



Thursday
18th February, 1954

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part I- Questions and Answers)

VOLUME I, 1954

Sixth Session

1954

**PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Date: 01.12.2014

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

97

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 18th February, 1954

The House met at Two of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

OIL SURVEY OF ASSAM VALLEY

*88. **Shri Amjad Ali:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an Aircraft (Percival Prince) has recently been added to the three helicopters in Assam for the three-way Geophysical Survey for petroleum prospects in the Assam Valley; and

(b) if so, whether it was done with the permission of Government?

The Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

Shri Amjad Ali: May I know under what conditions this Percival Prince Aircraft has been added to the existing three helicopters for oil prospecting in Assam?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Under the agreement, the Assam Oil Company had the option of importing a number of aeroplanes for aeronautical surveys, and that is why they got one more.

Shri Amjad Ali: Are they going to give the results of their findings to the Government?

697 PSD.

98

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Yes. Under the agreement, after the completion of the survey and all the necessary computations, the records relating to the survey including maps and aerial photographs will be handed over to the Government.

Shri Meghnad Saha: May I know if any Indian technicians have been attached to this survey party?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Yes, under the agreement the representatives of the Indian Government had also to accompany the party.

Shri Amjad Ali: Will it be possible for Government to state what data they have collected as a result of their surveys up till now?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The results of the survey are still being investigated by the company.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: May I know if any oil geologists have been attached to the party? That was the question when a previous hon. Member referred to oil technicians. The reference was not to government officials.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Technical officers have been associated. I cannot say precisely whether he was an oil geologist.

OPIMUM

*89. **Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** (a) Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state the quantity and cost of contraband opium seized by Customs Authorities since January 1953?

(b) What is the number of persons arrested during this period and how have they been dealt with?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) 105 mds., 37 seers and 78 tolas of opium worth about Rs. 2½ lakhs were seized during the calendar year 1953.

(b) A statement giving the required information in respect of the year 1953 is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 19.]

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिन मामलों में लोग मुकद्दमेबाजी से छूट गये हों या बरी हो गये हों उनमें जो अफीम पकड़ी गई उसका क्या हुआ ?

Shri A. C. Guha: The opium has been confiscated.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : जिन मामलों में बरी हो गये हों, क्या वह अफीम भी पकड़ ली गई ?

Shri A. C. Guha: Any opium seized as contraband opium must have been confiscated.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कौन कौन से ऐसे स्थान हैं जहाँ पर अफीम को इस तरह ले जाने का काम चलता रहा और इस को बन्द करने के लिये सरकार ने कौन कौन से उपाय किये ?

Shri A. C. Guha: There are certain regions where opium is cultivated. In some of these regions, I think smuggling is more prevalent than in other regions, and Government are gradually curtailing the cultivation in those regions which are suspected of indulging in smuggling. The policy of the Government is gradually to eliminate the cultivation of opium in those areas. The usual procedure and methods followed for checking smuggling of other articles are also being followed here. And in the case of opium the measures taken by Government really are of three categories firstly, in the regions where opium is

cultivated; then inter-State smuggling; and lastly, international smuggling. Proper measures are taken to control smuggling at all these stages.

NATIONAL INCOME

***90. Shri Bansal:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 1053 asked on the 17th December, 1953 and state:

(a) whether the national income unit have since computed the national income for the year subsequent to 1948-49;

(b) if so, for how many years; and

(c) the *per capita* national income for each of these years?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) for 1949-50 and 1950-51.

(c) Rs. 246.9 for 1948-49 (revised estimate)

Rs. 263.9 for 1949-50.

Rs. 265.2 for 1950-51.

Shri Bansal: Why have the figures for 1948-49 been revised?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: For technical reasons. More up-to-date data were available.

Shri Bansal: Do these revised estimates take into account the increase in food production by 20 per cent. to 25 per cent. as was stated by the hon. the Finance Minister in one of his statements?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: This report has not been prepared by Government. It is being submitted to Government. If the hon. Member will wait for a few days longer, he will have the report in his hands and will be able to find out in detail the reasons why the estimate has been revised and the heads under which it has been revised.

Shri Muniswamy: May I know whether there is any such committee

as the National Income Committee, and if so, who are its members?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: There is such a committee as the National Income Committee and they have signed this report on the 14th February 1954.

Shri Meghnad Saha: May I know if these figures do not indicate that there has been absolutely no improvement in the *per capita* income during the three years of the Plan and therefore planning has been an absolutely hopeless failure?

Mr. Speaker: He is mixing up inferences with a question.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The information I would like to give is that on the figures there has been an improvement but it is probably true that there has been no improvement in the real income.

COTTON IMPORT

***91. Shri Bahadur Singh:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity and value of foreign cotton imported into India during 1953-54 as far as figures therefor are available; and

(b) the duty charged on this imported cotton?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) The quantity and value of foreign cotton imported into India from 1st April 1953 to 31st December 1953 are tons 88291 and Rs. 39,16,03,663 respectively.

(b) The duty collected on this imported cotton is Rs. 2,70,03,000.

Shri Bahadur Singh: May I know whether this cotton was of some special quality that could not be grown in India, and if so, what are the countries from which it was imported?

Shri A. C. Guha: Only long-staple cotton is imported and there also Government is taking steps to replace, as far as possible, the use of long-staple cotton by short-staple cotton grown in India and thereby

reduce the import. As for the countries from which this long-staple cotton is being imported, I may mention Pakistan, (Western) Kenya Colony, Tanganyika territory, Egyptian Sudan, Egypt, the United States of America, Peru and some other countries wherefrom small quantities are imported.

Shri Bahadur Singh: May I know whether any portion of the duty charged has been refunded, and if so, what are the reasons therefor?

Shri A. C. Guha: I think the hon. Member may be aware that under the recent Sea Customs Amendment Act Section 43 (b), refund is allowable to certain type of cotton manufactures that are made out of imported cotton and are exported. But as yet no refund has been applied for and given, because exporters are entitled to make their demands within six months after the export, and that period has not yet expired. Therefore, we have not yet given any refund.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether any attempts have been made to grow long-staple cotton in India, and if so, what are the results thereof?

Shri A. C. Guha: Every attempt is being made and some small quantity of long-staple cotton is being grown in India.

MEDICAL EXPENDITURE ON MINISTERS

***92. Th. Lakshman Singh Charak:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state the expenditure that has been incurred on medical treatment in India and abroad of Cabinet Ministers, Ministers of States and Deputy Ministers during 1950-51, 1951-52 and 1952-53?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): A Statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 20.]

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: May I know if any maximum figure has

been fixed up to which Ministers can get medical treatment free from Government hospitals in a year?

Shri Datar: No, Sir.

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: May I know if the Government is considering the desirability of extending the same facility to Members of Parliament?

Shri Datar: It is in the hands of the Parliament.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know how the *per capita* expenditure of the Ministers compare with the *per capita* expenditure incurred on medical facilities for Class III servants under the Central Government?

Shri Datar: I have no figures so far as that comparison is concerned.

Shri T. N. Singh: Is it true that the House Committee of this Parliament has made certain recommendations regarding medical facilities for Members of Parliament who have to come here from long distances?

Shri Datar: So far as I am aware, we have not received them.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know whether, when Cabinet Ministers go for treatment abroad, they are required to be sent by the Government doctors as in the case of other government servants?

Shri Datar: That is a question of procedure. Certain procedure is followed according to which they have to bear the expenses first and then Government gives a refund.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That is not my point. The point is this. In the case of Class III servants, any treatment for which the Government has to pay has to be recommended by the Government doctors. In the case of Ministers, is it to be recommended by the Government doctors or can they go of their own accord?

Shri Datar: That is entirely a different question. The question relates to Ministers. The hon. Member is asking about Class III servants.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I am asking about the Ministers themselves.

Mr. Speaker: In the case of Class III servants, it is the doctor who has to give a certificate that that treatment should be given. Is that so in the case of Ministers also?

Shri Datar: Yes, Sir.

बर्मा द्वारा चुकाया गया ऋण

*१३. **सेठ गोविन्द दास :** क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत से लिये गये ऋण में से बर्मा सरकार ने १९५३ में कितनी धन राशि चुका दी है ?

वित्त मंत्री (श्री सी० डी० देशमुख) : कुछ भी नहीं ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : क्या इस साल कुछ नहीं मिला है, या अबतक जो हमारा रुपया उन पर बाक़ी है, वह मिलता ही नहीं रहा है ?

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : इस विषय में उच्चतम स्तर पर वार्ता चल रही है और यथासम्भव शीघ्र ही संसद को इसके परिणाम की सूचना दी जायगी ।

श्री जी० पी० सिन्हा : वित्त मंत्री ने अभी बतलाया कि हिन्दुस्तान और बर्मा के बीच बात हो रही है, तो क्या यह नेशनल डेंट बर्मा से मिलने वाले चावल के दाम में एडजस्ट किया जायगा ?

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : सम्भव है, अगर बर्मा की सरकार उस ऋण का भुगतान उससे कर सकती है, तो वह जरूर करेगी ।

COMMONWEALTH FINANCE MINISTERS'
CONFERENCE

***94. Sardar A. S. Saigal:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) how many countries participated at the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference held at Sydney in January, 1954;

(b) whether any proposals on the balance of payment position in 1954 as regards sterling area were discussed; and

(c) what proposals were agreed to?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Nine countries participated in the Conference.

(b) and (c). I request the hon. Members to await the statement which I propose to make shortly in the House.

सरदार ए० एस० साहगल : भारत को इस साल जो कर्जा लेना है, क्या उसके ऊपर वहाँ कोई चर्चा हुई थी?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I still have got to advise the hon. Member to await my statement.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know if the hon. Finance Minister can give us an assurance that it has resulted in no commitments on India's financial resources as a result of the decisions taken at that Conference?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is right. I can give that assurance.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether the Finance Minister who had attended the Conference has submitted any report to the Government and if so, what are the main features of his report to the Government?

Mr. Speaker: I think he is going to make a statement to the House. I think that is a fact.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister is going to make a statement to the House about the Conference.

Shri B. S. Murthy: The first part of my question has not been answered.

Mr. Speaker: After the Question Hour.

I. A. F. PERSONNEL

***95. Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that I. A. F. personnel in uniform were made to work as gate-keepers during the cricket test match in Delhi, in November, 1953; and

(b) if so, the reasons for drafting I. A. F. personnel for duties in connection with functions organised by non-official bodies?

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): (a) No, Sir. Actually, a request was received by Air HQ from the Delhi Cricket Association for giving help in organising and staging the Cricket Test Match in Delhi. Those who volunteered from amongst I.A.F. Personnel serving in Delhi were permitted to help the Delhi Cricket Association.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Has the attention of the Government been drawn to Press reports that these air force personnel in uniform were working as gate-keepers, and that the Chairman of the Test Match Subcommittee happened to be a Joint Secretary of the Defence Ministry which was perhaps the reason why they were drafted for such jobs?

Shri Tyagi: It is not a question of Press report. They were sent to work as gate-keepers in the stadium for the Test match.

Shri R. N. Reddy: May I know why the uniforms were used? That is the point.

Shri Tyagi: They were in uniform.

Mr. Speaker: Why were they in uniform?

Shri Tyagi: They were in uniform.

Mr. Speaker: They were not on Government duty. Why were they in uniform?

Shri Tyagi: They were sent in uniform. In fact, the Cricket Association had requested us to help them. Therefore, they were sent in uniform of course, after they volunteered to serve.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Since the civilian gate-keepers were paid a certain sum and also given lunch, may I know to which organisation the saving effected by the loaning of these air force personnel accrued actually?

Shri Tyagi: Charges for the transport of their lunch were paid for by the Cricket Association.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Did they get any emoluments for the service?

Shri Tyagi: No, Sir. The Cricket Association only gave them the concession of bringing their families on passes issued free.

LOWER DIVISION CLERKS

*96. **Shri T. B. B. Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply to Unstarred Question No. 47 asked on the 18th November, 1953 and state whether a decision has since been taken on the representation made for raising the pay scales of lower division clerks working in the Central Secretariat and attached offices?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri M. C. Shah): The matter is still under examination.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: When will the decision in this connection be arrived at?

Shri M. C. Shah: Very soon.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: May I know what decision has been arrived at

regarding the compilation of the All-India Cost of living Index for the middle classes?

Shri M. C. Shah: That does not concern this question. I will require notice.

SECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

*97. **Shri Jhulan Sinha:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state the steps that are being taken to implement the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the reply to Starred Question No. 95 by Shri D. C. Sharma on 18th November 1953. The Committee referred to therein has completed its deliberations and its report has been considered at the 21st annual meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education which met from the 7th to 9th February, 1954. The recommendations of the Board will be considered by Government in due course.

Shri Jhulan Sinha: May I know what time the Government will take to implement this recommendation?

Dr. M. M. Das: The Central Advisory Board of Education have completed their deliberations only last week. The Government are expected to take some time to consider those recommendations.

Shri N. M. Lingam: May I know whether a team of foreign experts and Indian educationists is touring various countries to study how far the recommendations of the Commission could be implemented in India?

Dr. M. M. Das: Yes Sir. A team of foreign experts and some Indian experts is touring several countries of the world namely UK, Denmark and USA. But, their purpose is to inspect the Secondary Education institutions in those places and see the methods of imparting training to the teachers in the secondary schools. They will be in India shortly and

their recommendations will be considered by the Government.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know if the Central Advisory Board as well as the Education Board have considered the question of pay scales of teachers throughout India?

Dr. M. M. Das: The Central Advisory Board has requested the Central Government in its recommendations to set up a Committee to go into this particular matter.

SALES-TAX

***99. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply to Unstarred Question No. 415 asked on the 14th December, 1953 and state:

(a) whether the various State Governments have since sent their reactions to the suggestions made by the Central Government with regard to making suitable changes in their Sales-tax laws; and

(b) if so, the further action Government have taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri M. C. Shah): (a) Yes Sir; the suggestions were regarding the administration of sales-tax so far as inter-State trade is concerned. Replies have been received from all State Governments except Orissa whose reply is awaited.

(b) A copy of the Press Note dated the 11th February, 1954, issued by the Finance Ministry and indicating the action taken by the Government in the matter, is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 21.]

Shri S. N. Das: From the Press Note a copy of which has been laid on the Table of the House it appears that some of the State Governments have not agreed to the formula that has been evolved. May I know the names of the States which have not agreed to the formula?

Shri M. C. Shah: Except Orissa, from whom we have not received any reply, and the West Bengal Government who have replied that they do not propose to levy tax on inter-State trade transactions, all States have agreed.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether any progress has been made with regard to having uniform laws on sales-tax, and whether the State Governments have been consulted in the matter?

Shri M. C. Shah: If the hon. Member refers to sales-tax on inter-state trade transactions, then we are still trying to evolve a formula. We are consulting the State Governments and thereafter we will proceed in the matter.

Shri S. N. Das: I wanted to know whether any progress has been made with regard to general sales-tax laws.

Shri M. C. Shah: As the hon. Member is aware, sales-tax is a provincial subject and the Centre is only concerned with sales-tax on essential goods. We are concerned with sales-tax on inter-State trade transactions also under article 286, and we are taking action on those matters.

SCIENCE LIBRARY

***100. Shri B. C. Das:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state whether there is any Central Science library in India?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): No.

Shri B. C. Das: Has the Government received any representation to establish such a library?

Dr. M. M. Das: No, Sir.

Shri B. C. Das: Are Government aware that the libraries of the Central laboratories are inadequate?

Dr. M. M. Das: So far as this particular question is concerned, I may submit to this House that the Universities of this country and the research laboratories have their own

well-equipped libraries and the scientists take advantage of these libraries.

EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES

*101. **Shri KeshavaIengar:** (a) Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state whether any memorandum of priority has been issued for filling up of the vacancies notified to the Employment Exchanges?

(b) Will Government lay a copy of the same on the Table of the House?

(c) Is the memorandum being strictly complied with and followed in all Exchanges all over the country?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) Yes.

(b) A copy of the instructions issued from time to time is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 22.]

(c) The instructions contained in the Office Memoranda referred to above are followed by the Employment Exchanges while submitting panels of names to the various Ministries or Departments who notify vacancies to them.

Shri KeshavaIengar: What steps is the Government taking, or is proposing to take, in cases where these priorities are not complied with?

Shri Datar: Then the ordinary rules are followed.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether the Shiva Rao Committee has given any report about these Employment Exchanges?

Shri Datar: The Shiva Rao Committee has not yet submitted its report to the Labour Ministry who have appointed it.

Shri Dabhi: How is the priority fixed?

Shri Datar: The priorities have been mentioned in the various memoranda. May I read them? It is a very long list.

Shri Dabhi: I wanted to know on what basis.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

EXPORT DUTY IN HYDERABAD

*102. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Minister of States be pleased to refer to Starred Question No. 776 asked on the 9th December, 1953 and state:

(a) whether Government have agreed to extend the period of duty on exports asked for by the Government of Hyderabad; and

(b) if so, for how many years?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): (a) Yes.

(b) For one year, up to the end of 1954-55.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: What was total income of the State in the year 1952-53?

Dr. Katju: From customs?

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: Yes.

Dr. Katju: I am not in possession of the exact figures. It is somewhere about Rs. 3 or 4 crores, both from imports and exports.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: Under the Constitution, Hyderabad as a Part B State can collect such duty for six years more. May I know whether the Government propose to extend it for six years more?

Dr. Katju: The agreement with Hyderabad was entered into for four years. The agreement with the other States was for five years. Now it has been decided that the agreement should be for five years with all the States, and the question will be considered later.

Shri Heda: Are there any commodities fixed on which the Hyderabad Government can levy export duty, and if so, what are those commodities?

Dr. Katju: I should like to have notice.

ORGANISATION AND METHODS DIVISION

*103. **Shri Raghbir Sahai:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to refer to the reply to Starred Question No. 1250 asked on the 22nd December, 1953 and state:

(a) whether the decision of Government to set up an "Organisation and Methods Division" and to sponsor the establishment of an Institute of Public Administration, as suggested in the Appleby Report, has been put into effect;

(b) if so, under what Ministry the two organisations will be set up;

(c) the objects for which these two organisations will be set up; and

(d) what other matters arising out of the report are under the active consideration of Government?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (c). The Director in charge of the Organisation and Methods Division will begin to function in the Cabinet Secretariat from the 1st March 1954. Other personnel will be added to the staff of that Division as its activities expand. Its broad object will be to maintain a continuous and critical review of the Organisation and the various branches of Government and of the methods of work followed therein. A more detailed description of the activities to be covered by this Division will be found in paragraph 21 of Chapter VI of the Five Year Plan.

The Institute of Public Administration will be an autonomous association of persons and organisations interested in the study of Public Administration and will be registered as a Society under Act XXI of 1860. Its object will be to promote a scientific study of Public Administration in a constructive and co-operative spirit. A draft Memorandum of Association and rules for the proposed Institute have been drawn up and circulated to all State Governments, Members of Parliament, individual officials, non-officials and organisations likely to be interested.

Enrolment of members is now in progress and the Institute will be formally inaugurated at a meeting to be convened shortly.

(d) The main points which are under consideration are summarised in the list of recommendations appended to Section I (pages 13-14) of the Appleby Report, a copy of which has already been laid on the Table of the House by the Finance Minister.

Shri Raghbir Sahai: May I know if the attention of the hon. Minister has been drawn to the following sentence in the Appleby Report on Public Administration: 'The extent to which there is graft or corruption is wholly within the responsibility of Ministers', which was the view expressed to Dean Appleby by one intelligent and eminent official? May I know how far this view is shared by the hon. Minister, and who that eminent official was who gave that view?

Shri Datar: Government are aware of these observations.

