

Saturday, 11th August, 1951



# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

---

VOLUME XIV, 1951

(6th August, 1951 to 29th August, 1951)

---

Fourth Session

of the

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

1951

## CONTENTS

*Volume XIV.—6th August, 1951 to 29th August, 1951*

	<i>Columns</i>
<b>MONDAY, 6th August, 1951—</b>	
President's Address to Parliament . . . . .	1—28
<b>TUESDAY, 7th August, 1951—</b>	
Motions for Adjournment—	
Exorbitant rise in the price of cloth . . . . .	29
Civil Defence of India against invasion by Pakistan . . . . .	29—31
Papers laid on the Table—	
President's Assent to Bills . . . . .	31
Report of the India Delegation to the Twelfth Session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council . . . . .	31—32
President's Proclamation assuming to himself all functions of the Government of Punjab . . . . .	32
Expenditure incurred on Medical Treatment in India and abroad of Ministers . . . . .	32
Toofan Express Accident . . . . .	32
Ordinances promulgated after the termination of the Third Session of Parliament 1950-51 . . . . .	32
Essential Services (Prevention of Strikes) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	33
Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	33
Parliament Prevention of Disqualification Bill—Further consideration of clauses—Postponed . . . . .	33—79
Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded . . . . .	80—100
<b>WEDNESDAY, 8th August, 1951—</b>	
Business of the House—	
Hours of Sitting . . . . .	101
Papers laid on the Table—	
Expenditure from the Aviation Share of the Petrol Tax Fund . . . . .	102
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	102
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	102—03
Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill—Passed, as amended . . . . .	103—62
Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded . . . . .	162—90
<b>THURSDAY, 9th August, 1951—</b>	
Papers laid on the Table—	
Notifications under Section 2C of Insurance Act, 1938 . . . . .	191
Amendments to Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1951 . . . . .	191
Notification in accordance with Section 4A of Indian Tariff Act, 1934 . . . . .	192
Appropriation Accounts—Defence Services, 1948-49: Audit Report, Defence Services, 1948-49; Commercial Appendix to Appropriation Accounts, Defence Services, 1948-49; Appropriation Accounts—Railways, 1948-49 (Parts I and II); Railway Audit Report, 1950; Balance Sheets of Railway Collieries and Statements of all-in cost of coal etc. for 1948-49; and Capital Statements, Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts of Govt. Railways, 1948-49. . . . .	192—93
Resolution <i>re</i> President's Proclamation on Failure of Constitutional Machinery in Punjab—Adopted . . . . .	193—255
Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Bill—Further Consideration postponed . . . . .	255—60

THURSDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1951—Contd.

Columns

Businesses of the House—	
Change in Hours of Sitting . . . . .	260—62
Employment of Children (Amendment) Bill—Passed, as amended . . . . .	262—67
Opium and Revenue Laws (Extension of Application) Amendment Bill— Passed, as amended . . . . .	267—71
Sea Customs and the Central Excises and Salt (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	271—73
Resolution <i>re</i> Convention for Suppression of Traffic in persons and exploitation of Prostitution—Further discussion postponed . . . . .	273—78
Notaries Bill—Motion to consider moved . . . . .	278—80
FRIDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Death of Shri Narayana Murthi . . . . .	281
Motions for Adjournment—	
Dalkhowachar and Salapara Islands . . . . .	281—83
Alleged election arrangement between Food Minister, U. P., and Sugar Industrialists . . . . .	283—84
State Financial Corporations Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee . . . . .	284
Tariff Commission Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee . . . . .	284
Forward Contracts (Regulation) Bill—Extension of time for presentation of report of Select Committee . . . . .	284—85
Delhi Premises (Requisition and Eviction) Amendment Bill—Extension of time for presentation of Report of Select Committee . . . . .	285—93
Go-Samvardhan Bill—Extension of time for presentation of Report of Select Committee . . . . .	293—94
Motion on Address by the President—Discussion not concluded . . . . .	294—329
Papers laid on the Table—	330—72.
Correspondence between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan . . . . .	329
SATURDAY, 11TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Presentation of the Report of the Committee on the Conduct of a Member . . . . .	373
Motion on Address by the President . . . . .	373—500
MONDAY, 13TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement <i>re</i> Railway Stores Enquiry Committee . . . . .	503
Resolution <i>re</i> raising of export duty on groundnuts and levy of export duty on oilseeds and vegetable oils not otherwise specified—Adopted . . . . .	504—43
Evacuee Interest (Separation) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	543
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded . . . . .	544—90
TUESDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Message from the President . . . . .	591
Business of the House . . . . .	591—92
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded . . . . .	593—706
THURSDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Indian Explosives (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	707—08
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Further consideration postponed . . . . .	708—10
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	710—74
FRIDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1951—	
Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement showing action taken by Government on assurances etc., given during Third Session (Second Part) 1951 . . . . .	775
Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill—Passed, as amended . . . . .	776—821
Delhi and Ajmer Rent Control Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	821—31

