This idea is totally wrong and totally mischievous. There is nothing accidental about this latest, and in Indian eyes the most egregious example of American intrigue against the freedom and peace of the world. It is not for love of Pakistan that military aid is being given to her. This aid is a menace to both our countries, a menace to our independence of action. Let us not, therefore, fall a prey however unwillingly to this American conspiracy to dominate the whole world, by methods ranging from corruption, engineering of *coups d'etat* and blackmailing of the gravest kind to open war. It will be absolutely fatal complacency to think that the whole matter can be safely left in the hands of the Government. The threat from the United States will not vanish because the Government of India is making protests against the proposed pact. It has to be remembered that along with these protests, Government has not hesitated to sign economic agreements with the United States. At the time of the Kalyani Congress, the Government of India was actually signing a new technical aid agreement with the United States. Possibly the Government had an eye on the Budget which President Eisenhower was going to present. This sort of weakness for commitments is going to be a fatal development. Actually we have already given concessions to such giant American monopolists as the

Standard Vacuum Oil Co. We have allowed a whole host of American experts, so called, to penetrate everywhere in our country. But let us realise now—even if it is late, we must realise it; if we do not, we have to pay through our nose for it—what wonderful friends of India these American imperialists are, who come here and pay encomiums to India and to India's greatness, who hand out wonderful compliments, particularly to the Prime Minister, and all the time plot against our sovereignty and our independence. Let us remember the conspiracy over Kashmir which was almost successful. It was on the point of being successful when democratic forces woke up, luckily for us, and we could scotch the conspiracy, and, even though temporarily, defeat the American conspiracy. Let us remember how even before, in November, 1952, we found the *New York Herald Tribune* referring to the visit of Admiral Arthur Radford, Chairman of the American Chiefs of General Staff, who went to Pakistan, met the Prime Minister and came away greatly impressed with Pakistan. Let us remember how Mr. Dulles came here. He was given the freedom of our microphone. He exuded tons of sympathy and goodwill for the Indian people when he spoke over the AIR and then went over to Karachi for preparing the preliminaries of the Pakistan-US pact. Let us remember that Mr. Nixon came here, all smiles. Then he went to Karachi with the consequent results, which we know very well. Let us also remember that the Prime Minister of Pakistan is in a position to taunt this country for accepting American aid. He said in Dacca on the 3rd January:

"Even the acceptance of economic assistance of all forms by any one country amounted in the last analysis to military assistance. If India was getting economic assistance from America in the shape of 100 locomotives *ex gratia*, this aid was tantamount

to indirect military aid inasmuch as the funds they saved could be diverted for the purchase of armaments."

We are also being black-mailed into the American orbit. That is the danger we have to face. Our so-called policy of non-involvement and non-alignment has not paid because it has not been a really positive, consistent policy of peace. That is why we find ourselves in a very tight corner. That is why today questions are being raised regarding the danger which this country faces. This danger has come in spite of the foreign policy of the Government. I say, while the country is with the Prime Minister in his vehement opposition to the U.S.-Pakistan pact, unless we realise the real implications of this whole matter, unless we cut ourselves away from the commitments and involvements which we have got with the American imperialist spider, we will not be able to do our duty by our people.

This reminds me of what happened in Korea. I do not wish to say anything uncomplimentary about the Neutral Nations Commission's Chairman, General Thimayya. I do not wish to say anything uncomplimentary about the Indian Custodian Force. I know that they had to work under very difficult circumstances. But, I know at the same time that knowing full well, they were being compelled to do wrong over and over again. Knowing full well that the United Nations side was behaving in a manner which should not be tolerated, we have acquiesced through our Chairmanship in the NNRC and our Custodian Force in those inequities. That is why months ago the Americans arranged the so-called escape of 27,000 prisoners of war. We know how our General Thimayya was upset because out of the 90 days for explanation to the prisoners, only ten days could be arranged because of the obstructive tactics of the UN