Shri Raghbir Sahai: May I know if the Government have examined the view of those Community Project Directors who told Dean Appleby that there is a wasteful use of personnel and confusion among villagers because there are so many officers, each concerned with his own department and no other, whereas what they wanted was a unified group of "jacks-of-all-trades"? If so, what conclusion has the Government arrived at?

Shri Datar: I may add that the Government are examining it.

Shri Raghbir Sahai: May I know if the Government have examined the view of Dean Appleby regarding the role of the Collector under the present set-up, about whom he says: "He is responsible to everybody and to nobody in particular"? If so, what steps are being taken to set right that anomalous position in which the Collector finds himself today?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I respectfully suggest that the question related to a particular organisation, and my hon. friend is now raising questions about different matters altogether. It would be much better if he gives notice of the question. Then we can deal with that.

Shri Bansal: May I know if the setting up of an Administrative Staff College is also under contemplation of Government, and if so, what will be the difference between the functions of these two bodies?

Dr. Katju: I should like to have notice of that question also.

FOREIGN MISSIONARIES

*104. **Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of foreign missionaries residing in India;

(b) their number state-wise;

(c) how this number compares with that of the years 1951 and 1952;

(d) the nature of work in which they are actually engaged; and

(e) whether Government have received any complaints in regard to their directly or indirectly indulging in politics?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

(d) Educational, medical, evangelical, philanthropic and rural or social uplift work.

(e) Yes, certain complaints have been received against individual missionaries working in certain parts of India.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know if it is a fact that there is concentration of missionaries in border areas?

Shri Datar: We are examining that question, because complaints have been received.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know whether any foreign missionaries were refused permission to come to India to work for their missions?

Shri Datar: I am not at present aware of any refusal, but before they come in, they have to take permission.

Shri N. M. Lingam: May I know whether it has come to the notice of Government as to whether any of the missionaries are engaged in espionage activities?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): We have received no such reports.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि नीकोबार द्वीप में जो मिशनरी हैं वे धर्म परिवर्तन के अलावा क्या भारत विरोधी कार्रवाई में भी लगे हुये हैं और क्या इस कार्रवाई में उनको आई० ए० एफ० के उन अधिकारियों से सहायता मिलती है जो वहाँ समय समय पर पेट्रोल भरने के लिये आते हैं ?

डा० काटजू : मैं इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं मालूम ।

Shri Syed Ahmed: Has the attention of Government been drawn to the fact that a pamphlet has been distributed on behalf of certain people in Kashmir, that during the last Kashmir agitation certain missionaries were working as the spies of a foreign Power?

Dr. Katju: I have received no such official report.

Shri Syed Ahmed: I am asking about the official report, whether his attention has been drawn to a pamphlet distributed in this connection.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: I want to correct one statement regarding the question I put earlier. It was the RAF, not the IAF.

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I say a word in regard to that question, if you would permit me?

आपने निकोबार द्वीप के बारे में जो कहा तो अम्बल तो निकोबार द्वीप के बारे में हमारे पास कोई इत्तला नहीं है। दूसरे यह कि वहां बहुत ज्यादा कुछ करने की गुंजाइश भी नहीं है क्योंकि वहां बहुत थोड़े से लोग रहते हैं। लेकिन अगर आनरेबल मेम्बर के पास कोई ज्ञाते की इत्तला हो तो वह बतायें। इस तरह से हवा में बातें कह देने से कोई पकड़ नहीं होती है।

WOMEN'S SMALL SAVINGS SCHEME

***106. Shri K. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the target fixed for Women's Small Savings Scheme;

(b) the amount collected under all the three heads so far;

(c) whether there is any proposal to reduce the interest; and

(d) if so, to what extent?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) Rs. 8 crores a year.

(b) The net deposits in Post Office Savings Bank, National Savings Certificates and Treasury Savings Deposit Certificates since the introduction of these investments up to the end of January, 1954 amount approximately to Rs. 225 crores, Rs. 184 crores and Rs. 39 crores, respectively. Of these, deposits during the current year are Rs. 7.75 crores, Rs. 16.16 crores and Rs. 5.60 crores, respectively.

(c) and (d) No, Sir.

Shri K. P. Sinha: May I know the amount deposited by small investors under Savings Stamps?

Shri A. C. Guha: No such separate records are being kept. It would

take a long time and labour to get all these informations.

Shri K. P. Sinha: May I know the steps taken by Government to popularise this scheme in the villages?

Shri A. C. Guha: We have already initiated a scheme for rural savings. It has already started working in Bengal and is soon going to be started in Madhya Pradesh; in the other States also, it is going to be introduced shortly.

Shri Nanadas: May I know the total amount expended so far in the form of salaries, allowances and advertisement charges, in connection with the Women's Small Savings Scheme?

Shri A. C. Guha: We expect that this organisation will spend within this year a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,000 in all, in connection with their organisational work throughout India.

Shri Nanadas: May I know whether any commission is being paid, and if so, at what rate is that commission allowable?

Shri A. C. Guha: The usual commission which is paid to all authorised agents will also be paid to them.

FOLK DANCE FESTIVAL

***107. Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the different Tribes invited from the different States to present performances of folk dance, art and music on the occasion of the Republic Day celebrations held on the 26th January, 1954; and

(b) what method of selection was adopted to ascertain the best of the lot from among the different tribal parties in the country?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) The names of Tribes or Parties that participated in the Tableaux and Folk Dances during the Celebrations are given in the statement placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 23.]

(b) All State Governments were requested to suggest items for the Tableaux and the Folk Dances for presentation during the Celebrations. The suggestions received from them were considered by the Sub-Committee at the Centre. The final selection was done at a meeting of the Co-ordination Committee at the Centre, at which representatives from the State Governments concerned were also present. I must add that the members of the Co-ordination Committee deserve our thanks for their valuable suggestions.

Shri Sanganna: May I know whether their expenses in Delhi are borne by the State Governments or by the Central Government?

Shri Satish Chandra: Their expenses in Delhi were borne by the Central Government, while their travelling expenses were borne by the State Governments concerned.

Shri Sanganna: May I know what arrangements have been made by Government for the scientific study and development of the folk dances in different tribal areas of the country?

Shri Satish Chandra: There is a Sangeet Natak Akademi, and various other cultural organisations also function in the country. Government as such have no organisation, but are certainly, interested in the popularisation of the folk dances.

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I answer that question, if you would permit me? If I might correct my young colleague, Government are very much interested in this, and they are taking, not absolutely direct, but nevertheless a fairly intimate, part in this. They are starting a dance academy, a small one, in Imphal in Manipur State; and another they intend to start in Shillong for this purpose. Government are reserving the money that has been obtained from the sale of tickets for these functions, for the encouragement of folk dances.

INDIAN NAVAL APPRENTICES

***108. Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some Indian Naval apprentices who were undergoing training at Naval Fleet Air Arm Base near Scotland have been called back to India; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): (a) Yes.

(b) Because of adverse reports against them.

Shri Gidwani: What was the nature of those adverse reports?

Shri Tyagi: While they were under training, they were alleged to be organising political cells, and engaging themselves in activities of a secret and subversive nature, but these are only allegations. I would therefore request the House not to go with any ideas about the truth of these allegations, because they are still under investigation.

Shri Gidwani: In view of what the hon. Minister has stated, was it proper to have recalled them, and to have wasted so much of money on their return?

Shri Tyagi: They were not recalled because it was a wild allegation, Government were satisfied that there was substance in the allegations, but then no action can be taken until the matter is thoroughly enquired into.

Shri M. R. Krishna: May I know whether this was the first batch sent to that part for training?

Shri Tyagi: I want notice for that, but I believe we must have sent some other batches also.

Shri Joachim Alva: How many candidates or apprentices were involved in these incidents? Had not Government satisfied themselves in regard to the capacity, character and patriotism of these apprentices, before

they were sent, and have Government observed any change in their capacities, after they were sent?

Shri Tyagi: At the time the candidates were sent, there was no inkling of their tendencies. As and when reports come against any employee in the defence services, engaging himself in different political activities or activities of a secretive or subversive nature, action is immediately taken. So, as soon as the Ministry got the information, action was taken against them.

MIDNAPUR BANK LIMITED

*109. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Reserve Bank refused licence to the Midnapur Bank Limited in December last; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The power of granting or not granting a licence is vested in the Reserve Bank by law under Section 22 of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 and Government understands that this step was taken by the Reserve Bank of India as the Midnapur Bank Ltd. failed to satisfy the requirements of section 22(3)(a) and (b) of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 in this regard.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether Government have any information whether the Bank ceased to have transactions, when they were refused licence?

Shri A. C. Guha: Naturally, when the licence was refused, the Bank cannot function as such.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I wanted to know whether Government have any information whether they transacted business.

Shri A. C. Guha: I would like to have notice for that particular information. If the Bank has done anything like that, then it must have

infringed the law, and would be liable for punishment.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the Bank has appealed to the court under section 37 of the Banking Companies Act for carrying on further transactions?

Shri A. C. Guha: I would like to have notice. I have no information on that point now.

FOREIGN EXPERTS

*110. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** (a) Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state the number of foreign experts who visited India during 1952-53 to advise Government on different educational problems?

(b) What were the schemes on which their advice was sought?

(c) What are the countries from which they came?

(d) What was the expenditure incurred on them individually?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) to (d). Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I know at what time, approximately, this information will be available?

Dr. M. M. Das: It is difficult for me at this stage to reply to that question. I think the hon. Member will understand the difficulties, because the Education Ministry is not the only Ministry that is concerned with this question. The Ministries of Health, Food and Agriculture, Natural Resources and Scientific Research have also invited foreign experts.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know whether before the budget discussion—the discussion on the Education Ministry—we will be able to get this information?

Dr. M. M. Das: It is not possible for me at this stage to give the information. The information is not now at my disposal.

FORMER RULER OF MALERKOTLA

*111. **Dr. Rama Rao:** Will the Minister of States be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the former ruler of Malerkotla withdrew some amount from the State Treasury after the integration;

(b) if so, how much and on what date or dates; and

(c) whether it has been recovered from him?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): (a) Yes.

(b) Rs. 1,117-8-0 on 23rd August 1948.

Rs. 7,000-0-0 on 31st August 1948.

Rs. 19,461-4-3 on 29th September 1948.

Rs. 6,504-8-6 on 30th September 1948.

Rs. 15,926-5-3 on 15th February 1949.

(c) The payment of these amounts was authorised by His Highness the Nawab of Malerkotla at the time when he still had the authority to pass such orders. Besides, an overall settlement was reached with him in connection with the settlement of his private properties which took into account the amounts in question.

INCOME-TAX INVESTIGATION COMMISSION

*112. **Shri Hem Raj:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of cases entrusted to the Income-tax Investigation Commission upto December, 1953;

(b) the number of cases investigated and decided by it during 1953; and

(c) the amount of money recovered by such investigations?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The number is 1668.

(b) The number is 168.

(c) The amount of tax actually recovered is Rs. 8.86 crores since the

time the Commission started investigation.

Shri Hem Raj: May I know the average number of cases that were decided yearly by this Commission after its institution?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The total number of cases decided is 1,032. That is for five years. So, the average number of cases is the quotient of the division!

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know whether Government have been able to realize the moneys from those adjudged persons according to the instalments that have been fixed as a method of getting the money as much as possible, or, are there arrears in regard to the instalments also?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The instalments that became payable by the 31st December, 1953, amounted to Rs. 18.05 crores, and the collection up to that date was Rs. 8.86 crores.

Shri T. N. Singh: What steps have been taken against those who have failed to keep to the instalments?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The usual steps are taken. Sometimes processes are issued; sometimes, further instalments have had to be granted.

ORDNANCE DEPOTS

*113. **Shri K. C. Sodhia:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether the stock verification of all the ordnance depots has been completed;

(b) if not, how much still remains to be done; and

(c) by what time this work is likely to be completed?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) Stock verification is an annual process. If the Hon'ble Member refers to the current financial year, the answer is in the negative. If however, the special reorganisation scheme undertaken sometime back in the various ordnance depots is meant, this has

been completed in all the depots except in the C.O.D. Agra, where the completion of the scheme is dependent on the availability of certain special equipment.

(b) Approximately 38 per cent. of items are still to be verified in the annual stock verification process.

(c) The annual stock verification is expected to be completed by the 31st March 1954.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Were any thefts of stocks reported during the last two years?

Shri Satish Chandra: I cannot say off-hand. There are dozens of depots.

Mr. Speaker: Not for a particular depot, but generally.

Shri Satish Chandra: Thefts have not come to my notice.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Are the Government aware of one such instance in the Jubbulpore depot?

Shri Satish Chandra: If the hon. Member passes on that information to me I can verify it.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know if these stock verifications of the various ordnance depots are complete physical and ledger checks, or are they merely percentage checks?

Shri Satish Chandra: The actual stocks are verified against the entries in the account cards. There is complete counting and verification with the ledgers and account cards.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether Government is aware that in Muradnagar depot, various cases of theft have been brought before the concerned authority and no action has been taken?

Shri Satish Chandra: There is no depot in Muradnagar.

IMPORT OF WATCHES

*114. **Shri Dhusiya:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases of illegal import of watches detected, in the year 1953; and

(b) how many Indians and foreigners were involved in those cases?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

I may add that on the 4th December last year, we gave some figures regarding illegal smuggling of watches for 6 months. For the whole year, we have not yet been able to collect the figures.

Shri Dhusiya: From the statistics obtained up to this time, may I know if there were any Government servants or an legislator involved in these cases?

Shri A. C. Guha: If the hon. Member has got anything in his knowledge, I would like him to pass it on to the Government, and then Government will surely examine it. But, as far as I recollect, we have no definite reports as yet.

HINDI SCHOOL, MANIPUR

*115. **Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 919 asked on the 14th December, 1953 and state:

(a) the area of land allotted for the site of the Hindi School of the Bharatya Adim Jati Sevak Sangh at Manipur;

(b) whether the same has been allotted in the name of the organisation or of Shri Adhikari, the head of the Institution;

(c) whether the said school has a Governing Body or Board;

(d) if the reply to part (c) above be in the affirmative, when it was formed; and

(e) the names of the Members of the Board?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) to (e). The information is being collected from the State

Government and the reply will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

DETENUS IN PEPSU

***116. Shri. Gopala Rao:** Will the Minister of States be pleased to state:

(a) the number of detenus in PEPSU; and

(b) whether any of them are standing as candidates in the coming General Elections to the Legislative Assembly?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): (a) Four.

(b) Three.

Shri Gopala Rao: I want to know whether the attitude taken in this context is in consonance with the declared policy of the Government that free and fair elections will take place?

Dr. Katju: These detenus were detained because they had decided upon a course of subversive action calculated to disturb public order. The grounds of detention were served upon them and their detention order was confirmed by the Advisory Board. This was in respect of two of them in August, 1953. As to the third, the order was confirmed later. It was not considered proper that simply because one of the detenus seeks election he should be entitled to get round the detention order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is it a fact that they are the only detenus who have stood for election and have not been released even upto the time of the election?

Dr. Katju: I really do not know because they were probably the only detenus. I am speaking subject to correction—who were detained because they were guilty or were suspected to be guilty of indulging in subversive activities. PEPSU is a very difficult State.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is the Preventive Detention Act kept for? I believe that it was kept for

subversive activities. That was what the Government said.

Dr. Katju: That is your insinuation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister may address the Chair.

Dr. Katju: I beg your pardon, Sir

DEFENCE PSYCHOLOGICAL UNIT

***117. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:**

(a) Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a psychological unit has been established at the Defence Science Laboratory for investigation of the problems of personnel of the three wings of the Military Service?

(b) In how much time was it established?

(c) What amount has been spent on this unit so far?

(d) What is the scope of its work?

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): (a) and (b). No Psychological Unit as such has been established in the Defence Science Laboratory. One Senior Scientist (Applied Psychology) has, however, been working in the Laboratory since December 1951. A Junior Scientific Assistant has been appointed to assist him with effect from November 1953.

(c) About Rs. 25,000/-.

(d) At present experiments are being carried out on measurement of environmental stress and its effect on the efficiency of the personnel in the Army, Navy and Air Force, with a view to suggesting improvements in working conditions and equipment design, for securing increased operational efficiency through over-all economy in human effort.

I might add for the information of the hon. Member that there is also a Psychological Research Wing in the Defence Science Organisation but this is not attached to the laboratory.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know, Sir, whether Government are

considering increasing the staff in this particular department?

Shri Tyagi: Sir, there is no such proposal just now under consideration, but as and when the need arises, I can assure the hon. Member that Government are very enthusiastic to take full advantage of this wing.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether these two scientists who have been employed already for this purpose have submitted any scheme or any proposal to the Government?

Shri Tyagi: Quite a few practical proposals have come to us after experiment by the scientists and a majority of them have already been adopted with advantage. They pertain to training programmes, modification of operational equipment etc. that suit the requirements today, and there are many others which are under consideration.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I know, Sir, whether this particular purpose of the overall economy in human affairs will be transferred to other Ministries also, that is to say, whether the advantage of the knowledge of the research which will be carried out by these two officers will be transferred to other Ministries also for their benefit?

Shri Tyagi: I am not quite sure about the actual recommendations they have made. They probably should be pertaining to the Armed Forces alone and their work. If they have made any recommendations with regard to secretariat work and some economy there, I would surely be glad to transfer these to them.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I have a definite answer to my question? The hon. Minister has been pleased to say that it relates to the question of overall economy in human affairs. Human affairs do not relate to the Defence services only. I would like to know in what way it is going to benefit other human affairs than the affairs of the Defence Ministry.

Shri Tyagi: I am afraid I said human efforts.

697 PSD.

NAGA NATIONAL COUNCIL

*119. **Shri L. Jageswar Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Naga National Council has launched a subversive movement on the Indo-Burma border near Naga Hills;

(b) whether the police force deputed by the Manipur Government have recovered a number of unlicensed service rifles and a large number of live cartridges from the possession of the tribal people;

(c) if the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative, whether those tribal people belong to Manipur State;

(d) the sources that supply them these rifles and cartridges;

(e) whether the subversive movement of the Naga National Council has received support from the Manipur tribals; and

(f) whether any arrests of the Manipuri Tribals have so far been made?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) The Central Government have no information.

(b) and (c). Yes; 110 arms and 431 rounds of ammunition were recovered during December 1953 from villages of the Manipur State near the border of the Naga Hills in the Ukhrul Sub-division.

(d) These arms and ammunition were collected by the tribal people from dumps abandoned by the Allied Army after the last war.

(e) The number of tribal people of the Manipur State who have sympathy with the Naga National Council is negligible.

(f) No.

Shri L. Jageswar Singh: May I know, Sir, whether Government have any reason to believe that some foreign agency is at the back of this Naga National movement?

Shri Datar: Government are considering all the aspects of the case. That is all that I can disclose at this stage.

Shri L. Jageswar Singh: May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that a Manipuri tribal belonging to the Ukhrul area was recently exterminated from the Naga Hills? If so, what is the reason for it and what are the political leanings of that person?

Mr. Speaker: Some person was exterminated from the Naga Hills. What is the political implication, and what were his views. That appears to be his question.

Shri Datar: I have no information on this point.

Shri Muniswamy: What steps have been taken so far by our Government to establish goodwill and understanding with the Nagas?

Dr. Katju: The Superintendent of the Naga Hills is taking all possible steps and we are trying to establish good relations with Nagas who can be dealt with on that basis.

OIL SURVEY OF ASSAM

*120. **Shri Amjad Ali:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply to part (d) of Starred Question No. 1239 asked on the 22nd December, 1953, and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the three methods of survey—aeromagnetic, seismic and gravimetric—were in simultaneous operation in search of new areas of possible oil finds in Assam in the last two months; and

(b) if so, the areas where the three methods of survey were carried on simultaneously and the results thereof?

The Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) Yes, Sir.

The three methods of survey—aeromagnetic, seismic and gravimetric—were in simultaneous operations upto 26th January, 1954.

(b) The aeromagnetic survey which started on 10th December, 1953 and concluded on the 26th January, 1954, covered Lakhimpur, Sibsagar, Nowgong and Darrang Districts of Assam and part of North East Frontier tracts.

The seismic survey which started in November, 1953 and is still in progress, has covered Naharkatiya area.

The gravimetric survey, which started about September 1953 and is still in progress has covered Lakhimpur, Sibsagar and Sadiya frontier tract Districts.

No information regarding the results obtained by the surveys is yet available.

Shri Amjad Ali: From the last two months' exploration, can Government give any working idea of the physical limits of the oil-bearing rocks in that area?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The information, which is mostly available to the Assam Oil Company, has been released partly in a Press Communique by them.

Shri Amjad Ali: Is the Assam Oil Company likely to continue the drilling operations further?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Yes, but for detailed prospecting in the entire area, negotiations will be undertaken in due course.

ARMY PENSIONS

*121. **Th. Lakshman Singh Charak:**

(a) Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state whether service in the following branches of the Army is allowed to be counted towards pension on re-employment of the personnel of the forces on regular engagement:

- (i) reserve service,
- (ii) service in the Army Reserve of Officers, and
- (iii) ex-Indian Territorial Force service?

(b) If not, will Government state what provisions for old age have been

made in those branches of the Army?

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): (a) Called-out service of the Army in India Reserve of Officers and embodied service of the ex-Indian Territorial Force, where followed by permanent commissioned service without a break, is counted for pension or gratuity subject to the refund of gratuity, if any, received in respect thereof. Reservists recalled to colours during World Wars I & II have been allowed to count half of their reserve service towards pension or gratuity on their eventual discharge from service.

(b) Reserve service as such does not interfere with an individual's normal civil avocation, but generally carries a liability to be called up for annual or biennial training and for active service in an emergency. Embodied service of reservists is either gratuity or earning, or counts to a prescribed extent towards pension/gratuity on final discharge. In the case of Sepoys enrolled for a period of colour service followed by reserve service, a pension (or gratuity in lieu) is admissible on completion of the combined service.

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak rose—

Shri Tyagi: The time is up, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: One question may be put.

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: Are Government aware that there are a number of army officers as well as other ranks from these categories who have been released during the last six years and who find themselves without any means to fall back upon? If so, are Government considering some way to rehabilitate them?

Shri Tyagi: Sir, I am sorry I could not understand the import of the question, but if there are any cases which come under this category and are deserving of some pensionary or retirement benefits, I shall be very

glad if the hon. Member will find out those persons and ask them to send their applications to me, and I will examine them.

Mr. Speaker: The question hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

✓ ***98. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state whether, according to the recommendations of the Inquiry Committee on the working of the Industrial Finance Corporation, Government propose to appoint a whole-time paid chairman for the Corporation?

(b) If so, when do Government propose to amend the Industrial Finance Corporation Act?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) As stated in this Ministry's Resolution on the subject already laid on the Table of the House, Government have accepted this in principle.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

IMPORT OF INDIAN SECURITIES

***105. Shri A. N. Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply to Starred Question Nos. 1027 and 1028 asked on the 4th September, 1953 and state:

(a) the result of the investigation by the Reserve Bank of India, on the import of Indian Securities from Pakistan to India since the 27th February, 1951 and the form and value of consideration that was paid in lieu of these Securities to Pakistan holders; and

(b) whether Government propose to lay on the Table of the House a monthly statement of Indian Securities that have been imported from Pakistan and changed encasement from the 27th February, 1951 to the 31st December, 1953?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) The investigations carried out by the Reserve Bank of India reveal that the securities imported can be classified under the following heads:—

(i) Imports for effecting transfer of liquid assets of Indian nationals;

(ii) Gifts of small value sent by Pakistan nationals to their relatives in India;

(iii) Securities transferred by Pakistan nationals to be held with their bankers in India or for crediting the sale proceeds to their accounts with banks in India;

(iv) Securities held by Indian nationals which were encased for payment in Pakistan;

(v) Securities brought in by brokers.

(b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 24.]

Monthly statistics for the period 27th February, 1951 to 10th January, 1952, are not available as instructions to maintain such data was issued to the Public Debt Offices etc. only in early January, 1952.

काश्मीर में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस

*११८. डा० लक्ष्मणजी : क्या राज्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) क्या काश्मीर में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस का कोई दल मौजूद है; तथा

(ख) यह दल वहाँ कब से है, और इस पर प्रति वर्ष केन्द्र का कितना व्यय हो रहा है ?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): (a) and (b). Four Companies of Central Reserve Police are at present stationed in the Jammu and Kashmir State. Two of these Companies have been in the State

since January, 1953 and the other two since May, 1953. The force was sent at the request of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and expenditure on it is recovered from the State Government.

NATIONAL MUSEUM, DELHI

*122. **Shri Bahadur Singh:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the answer to starred question No. 607 asked on the 4th December, 1953 and state when the work of construction of the National Museum in New Delhi is expected to start?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): An expert committee has been appointed to determine the space requirements of the Museum and to prepare a plan for the building. Government will take further action in the matter in the light of the report of the Committee.

COURTS OF WARDS

*123. **Sardar A. S. Saigal:** Will the Minister of States be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to pass any legislation under item 34 of List I of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution;

(b) if so, when; and

(c) the names of the estates of the Rulers of the former Indian States, which are at present under the Court of Wards?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): (a) Yes.

(b) As soon as the examination of the issues involved is completed.

(c) 1. Aundh.

2. Tharoch,

3. Bastar, and

4. Rajnandgaon.

INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, CALCUTTA

*124. **Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indian Statistical Institute of Calcutta has built any computing machine; and

(b) if so, up to what digits it would solve the equation?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes, Sir. The Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, has built an "Analogue Machine" for solving linear equations and related problems.

(b) The machine can solve equations upto an accuracy of three decimal digits.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS IN AGRA

***125. Shri B. C. Das:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state the strength and conditions of employment of the staff employed for the upkeep and maintenance of the historical buildings and monuments in Agra and Fatehpur Sikri?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): 10 permanent employees and 87 Work-charged employees. The conditions of service are indicated in brief in the statement placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 25.]

LIMESTONE IN SAURASHTRA

***126. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that limestone reserves suitable for the manufacture of portland cement have been discovered in Saurashtra; and

(b) approximately how much quantity of these limestone reserves has been discovered and how much would be the quantity of portland cement manufactured, if they are properly exploited?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) 64 million tons approximately.

It is estimated that the quantity would be more than sufficient for a 1,000 tons per day cement manufacturing plant based on a calculation of 20 years reserve.

PAY SCALES IN MANIPUR

***127. Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Assam pay scale has been introduced in Manipur with retrospective effect from 1st April, 1950;

(b) if so, the number of teachers who have been benefited by the new scale as well as the number of those who have not been benefited thereby;

(c) the reason, if any, why they have not been given the benefit of the new pay scale;

(d) when a final decision will be taken in respect of those cases which were pending, when the order was issued; and

(e) whether Government contemplate to recruit a new batch of teachers, as a result of the introduction of the new scales of pay?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) to (e). The information is being collected from the State Government and the reply will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

SODEPUR GLASS WORKS LTD

***128. Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to refer to the reply to unstarred question No. 765 asked on the 27th March, 1953 and state:

(a) whether Government have come to any decision regarding the case of the Sodepur Glass Works Ltd., which had been given a loan of Rs. 40,000 by the Industrial Finance Corporation; and

(b) if so, what?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. O. Gupta): (a) and (b). The total amount of the loans given by the Industrial Finance Corporation to the Sodepur Glass Works Ltd., is Rs. 50 lakhs. The loans have been given by the Industrial Finance Corporation and Government understands

that the Industrial Finance Corporation is considering the question of necessary steps to be taken in the matter.

CUSTOMS VIOLATIONS

***129. Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of cases in which restrictions relating to the carrying of currency, gold and jewellery by travellers from India to foreign countries were violated during the year 1953-54; and

(b) the amount collected as fines etc.?

The Deputy Minister of Finance: (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) The number of such cases detected during the first six months of 1953-54 was 1702.

(b) The relevant information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House, in due course.

LICENTIATE MEDICAL OFFICERS

***130. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:**

(a) Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a number of licentiate medical officers who did not possess qualifications prescribed in clause 2(1) of the Indian Medical Council Act 1933, have been released on earning their minimum pension?

(b) What is the number of officers so released during 1953?

(c) What is the rate of pension given to each officer?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Forty-one.

(c) Rs. 160/- per month to those who were released in 1953. Higher rates (owing to longer service) to those who were released earlier.

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS IN MANIPUR

***131. Shri L. Jogeswar Singh:** Will the Minister of States be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question

No. 164 asked on the 5th August, 1953 regarding administrative reforms for the Manipur Hills and state:

(a) the progress that has so far been made on the proposal submitted by the Chief Commissioner, Manipur, in this behalf;

(b) whether a decision has been taken on the details of the scheme; and

(c) if so, what they are?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): (a) to (c). The matter is still under consideration.

ORISSA BY-ELECTION

***132. Shri B. C. Das:** Will the Minister of Law be pleased to refer to the answer given to starred question No. 790 asked on the 9th December, 1953 and state:

(a) whether the Chief Electoral Officer of the State of Orissa has completed his enquiry into the allegation regarding omission of several Andhra names from the Electoral roll of Berhampur plural constituency; and

(b) if so, whether Government can place on the Table of the House a copy of his report?

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): (a) Yes.

(b) A copy of the report is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 26.]

NATIONAL CADET CORPS (GIRLS DIVISION)

11. Shrimati Kamlendu Mati Shah: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of girls enrolled so far in the Girls' Divisions in the National Cadet Corps;

(b) the branches of training for the girl cadets; and

(c) the number and rank of the Commissioned and non-Commissioned personnel of the force?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) About 850.

(b) The training to girl cadets is given in the following subjects:—

- (a) Physical Training.
- (b) Squad Drill.
- (c) Map Reading.
- (d) Signals.
- (e) First Aid.
- (f) Hygiene & Sanitation.
- (g) Home Nursing.

(c) 20 Lady Officers and 600 Girl Cadets is the present strength. About 250 girl cadets have so far left the Corps on completion of training or other causes.

अनुसूचित जातियों के लिये छात्रवृत्तियाँ

१२. डा० सत्यबादी: क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि १९५३-५४ के लिये जिन अनुसूचित जातियों, आदिम-जातियों तथा अन्य पिछड़े वर्गों के छात्रों को छात्रवृत्तियाँ दी गई थीं उनकी राज्यवार संख्या क्या है ?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): The hon. Member's attention is invited to the statement laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 27.]

OUT-OF-TURN PROMOTIONS IN CENTRAL SECRETARIAT

13. **Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** (a) Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to starred question No. 1311 and the supplementaries thereon answered on the 16th September, 1953 and state the number of displaced Government employees appointed after the partition who have been given out of turn promotions under the Central Secretariat Re-organisation Scheme?

(b) How many of such employees have risen to the rank of (i) Deputy Secretary, (ii) Under Secretary, (iii) Superintendent, (iv) Assistant Superintendent and (v) Assistant-in-charge?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) Displaced

Government servants were given certain special facilities for being considered by the Union Public Service Commission for grades I—III of the Central Secretariat Service. Those who were recommended by the Commission were appointed to the respective grades. Some of the displaced Government servants so appointed to the grade of Assistant Superintendent were also protected from reversion to a lower grade. Permanent displaced Government servants holding supervisory posts before the implementation of the scheme were also protected against reversion to non-supervisory posts even in cases where they were not graded high enough for retention in supervisory posts. Apart from these cases of protection about a dozen cases of out-of-turn promotion to posts of Assistant Superintendent are, at present, under consideration in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission.

(b) Except to the extent mentioned above, there has been no out-of-turn promotion to any of the grades referred to.

I.C.S. OFFICERS

14. **Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of I.C.S. Officers in the Service of the Government of India and of the various State Governments at present; and

(b) the number of non-Indian I.C.S. officers still in service in India?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) 362; of whom 223 are serving under the various State Governments and 139 under the Centre.

(b) Four.

TITANIUM

15. **Shri B. C. Das:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 617 asked on the 4th December, 1953 and state the steps that Government have taken

so far to ascertain the extent of the area in which titanium is available in Keonjhar District of Orissa State and the quality of the mineral available?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): No important deposit of titanium bearing mineral has so far been found in the Keonjhar District, Orissa.

Some vanadium bearing titaniferrous magnetite deposits (east of Phuljhora Huli) estimated to contain about 5 lakh tons of ore were discovered by the Geological Survey of India in 1942-43.

Thin lodes of vanadiferrous magnetite of poor quality in the north east of Godasahi were located by the Geological Survey of India in 1949-50.

CONTENTS

(Volume I— Thursday, 18th February, 1954—)

	<i>Columns</i>
Motion for Adjournment—	
Failure of Government to bring in a motion to discuss Calcutta situation —negatived	237 248, 280—310
Messages from the Council of States	249
Drugs and Magic Remedies (Objectionable Advertisements) Bill—	
Laid on the Table, as passed by the Council	249
Statement <i>re.</i> Commonwealth Finance Ministers Conference held in Sydney .	250 255
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions— Second Report presented	255
Statement <i>re.</i> Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1953-54 .	255
Papers Laid on the Table—	
Delimitation Commission Final Orders Nos. 5 to 9	256
Statements of the State-wise position of election petitions	256—257
Agreements between Rajpramukh of Saurashtra and Reserve Bank of India	257—258
Notification under the Sea Customs Act	258
Muslim Wakfs Bill—Time for presentation of Report of Select Committee— extended	258—259
Motion on Address by the President— <i>Not concluded</i>	259—279, 309—338

Date 01.12.2014

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

**(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT**

237

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 18th February, 1954.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion:

"That the business of the House be adjourned, to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., that the Government which is responsible to this House has yesterday agreed in the Council of States to a discussion of the grave incidents in Calcutta, while, though they were aware of the feelings in this House on this matter, they did not take steps to bring in a motion themselves for such a discussion."

I do not know what happened in the other House.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): You would recall, Sir, that yesterday a motion was given notice

713 P.S.D.

238

of in this House and you were pleased to give your ruling. I am not questioning that ruling. Just about the same time, in the other House, a similar motion was given notice of by a number of Members, and the Chairman was pleased to say as follows. It was sought to be raised by Mr. Sundarayya. With your permission, Sir, and with the permission of the House I am quoting the ruling of the Chair. The Chairman said:

"I have received notice from you, from Mr. B. C. Ghose and Mr. Dhage. Though Law and Order and Education are State and not Central subjects, in view of the general feeling on the matter and in consultation with the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju....."

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): The Leader of the House is not Dr. Katju.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I think, Sir, my hon. friend must have a second instrument. I said "the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju."

The Chairman said:

"In view of the general opinion on the matter and in consultation with the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju, as a special case, I allow a discussion to be raised on this matter tomorrow at 6 P.M. The discussion will last an hour."

Sir, I beg you to remember the words 'in consultation with the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju'.

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

Yesterday, Sir, my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee, as will be clear from the record of proceedings of yesterday in this House, wanted a discussion on this matter. Sir, under Article 75(3), the Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the House of the People, and that means to the House of the People. It is the duty of the Government, in view of the fact that different sections of this House are exercised about the grave incidents in Calcutta, to have agreed to a discussion or to have made a statement at least. Even under the present procedure, which your good self has enforced in this House for two years and more, whenever a motion of adjournment is given notice of, the Chair gives a chance to the mover, and a change to the Government to state their respective viewpoints. Even that particular opportunity was not availed of by the Government yesterday, for example, by agreeing to make a statement, or making a statement then and there itself. I consider that this is a very grave matter. It is an affront to this House and I feel, Sir, that this motion, which I have given notice of, will be admitted by you.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I add one word, Sir? Yesterday, as you know, I brought forward that adjournment motion and there were several stages in the procedure which ensued. You, Sir, were pleased to rule it out of order and then I tried to make a submission in an effort to persuade you to change your mind, if I possibly could. I could not change your mind. What happened at that stage was that I wanted to make a statement because, representing Calcutta as I do, I thought I should say something in this House, at least to give expression to the kind of feeling which was uppermost in the minds of most of us. All that time, the Leader of the House as well as the Home Minister were present. None of them said a word. You were pleased to repeat your previous ruling that you

could not possibly allow me even to make a statement and that precipitated matters and brought out a different kind of atmosphere, in which we had to make a certain gesture, which I do not wish to recall. But, what I do wish to say is that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister were present here. The Home Minister's name is mentioned by the Chairman of the other House as the person whom he had consulted. The consultation, obviously, had taken place before the hour when we raised this matter by way of adjournment motion in this House. This House is the House to which alone the Council of Ministers is responsible and not the other House; but, in spite of that, we got complete silence from the other side. What happened was that you, Sir, in your discretion just ruled out the adjournment motion which I had brought forward. Now, the entire proceedings suggest a kind of cavalier attitude towards this House, which I particularly wish to resent. I wish also to say that this is a matter which really agitates the public mind so deeply that I hope that even at this late stage the Leader of the House and the Home Minister might put their heads together and give us an opportunity, perhaps at the same time as the other House, to have a discussion on this issue.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Apart from the merits of this question, which you have to judge, Sir, the hon. Member seems to imply that there was some intrigue, that it was wrong on our part to have remained silent when he was discussing this matter and raising this question, and you were pleased to give your ruling, that there was some intrigue on our part which led to our giving one expression in the other House and another here by our silence. Well, my colleague will no doubt say that no occasion arose. I, on my part, was not even aware of what happened in the other House. In fact, I heard only last evening on the

subject—not an adjournment motion, but some kind of factual statement would be placed. I believe the Chairman—I speak subject to correction—suggested that some kind of statement should be made and my colleague agreed to it. Here the question did not arise at all. We had at no time, from a strictly legal or technical point of view, desired to keep anything from the House, even though technically that might be so.

You will remember, Sir, in regard to the Kumbh Mela affair we stated the facts. That should not be treated as a precedent; otherwise, we will be flooded with a string of matters of State concern. In this particular matter, I really do not understand how, if I may use the word with all respect, hon. Members who acted in a way which I thought was highly improper yesterday not merely in going out after your ruling, but in giving expression in loud voices...*(Interruption)*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely saying that it is rather extraordinary that after grave misbehaviour yesterday, against your dignity and the dignity of the House, they should come and tell us that I ought not to have remained silent but, perhaps, replied to them. Well, I preferred to remain silent, a silent witness of their misbehaviour.

Dr. Katju: Sir, my name has been mentioned. I should like to say that in the Rules of Procedure and Business of the other House there is a particular provision for a 'Motion for Papers'. Notice of that motion was given. I was asked whether I had any objection to that particular motion. I said, I had none. I had not read the Rules of Business and I was not even aware of that. But, there is a particular procedure for a 'Motion for Papers' on which any question can be raised and I was informed that the Chairman thought that it might be considered. I said, I have no objection and it was on that basis that

the 'Motion for Papers' was allowed to be debated today.

Now, you would be pleased to remember that this was a 'Motion for Adjournment', which is regulated by strict considerations. If I had been asked or the Leader of the House had been asked whether we had anything to say about it, probably, we would have mentioned the technical objection that had been raised by you. You, probably, made a suggestion to my hon. friend that he might put a short notice question and I would have answered that; there is nothing to shirk. What I know is really from the Calcutta papers. Yesterday in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* there were four columns of statement on what actually happened there. Everybody knows it and there is no question of concealment or trying to do anything against the dignity of the House or anything like that. It is all public knowledge.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): May I ask one question?