## (iii)

	<i>Columns</i>
<b>FRIDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1951—Contd.</b>	
Notaries Bill—Discussion on motions to consider and to refer to Select Committee—Not concluded . . . . .	832—41
Import of Dates . . . . .	842—52
<b>SATURDAY, 18TH AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Displaced Persons (Debts Adjustment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	853
Notaries Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	853—56
Evacuee Interest (Separation) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	856—99
Tariff Commission Bill—Discussion on motion to consider—Not concluded . . . . .	899—930
<b>MONDAY, 20TH AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Forward Contracts Bill—Presentation of Report of Select Committee . . . . .	931
Displaced Persons (Debts Adjustment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	931—74
Tariff Commission Bill—Discussion on motion to consider, as reported by the Select Committee—Not concluded . . . . .	974—1014
<b>TUESDAY, 21ST AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Papers laid on the Table—(i) Amendments to Delhi Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940, (ii) Amendments to Punjab Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940 . . . . .	1015—16
Tariff Commission Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded . . . . .	1016—98
<b>WEDNESDAY, 22ND AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Papers laid on the Table—	
Declarations of Exemption under Registration of Foreigners Act, 1939 . . . . .	1099—1100
Agreement <i>re</i> Loan from U. S. A. for purchase of Foodgrains . . . . .	1100—01
Motion for Adjournment—	
Fast by public men of Andhra <i>re</i> formation of Andhra Province . . . . .	1101—03
Tariff Commission Bill—Consideration of Clauses—Not concluded . . . . .	1103—80
<b>THURSDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Resolution <i>re</i> measures for increased food production—Negatived . . . . .	1181—1205
Resolution <i>re</i> necessity for an All India Bar—Withdrawn . . . . .	1205—09
Resolution <i>re</i> opening of Provident Fund Accounts in Post Offices—Withdrawn . . . . .	1209—11
Resolution <i>re</i> altering the boundaries of West Bengal—Negatived . . . . .	1212—54
<b>SATURDAY, 25TH AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Railway Companies (Emergency Provisions) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	1255
Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement <i>re</i> Food Position . . . . .	1255—56
Business of the House . . . . .	1256—59
Tariff Commission Bill—Passed, as amended . . . . .	1259—87
Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	1287—1328
Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	1287—1328
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded . . . . .	1328—56
<b>MONDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1951—</b>	
Statement <i>re</i> Japanese Peace Treaty . . . . .	1357—62
Business of the House . . . . .	1362—63
Papers laid on the Table—	
Constitution (Removal of Difficulties) Order No. II (Third Amendment) Order . . . . .	1363
Third Annual Report of Industrial Finance Corporation . . . . .	1363
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Extension <sup>2</sup> of time for presentation of report of Select Committee . . . . .	1363—64
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded . . . . .	1364—1426

**TUESDAY, 28TH AUGUST, 1951—***Columns***Papers laid on the Table—**

(i) Recommendation by I. L. C. concerning Vocational training of adults including disabled persons ; and (ii) Action proposed to be taken by Government of India on the recommendation . . . . .	1427
Occupation of two islands in the Brahmaputra by Pakistan Police . . . . .	1427—30
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1430—1524

**WEDNESDAY, 29TH AUGUST, 1951—****Motion for Adjournment—**

Maintenance of electrical equipment in Parliament Chamber . . . . .	1525—27
---	---------

**Papers laid on the Table—**

Delhi Road Transport Authority (Advisory Council) Rules, 1951 . . . . .	1527
Madras Port Trust (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	1527
Government of Part C States Bill—Consideration of clauses—Not concluded	1528—94

**THE**  
**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**  
**(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers.)**  
**OFFICIAL REPORT**

373

374

**PARLIAMENT OF INDIA**

*Saturday, 11th August, 1951*

*The House met at a Quarter to Eleven  
of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

(No Questions. Part I not published)

10-45 A.M.

**PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE  
CONDUCT OF A MEMBER.**

**Prof. K. T. Shah** (Bihar): I beg to present the Report of the Committee on the conduct of a Member.

[Placed in Library. See No. IV c(b)  
(106).]

**MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE  
PRESIDENT—concluded.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion:

"That the Members of Parliament assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to the House".

Several hon. Members are anxious to speak; it is therefore essential that they should observe some time-limit.

**Shri R. Velayudhan** (Travancore-Cochin). Not one who has moved an amendment has yet been given a chance to speak.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will try to give an opportunity to hon. Members who have moved amendments.  
219 P.S.Deb.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya** (Bihar): I should like before I deal with the Address of the President to congratulate the mover Mr. Jaipal Singh who hails from the same province as I do, namely Bihar. The House will appreciate my pleasure in offering him my congratulation. His selection to move the motion of thanks to the President is also a departure from the normal procedure followed, because, as he himself said, he does not belong to the majority party.

**Sardar B. S. Man** (Punjab): He does.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** My hon. friend says he does; but I think I can claim to know Mr. Jaipal Singh's party affiliations more than Sardar Bhupendra Singh Man.

**Shri Sondhi** (Punjab): Who is no more with us!

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** In any case that was what he said yesterday and I do think that it is a welcome departure, for the right to express words of gratefulness should not lie only with one party or set of people. It is the privilege of the House and I must say on this occasion the selection was rightly made.

I would also congratulate Mr. Parmar for his selection as the seconder of the motion moved by Shri Jaipal Singh and also for the excellent address in Hindi which he delivered on the occasion.

I join the movers of the motion in thanking the President. But this is an occasion perhaps the last in the life of this Parliament to take an overall picture of what we have been able to do in this House. While discussing the points which have been raised in the Address—particularly at this time—it would not do merely to indulge in any carping criticism. The responsibility of this Parliament, in my opinion, is no less than that of the Government or the President.

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

because while the Government is responsible to Parliament, the Members of Parliament are responsible to the people and they have to account for what has been done or what has not been done when they go back to their constituencies. I will, therefore, try to take part in these deliberations not in a spirit of criticism but in a spirit of, what I may call, self-introspection.

On an occasion like this one likes to be enthusiastic either in praising the Government or denouncing it. It is a fact however that we do not feel the same amount of enthusiasm or fervour in speaking about what we have been able to achieve during the last four years as we would have all liked to feel. There is no denying the fact that we were faced with many complications. There is no denying the fact that conditions prevailed which would have baffled any Government in achieving the objective which they placed before them, but the fact also remains that we have not in any measure been able to achieve what we would have liked to on different fronts, the food front, or the cloth front or even, if I may say so, on the Indo-Pakistan front. It is a fact whether the Pakistan Government accepts it or not—that the Indian Government have gone to the farthest limits in order to achieve the goodwill of that country and the Prime Minister, in my opinion, has in this matter been prepared to meet with criticism of all and sundry to pursue his policy of conciliation to the greatest lengths possible. But the condition today, in my opinion, is such that well could the Prime Minister repeat to himself what was once said by an Urdu poet and which, with your permission, I will quote here:

वायें किस्मत वह भी कहते हैं बुरा,

हम बुरे सब से हुए जिन के लिए

[*Vai Kismat woh bi kahtay Hain  
Bura Ham Buray Sabsey Huyey  
Jinkey Liyay*]

The present position is that in spite of the fact that all conciliatory attempts have been made by this Government.....

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : इस के मानी क्या है ?

[*Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Bihar):  
What does it mean?*]

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya : बहुत साफ है बाबू रामनारायण सिंह सहब ।

बाप जरा गौर करेंगे तो मालूम हो जायगा। (It is very simple Just think over it and you will get the meaning.)

The present position is that whether we say it or not we feel we are on the brink of a serious conflict, whatever it may result in. As I said before, it is with no desire of apportioning blame that I refer to this out certainly with the purpose of finding out where we have erred that the situation ultimately has developed into this. I must say candidly that in the matter of placing the view-point of this country before other countries we have not succeeded as well as we would have liked to.