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Command. This has happened over and over again. We must have felt ashamed of it that on the 22nd January, thousands of these prisoners were given over to the American Command so that they could be incorporated in the fighting ranks of Syngman Rhee or Chiang-Kai-Shek. They have been transported to Pusan in South Korea or somewhere in Taiwan. All that happened in spite of our Chairman of the NNRC knowing full well that it was against the rules, against the real and truthful interpretation of those regulations which governed the conduct of the NNRC. That is why I have to say that this is a matter of the very gravest concern even today. Yesterday we found the news of how General Thimayya had to hand over to the UN Command, that is to say, the American Command those people against whom a definite case of murder had been established. General Thimayya had to do it under protest. Every time he does it under protest. Why should this have to happen? Why do we acquiesce in this kind of inequity? That is because we have linked ourselves with the American spider in such a fashion that we cannot really assert our independence. We could have done so. The political conference has not been called. I wish at a later stage when the Foreign Affairs debate comes in, when the Budget grants of the External Affairs Ministry are on the anvil of this House, to ask how it is that our representatives in the United Nations allowed the majority in the United Nations which is controlled by the United States to arrange to manoeuvre things in such a manner that the United Nations General Assembly was not called, that the Political Conference was not called, that the Korean Armistice terms were grossly violated and that the chances of peace in the world were seriously jeopardised. That is why I say that all these officials, our Chairman, General Thimayya, of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, and our Indian Custodian Force

way in which they should have functioned because of our link-up with the Americans, and that is why we must wake up to our responsibilities. If we do not do that, it will be too late. That is why I want to draw the attention of the House to a statement issued by the Chinese Foreign Minister, Mr. Chou En Lai, who says these things have happened. We know that the Indian Chairman had to work under very great difficulties, but all the same, he should have asserted himself. Now, the only way out is to have a real conference, of the five Big Powers on peace in the Far East. Let our Government try, take the initiative in calling these Powers to get together and see to it that the terrible pass, the straits to which the Korean question has been reduced by the United Nations Command's behaviour, is not allowed to threaten the peace of the world. That is why I wish to emphasize that on this occasion also we find that we are so dependent upon the good offices and the favour of the Americans that we have not been able to assert our independence, to pull our weight in international affairs in the way in which we ought to have done.

This weakness of our country in regard to the United States of America is not an accidental circumstance. It is because our economy also is largely dependent on British capital, on those interests in this country which are collaborating with foreign capitalists and also the feudal interests which are still operating in our country. All these things have been shown up to us spectacularly by the Pakistan-United States Pact, and that is why I say this pact should have roused us from our torpor, but instead of rising from our torpor we still seem to be asleep. There still seems a kind of feeling that we can leave everything to the Government. I know of Congress spokesmen, very important dignitaries in the different States, going about and saying: "Let us leave everything to the Prime

Minister. He is protesting against the United States-Pakistan Pact. Therefore everything is safe in his hands." But I say that is not by any means enough. That is not enough because the United States-Pakistan Pact is not something accidental. It is not something which has suddenly come from the blue. It is part of a long-standing conspiracy of the Americans—a conspiracy which is eating into the vitals of the economy of our country, a conspiracy which is linked up with the presence and operation of British capitalists in this country, a conspiracy which is linked up with the feudal forces in this country, a conspiracy which is linked up with certain interests like the Democratic Research Service which a Bevanite Member of the House of Commons, Mr. Ian Mikado, has tried to expose in a recent article which was published in the *Free Press Journal* of 17th February. This kind of tentacle-grip of the American and British imperialists is to be seen everywhere and that is why I say we have to be on our guard. We have to be on our guard against expressions of anger against Pakistan, the idea of having to fight Pakistan. We have to be on our guard against the idea of having to exchange Kashmir in order to win the favour of the United States. I have seen in the *Eastern Economist* which is run by the house of Birlas as far as we know, on the 29th January, 1954, a leading article which suggests that as a necessary price for American friendship we should exchange Kashmir. This is the kind of thing which is being said. These people who depend upon the favours of the Anglo-American imperialists want to rule the roost, and that is why we find that our country is being sort of left in the lurch, our people are not made to realise the gravity of the situation and there is a sort of feeling that the Prime Minister is going to look after all our interests.