Dr. Katju: At what stage was I to intervene? It was entirely a debate between the Speaker and my hon. friends. They were exceedingly excited and you were trying to pacify them.

Shri Gadgil: May I know whether the consent of the Minister concerned will regularise what is not regular according to the rules of procedure?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: My motion is purely constitutional and procedural, and unfortunately my hon. friends who have so far spoken, brought in the question of the merits regarding the incidents in Calcutta, the incidents yesterday in this House and so on. I beg of you to see and remember the words of the Chairman of the other House, and I again request you kindly to note the wording of my motion. Knowing as they do the feelings of the House, they should have agreed to make a statement. As they had not done so and come forward with a statement. I beg leave to press my motion.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In the other House there is no provision for an adjournment motion. It is more as a substitute for an adjournment motion that papers are called for. I could have certainly given notice of a short notice question, but in order to expedite matters, the only device open to us so far is to give notice of an adjournment motion. I may not have the refinement of the Prime Minister who may have all the monopoly of it. I do not think I raised my voice till after the atmosphere in the House, for varied reasons, came to a sharp pitch. I am not going to be sorry for it, but what I do insist is that if in the other House there may be an agreement on the part of the Government to have a discussion and not merely a statement, I do not see why the Ministers concerned could not have taken this bit of initiative for a moment and said that they were going to make a statement to this House, that they were going to have a trunk telephone talk with Calcutta to find out the facts which could be vouchsafed to us. They did not have that much courtesy. Today we hear lectures about refinement, decorum and good behaviour from the Leader of the House, who sometimes forgets—every time he opens his lips on such occasions—that he is the Leader of the whole House and not only of his Party. I am tired of saying this, but I do resent the observation being made. More than that, what I do resent is the kind of treatment that is continuing to be meted out to this House and I do not understand why even at this stage the Leader of the House should not come forward and say that he is going to have the statement repeated in this House and a discussion to ensue.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is highly unbecoming of the hon. Member. May I ask for your ruling, Sir, whether he acted properly in walking out with the other Members yesterday, and the cries they raised? Yet he has the temerity to say what all he has said now.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no room for excitement. We can dispassionately and coolly consider this, because the matter has a procedural importance apart from a constitutional importance. To the general question posed by Shri Gadgil I may say that, if a thing is out of order, illegal or unconstitutional, the consent of the entire body of Ministers is not going to validate it. I am very clear on that point.

The point here seems to be limited and the motion seems to me, even as stated by the sponsors—the sponsor is only one, but I take it that Shri Mukerjee is supporting it—is a very short one and it is not about the merits of what happened at Calcutta—and no discussion on that point,—but the way in which the Government have treated this House in agreeing to a discussion there and keeping silent at the time of the adjournment motion here. That seems to be the short point, and from that point of view, the motion would rather sound as a motion of censure on the Government. Yesterday, while discussing the merits of the admissibility of the motion, I gave my ruling and I stated, if I remember rightly—I am quoting only from memory—that the mere use or help of the military will not bring the matter within the cognizance of this House. I said also that I presumed that the military was acting under the control and direction of the Bengal Government and the hon. Home Minister nodded assent to that as he does even now. So, it was clear that the adjournment motion could not be admissible. That is a matter of procedure for this House. I also said that discussion here would be interference with the autonomy of the States, but that is a different matter and I need not repeat it. The present motion is not based on that, I did suggest yesterday the procedure to use short notice question, and I also suggested that there are other ways of discussing it. Our rules are now more liberalised and a discussion could have been asked for, not by an adjournment motion but by request and consultation with the Min-

ister. I did not say so in so many words, but I think the rules provide that way. So, if it is possible and if the Government are agreeable, I should have no objection to a discussion of one hour under one or other of the rules, though I myself think that discussion here would practically be of no avail. I am therefore trying to suggest whether it is not possible for the Parties to agree and carry on the business of the House in a spirit of give and take.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I make a submission, Sir? You have rightly pointed out that the purpose or the intention behind this motion is one of censure on the Government for the way they have acted in the other House and not here. As I said earlier, I never intended to raise the question of the incidents at Calcutta, or go into the merits of the case, or as to what happened there. I think, under the Rules of Procedure of this House, if I press my motion and if fifty of my colleagues support me, I am entitled to have a discussion on the adjournment motion. I want your ruling on that point, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Do Government object to the motion?

Dr. Katju: I understood my hon. friend to say that he wants to discuss the point, namely, that I should have intervened yesterday and informed the House on the merits of the Calcutta incidents.

Mr. Speaker: To discuss generally on the conduct of the Government with reference to their behaviour with the House.

Dr. Katju: That is a matter for you to decide. We need not be censured for that. We were discussing the question of the admissibility of the adjournment motion yesterday and how could I intervene at that time?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The Government did not object to my motion and it is within your competence to admit

it. If they challenge my motion, then if fifty of my colleagues stand with me, the motion ought to be admitted. That is the only point that I submit for your final decision.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is entirely for you to decide, but I do confess that I do not see where the comparison comes in as between what happened here and what happened there. In that place the procedure is different and the suggestion there was made on the lines of your suggestion here—maybe slightly varied—and if you have been pleased to put that question to me, my answer would have been exactly the same at that time, although I did not know what was going to happen there. But if this point is going to be discussed, I suggest that the whole proceedings of yesterday be discussed. I am prepared to discuss it including all that happened here yesterday, the walk-outs, etc

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Will it not be necessary, on a point of information, if the Leader of the House wants to discuss the conduct of some of the Members of the Opposition yesterday, he should table a separate motion for that?

Mr. Speaker: I feel myself rather in an uncomfortable and awkward position. Having failed to induce some agreed course, I think there is only one course open to me. In the meanwhile, I would like to know whether Government agree to the motion being taken up, or they object to it.

Dr. Katju: This motion, Sir? That is to say, to discuss the conduct of Government yesterday?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot really understand what is going to be discussed. I am prepared to discuss the conduct of Government and the Opposition yesterday, because it all hangs together: it cannot be separated. It is obvious. But if you are of the opinion that it should be discussed, we are prepared to abide by your wishes in this matter completely.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): May I submit to you, Sir, that the conduct of Government yesterday is certainly not under fire. Whatever may have been the procedure adopted in the other House, the Ministers are not to be taken to task for that. But if the Opposition is very keen on what happened in Calcutta, that is entirely another issue. So, I beg of you to divide the two things completely.

Mr. Speaker: I think we have sufficiently discussed this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I clarify a point, Sir?

My hon. colleague was not in the other House at all. A message was sent to him at half-past one to his house and he said that if the Chairman so desired he had no objection.

Mr. Speaker: May I then proceed on the assumption that Government have no objection to a discussion of this matter, whatever it is?

Dr. Katju: I have no objection whatsoever to discuss anything, if you so decide.

Mr. Speaker: Our Rules of Procedure say:

"If objection to leave being granted is taken, the Speaker shall request those members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their places..."

If there is objection, I must ask them to rise in their places. If there is no objection I will say straightaway, all right, I fix the time.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): May I submit a point?

The conduct of the Government in the other House is being discussed here by this motion. My point of order is this. Yesterday when an adjournment motion was brought you were pleased to disallow it: there was no fault on the part of Government. Just now you gave a ruling, in reply to a question put by Shri Gadgil, that even the consent of the Ministers cannot

validate a thing which is not otherwise valid. Now, what transpired in this House was perfectly in order and the conduct of Government cannot be questioned, because the procedure adopted was correct. Can a motion which was disallowed yesterday be allowed to be discussed, because it has been allowed in the other House? I want your ruling on that point.

Mr. Speaker: I think there is a misapprehension on the part of the hon. Member who raised the point of order. The real point of this motion is that they complain that the Government behave one way in this House towards Members of this House and in a different way with the other part of Parliament. How far they are right or wrong in doing so, is another matter. Therefore, their contention is that Government deserve some kind of censure. That is how I interpret the motion.

So, I take it that Government have no objection: otherwise I have to ask them to stand.

Dr. Katju: I have no objection, Sir. But it is for you to decide whether you are not going to do something which will create a dangerous precedent, because it has nothing to do with the merits of the happenings in Calcutta.

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to compromise the position of the Chair.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We accept this, Sir. Let us have a full discussion, if you are clear. But as my hon. colleague has pointed out, it is a completely pointless thing and a dangerous thing. But as I see that you are in some difficulty, we accept it and you may fix any time for it.

Mr. Speaker: Ordinarily an adjournment motion is to be taken at four; but this may be taken up at six o'clock.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In that case my hon. colleague may not be here.

Mr. Speaker: In that case let us have the discussion from half-past four to half-past five.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

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

(i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Drugs and Magic Remedies (Objectionable Advertisements) Bill, 1953, which has been passed by the Council of States at its sitting held on the 16th February, 1954."

(ii) "I am directed to inform the House of the People that the Council of States at its sitting held on the 16th February, 1954 has passed the following motion extending the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Special Marriage Bill, 1952:—

MOTION

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide a special form of marriage in certain cases, and for the registration of such and certain other marriages, be extended upto Thursday, the 18th March, 1954."

DRUGS AND MAGIC REMEDIES (OBJECTIONABLE ADVERTISEMENTS) BILL

Secretary: Sir, I lay the Drugs and Magic Remedies (Objectionable Advertisements) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Council of States, on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT RE: COMMONWEALTH FINANCE MINISTERS' CONFERENCE HELD IN SYDNEY

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): With your permission, Sir, I wish to make a statement on the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference held recently at Sydney, which I attended on behalf of the Government of India.

This Conference is one of a series held in recent years with the object of facilitating consultations among Commonwealth countries in regard to the economic policies that should be followed by the Sterling Area countries in order to strengthen their balance of payments and to promote the expansion of world production and trade. The deliberations of the Conference and its conclusions were published in a Press Communiqué in Sydney on the 15th January 1954 and I am laying a copy of it on the Table of the House for the information of hon. Members. [Placed in Library. See No. S-20/54.]

During the period of over a year which had elapsed since the last Conference met in December 1952, there had been an improvement in the balance of payments position of the sterling area. The action taken in the previous years had enabled it to overcome the crisis in its central reserves of gold and dollars and a continuous deficit had been turned into a moderate surplus during 1953. This encouraging result has been achieved by the determined action of member countries in following sound economic policies, internal and external. The essence of these policies is that each country should maximise its production and development and achieve.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no talking, please.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh:...a competitive position in foreign markets so that its exports and balance of payments may be maintained and an expansion of world trade as a whole secured. It is not sufficient for this pur-

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

pose that each country should live within its means—each should strive to live upto its means—in other words, a balance should be struck at the optimum level of production and trade. Moreover, it is not enough for each country to achieve a balance in its external account but the balance has to be achieved at a high level of imports and exports which would secure for the vast population of the areas comprised within the Commonwealth a higher level of consumption, which alone is the test of an improving standard of living.

The Conference paid particular attention to this aspect of the matter. The member countries realised that it was imperative that restrictions on world trade inherited from the war time scarcities should be gradually eliminated. This would result in the strengthening of sterling, the currency in which the countries of sterling area carry on their trade among themselves and with the world at large. The objective is to move towards freer currencies and anything that strengthens sterling would help in the attainment of this objective. At the Conference, the participating countries reaffirmed their faith in this objective and undertook to follow policies which would assist in making this feasible.

The economic development of the various participating countries in the period since the last Conference was reviewed and the Conference felt satisfied that this development was proceeding on a sound basis that would, among other things, assist in strengthening the balance of payments position of the sterling area as a whole. While individual countries were raising the maximum amount of resources for their development, it was realised that there still remained very considerable scope for both mutual assistance inside the Commonwealth and support from outside for ensuring fuller development. The United Kingdom have been making

special efforts to make increased capital available for Commonwealth development from the London market, and with the level of production attained in that country an indication was given at the Conference that some additional capital may be available from that source. This finance would be not only for individual schemes but also for general schemes of development so long as the essential conditions were satisfied.

The Conference reviewed the general prospects of world trade in the context of certain indications of a down-turn in the economy of the United States and the fears expressed in certain quarters of this developing into a large scale recession. On the indices available to it the Conference came to the conclusion, which I believe is substantially correct, that any such recession, if it developed, would be moderate and short and that while the sterling area countries were bound to be affected by such a recession their long-term objectives should not be allowed to be affected by temporary fluctuations. It has also to be remembered that any large-scale recession would affect the economy of the United States nearly as much as it would affect the economy of the countries outside, and that it was not unreasonable to expect that the United States administration would itself take steps to secure that a recession does not lead to a slump. In this view the Conference was greatly encouraged by the United States President's message to Congress delivered about the time the Conference was in session. Since then the report of the Commission appointed by the President to examine the economic policy of the United States has been published....

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): May I ask if the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is doing a right thing in standing between you and the speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I agree; he is not

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: And there are already welcome indications of the extent to which action will follow.

The Conference reaffirmed its support to the general policy of securing the widest possible system of multi-lateral trade and payment, the reduction and progressive elimination of import restrictions and the convertibility of sterling and other important currencies. These require collective action by both debtor and creditor countries. In recent months, the growing confidence in sterling and the increasing strength and flexibility of the sterling area countries had led to some progress towards expanding trade and freeing currencies. The attainment of these objectives, however, depends not merely on the soundness of internal policies of the countries concerned but also on the willingness of trading nations to adopt policies designed to assist the expansion of trade and the availability of adequate financial support from such organisations as the International Monetary Fund. It is obvious, and this was emphasised at the Conference, that we have to work as far as possible through existing international organisations dealing with trade and finance. In this context the functions of GATT and I.M.F. will become increasingly important and the Conference recognised that the rules, procedure and organisation need close examination and review so as to enable them to play a full and effective part. The participating countries agreed that there should be prior consultation among Commonwealth countries in connection with forthcoming review of GATT.

The discussions of the Conference provided an excellent opportunity for a full and frank exchange of views on the various economic problems of the Commonwealth countries represented at it. I believe I am right in saying that all those who attended the meeting came away with the feeling that the last twelve months had been a period of progress and achievement in the sterling area as a whole. We have moved from a period of crisis

to one of reasonable confidence and although there is no justification for any complacency and the efforts of individual countries to increase production and development must continue, the future can be faced with some measure of optimism. While it is true that there is an element of uncertainty in regard to what might happen if any large-scale recession develops I feel that one could look with confidence to the countries outside the sterling area, notably the United States, and international organisations like the International Monetary Fund to do their best to ward off a major set-back which would be a set-back not merely for certain countries but for the world as a whole. So far as our own country is concerned, as I said in this House on my return from the previous Conference, while we help ourselves by implementing our development plans we shall also be helping the Commonwealth and the rest of the world in their approach towards an expansion of world production and trade and a more stable and broad-based international solvency.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): As soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer returned from Sydney, there was a discussion in the House of Commons regarding his report of the Conference. I hope the Government will give us some time so that we could see the points he has raised for a discussion.....

Mr. Speaker: There is no hurry to make a statement just now.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: We have received a communication from an hon. Member of this House and we are considering this matter.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): On a point of information, Sir. Subsequent to this Sydney Conference, a point has arisen affecting the sterling area. A trade agreement with Japan has been signed in London on 19th January and I understand from the *Board of Trade Journal* that the Economic Secretary to the Treasury

[Shri Bansal]

while making a statement in the House of Commons, said:

"There was a review of trade between Japan and the Sterling Area in the light of Japan's heavy balance of payments deficit and acute shortage of Sterling which in the absence of any action would have compelled Japan to impose heavy restrictions on the purchase of Sterling Area goods."

Inasmuch as this new agreement is bound to help the countries—the whole of sterling area—and India being a part of that area, I want to know whether Government of India were consulted by the U. K. Government when this agreement was discussed and signed.

Mr. Speaker: This also will be left over and may come up when the matter is taken up for discussion, because we do not allow any supplementary questions on a Statement made.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

PRESENTATION OF SECOND REPORT

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): I beg to present the second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

STATEMENT RE: SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) FOR 1953-54

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri L. B. Shastri): I beg to present a Statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants for expenditure of the Central Government on Railways for the year 1953-54. [Placed in Library. See No. S-21/54.]

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

DELIMITATION COMMISSION FINAL ORDERS Nos. 5—9

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to lay on the Table, a copy of each of the following Orders, under sub-section (2) of section 9 of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952:—

(i) Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 5, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, dated the 21st December, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-22/54.]

(ii) Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 6, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, dated the 23rd December, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-23/54.]

(iii) Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 7, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, dated the 29th December, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-24/54.]

(iv) Correction to Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 7, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, dated the 18th January, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. S-24/54.]

(v) Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 8, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, dated the 30th December, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-25/54.]

(vi) Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 9, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, dated the 30th December, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-26/54.]

STATEMENTS OF THE STATE-WISE POSITION OF ELECTION PETITIONS

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to lay on the Table, a copy of each of the following statements showing the

State-wise position in respect of the election petitions:

Statement No. I.—Showing the number of election petitions filed before the Election Commission. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

Statement No. II.—Showing the number of election petitions either dismissed by the Commission or permitted by it to be withdrawn. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

Statement No. III.—Showing the number of petitions referred to Election Tribunals for trial, number of petitions disposed of by them and number of petitions pending with them and the Election Commission. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

Statement No. IV.—Showing the number of election petitions disposed of by the Election Tribunals. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

Statement No. V.—Showing the number of petitions pending before the Election Tribunals in respect of General Elections. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

Statement No. VI.—Showing the number of election petitions pending before the Election Tribunals and Election Commission in respect of bye-elections. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

Statement No. VII.—Showing reasons for the delay in the disposal of 19 election petition relating to general elections. [Placed in Library. See No. S-27/54.]

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN RAJPRAMUKH OF SAURASHTRA AND RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): 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 each of the Principal and Supplemental Agreements executed between the Rajpra-

muukh of Saurashtra and the Reserve Bank of India on the 23rd December 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-19/54.]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE SEA CUSTOMS ACT

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, 1878, a copy of each of the following notifications:—

(i) Customs No. 91 dated the 26th November, 1953; and

(ii) Customs No. 92 dated the 26th November, 1953.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-18/54.]

MUSLIM WAKFS BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of Mutawallis' management of them, in India, be further extended upto Saturday, the 6th March, 1954."

The Select Committee has practically completed its labours. But it was decided to redraft the whole Bill so as to make it simpler, and the revised draft consists of about seventy clauses. We have already done fifty-five or sixty of them and only a few remain. Then it has got to be printed. Therefore we are asking for this short adjournment. But it may be possible to present the report even before this date.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of

[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]

fence 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~~ ^{house} 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 Melas 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 today 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 assurances 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 Confession-^al 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 have not been able to function in the

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....

Shri S. S. More: Does that mean something?

Mr. Speaker: It is not to be discussed as an adjournment motion.

Some Hon. Members: It is an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: You may call it by any name you like, but the time-limit is one hour.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): It is an adjournment motion, but the time-limit, with the consent of the House earlier, is only one hour.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever it may be, it makes no difference. Whether you call it as an adjournment motion or any other motion, provided you agree to the time-limit of one hour. I do not mind what description you give to it. But the point is that it being a motion in the nature of censure, I think I cannot permit it to be talked out. There has to be voting at the end of that one hour, and therefore I must limit the speeches as also the number of speakers. As I said earlier, the issue is very much limited. The wider issue as to what happened in this House yesterday or what happened in the other House yesterday, is not an issue before this House for discussion. The issue is, as the hon. Member has said, something which Government ought to have disclosed in this House, but which they did not, or something which they have stated in the other House, but which they did not in this House; therefore, the limited issue before us is the kind of treatment that Government give to this House, and speeches will be restricted only to that. Hon. Members, therefore, need not take a very long time. I propose therefore to allot half an hour to the proposers or to those who want to support the motion, and half an hour for Government to reply, at the end of which, we will go to voting.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I beg to move:

"That the business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., that the Government which is responsible to this House

has yesterday agreed in the Council of States to a discussion of the grave incidents in Calcutta, while, though they were aware of the feelings in this House on this matter, they did not take steps to bring in a motion themselves for such a discussion".