If we look at this Kashmir question we will remember that it was alleged in the initial stages that the trouble started with what was known as Kabali invasion. Then it was admitted that a certain number of Pakistan volunteers had joined that force. Then it was admitted that the Pakistan regular army was in it. And then it was admitted that it was done with the full concurrence of the Pakistan Government.

**The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Admitted by whom?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: By the Pakistan Government. Of course, by them. It will be seen that although at the initial stages the Pakistan Government disowned all responsibility for the invasion of Kashmir, ultimately they accepted that they had the fullest hand in the matter. Even with such flagrant breach of neighbourly relation the position today is that there is negotiation going on for arbitration. Let me repeat again that I am saying this not with any desire of apportioning blame, but I am certainly trying to recapitulate what has happened and try to find out what in the circumstances should be done or could have been done. Sir Owen Dixon reported to the United Nations Organisation that the action of Pakistan in Kashmir was against all international law and convention. But even so today we find that a portion of Kashmir is still occupied by the Pakistan forces. They may call them by the name of 'Azad Kashmir Government', but the facts will remain what they are. The Kashmiris have waited long enough and the initiative has rightly now passed into their hands. They have rightly decided to hold a Constituent Assembly, and I think it was time—we do not want to

precipitate matters, but we do not want to delay them either—I think it was time that we let the world and also the Pakistan Government know that the decision now lies, not in the hands of the U.N. Arbitrator or Mediator, but in the hands of the people of Kashmir through their Constituent Assembly and that once a decision is taken by that Constituent Assembly the Government of India will not allow any coercive measures to upset that decision of the Constituent Assembly. It was because of this that one of the points that I mentioned in my amendment to the Address was that it was time that we made some declaration, some statement, with regard to the attitude of the Government of India in connection with that Constituent Assembly.

11 A.M.

The other question which is of very vital importance today is what we are reading everyday, not in the newspapers of India, but in extracts published in the newspapers of India from publications and newspapers in Pakistan. What do they indicate? They indicate every moment a 'jehad', 'war', 'victory over Delhi', 'the Red Fort is calling' etc. That is the kind of thing that we are hearing. Well, whatever that may mean—surely the Prime Minister knows more about it; we are not in possession of facts—but one thing appears to us even from what we read and hear, that conditions in Pakistan today are such as have been found by 'history' in all countries which have decided to go to war. The question arises what are we to do in the circumstances? The Prime Minister said the other day in reply to a question that we do not want to be panicky. No one would advise him to be so. On the other hand I have no doubt he will realise, as he must be realising—perhaps it may not be time for him to say it in the Parliament—that a war in the present day is not fought merely on battle-fronts. War today is what is known as total war. Therefore, some instructions, some precautions, some literature, some spread of knowledge about the defence of the civilian population in my opinion is called for. It may lead to a certain amount of panic. Perhaps it might. But we have to choose between facing a situation suddenly, not keeping the people apprised of what may happen, and allowing them to be a little panicky for a little while. This is the choice that has to be made, and I have no doubt the Government

and the Prime Minister will make that choice in good time.

The other thing to which I wanted to draw your attention and the attention of the House was with regard to certain portions of India still under other Governments and countries and known as Foreign Settlements. I know the Government of India must be doing what they possibly can in order to bring them also within the Indian Union. But I thought this was a question which should have received consideration and attention in the Address of the President. I think it is very unfair to India that places like Goa and other places should still remain outside the Indian Union.

The last thing to which I will draw the attention of the House and make a particular appeal to the hon. the Prime Minister is with regard to Hindu Code. We found that ultimately the question of passing of Hindu Code found place even in the Presidential Address. I suppose the differing views on this Code and on its enactment in this Parliament must be very well known to Members of this House and also to the Prime Minister. It cannot be denied that this is a very controversial measure, and I would appeal to the House as also to the Prime Minister not to pass it at a time when the next Parliament is coming into being with duly elected representatives who shall have received the directives of the people on this matter as this matter is bound to be discussed on public platforms during the next elections. I would therefore appeal to the Government not to rush through this measure. I think nothing will be lost if we stayed our hands in passing this legislation for the next few months. A new Parliament will come into being very shortly if the elections are to be held in January as we do hope and trust it will. That will be the right forum—the next Parliament with necessary directions from the people themselves for this Code to be passed.