That is why I wish to raise my voice in warning against what the Government is trying to do. That is why I say that the President's Address

has not given us a real indication of the way the wind is blowing today. The President's Address does not tell us how the Government ought to rectify its policies, internal as well as external. The President's Address breathes an air of complacency which we have got to shed. The President's Address highlights the fact that our country's administration today is being conducted in a fashion which our people should not tolerate for very much longer.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): The Deputy Leader of the Communist Party has been very eloquent. I admire his courage, but it will be futile for me to compete with him so far as his *vocabulary for showering* abuses or words like "mischievous", "jugglery", "callous" etc., are concerned, of which he is a past master professor. I will confine myself to just a few words about the Presidential Address.

First of all, we are thankful to the President for directing our attention to such dangers which are facing us today. Amongst these there are external dangers, and as we have seen in the last few days, there are also dangers on our home front. Before I come to the external dangers, I will deal with those on our home front, and by that I mean first of all, what has been happening in Calcutta.

Last year in July I was myself there when the things were moving very fast. I have myself seen that the Communist Party was behind that whole show. What should I say? Words fail to describe it when innocent people got bombarded in the streets with their *patakas* (country bombs) which was the result of an organised conspiracy of the Communist Party. The same thing has revived again.

I have been following the details very minutely. Just before they had their conference at Madurai something came to my hands, a document which was sent to the Members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The heading of the

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

document is "Tactical Line" of the Communist Party. In that they mention that the Communist objectives can be realised only through a revolution, through the overthrow of the present Indian State and its replacement by a People's Democratic State.

The second paragraph says: "It is also necessary that while utilising all legal possibilities, the existing illegal apparatus of the Party is strengthened enormously".

The third point is "Partisan war". "Partisan war", the document continues, "must be one of the major weapons in our armoury as in the case of all colonial countries. But this weapon alone cannot ensure victory".

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): May I know what he is reading?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I am reading from a document circulated to the Members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. It continues: "It has to be combined with the other major weapons.—that of strikes of the working class, general strikes and uprisings in the cities led by armed detachment of the working class". Whenever they mean to mention themselves, they bring in always the name of the working class. "Therefore, in order to win victory of the popular democratic revolution, it is absolutely essential to combine two basic factors—the partisan war of the peasants and workers uprising in the cities."

The fourth point is this: "With hundreds of streams of partisan struggles merging with the general strikes and uprising of the workers in the cities, the enemy (*i.e.* the Government) will find it impossible to concentrate his forces anywhere and defeat the revolutionary forces but will himself face defeat and annihilation. Even inside the armed forces of the Government the crisis will grow and big sections will join the forces of revolution."

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO BRING IN A MOTION TO DISCUSS CALCUTTA SITUATION.

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the motion, and before the House proceeds with it, I would like to clarify the nature of the motion and the scope of discussion. As I said, it is in the nature of censure, if not of the whole Government, at least of some Ministers of Government. That is the first point. Secondly, the scope is limited only to what is stated as the aggrieved conduct of Government by the hon. Member or Members, who have tabled the motion. The general question of what happened in Calcutta is not a matter under discussion. That is not the point to be discussed here. Therefore it is necessary that we finish our discussion within the time allotted.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I bring to your notice Rule 81, which reads:

"The Speaker may, if he is satisfied that there has been adequate debate, put the question at 6-30 P.M. or at such other hour not being less than two hours and thirty minutes from the time of commencement of the debate".

and Rule 82 which says:

"The Speaker shall prescribe a time limit for speeches."

I think you may be exercising your powers under Rule 82, but I bring Rule 81 also to your notice.

Mr. Speaker: I think hon. Members may assume that the Chair knows the Rules sufficiently.

As I said, the character of the motion is a very peculiar one. It was sought to be introduced in the form of an adjournment motion, and it was accepted by Government. I did not therefore put in anything on that ground, and by the consent of the House we restricted the time for discussion to one hour. The hon. Member will see therefore....