This is a very historic occasion in the life of the present Parliament, this being the first adjournment motion which could get through with the Rules of Procedure. As I have said earlier, and as you very clearly pointed out just now, my motion is a very limited one with a specific implication, and therefore I will not raise any issues relating to the incidents in Calcutta, to what happened yesterday afternoon in this House, and to what happened in the other place.

The one simple reason which prompted me to bring this motion before this House is to demonstrate, beyond a shadow of doubt, that there is lack of co-ordination between the various Ministers of the Council of Ministers, as between the Government on the one side and both Houses of Parliament on the other, and also in relation to the relationships which ought to subsist between this House and the other House. The hon. Leader of the House earlier today revealed that about half past one yesterday, the hon. Home Minister was informed by some means that certain things were going to take place in the Council of States, and as a result of that indication, he seems to have agreed to the procedure sought to be undertaken or enforced in the Council of States. This very simple point—I am certain in my mind, and I am sure hon. Members on either side of the House will not disagree with me on this issue at least—clearly demonstrates that there is not only lack of co-ordination, but also lack of courtesy to you in particular, in regard to the manner in which certain arrangements are sought to be made in the Council of States, and those arrangements are denied in this hon. House. I would like to know from you, with great deference to you, as to whether at any time yesterday,

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

any indication was sought to be made to you as to the manner in which they proposed to deal with adjournment motions both in this House and in the other House. I have taken the care to see that the motion for adjournment given notice of in the other House is exactly identical in form and content to the motion given notice of in this hon. House yesterday morning, but the result is that what the Home Minister and the Leader of the other House agreed to do with regard to the adjournment motion in the Council of States was not made available to this hon. House. That, in substance, is the gravamen of my censure on Government.

You will see also that a very important constitutional and procedural point is involved. As I said earlier this afternoon—and I repeat that now—I am not questioning the ruling you have given yesterday on the adjournment motion in this House. But the point is this. Mr. Chairman in the Council of States said—and I am quoting—

“Though Law and Order and Education are State and not Central subjects, in view of the general feeling on the matter, and in consultation with the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju, as a special case, I allow discussion to be raised on this matter tomorrow at 6 P.M.”

Exactly the same reason was invoked by you yesterday to disallow the motion of my friends to the right here. Government which had agreed to a debate on a question of this character on a motion in the Council of States, which was exactly identical to the motion sought to be moved here yesterday, could have at least informed the Chair. Even if they did not care to inform the Chair, they could have taken that position in this House, even under the existing Rules of Procedure for adjournment motions, to care to make a statement either there and then or at a subsequent stage. You will see that this unfortunately happens to be the case as between the

relations between the Upper and the Lower Houses, and also the relations, as I said earlier, between Government on the one hand, and both the Houses of Parliament on the other.

If only Government moved with a certain sense of responsibility, with a certain sense, shall I say, of dignity towards this House yesterday, and indicated their mind as to the course of action they were proposing to take in the other House, I am certain, the temperature in this House and the incidents that occurred yesterday in this House would not have been there. I feel, as I have said earlier, without going into the merits of the case, this is an affront to this House. It is an affront based upon not only lack of co-ordination, but also—if you will permit me to say without any disregard to the Chair and to this House—contempt of this House.

We have had several such occasions, and I shall presently show that this is not the only such occasion, when Government set about this business of dealing with this House in a cavalier manner. I am going to show here at least three concrete issues. Two of them have figured in the discussions in the last session in this House and the other is still figuring presently on the agenda of this House, and they go to show that the entire approach of the Government of India, and, in other words, of the Council of Ministers here to the House of the People in relation to the Upper House is completely wrong and does not redound to the credit of this hon. House and infringes the rights and privileges of this House.

You would recall that more than a year ago a motion was sought to be placed in this House by no less a person than the Leader of the House himself seeking to associate Members of the Council of States with the Public Accounts Committee of this House. You also recall how, as a result of the first day's debate in May last year, that motion was adjourned, and it took two long sessions for the Government to bring back this motion

which—ultimately—I crave the indulgence of the House for the expression I am going to use and I hope it will not be called unparliamentary—they rammed down the throat of this hon. House.

Secondly, I refer to the motion of my hon. friend the Law Minister relating to Joint Select Committees. It was the so-called Battle of the Houses which was waged last year and again, with the customary majority which is behind the Government, in conjunction with the lack of foresight, lack of attention to first principles, lack of respect for the Constitution and procedure of this House, even that Select Committee motion was pushed down the throat of this hon. House.

Finally, I wish to place before the House the instance regarding the report of the Joint Committee on the payment of salaries and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament. A motion stood on the Order Paper in the name of my hon. friend the Minister of Law on the 15th December, 1953. Actually, this report was published in July, 1952. Neither the report was debated in this House, nor the motion which was actually brought on the Order Paper on the 15th December in this House came to fruition. Yet, Members of the other House are ascribing to themselves the title of M.P. I am not going into those details at this moment. I am trying to direct the attention of the House to the fact of how, without a sense of responsibility, but with the cavalier manner, the unthinking manner, and the utterly irresponsible manner in which Government is dealing with the rights and privileges of this House.

Sir, you very rightly said earlier that this is a censure motion. I intended it to be a censure motion, a censure motion dealing with the manner in which the Government is functioning in this hon. House. I am certain that large numbers of people in this hon. House would press it to a division. It may be recalled that the

moment when you said in your opening remarks, when the motion was to be moved by me, that it is a censure motion involving division, some of my hon. friends were jubilant. I know they have got a vast majority. They have got a vast and muzzling majority. Let them exercise it. But that would not validate a wrong procedure. That would not heighten the prestige and the position of the Government. I would beg of the Leader, whose sense of impartiality and fairness is well-known all over the world, to accept this motion and say that a mistake has been committed. Otherwise, he can defeat us, and we will take the defeat. I place this motion before the House and I leave it to the Leader of the House to accept or reject it.

Shri Raghuramalah (Tenali): I rise to oppose the motion.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Naturally.

Shri Raghuramalah: My friend says, "naturally", but before I conclude I am sure he will say, "reasonably". Just a few minutes before, he made a certain statement which I think practically clinches his issue. He referred to the impartiality of the Leader of the House. Well, I thought that in moving this motion, he just cast a reflection on that impartiality, that the Leader of the House agreed to make a certain statement in the other House which he did not indicate he would make in this House.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Not this Leader; the other Leader.

Shri Raghuramalah: You yourself said that this is a case of joint responsibility. It makes no difference. Whether it is the hon. Law Minister or some other Minister, the Government takes the responsibility for everything that is done. Therefore, it makes no difference. What surprises me is that my friend, who has been on so many occasions coming forward to uphold the dignity of this House, does not seem to go into the facts of the case at all. Well, he was obviously out to find something to argue about.

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

He reminds me of an angler, who was angling for three or four hours but could not catch any fish. But he did not like to go empty-handed and so he caught hold of a few stones and was carrying them in his net. On the way, he was asked: "What is the matter? What are these stones for?" "Well", the angler replied, "I care more for my face than for my stomach. I cannot tell the people that I have come empty-handed, and now I can make a show that I have caught something". My friend reminds me of that.

We on this side of the House are no less particular that the dignity of this House should be maintained. But let it be known that we are also particular that the Constitution must be upheld and particularly the dignity of the Chair must be upheld. I refer to the dignity of the Chair because those who have followed yesterday's proceedings will note one thing, namely, that the hon. Speaker was very particular, and he made it very clear that the motion was entirely out of order. You will forgive me, Sir, if I refer to one or two statements made by the Chair, because that has got a very great bearing on the subject at issue. Your opening words on the motion of Shri H. N. Mukerjee were:

"I think I am very clear in my own mind that such a Motion cannot be consented to in this House. Education is entirely a State subject. It is a matter of law and order."

And then, somebody said: "The military was called in".
Then you said:

"I see a tendency of bringing in Adjournment Motions on everything that happens in any part of the country."

You added—and this is very important:

"Hon. Members must have some idea about the constitutional set-up in this country. Every State has got its own legislature and it

will be wrong, I think, on the part of the Centre to interfere with, and encroach upon, the autonomy of the State."

Then you were good enough to say:

"That is one part of it. Then, as I have said before, in case any information is required, the first and best course is to have a short-notice question."

You have indicated to them the means whereby they could obtain the necessary information from the Government. And you have said also:

"I do not propose to enter into any argument. Anything can be argued, good, bad or indifferent. I am clear in my mind."

After this clear ruling from you, it is beyond me to imagine how the friends opposite, who used so many eloquent words on the prestige of this House, expected the Government, or, for the matter of that, any person in the House to get up and say, "No, Sir; in contravention of your ruling, I propose to say a few words". What happened in Calcutta is within our knowledge. But it is quite a different thing. This House, I say, while particular about its own dignity should also be very particular about the dignity and impartiality of the Chair. And when you have given a clear ruling like that, how could any Minister or any Member of this House get up and say: 'No, no. I am going to make a statement'? That, Sir, was the very difficult position in which, as I understand,—because I was watching yesterday—the Government was placed. That the Chairman in the other House took a different course, consulted the Government and then said that he would allow a discussion, is altogether a different matter. Perhaps, Sir, if I may humbly point out, the same result might have followed, and I have no doubt would have followed, if you were inclined to be generous—over-generous—because, as I say, I am one of those who feel that your ruling has been the best; because situations like this, however horrible to contem-

plate, cannot be discussed on the floor of the House irrespective of the subject matter. We cannot go on trespassing on State rights. Those Members who are particular about the dignity of this House and about the powers of the Centre, should also be particular about the dignity of the other Houses and the powers of the other Governments. If this is a State matter—and entirely a State matter—how can we go on discussing it? Would they not have a perfectly legitimate right to say: 'Well, the Centre has no business to trespass on our rights. The Central Minister has no business to provoke a discussion in Parliament. This is a matter which the Constitution leaves to us entirely'. Therefore, Sir, the Members of the Opposition who expressed so many eloquent words on the dignity and the prestige of this House, should also remember that the State legislatures have also got a dignity, a prestige and a certain position allotted to them under the Constitution. I am not denying—and everybody will bear with me—that every Member of this House feels intensely that a situation like that should have developed in Calcutta, but that is a different matter. As you have rightly pointed out, Sir, we are not going into the merits of that situation.

There is one other matter, Sir, which I would respectfully bring to your notice. It has become a fashion—almost a passion—to bring into question the attitude of this Government, that they are trying to treat this House in a step-motherly fashion. Everytime, in and out, the allegation is made. But when examined hardly anything appears which has even a semblance of justification. They say the Council of States is given precedence. One must remember the circumstances in which each incident occurs. Suppose a few Members of the Council of States go to the railway station and book all the tickets and we do not do anything of the kind. Then we come forward and say: 'This is an affront to us. The Railway Minister is responsible to this House. How can he allot all the seats to the Members of the Council of States'?

Yesterday, Sir, you were good enough to indicate in your ruling that there were other courses open. Instead of an adjournment motion, they could have taken advantage of the new rule which would have allowed them to bring any matter of public importance to your notice; you would have consulted the Minister in charge and then the whole matter would have been explained or some explanation could have been sought. They do nothing of the kind, but bring in an adjournment motion. Then, Sir, you were good enough to give a perfectly harmless ruling; the Government obeys it and I do not see how any question of censure arises. Of course, it is a compliment to this Government that the Opposition, particularly my friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, cannot think of any other ground of censuring the Government than this. It is really a compliment and now and then when censure motions are brought in like this, it only brings into great relief the solid foundations on which this Government is based—that the Opposition has got no other substantial matter on which they could provoke a discussion to censure this Government.

Anyhow, I want to make it clear that in adopting the attitude which the Government have adopted—because I was also sitting in the House then and was watching—there was absolutely no room left for the Government to interfere and offer to make a statement. That would have been, I submit with great respect, an affront to the Chair.

There is only one other matter which I would like to point out. Members opposite who time in and time out go on parading about the dignity of this House, should remember that the conduct of some of them yesterday was certainly not commensurate with the dignity of this House. Those cries of 'shame, shame'.....

An Hon. Member: That is irrelevant.

Shri Raghuramaiah: I am on the dignity of the House. The Motion is on the dignity of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will note that the dignity of the House *vis-à-vis* the Government is the issue. Let us not go into other matters again and complicate the issue today and give room for passion.

Shri Baghuramiah: I accept the ruling of the Chair, as we accepted it yesterday. I shall not go into that matter except to say that so far as I have followed yesterday's debate and the proceedings subsequent thereto, I cannot charge the Government with any guilt as regards the maintenance of the dignity of the House. And I would appeal to you, Sir, that to avoid any such complication as this, perhaps it would be better if you would be so good as to consult the Government in advance—this is purely a matter for your consideration—and eliminate this kind of embarrassment. But so far as the Government is concerned, I submit that there is absolutely no ground for censure in this matter.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, we must approach this question which is of first-class constitutional importance with a more serious mind.

Mr. Speaker: Only ten minutes are left.

Shri S. S. More: Yes, Sir, this Constitution has been framed and it is the Congress Government which is the architect of this Constitution. Now, according to article 75(3), the Council of Ministers is made responsible to the House of the People. Though there are certain articles which have created the Council of States and also another article which has also created the House of the People, we shall ask ourselves the question very seriously why these two Houses have been created. What is the position of the Council of States? What is the function and power of the House of the People? If we ask these questions, and want to go to the spirit, to the root, of the matter, we shall have to go to the constitutional developments in the history of the U.K. I speak without fear of contradiction when I say that this particular structure of our Government was framed mostly after that

prevailing in the U.K. Now, there you will have to take into consideration the constitutional struggle. The House of Lords was there; the Crown was there....

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid he is going into unnecessary background details. The question is a short one—whether the Ministers failed in their duty to this House in not offering to make a statement. That is the only thing.

Shri S. S. More: I am not confining myself to the letter of the Constitution. I am asking the House to take into consideration the spirit of the Constitution. The House of the People is supposed to be the representative House of the People, and in that capacity has been given superior powers under the very Constitution itself. The Council of States has a purpose which is of a very revising nature. The very constitutional issue that crops up in this matter is: to whom is this Council of Ministers mainly responsible if they had to offer any explanation, if they were to consent, that this matter needs some discussion, and as a matter of fact, give their consent that the matter should be discussed in the other House? It is to this House. This position has been conceded. I am speaking collectively and not of particular Ministers. But this fact has been now automatically conceded. It cannot now be contradicted that as far as the other House is concerned they concede 'Well, this is a matter which needs some discussion and we are prepared to place our facts before that particular House'. If there is any House which deserves priority, which deserves authority, which deserves first claim, my submission is that it is that House of the People. If they came to that conclusion there, that what happened in Calcutta needed some explanation, needed some discussion on the floor of the Council of States, it is much more urgently needed on the floor of this House because we are directly responsible to the people and in that context we cannot discharge our responsibility unless the Council of Ministers submit their case and their explanation to this House primarily.

The Constitution makes a discrimination, but that discrimination is in favour of this House. Certain powers have been given to this House alone and not to the Council of States. But, unfortunately, in this case, Sir, the responsible Ministers have discriminated against this House and in favour of a House which has a subordinate position. That is my contention. On this contention I argue and I maintain that there is a serious negligence, serious overlooking of the responsibility of the Ministers to this House, serious overlooking of the rights and privileges of this House, and therefore, I say that they do need some censure at the hands of this House.

5. P.M.

Sir, I do not want to go into the constitutional history but the real point is this. You will permit me to make one quotation because these questions were also frequently discussed on the floor of the House of Commons and I can, with some profit, quote one relevant extract from the speech of Mr. Asquith, who led this controversy. He refers to the different stages of the controversy between the House of Lords and the House of Commons and after narrating the links in that controversy, he sums up the position like this.

"I say that for the simple ground: you cannot have two Kings in Britain, you cannot have two masters to whom the Executive Government of this country is at one and the same time to be responsible. If you once establish the principle, the doctrine, that the House of Lords could control finance by the rejection of the Budget of the year and thereby paralyse the Executive Government of the day, then the responsibility of the Executive Government to this House becomes a shadow and a sham, and you might just as well revive the whole paramount power and ascendancy of the Crown itself. If there is any principle which we thought, until these recent discus-

sions, had been well established and firmly rooted in our constitutional system. It was the responsibility of the Executive Government to the House of Commons and to the House of Commons alone. That principle is involved in this Resolution, and it is upon that ground that I ask the House to accept it."

This quotation sums up the whole history of the struggle between those two Houses. When we create two Houses, naturally, we sow the seed for discord, for a sort of rivalry for power between those two Houses, and if such sort of rivalry comes to the surface, as a matter of fact, then the rights and privileges of this House must predominate; they must have the sole and exclusive ground in the matter. Therefore, I say, Sir, I am not questioning your ruling here, I am accepting that your ruling was perfectly clear as far as the motion was concerned—but the Minister concerned, by accepting the discussion could have raised the same points that this is a matter which is in the jurisdiction of the State Government and the Council of States had no right to go into the matter. By conceding that they were prepared to discuss the matter on the floor of that House, they have slighted not only your ruling but the paramount privileges of this House. Therefore, Sir, this Government needs some censuring.

Mr. Speaker: I think I shall now call upon Mr. Chatterjee. There are only ten minutes now. Then I want to call the Leader of the House.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): I think that the real issue should not be clouded. We need not go into the constitutional history of other countries. But the fact is that there has been discrimination on the part of Government between the two Houses of Parliament. That is deplorable, that is regrettable. Nothing should be done by anybody to bring about any conflict between the two Chambers in a bicameral constitution and it is most regrettable—and I add most reprehensible—that Government is doing

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

something which is dramatising the conflict between the two Houses of Parliament. They could have easily come forward with their attitude. How is it that the Law Minister, the Leader of the Council of States, says that the Government is willing and our Ministers here sit dumb and mute and do not stand up and say that they are also equally anxious to place facts?

Sir, the situation is very serious in Calcutta. There has been bloodshed, there has been large-scale disturbance: military has been brought out, people have been killed. Naturally, the whole country is anxious. It is our right, it is our duty, as a democratic elected Chamber, to get facts, get elucidation, to get some statement from the Government. How is it that the army was called out? This is a very serious matter. In this state of things, the Law Minister was perfectly right, as the Leader of the Upper House, to say that the Government is anxious to take the Upper House into confidence. But, what I find is that they are riding a high horse so far as the House of the People is concerned and they are very amiable, decent and gentle so far as the Upper House is concerned. That is not right; that is not proper.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Perhaps, the Members there are more vigilant.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; let him proceed.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am sorry that Mr. Tyagi's intervention is most inappropriate. They are not more vigilant. We are certainly equally vigilant, if not more vigilant. You are not courteous enough, you are not decent enough, you are not assiduous enough in the discharge of your elementary duties. What is most deplorable is that this Government is behaving in a peculiar manner in the two places. What is most deplorable is that they are singing in two tones. At one place, they say, we shall place all the facts; at the other place, there is a regrettable reluctance to come out

with facts and to have a scrutiny by the democratic Chamber. Really, if there is any question of placing facts, if there is any question of taking the people's representatives into confidence, this was the proper place. This thing has been enacted on other occasions also. I will not repeat old history. But, I will tell them, in their own interests they ought to jump at the opportunity, they ought to have come forward with alacrity and ought to have said that they want to place facts before the House, that they want to take the House into confidence and say what steps have been taken to bring about a reconciliation between the elements which are functioning in the City of Calcutta. Certain steps have been taken. If those steps had been taken earlier, possibly, bloodshed could have been avoided. But, we want to know from the Government what their attitude is; have they anything to say, any plan or programme on the important issues? We want to know that. It is our duty to ask the Government to take us into confidence before they go to the Upper House and say something. I say, Sir, that it is in their interests that they ought to have utilised that opportunity. It is in the interests of the country, it is in the interests of Bengal, it is in the interests of the whole of India that they ought to have come forward and said that they seize the opportunity, rather than take up this attitude. It is this conflict that is deplorable; it is this discrimination, deliberate and conscious on the part of Government, which is regrettable. I say, that it is a deliberate, conscious and wilful discrimination between the two Houses in their approach to a very vital matter affecting the country and they deserve opprobrium, censure and admonition. They should certainly express their regret and say that they would not behave in this manner, whatever may be the result of the division—and we know what is going to happen. But, in the interests of the country, which is predominant, sectional loyalty should be subordinated, party alignment

should be forgotten and we should all stand up for the prestige, honour and dignity of the House and also the welfare of the entire nation. We should ask that this sort of thing should not be repeated in future and there should be no discrimination in favour of the Upper House.

Mr. Speaker: I want to call upon the hon. Minister at 5-15. Will fifteen minutes be sufficient for him?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I would call Mr. Ramaswamy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Sir, I would like to speak for five minutes because my name has been mentioned in this debate.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow him if he will finish in five minutes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Sir, it is impossible to finish in five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I said in the beginning that I will give half an hour to the Opposition and half an hour to the Government. Three Members have spoken on behalf of the Opposition and only one has spoken on behalf of Government and I am giving a chance to another Member. I will give one more chance to the Opposition if he will finish it within five minutes and then I will call upon the hon. Minister at 5-15 P.M.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I shall speak only for five minutes. My name has been mentioned so often.

Mr. Speaker: I will give him a chance if he does not take up any time now in arguing.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): My friend, Mr. Raghuramaiah said that there is no substance at all in the adjournment motion or the motion of censure. I go a step further. Not only does it lack substance, but it lacks straightforwardness, if not honesty of purpose. The gravamen of the charge,

as my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram said, was that there was discrimination between the two Houses, that there was cavalier treatment to this House, a sort of a step-motherly treatment, while all favours were shown to the other House. I ask you in all earnestness, why did he not bring in a motion of no-confidence? What is the motion now before the House? The motion has not been read before the House. With your kind permission, I will read it.

Mr. Speaker: The motion was read before the House.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Then, I will read the last few lines that 'they did not take steps to bring in a motion themselves for such a discussion'. Now what is the charge? It is that the Government did not themselves come with a motion for adjournment. What is there in this charge to be discussed? As Dr. Katju said, it was really a discussion between you and Mr. Mukerjee and there was no time or opportunity for the Government to intervene or butt in saying "I come forward with a statement", and it will be wholly out of order. My friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram was waxing eloquent with regard to the question of Public Accounts Committee and the Joint Select Committee and so on. In all seriousness if he had a grouse, if he felt, as he says now, that the thing was being rammed down the throat of this House by means of a steam-roller majority, I ask him this question—did he call for a division then? Did he raise a little finger against the measure being passed without a vote? What did he do then?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The House divided and the vote was recorded. My hon. friend did not know it; perhaps he ran away from the House then.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: No, Sir, I was here.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I got 27 votes.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: The manner in which the motion has been brought

[Shri S. V. Ramaswamy]

does not help anyone of the Opposition either. They could have, for instance, catalogued a list of occasions on which the Government made invidious distinctions between the two Houses, as Shri Chatterjee said. If they had such a catalogue and then called for a debate, instead of surreptitiously raising the question of censure on the Government...

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Is that expression Parliamentary?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Perfectly Parliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: Let him not argue it.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Now, the charge is that they failed in their duty to make a mention of it in this House. As I said, there are other procedures. They could have asked for a statement themselves according to the procedure of the House and they could have called for papers and they could have asked for a statement and Dr. Katju or any hon. Minister of the Cabinet would have certainly come forward with it. What is the peculiar benefit or pleasure that they derive by making a statement there and not here? They know, as hon. Members opposite are well aware, that under article 75(3) of the Constitution they are responsible to this House and they are not forgetful of it. They cannot forget it even for a moment. The Opposition have not taken care to see that they acted in a dignified manner—how did they behave yesterday? It was in a most undignified manner that they staged their walk-out, crying 'shame, shame' etc. Let them follow the rules of procedure. Why can't they go to your Chamber and ask for information? My point is that they acted in a manner which is not in conformity with the dignity of this House. I strongly oppose this motion and I have no doubt that the House will throw it out with a thumping majority.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Unfortunately for my voice, which the Prime Minis-

ter says, is very loud, I have to speak so often in the House that I am pretty well sick of the sound of it, but I must speak because my name has been brought in. I think I can certainly justify the adjournment motion which has been placed before the House. What exactly did happen yesterday? I gave notice of an adjournment motion. Copies of that motion were sent to the Minister concerned and to the Secretary of the House as well as, of course, to the Speaker. I saw the Speaker before the House met. I tried to ascertain from him, if I possibly could, what his views were in regard to the matter. It was in performance of an indubitable right of every Member of the House that I brought in an adjournment motion. I was undertaking, of course, the risk that the adjournment might be ruled out of order, but I thought that that was the only expeditious way of bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the country. I am not interested in driving a wedge between the two Houses or entering into a competition with the other House. I am not even going to say that Government discriminated in favour of the other House and against us. I only say that Government shows itself to be absolutely insensitive and unresponsive to the anxiety which was felt by this House and the country. I say this because an adjournment motion was brought in and normally what happens is that the Chair sometimes asks the Government to say something if it has anything to say in regard to the matter. Obviously, in regard to this matter, Government has a hell of a lot to say. On this occasion, however, Government in this House chose not to say a syllable. There was a kind of a talk between you and myself, and I was trying, to put it in my own words, to see whether you could be persuaded to change your mind.—not to give, what I consider, a rigid, technical, literal interpretation of the rules, but to give a creative interpretation of the rules which would enable the House to take into consideration problems which were agitating the people of

the country. That was the point between you and myself, but all the time Government was keeping mum. We did not have the ghost of a notion at that time that in the other House Government had agreed, by prior consultation with the Chairman or otherwise, to make a statement and to permit that House to have a discussion. That shows that Government did have some material on which they certainly were prepared to have a discussion, not immediately, but after a certain period. If any suggestion of that sort had come from Government, naturally the adjournment motion would have stood over and possibly you would have agreed to the adjournment motion not being there but merely having a discussion. That was the reason why I went to you in order to ascertain what was going to happen if my adjournment motion comes off. Government behaved in this absolutely irresponsible fashion—and this is not the first time either. We know that on another occasion when there was firing in Calcutta, we had a good deal of difficulty in getting Government ultimately to agree to a short discussion in the House. This shows how Government is insensitive and unresponsive to the needs of the people and their sufferings, and that is why I brought in an adjournment motion. There was then an allegation that I behaved in a manner which is not in conformity with the dignity of the House. You yourself gave a ruling and when a point of order was raised by my hon. friend Shri Algu Rai Shastri who said that I was out of order in saying something which I should not have said, you said that I had every right to make a submission with a view to persuading you to change your mind. Unfortunately, your mind was not changed. The charge of undignified behaviour comes now. After your ruling went against us, we left the House. I think we know how to behave ourselves in this House and you will concede that our behaviour has always been with a sense of dignity and with the idea that the Chair has got to be respected. But yesterday what happened was that

after you gave that ruling, it was impossible for us, believe it or not, to apply our minds to whatever proceedings were pending in the House and that was why we walked out, but walk-out is a completely parliamentary procedure. If the Leader of the House or anybody else for that matter says that I was guilty of disrespect to the House or that I deserved to be castigated by further measures, surely, Sir, under the rules you have the right to name me and take whatever action you think fit in the circumstances. But I do resent all sorts of people, including the Leader of the House, coming up and saying that we indulge in undignified behaviour. I say on the contrary, that Government behaviour in the House in regard to a matter which is agitating the people, particularly of Calcutta and Bengal, was undignified, unresponsive and unworthy, and that is exactly the reason why I want the House to pass the adjournment motion because it is a way of censuring the Government. I need not refer to what was said frivolously by my stalwart friend from Andhra and somewhat unintelligibly by my hon. friend from Tamilnad. I only want to say that Government was absolutely turning a deaf ear to the voice of the country and indeed the anguished voice of the people of Bengal whom we seek to represent. I say, of course, that when we are in indignation, when the coals of anger glow in our hearts, we do not proportionately measure our steps in the manner in which Mr. Somebody from Salem would like us to do. That is why I support the adjournment motion.

Dr. Katju: Sir, I shall speak with some restraint. While I completely repudiate all the allegations of discrimination and other charges which have been made against me or the Government of trying to ignore this House, I say at the very outset that as a Member of this House, the dignity and the status of this House is as dear to me as to any Member sitting on the opposite Benches. I would rather—I do not want to use what you may call exaggerated language—cut off my

[Dr. Katju]

hand before I do anything which is derogatory to the status and dignity of this House, because it is the sovereign Parliament of India. If I had been conscious of any error committed by me yesterday I would have been the first to apologise and to say I am sorry for it.

I have thought over the matter over and over again. What has happened? Let me first tell you what actually happened in the other House, so that any vagueness might be removed. In the other House under the Rules, there is a procedure about a motion for adjournment on certain grounds. As you know, there is also a procedure for a motion for papers. There is also a procedure—I do not know whether they have got any rule or not, but they have developed it—to have a discussion. The Chairman may allow a discussion without any motion, without any voting, without anything, on any matter of general interest.

Mr. Speaker: The procedure is the same in this House. We have the same rules for this House also.

Dr. Katju: I do not know whether they have got any rule there in the Council of States, as we have got here. For instance, we had a general discussion about Ordinances here.

Now, I was shown at halfpast one, yesterday before I was coming to the House here, a copy of a motion for papers. A motion of adjournment leads to voting upon it. We are all familiar with that procedure. The Secretary came to my house, showed it to me and asked what I had to say. Well, I said that if the Rules permit it and if the Chairman grants it there would be an end of the matter. Now, I did not go to that House at all. My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram has read to you the relevant portions from the proceedings of the Council of States. It appears that the Chairman of the Council of States did not allow that motion for papers at all. There was no question of a motion for adjournment.

The House will allow me to read these three sentences. What he said was:

"In view of the general opinion on the matter, and in consultation with the Leader of the House and Dr. Katju, '(I have told you what my part was)', as a special case I allow a discussion to be raised on this matter tomorrow at 6 P.M."

No question of any motion for papers, or any motion for adjournment,—just a general discussion which you may now allow under the rules that you have framed on "a matter of general public interest, or urgent public importance". The difference is this. When you allow this general discussion as we had it two days ago on the Ordinances, as you yourself pointed out, there is no question of censure, no question of voting, nothing. I was not aware when I was sitting here as to what had actually transpired in the Council of States.

Now, when this motion was taken up yesterday—it may be by mistake—you never turned to this direction. I am not blaming you—I do not want to bring you into the discussion at all. You at once said that according to your comprehension of it, this motion was completely out of order. You said that there are other ways of raising a discussion on this subject—by a short notice question, or a general discussion. A motion for adjournment has some technical importance—it raises a discussion for two hours, solid, the House divides and votes are taken. You were pleased to say that for a variety of reasons it was out of order. Having indicated your preliminary view you asked my hon friend to say whether he had anything to say to justify that motion. Where was I to intervene? I thought it would have been impertinent on my part to get up at that time and to say: "No no, Sir, my hon. friend may raise a general discussion" and so on. Well, he answered your questions. I am not going into his voice, or into his

manner. It is not for me to discuss that. The discussion was carried on. I think he spoke for about five or ten minutes. You heard him at length and pronounced your ruling. What was I to do; where was I to come in? You indicated to my hon. friend that there were other methods of raising a discussion on this matter. But he did not take advantage of it. My hon. friend got into a temper—I withdraw that—let us say he got into some sort of a very affectionate feeling. He said he could not remain in this House and they walked away. I do not know whether the slogans which they raised were in keeping with the dignity of the House, or on the other hand my conduct. We are conducting formal business here. Supposing the adjournment motion had been ruled out by you. My hon. friend could easily have said: Would you allow us a general discussion just like the discussion on the ordinances? If I had then said: "No, no, we do not want to discuss it at all" then you might have blamed me; you might have blamed the Government.

So far as the Calcutta incidents are concerned, my heart bleeds as much as theirs do—perhaps much more. I am speaking with a feeling of sensitiveness on this matter. I have spent three years of my life there. It is all very good to make politics out of it. But what was I to do? Here is this motion. What is the charge against me? The charge is having—

"agreed in the Council of States to a discussion of the grave inci-

dents in Calcutta, while though they were aware of the feelings in this House on this matter, they did not take steps to bring in a motion themselves for such a discussion."

That is the motion which the House is discussing today. Let us be quite clear about it. While their motion was completely out of order yesterday and your ruling was absolutely correct, it is said that recognising or appreciating the very bitter and angry and glowing feelings on the part of the Opposition, I should have stood up myself and said: "Mr. Speaker, will you please allow me to make a motion for a discussion of this subject?" I do not want to go into the technical aspect of it. It would have been unprecedented motion—never heard of it in my life. Here is May's Parliamentary Practice. My hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee, is a great lawyer, much greater than myself. Let him find out any single precedent in his favour. I do not want to go into the matter any further. It is half-past five. I am really surprised and am pained, while we are having a discussion on the President's Address—that is a very important matter—that discussion should be interrupted in this manner on these matters which are of comparatively little importance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am putting the motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn".

The House divided: Ayes 66, Noes 259

AYES

[Division No. 1]

Achal, Shri
Amjad Ali, Shri
Anandchand, Shri
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Boovaraghasamy, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chowdhury Shri C. R.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.

Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Deo, Shri R. N. S.
Deogam, Shri
Deshpande, Shri G. H.
Gam Malludora, Shri
Gidwani, Shri
Girdhari Bhoi, Shri
Gupta, Shri Sadhan
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
Jalpal Singh, Shri

[5.30. P. M.]

Jaisooria, Dr.
Jayaraman, Shri
Kachiroyer, Shri
Kamal Singh, Shri
Kandasamy, Shri
Kripalani, Acharya
Krishnaswami, Dr.
Mathuram, Dr.
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Menon, Shri Damodara
Missir, Shri V.

More, Shri S. S.
Mukerjee Shri H. N.
Muniswamy, Shri
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Nanadas, Shri
Pandey, Dr. Natabar
Raghavachari, Shri
Raghavaiah, Shri
Ramasami, Shri M. D.
Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
Rao, Dr. Rama

Rao, Shri K. S.
Rao, Shri P. R.
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Rao, Shri Mohana
Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal
Reddi, Shri B. Y.
Reddi, Shri Ramachandra
Reddy, Shri R. N.
Rishang Keishing, Shri
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Sharma, Shri Nand Lal

Singh, Shri R. N.
Sinha, Th. Jugal Krishore
Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Swamy, Shri N. R. M.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Tulsidas, Shri
Vallatharas, Shri
Veeraswamy, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achint Ram, Lala
Agarwal, Shri S. N.
Agarwal, Shri H. L.
Agrawal, Shri M. L.
Ajit Singh, Shri
Akarpur, Sardar
Alagesan, Shri
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Ansari, Dr.
Asthana, Shri
Ayyangar, Shri M. A.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balmiki, Shri
Bansal, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Babu, Shri A. K.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhandari, Shri
Bharati, Shri G. S.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhartiya, Shri S. R.
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bhonsle, Shri J. K.
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Bogawat, Shri
Borooh, Shri
Bose, Shri P. C.
Brohmo-Choudhury, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandak, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Churak, Th. Lakshman Singh
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri G. L.
Chaudhuri, Shri R. K.
Chavda, Shri
Chettiar, Shri T. S. A.
Chinaria, Shri
Choudhuri, Shri M. Shaffee
Dabhi, Shri
Damar, Shri
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B. K.

Das, Shri Beli Ram
Das, Shri K. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Das, Shri S. N.
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri S. C.
Desai, Shri K. K.
Desai, Shri K. N.
Deshmukh, Shri C. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Deshpande, Shri G. H.
Dholakia, Shri
Dhulekar, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dube, Shri U. S.
Dubey, Shri R. G.
Dutt, Shri A. K.
Dutta, Shri S. K.
Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Ebenezer, Dr.
Fotedar, Pandit
Gadgil, Shri
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganpati Ram, Shri
Garg, Shri R. P.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Ghulam Qader, Shri
Gopi Ram, Shri
Gounder, Shri K. P.
Govind Das, Seth
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Badshah
Hari Mohan, Dr.
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hyder Husein, Ch.
Iyyani, Shri B.
Jain, Shri N. S.
Jajware, Shri
Jayashri, Shrimati
Jena, Shri K. C.
Jena, Shri Niranjan
Jhunjhunwala, Shri
Joshi, Shri Jethalal
Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
Joshi, Shri M. D.

Joshi, Shri N. L.
Jwala Pras
Kajrolkar, Shri
Karmarkar, Shri
Kasliwal, Shri
Katju, Dr.
Keshavaiengar, Shri
Kekar, Dr.
Khedkar, Shri G. B.
Khongmen, Shrimati
Khuda Baksh, Shri M.
Kirolikar, Shri
Kolay, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Kureel, Shri P. L.
Lakshmayya, Shri
Lal, Shri R. S.
Lallanji, Shri
Laskar, Shri
Lingam, Shri N. M.
Mahodaya, Shri
Majhi, Shri R. C.
Majithia, Sardar
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malliah, Shri U. S.
Malvia, Shri B. N.
Masuriya Din, Shri
Maydeo, Shrimati
Mehta, Shri B. G.
Mishra, Shri Bibhut
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mishra, Shri Lokenath
Mishra, Shri M. P.
Misra, Shri B. N.
Misra, Shri R. D.
Mohd. Akbar, Sofi
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Muthukrishnan, Shri
Nanda, Shri
Narasimhan, Shri C. R.
Naskar, Shri P. S.
Natawadkar, Shri
Natesan, Shri

Nathwani, Shri N. P.
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Palchoudhury, Shrimati Ila
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pannalal, Shri
 Paragi Lal, Ch.
 Perekh, Dr. J. N.
 Parikh, Shri S. G.
 Pataskar, Shri
 Patel, Shri B. K.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Pathriker, Dr.
 Patil, Shri Kanavade
 Patil, Shri Shankargauda
 Pawar, Shri V. P.
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Prasad, Shri H. S.
 Rachiah, Shri N.
 Radha Raman, Shri
 Raghubir Sahai, Shri
 Raghubir Singh, Ch.
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Rahman, Shri M. H.
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Ram Das, Shri
 Ram Saran, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramanand Shastri, Swami
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Sesagiri
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reddy, Shri Janardha

Reddy, Shri Viswanatha
 Richardson, Bishop
 Roy, Shri Bishwa Nath
 Sahaya, Shri Syamnandan
 Sahu, Shri Bhagbat
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Sardar A. S.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sanganna, Shri
 Sarmah, Shri Debeswar
 Satish Chandra, Shri
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Sewal, Shri A. R.
 Shah, Shri C. C.
 Shah, Shri R. N.
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. R.
 Sharma, Shri R. C.
 Shivananjappa, Shri
 Shobha Ram, Shri
 Shukla, Pandit B.
 Siddananjappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar
 Singh, Shri M. N.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Dr. S. N.
 Sinha, Shri A. P.
 Sinha, Shri Anirudha
 Sinha, Shri G. P.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha, Shri Nageshwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan

Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Snatak, Shri
 Sodhia, Shri K. C.
 Somana, Shri N.
 Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Suresh Chandra, Dr.
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
 Syed Ahmed, Shri
 Syed Mahmud, Dr.
 Tandon, Shri
 Telikar, Shri
 Tewari, Sardar R. B. S.
 Thimmaiah, Shri
 Tivary, Shri V. N.
 Tiwari, Pandit B. L.
 Tiwari, Shri R. S.
 Tiwary, Pandit D. N.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Tripathi, Shri V. D.
 Tyagi, Shri
 Uikay, Shri
 Upadhyay, Pandit Munishwar Datt
 Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Dayal
 Upadhyay, Shri S. D.
 Vaishnav, Shri H. G.
 Vaishya, Shri M. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Varma, Shri B. R.
 Verma, Shri M. L.
 Vijaya Lakshmi, Shrimati
 Vyas, Shri Radhelal
 Wilson, Shri J. N.
 Wodeyar, Shri
 Zaidi, Col.

The Motion was negatived

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the debate on the President's Address.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I am purposely waiting, so that when the turmoil subsides I shall begin. (*Interruption.*)

I was trying to convince this House that it has become a patent fact that the Communist Party of India tries to fish in troubled waters. Perhaps I am under-estimating them. They have made it their profession to indulge in violence—and what is worse—at the

instigation and instruction of a foreign Power. Recently what they have decided in Madura and what is going to come true and the spectacle which we are seeing in Calcutta as well in this House is sufficient to prove which line they are going to adopt now. They have seen that parliamentary methods are not for them. That is not the way they can achieve their purpose. In that way they do not fit in in this atmosphere of democracy. They do not fit in in this atmosphere of peace and non-violence. They have a different philosophy and that is why there is a demand in the whole country today, as to why, when these people instigate violence, when so many innocent lives are lost as they are being lost even today in Calcutta, this party should not

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

be banned. Some Members have decided to leave Parliament and to begin their subversive work with more energy and to devote all their time to that. Before they are going to leave this House, they want to create a spectacle which is going to lower the prestige, honour and dignity, not only of the Speaker, but of the House and the country as a whole. But, we should not allow them to do so. As I have said from the very beginning, the abusive language they use whenever they have to obey the Speaker cannot be tolerated even in a wild country. I think, perhaps, in a wild atmosphere, the behaviour would be much better than what they have shown here. The most eloquent was Mr. H. N. Mukerjee, the professor of abusive languages, when he referred to certain matters about this Pentagon-Pakistan Pact. Sir, in this case we have to see and we have to study them correctly and dialectically according to their method. According to that method, very often when they say 'yes' that means 'no' and whenever they say 'no' that means 'yes'. In their vocabulary, whenever they speak about peace the whole world knows it definitely that they mean war. When they speak about war-mongers, it is certainly known that it is something which is going to check trouble. When we see it in this light, we also find that they have definite reasons to be joyous, to be very glad about this Pentagon-Pakistan Pact, and they are actually very glad about it. We do not care for their crocodile tears or their hypocrisy in talking. The party of the same people instigated violence in Calcutta, committed murders and they have the cheek to come to this House and to talk on behalf of the People of Bengal.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Dr. Ram Rao (Kakinada): On a point of order, Sir. (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members whenever they speak and make any reference to Members of this House, will kindly dissociate themselves from any other thing that may be alleged

against any party in general. Therefore, hon. Members need not say that Members who committed murders come to this House. Persons who committed murders are different from Members who come to this House.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: When I refer to Members, I mean their party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all right. But hon. Members must be careful in saying that the very same Persons who committed murders have come to this House.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I mean members of the same party. They go to Calcutta, indulge in violence and people of the same party come here and they talk about peace.

Dr. Rama Rao: A point of order, Sir. (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I am anticipating the point of order. It is not necessary for the hon. Member to say that the very same persons who go and instigate violence come back here in this House. Is not that party big enough and some members of that party may indulge in violence?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Let it be that way. Let it be 'belonging to the same party'. That is what I intended to emphasise.

Dr. Rama Rao: The hon. Member made a defamatory statement against a party which is represented here and continues to make further defamatory statements. (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. A point of order has been raised. Why don't you observe the Rules of Procedure here? The point of order is that no defamatory statements must be made on the floor of the House. Now, any hon. Member who makes a defamatory statement is not punishable for defamation, but he should not make such statements unless he has sufficient reasons. I am sure all parties in the country are represented in this House. Therefore, defamatory statements should not be made unless there is some reasonable grounds for making those statements.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Yes. Not only reasonable grounds, but I have definite documents in my hands. Perhaps I will read them because I read certain portions from those documents when I began my speech, and since no Member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party is here, perhaps the other Members are not aware of that document because this document was sent to the Central Committee only.

Shri R. N. Reddy (Nalgonda): A point of order, Sir.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: You are a member, then you must have received this document.

Shri R. N. Reddy: Sir, I want to make it clear that it is a tissue of lies.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Then, perhaps, your name will also be here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will look at me and speak.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Sir, whatever time is lost on this point of order, I will request you to give me as extra time because it is not due to my fault that I lost this much time.

What I am expressing here is the voice of the country as a whole. *(Interruption.)*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We are hearing both America and Russia here. Let there be no interruption.

Dr. Rama Rao: He is making a defamatory statement against the Communist party. *(Interruption.)*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no, no. I am afraid, hon. Members are losing patience when something which is not to their taste is said on one side of the House. In this House both sides are represented, otherwise all of them would have been on the left or right. Therefore, hon. Members must be a little more 'thick-skinned' when they make accusations. They should not only give but take also.

So far as the document is concerned, there is no good again and again say-

ing that it is a forgery or otherwise. The hon. Member has got a printed paper. I will allow hon. Members to say what they did at Madurai. It is a democratic Constitution where we can convert the majority into a minority. Therefore, crying out or interrupting while an hon. Member is speaking will only make me give more and more time to the hon. Member. Therefore, I expect both sides of the House to observe this decorum and not interrupt when other Members are speaking except in cases where they use language unparliamentary or absolutely defamatory without any foundation. Such matters can be brought before me and I am here to check all that. Otherwise the smoothness of the debate must be allowed to proceed.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Thank you, Sir. What I was going to drive at is this. Here in my hand I have a document which speaks about the tactical line of the party. These instructions were sent just before the Madurai conference of the Communists from Moscow.

Dr. Rama Rao: A point of order, Sir. How is this relevant to the President's Address?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Every hon. Member must sit down when I am standing. This is quite relevant. In the President's Address many things have been said. He wants to say that there are unsociable elements in this country and they must be put down. That is what he exactly means.

6 P.M.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I realise my responsibility and I am speaking on the President's Address. The President has justly and correctly warned us against a certain danger and a very important danger—that is the Communist menace to this country and in that connection I am speaking. I am reading from this document. It definitely says:

"These 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."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He must place it on the Table of the House.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I shall do so after reading it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It may be a bloodless revolution.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: No. It must be a bloody one. I shall read the second part where it says:

"It is necessary that while utilising all legal possibilities..."

i.e. Parliament etc.—

"...the existing illegal apparatus of the Party is strengthened enormously."

The third part refers to violence. It says:

"Partisan war must be one of the major weapons in our armoury as in the case of all colonial countries."

I do not think people here understand the expression "partisan war". It comes from Russian. It really means guerilla warfare. The use of this expression also indicates that this whole thing is directed from Moscow and from nowhere else. This word is not used in the English Army. It is used in the Russian Army.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): And the Chinese Army.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Yes. The document continues:

"But this weapon alone cannot ensure victory. It has to be combined with the other major weapons—that of strikes of the working class, general strike and uprising in the cities led by armed detachment of the working class."

This is what is happening in Calcutta. The document continues:

"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 workers uprising in the cities."

The next point deals with the results expected. You must read this statement minutely. It says:—

"With hundreds of streams of partisan struggles merging with the general strikes and uprising of the workers in the cities, the enemy 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."

I now place this document on the Table of the House.

I have got some other documents also. This is a very important question. There is a menace. There is a change of tactics at Madura. It is at a very significant point, because the Communist Party always adjusts itself according to the dictates of Soviet foreign policy. Since last summer when I myself visited Berlin, Poland and several other East European countries, I saw that the Soviets were facing a very dangerous threat from the West, from the NATO forces, because there was turmoil throughout Eastern Europe. Even a beginner in strategy knows that if there is any threat to Moscow from a military point of view, it can only be from Berlin or from Eastern Europe. There is no other way. This has been the lesson of the Second World War, and a great lesson. But in order to divert the forces of the Western Powers to other sectors, Moscow always tries that they disintegrate and shift their forces from one sector to another. In this connection, they have been trying their best to shift those forces or to force the Western bloc to shift their forces from the West towards the Asiatic sector with which we are definitely concerned, and which is our home.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that the reason for the U.S. Pact with Pakistan?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Yes, Sir. I will read it. The Soviets have been working and trying to lure the Western bloc forces as far as possible from Western Europe towards the Asiatic sector. Here, as a proof I have a document published in Moscow. It is published in nine very important languages of the world. Since this House understands English well, I have an English copy in my hand. This was published in June 1951.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: In Moscow. I shall read it. Dated 12 Kalashny Pereulek, Arbat, Moscow. U.S.S.R. Editor: V Berezin. It is a very important document. If we want to understand from a military point of view the implications of the Pentagon-Pakistan pact, we have to go to the very root of it. In that connection, this document is very valuable. It reads:

".....penetration of American agents in Northern Kashmir, particularly in Gilgit.....an American military mission had arrived in the northern areas of Kashmir to study the locality and meteorological conditions with a view to building air bases there. The mission which included some 50 experts on air field construction in mountainous regions, arrived in the middle of March and set to work at once. Its chief purpose was to survey and chart the Gilgit area. It had three air planes with Pakistan identification marks at its disposal. The members of the mission had been given permission to fly freely over any part of Pakistan territory, and the Pakistan Government had given secret instructions to the military authorities to render it every assistance."

In this connection, a letter recently received by *New Times* from one of its readers in Gilgit merits attention.

And that document says:

"Gilgit lies in close proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union

and that is why the Pakistan Government has started to build military roads, air fields and other military objectives in the valley. A host of army engineers and diverse specialists have been dispatched to Gilgit for the purpose. In some places, forced labour is being used for the construction of air fields and roads, which are being built at the cost of tens of millions of rupees."

Our Gilgit reader notes that the local authorities gladly welcome the Americans who intend to use the area as a base for their aggression.

I lay it on the Table of the House. This is a document which has been published in the summer of June 1951.

At that time, our country did not know, in fact no country knew, that there is a base in Gilgit or that the Americans are going to build one there. We must scrutinise it, as I myself did. I tried to reach as far as possible nearer to Gilgit to see with my own eyes how far this statement is correct, because it affected our country and I came to this conclusion that this report was grossly exaggerated. If it was true, as it says, that in 1951 a base was going to be established, it does not take very long, with modern methods, to build a base. How long will it take in Gilgit? With tens of millions of rupees and forced labour, I think, today it would have been a *fait accompli*, an accomplished fact. We know definitely that Pakistan and, so far, United States also were vehemently denying all talks about bases. The Soviet Union was the first country which attracted our attention towards it. It is in a very exaggerated form. That proves that they were very much interested in diverting the NATO forces which were being concentrated in Western Europe from Europe to the Asiatic regions.

This is not the whole picture. What we read in foreign papers and we do not find in our papers correctly is what is happening in the North East sector. It is always secret. Whenever you

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

read a Russian document, of military value or of foreign office value, you will always find, from their own designs, whether there is something hidden behind it or not. In this connection, one of our professors from Madras University wrote very recently in the *Foreign Affairs* that the Chinese penetration of all the previous dependencies of the Chinese Emperors is likely to increase. "Communist pressure in Sikkim, Bhutan and Darjeeling is increasing." He says it is certain "that the Chinese are building a strategic road from Lhasa to the frontier of India and Sikkim. This is the same track along which Colonel Francis Younghusband's army pushed in more primitive conditions in 1904 from India to Lhasa, and there is no reason why it could not be used for aggressive purposes in the other direction. The Chinese are reported to be building near the old fort a modern fort located in Galingk'a. They are also reported to be building, with the help of Soviet experts, several air bases all over Tibet, one at Lhasa and one on the plain between Lake Manasarowar and Lake Rukas, which is only 300 miles from New Delhi. It has been officially admitted by Indian politicians that there are Chinese military detachments stationed all along the Indian frontier. There are also rumours of atomic experts conducting investigations in uranium deposits in southern Tibet."

If the North-west base is dangerous for our country, then in the same light, the North-east bases are equally dangerous to us. The Americans have this pretext that since the Chinese are building a base there in the North-east, to counteract it they must build a base in Gilgit. But strategically it is not sound. Even if it is possible to fly over the Himalayas, where are the targets? I do not find any. I have myself been to Kazakhstan and other places and I do not find any targets which the Americans can bomb. They must violate our territory. For the Chinese also there is no target to bomb from their base in the North-east. They cannot jump upon the Western forces

unless they violate our country, which in no case will we allow to the last drop of our blood. We will try to maintain our neutrality.

In this perspective, the role of the Communist Party is just to help the plan of the southward drive of the Chinese towards Sikkim and Calcutta, and the Communist Party always helps them. If they can have a base in Calcutta, they will be very, very glad about it. They will hand over the country if they can, because they are interested always in that direction.

Therefore, what I am driving at is that even if this Pentagon-Pakistan Pact materialises, there will still be a great deal of difficulty. As the latest information shows, perhaps there is talk of about 250 million dollars or 13 divisions, or in terms of manpower, 250,000 men. Let us say Pakistan will have 13 divisions, but where are these divisions going to fight? There is no target. There is no way to jump over the Himalayas even for the planes. It is technically impossible. Just the other day, I went on the Himalaya-Tibet Road and I saw how difficult it is to cross in winter. Technically and strategically it is wrong.

If the Pact materialises in spite of our endeavours and we are not successful in stopping this aid to Pakistan, in that case what we have to do is to judge correctly the real position as to where we stand from the point of view of strategy, manpower, armaments and everything. If we judge that correctly and not in an exaggerated way as Moscow shows us, our Army is capable of counteracting the Western as well as the Eastern bases. There is no doubt about it, because what mainly counts in the country is the enthusiasm of the people. The enthusiasm of the people takes us a long way, and this enthusiasm today we find in our country.

The Communists want to take shelter under us and they also want us to carry on hate-America propaganda. They want to exploit the present situation for their own benefits which they must not be allowed to do. Since it is

a very critical time for our country, we have to see that the more we fight this Communist danger, the more we strengthen our country and our defences.

If I am allowed to disclose before the House, the communists keep in touch in open daylight with diplomats of many foreign Powers. I have never seen such a spectacle in the whole world; although I was in the diplomatic service of our country in foreign countries for a number of years. I have never seen that a foreign diplomat degrades himself to such an extent that he invites also the traitors of the country at the same time when he invites our Prime Minister and others to a dinner or a party. It is never in the diplomatic protocol. I have never heard of such a thing. Only a couple of months ago, it became a very big question when they invited one of the Communists to the same dinner party to which the Prime Minister, M. Peti-pierre, who is also the Foreign Minister of Switzerland had been invited. But in our country, the rules are different, and we are more democratic than any other country in the world, we tolerate much more than any other country, but this toleration should not weaken us any further. We have to strengthen ourselves in every way and to see that all our sectors, whether on the Calcutta side or on the Sikkim side etc., are properly guarded, and we should see that every atom of our energy is concentrated on this matter, so that we fight more this Communist menace, because the Communists, though by themselves are not very important, are still instruments of a foreign Power, they have certain bases. That is the important point here.

The Communists do not carry weight in the public sector. The public hate them like poison; they know that they are being cheated, and the Communists are nobody. The Communists will be defeated everywhere, unless they cheat the people and mislead them.

If we have to achieve in a short time, what we cherish most in the world today, we have to organise ourselves and

take cognizance of this party. They are going to leave Parliament—and we should see that they do not create any spectacle or scene while leaving this House. We should also see that what we are going to achieve, and what our aim is to achieve, must be achieved definitely through all our energies united—I mean peace.

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi—Bolangir): The Address of the President indicates the awareness on the part of our Government, of the dangers, the difficulties and the grave problems facing our country. But unfortunately it does not leave on us the impression that there is the necessary determination on the part of our Government to solve the problems or meet the difficulties and dangers with imagination and boldness and in time. If the great Kumbh Mela had been organised a little more imaginatively and timely action had been taken, a great tragedy might have been averted. But what is more distressing is the fact that our greatest leaders have lost that Gandhian touch, and instead of following the footsteps of the Father of the Nation, who had the courage to admit even Himalayan blunders, today our Government are not prepared to admit their shortcomings, their lack of imagination and planning. Instead of undertaking repentance—I do not suggest that they should have undertaken a fast in expiation of their sin—at least—we should have expected—they should have cancelled the feasts and festivities. The same callous and indifferent attitude, we can see in other respects also, as we bring to the notice of the House, the other grave problems that have arisen in certain parts of the country. The President has been pleased to refer to the appointment of a high-powered Commission for the purpose of reorganization of States, and he has been pleased to say that "this is a task of high and historic importance, which has to be dealt with in an objective and dispassionate manner so as to promote the welfare of the people of the areas concerned as well as of the nation as a whole." But I ask whether the Government have actually approached this question of

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

reorganization of States with the boldness that is required. The terms of reference of this Commission have been left beautifully vague. The purpose of this Commission itself is rather doubtful, for, there was no need for a fact-finding Commission to go into the question of what the map of India should be. Once the principle of linguistic reorganization is accepted, the Government themselves could have drawn up the broad outlines of the picture and then straightaway they could have appointed Boundary Commissions to go into specific issues. But there has been this hesitancy, this indecision and this desire to shelve this problem. The result is that the more you delay in solving this issue, the bitterness and tension between the different States go on increasing.

Now, I will draw your attention to what is happening in the disputed areas of Bihar. I have personally been the victim of rowdiness at a meeting held in Seraikela on the 7th of this month. If it had been only an isolated instance, it would not have been so distressing, but the fact is that it is not an isolated instance. It is a deliberate and planned attempt on the part of the Bihar authorities to suppress the cultural and linguistic minorities not only in Singbhum, Seraikela and Kharsawan but also in Manbhum and other Bengali-speaking areas. This is a regular plan. If it is a mad thing, there is a plan in the madness, and this has been going on for years, and it has become more accentuated soon after the appointment of this Commission. I hold the Centre entirely responsible for this unfortunate state of affairs, because, time and again, we have brought this wrong attitude, this inhuman treatment meted out to the minorities in Bihar, to the notice of the Central Government and the Ministers, but they have always shirked their responsibility.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea cum Santal Parganas): It is a lie; it is a total lie.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I would ask my hon. friend from Bihar to have some patience, because he did not happen to be in that place.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I have been there and I have also seen your place.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: But he was not present at the meeting. I speak with personal knowledge, and I would like to make it clear here that I have got no quarrel with my Bihar friends.

Shri R. C. Das (Ganjam South): Is it Parliamentary to say 'lie'?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may change the 'lie' into 'incorrect statement.'

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I have got some Bihar friends here. I know there are high-minded persons, there are good persons; I know that if they themselves knew the true facts about what is going on and what is being done under the very nose of their administration there, their conscience will also be touched and they will be the first persons to join with us in strongly condemning these things. (Interruptions). I will just place before you the facts. Sir, on the 7th of this month we were having a meeting in Seraikela. According to the admission of the Chief Minister of Bihar himself, he anticipated that there might be some trouble there. He had arranged for 1 First-Class Magistrate, 1 Inspector of Police, 1 Sub-Inspector of Police, 3 ASIs and 22 armed constables to preserve peace there. And, strangely enough, he himself admits that on the request of the sponsors of the meeting who also anticipated rowdiness there, the police removed walking sticks from nine persons from the audience. Then suddenly where did the huge lathis appear from? The heads, arms and legs of people were broken. Sir, it is a shame that the Deputy Leader of Opposition of the Orissa Assembly, Shri Partap Keshari Deo, had his head and arm broken and is now lying in Calcutta

for treatment. Is this the sort of freedom of expression and freedom of association guaranteed under our Constitution that the linguistic minorities are going to have in Bihar? Is it not a condemnation of his own saying? Can the Chief Minister justify this? If he had made those arrangements for preservation of peace, then why did these police do nothing? I have got photographs here and I have shown them to some of my friends. If anybody else wants to see them, I am prepared to lay them on the Table of this House. You will see the huge *lathis* that were brought. All these people were brought in a truck, imported from outside, from Jamshedpur mostly, and they raided the meeting...

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: They were borrowed by the organisers of the meeting.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: This is not the first time that we have had experience of this rowdiness. We have had experience of black flags being shown, and all that. We have always seen that the purpose of all that is to disturb the meeting and to create confusion. Here at the very beginning I wanted to explain the purpose of the meeting.

An Hon. Member: What was the purpose?

Shri R. N. S. Deo: This was not a new incident. On the 15th December last, the same thing was done and there were telegrams received when this House was in session. We brought them to the notice of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and there were statements and other things appearing in the papers also. Therefore, this is not a new thing. This is a repetition. We also anticipated this thing. Therefore, I was making an appeal. As the president at that meeting, I was explaining to people that Biharis are our brothers, we are all Indians and there is no reason why we should break each other's heads. The very purpose of the meeting was to explain to the people how they should put forth their claims before the Commission. Now, before I had concluded...

An Hon. Member: How did you go there?

Shri R. N. S. Deo:..... those preliminary remarks, they attacked and cut the wires of the loudspeaker. That is understandable. The purpose was to disturb the meeting. Then immediately without any provocation these hired *goondas* came through one side of the road.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Led by you?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Led by whom?

Shri R. N. S. Deo:...I say with the connivance of...

Shri Jajware (Santal parganas *cum* Hazaribagh): How is all this relevant? (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far I allowed some remarks to be made regarding this matter because it relates to the Commission that has been appointed by the Central Government. True, till the Commission goes round, takes evidence and sends in its report, normal peace conditions must be maintained and the State Governments are in charge of law and order. But inasmuch as this may be a matter where there may be differences of opinion—and I allowed certain remarks to be made to some extent—to go further into details when the State Government is not here and we have no opportunity to know the details, is not proper.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: He said 'hired *goondas*'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the hon. Member may pass on to other subject with some general remarks that one or two such things have happened—without going into too many details which cannot be refuted. Otherwise, they will go unchallenged and there is no opportunity here to know the facts.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I shall not go further into details. But, the purpose for which I refer to this incident is to show that this is nothing new and that this is according to a pattern. Sir, in

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

1949, a reign of terror was let loose on the people of Seraikela. On the 31st July, 1949, we had an indication of what was brewing. I was present there on that day and I tried to give a warning to the Central Government. I sent a telegram to the Governor-General, to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and also to the Governor and Chief Minister of Bihar and the Governor and Chief Minister of Orrisa. But, you will be surprised to know, Sir, that we could not send a telegram from Bihar territory. Not only that day; but we had to send a man to Bengal to send the telegram. We could not send the telegram from Bihar.

Shri Jajwara: How is it relevant?

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I am saying that this is not a new thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We must stop at a particular stage so far as this particular matter is concerned. Now, there are the Bengal Government, the Bihar Government and the Orrisa Government. If the hon. Member does not get redress from one Government, according to him, he could make representation to another Government. What has the Centre to do? It is helpless unless an emergency is declared on account of the fact that the meeting at which the Maharaja of Patna was addressing was disturbed. These matters need not be pursued except generally. There is no State Government here to refute the allegations that are being made. I would appeal to the hon. Members to bear this in mind. We seem to be under the impression that this is a unitary government. The remarks that are made are more fitting to a unitary government and to a unitary Assembly, where all the States are subordinate to the Centre and we can give directions. Fortunately, the States have got the State Assemblies, and they should take up the matter in the State Assemblies. Under these circumstances, I would like to avoid a conflict, as far as possible and no aspersions are cast on the State

Governments. There are State Assemblies and it is for the State Governments to take up the matter with the Centre or the President and suitable directions taken from them. The hon. Member promised not to go into details any further but he is diving deep into them.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I wish to bring to your notice what happened.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May be; but this is not the forum.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: Telegraph is a Central subject.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Two maharajas in the meeting took up their pistols against each other.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I am not yielding to him.

We have asked the Centre to institute an enquiry and I would be the first person to welcome such an enquiry. Is the Bihar Government prepared to accept such an enquiry? But, our charge is that the whole civilised government has come to a standstill there. (*Interruption*). It is impossible for the minority even to carry on their ordinary life. Therefore, it has become a matter serious enough for the Centre to intervene.

Sir, I was referring to the telegram being refused. That is a Central subject. How has this come about that in 1949, no telegram could be sent about the reign of terror in Bihar? In spite of the facts being brought to the notice of the Centre, nothing was done. Again, the same thing happened on the 7th. We tried to send a telegram to the President, the Prime Minister and the Home Minister of India and that telegram also was refused on the plea that the line was out of order and only the next morning were we able to send it. Sir, I have already drawn your attention to the fact that this is not an isolated or a new instance. The same thing had happened on the 15th December last and the matter had been brought to the notice of the Central

Government. With reference to that the Prime Minister had written to me—

"I should like to express my regret at the violence and conflicts that have recently taken place in regard to Seraikela. I hope all concerned will put an end to this for it did little credit to anyone and did not advance any cause."

My point is that the Centre is aware of all these conflicts. But, simple awareness is not sufficient. What is happening in Manbhum or in Singhbhum or Seraikela has become such an important matter. The tension and bitterness that these things are creating and the terrorism that is going on is the seed for chaos in this country. Are we to leave these inter-State disputes to be settled by civil war or are we to see that these things are solved by the Centre taking a strong hand in the matter? Indifference is my charge against the Centre. The Home Minister says that because it is a Part A State, they are helpless. Then the question arises—are these things to be left to be decided in a civil war? Are we to leave the fate of the country to chaos? If there is terrorism from one side, it is inviting terrorism and chaos in the country. That is why I plead that the Centre must take a strong attitude. It is not enough to utter some platitude, or to utter some advice and sermons. Simply by wishful thinking everything will not turn out all right. Therefore, the Centre has got to be strict and take timely action to prevent further trouble in the country.

Shrimati Na Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): As a very new Member, I submit a few points that occur to me after the President's Address. The world is full of tension and there are various conflicts of ideologies, interests, cultures and the age-old conflict of the races, but India has taken and assumed the lead. We have been following the path shown to us by Mahatmaji and it is India's own path. I do not think we need be frightened by anybody, because India's ideology does not need armaments. Nearer home, there are problems that need to be solved more urgently. The President's Address

refers to a sum of Rs. 72 crores having been given as subsidy to the displaced people for housing purposes. I speak for West Bengal particularly because I come from that part of the country. Pakistan, nursed and reared by the same mother, can never be separated from our minds. The terrible tale of woe in West Bengal, if it could only be seen would be fully realised. It is a two-fold tale of woe. Thousands of people came from Pakistan on the one side, and on the other side, thousands that went away from Bengal have again come back. They find their houses occupied, their lands cultivated by others, their fruit gathered by others, while they starve and wait outside. They need the speedy help of the Rs. 72 crores or whatever sum is granted, so that some solution may be found to their problem. Could not the machinery that arranges for these grants move more speedily? If the grants are given in small lots—as they were in the beginning—they were not utilised for housing. Before you could say—Jack Robinson—it was really eaten up—because immediate wants were acute. Now the grants are being given in one lot, and it is more satisfactory, but quicker distribution is needed. The housing problem must be solved, for there is great frustration. It is amongst such people that the hot-bed of dissenting ideas flourish.

The President's Address refers to the providing of more employment under the revised efforts of the Planning Commission on the Five Year Plan. In the sphere of education, I think, there is a great channel where employment can be given to hundreds. Teachers are the illest-paid workers in India. It is a great dis-orientation from the ancient ideas of India, because teachers in ancient India were regarded with love; they were our guides, philosophers and friends. There was never any question of having to pay them, they were given what was known as their *marjada* or *sanman*—honorarium if you like and it was always gladly given. Today teachers are fighting for their very existence with their lives. If they are not heard

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury]

today, they must be heard tomorrow for in their hands lie the minds of the future generations of India. The lot of the Sanskrit professors is still worse, yet they are the guardians of our ancient heritage—*sanskriti*. They live on a mere pittance, that is hardly enough to hold their body and soul together. There are yet to this day professors of Sanskrit in Mithila and Nawadwip who are eking out an existence, who are great scholars and who can hand down the heritage of ancient India. Could not the Centre do something to give encouragement for the founding of a Sanskrit University? Nawadwip and Mithila are the homes of Hindu Law, philosophy and Sanskrit. A University here does not mean large sums of money, because it need not be housed in big houses with elaborate paraphernalia. It need be only a rural cottage university, but it would form the nucleus of a centre from which thought could go out of India to the whole world.

De-Centralised cottage industries are channels where again employment could be found, and there I would again point out for the consideration of this House that rural unemployment, particularly amongst displaced people—I speak with special reference to West Bengal—is a terrible thing. It applies particularly to those who have come back from Pakistan, because they have no lands to till; their homes are occupied, there are no industries to absorb them, and anyway, they have no technical training. The only way that one can alleviate their condition is by affording employment through cottage industries. Adult female employment is a solution here. It would employ people who teach the handicrafts—it would employ those who learn—for they could earn while they learn. The target of earning need not be high. Anything from ten to fifteen rupees a month for each adult female member of the family would be something for them. To popularise their products—could not exhibition trains be promulgated again? These trains used to exist before, could they not

be used now, to show the village handicrafts of different parts of India—and thus create a demand for them.

While speaking of channels of employment I would like to bring to the notice of this House that financial aid to artists, poets, musicians and authors are singularly lacking. To this day, talent wastes its sweetness in the desert air in India. If sufficient help could be given to them they could be really employed in a suitable sphere. Even now, the parents are not much concerned about a girl who is really talented. They think that she will be married and she will be all right. If a boy, on the other hand, is talented, he is advised to take to some technical training! Thus India loses much of her cultural richness and people are not placed in surroundings really congenial to them. As the hon. Member on the opposite side has so aptly written in a little book of mine:

"The doctor's fees are heavy,
And the lawyer's fees are high.
But the artist—he is just supposed
To entertain—and die."

In regard to external publicity of Indian culture, may I submit that it could be tackled more effectively. There are various delegations that come to India and there are numerous delegations that go out. But they should be composed of personnel that are really able to carry over to foreign countries the thought and culture of India in the right way so that enthusiasm is fostered in foreign countries, to come in contact with India and to really study her thoughts and understand them. I do not know if any of the Members here know that there is a scholarship in the Calcutta University existing to this day for foreign students to come and study Indian culture. Even last year they had to call a meeting to decide what was going to be done to the scholarship because there was no foreign student available to take advantage of this. If Indian culture could really be publicised in the right way there would be no dearth of students. India's culture would be known to the world and

these delegations which go out to foreign countries are the real ambassadors of India. The ever widening circle of contacts of her cultural efforts would really be more important than political contacts, because cultural friendships would create a greater India that is not confined within the bounds of the Himachal and the blue seas but extends to the whole world through her thoughts.

Coming to more practical things, I would like the indulgence of the Centre about roads. A number of roads are made in West Bengal, for Test Relief. The money is used, as it is supposed to be used,—by giving relief to people but a very temporary kind of road is made. That is really a waste. You waste the money; you waste the labour. Could not a more permanent kind of road, even for smaller distances be made with the money available? Then, there are the national highways which come directly under the Centre. I have one thing to suggest about these which would also create channels of employment. India has the most beautiful flowering trees that you can find anywhere in the world. There is the flaming red and gold flowers of the Flame of the Forest. The pink and white flowers of the prunus Japanica, that strew the ground with their soft petals, the exotic beauty of the simul-flowers, whose pods could also yield revenue for Government and the delicate mauve trellises of the Jaquaranda. All these could be planted besides the national highways. It would bring such spectacular beauty to the country-side of India that not only Indians, from all parts of India would come to see their own land, but it would attract tourists from all over the world as people are attracted to Japan, to see the cherry-blossom and the chrysanthemum. It may be frivolous to talk of this in the midst of the very serious discussions here, but the planned planting of trees would, I am convinced, give employment and create beauty at the same time.

I regret to say that there is no mention of medical facilities whatsoever

713 P.S.D.

in the towns, or, particularly villages, in the President's Address. The condition in the villages, if one travels through them, is really disheartening. There is, I believe some four crores of rupees in the hands of the Social Welfare Board. Would it not be possible to use some of this money in the villages of India before they are used anywhere else? It is in her villages that India lives, it is in her villages that the heart of India pulsates; it is with the simple folk of her villages that India will march to prosperity.

Food, of course, is the burning question everywhere. It will always remain so. We are told that we are well out of the woods now. Let us hope that this is more and more true. There are yet shortages; there is yet rationing, and dissatisfaction in many places over this rationing. Some of this dissatisfaction is created. Why it should be so, I do not know. But, if India is to advance as a whole and to achieve her goal, there must be absolute co-operation from everybody. This absolute co-operation cannot be only brought out and aired during a great crisis. It reminds me of the story of a husband who always proclaimed that he loved his wife but never showed it, he would be ready, he said to risk his life for her in case of a fire or drowning to save her. But, since none of these major tragedies happened in her life time the wife never knew that her husband loved her! So there it is. If only a very great emergency is going to unite us, let us hope that a great emergency does not occur. But I want to know what further emergency are we waiting for? Are we not in the midst of a crisis now? Do we not want many things urgently? It is surely time to be united already. If India is to march on to the goal that she has set for herself, surely constructive criticism, which is helpful, can help, but destructive aloofness can never help at any time. Let us learn by all means from the U. S. S. R., China, America, wherever you will, but let us apply it, in a unified way to India to create the India that we all visualise, irrespective of party politics or creeds.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): Sir, I would like to speak a few words on this occasion particularly with reference to the amendment which I have moved. That amendment relates to the proposed military alliance between Pakistan and the United States of America. Well, it was shocking to me when I first read in the papers about this proposed military alliance. It is really very surprising that gentlemen who were reputed for keen intelligence and farsightedness should have fallen into this grave, suicidal policy of entering into this kind of alliance. It does not require much deep thought to realise where it will lead that country to. It is very surprising that the authorities of Pakistan should have forgotten recent history which has shown what the result of such an action will be. We all know how the East India Company came to India first, namely for purposes of trade, and how they developed into an imperial power and ruled this subcontinent. As Mr. Pataskar put the other day, this proposed alliance will lead to the annihilation of that State and they will be bartering away the freedom which was gained for them not by themselves but by the people of the whole of undivided India. It does not require much foresight to see where it will lead to and how these Western Powers, when they get more opportunities, have availed themselves of those opportunities and enslaved the nation to their best advantage.

Now, if any military aid is required for a country it must be either for its internal purposes or for external purposes. If they are entering into this alliance for military aid for internal purposes, it is most reprehensible. I do not think any people with self-respect will tolerate such a step for a moment. So it must be for external purposes, that is to defend themselves against foreign aggression.

Well, looking at it from this point of view, if at all there is any external danger, it will be a common danger for India and Pakistan, and not one separately or exclusively for them. So in that state of affairs they should have acted in co-operation with India. And

it is really very surprising that while negotiations were going on in the most cordial manner between the two Prime Ministers on various matters facing them, they should have gone behind the back of India to make a proposal to enter into a military alliance with a State like the United States of America. I do not want to dwell at length on the aims of the United States and the kind of trap they have laid for Pakistan. That has been given in detail by some of the previous speakers, particularly Mr. Pataskar. Therefore it is only—I should say—blind on the part of Pakistan to enter into an alliance like this. It is not only dangerous and suicidal for themselves, but it is, probably, dangerous to the neighbouring countries like India to give such a foothold for the United States. I am sure if such an alliance is entered into, they will make the best use of it to their own advantage and they do not care what happens to the country with which they have come into alliance. In fact that country would be enslaved. We know that the United States of America was observing a policy of isolation before the previous war. But, all that has disappeared and now they are on the aggressive and it will not be wrong to call them warmongers. Therefore, I hope that in view of the fact that there are so many outstanding disputes between India and Pakistan, and cordial negotiations are going between the two countries, Pakistan will even now desist from pursuing this suicidal policy. I must also warn this Government against falling a prey to this kind of conduct on the part of Pakistan. It has been suggested, I find from some of the amendments given, that if Pakistan enters into a kind of military alliance with the United States, then certainly India must enter into such an alliance with Russia and China. There cannot be a greater folly than that. As a matter of fact, if at all there is any common danger to Pakistan and India, it must be from these quarters. That is why I said that the common interest of both Pakistan and India lies in their acting together and relying on themselves and themselves alone to ward off any such

dangers. Both these countries have sufficient manpower and natural resources. They have only to be organised and if there is any common danger it is only from these quarters, from the Communist countries like Russia and China. It is a danger that is common to both India and Pakistan and therefore Pakistan should have acted unitedly with India and entered into proper pacts with India instead of going too far off to the United States of America who belongs to that category of Powers who have enslaved with their imperialistic policies over the countries in the East all along in the past. Pakistan ought to have taken their lesson from the past and desisted from this policy. I hope that better sense will prevail and they will refrain from taking this false step.

It has also been suggested that in view of this development, it is necessary that India should at once organise her defence and get ready for any contingency. Certainly, not only for this contingency, but for any contingency, India should always be ready to fight against any aggressor, whether on account of this alliance or from other quarters. Therefore, in that matter, it is for the Government to take such steps as they deem fit in order to see that India gets ready.

7 P.M.

I have only to say one word about another subject about which there has been so much controversy here and that is about the tragedy of Kumbh Mela. Here a Committee has been appointed and that Committee will go into the matter. We will have to wait for an impartial report about the matter and then it will be time for us to consider where the responsibility lay. In the meanwhile, I would say only one thing. From what I heard from one of the Congress Members, he said that he had occasion to go to London and stay there at the time of the Coronation and he was comparing the arrangements there, with the arrangements here, and he said that he found that the arrangements were satisfactory. Even he was suggesting that some steps ought to have been

taken to prevent such a kind of occurrence. Anyhow, we shall withhold our views until the Committee has submitted its report. But, there is one aspect of the matter to which I should draw the attention of the Government. This tragedy, which shocked the whole of India, happened in the forenoon and it is stated by responsible men like the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister of U. P. that the matter was not brought to their notice even in the afternoon when they had assembled for tea. This is a very very unsatisfactory state of affairs. This is a matter about which we do expect some explanation from the Government and we expect the Government to take very serious action in the matter. I do not know whether this also is the subject matter of the reference to the Committee.

There is only one other point about which I would like to say a few words. We have got freedom and we have got adult franchise to be exercised by all the adults in India. The last General Elections showed that our people, even very illiterate people were realising the sacredness and importance of the franchise that they had to exercise, and both men and women, particularly women, exercised it in a very satisfactory manner. In view of the fact that we have got adult franchise and our future depends upon the way in which that franchise is exercised, it is very necessary that the Central Government should take note of the fact that it is highly necessary that free and compulsory elementary education should be given in all the States alike. Unless some step is taken in that direction. I do not think that the right which we have secured, the right which the Constitution has given to the common people can be properly exercised. No doubt, it involves financial responsibility and it is a very high responsibility. But, I hope that the Central Government will take it upon themselves and solve the problem.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Friday, the 19th February, 1954.