As I said, there are not one but many matters which require attention. The time is limited and therefore I have tried to draw the attention of the House and your attention to what I consider to be the most important of them. It does not mean that there are not other important matters, for instance, there is this question of the efficiency of Government administration. From the extracts that we have read so far of the report of Mr. Gorwala, it is quite clear that the situation deserves more attention than what it has received

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

either at the hands of the Government or at the hands of the Members of Parliament. If you want to run the administration properly, it is essential that our services and our Government should be so run that the type of report which Mr. Gorwala has submitted may not be called for. I thank you, Sir, for having given me an opportunity to make my submission.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya (Mysore):**

Yesterday I felt very glad to listen to the speeches of people who do not belong to the Congress Party. I heard with great interest the speeches made by Prof. Ranga and Dr. S. P. Mookerjee and others. The most troublesome question that is facing us today is of our relation with Pakistan. It is agitating the public and the Press not only in India but throughout the world. In fact, the leading newspapers of America and England have unfortunately taken a wrong view of the matter. When things are developing this way, it was very good and magnanimous on the part of Members like Dr. Mookerjee and Prof. Ranga to place their unstinted co-operation and support at the disposal of the Leader of the House. That is the spirit with which we people of India have to work in order to make this country survive the wordy onslaught that is taking place from Pakistan, from England or from America. On behalf of the Congress Party and as a humble member of it, I thank them for this co-operation. They have also made certain suggestions and it is up to us to consider those suggestions with equal spirit of co-operation. Every time there is a crisis between Pakistan and India somehow it ends to our disadvantage, whether it is in the matter of exchange of population or exodus of population or the property involved or the propaganda that takes place. Here the other day the Deputy Minister for External Affairs made it clear that in the exodus that has taken place, we stand to suffer by taking about 80,000 people more than Pakistan has done. In every crisis, whether it is this year or last year or the year before, every time this exodus of population results to the disadvantage of India. So also the property question. I would request the hon. the Leader of the House to take a very serious view of the matter. Aggression does not only mean occupation of a few places in Kashmir. Aggression means, in a very much pointed manner this exodus of population. The situation created has been very graphically described by the Government that the honour and

safety of the minorities in Pakistan are not safe. After they have made that clear statement, I want the Government of India to recognise that this is a form of aggression which ought to be taken serious notice of. There is no use going on every time pocketing these disadvantages and insults. If aggression has to be met by defensive measures, here is a case of a kind of aggression which we have to take serious notice of. Unfortunately we have not so far taken serious notice of it. Every time we allow it to happen and forget it. This glossing over has made Pakistan believe that it can continue doing this. It pays to create a situation like this. Every time, they try to completely denude Pakistan of Hindus, they have succeeded in so doing so far as West Pakistan is concerned and they are trying to do it in East Pakistan. Their strategy is succeeding. I do not want the Prime Minister who has made up his mind to be firm about Pakistan this time, to allow this thing to happen again. It is a very sad state of affairs that the two leading democracies of the world, the U.S.A. and the U.K. should not know where the true principles of democracy are being implemented. Here is India which does not make a distinction on the ground of caste or religion and gives protection and equal opportunity whether they are Mohanumedans or Hindus or belonging to any other community. Pakistan is avowedly a religious state, a theocratic State. These two democracies had a little taste of this theocratic state in the middle ages. After knowing the disadvantages, the inhuman atrocities that took place under the name of this theocratic state, they gave it up. They adopted the ideal of a secular state several centuries back and in this modern age India is merely trying to follow the principles these two countries have been following for centuries. Pakistan is now doing what the Middle Age countries were doing. They have created such a psychology in this theocratic state that no man who does not belong to what is called the majority community feels safe either in regard to religion, property or the safety of his womenfolk. This ought to have been sufficient for these two leading democracies to see which way their sympathies should lie; but international politics is clouding their minds. They ought to see every case on its own merit and judge it. That is the way to gain the sympathy and the admiration of 35 crores of people in India. Instead, they try to win an advantage over us in the difficulties that we have been entangled in on

account of the bigotry of Pakistan. I appeal to them that it is better in their own interests and in the interests of the future of the world, in the interests of the peace that has to be established in this world that these two countries revise their opinions and adopt a correct attitude.

When I speak of aggression I cannot forget that the President's address does not mention the very long standing aggression which is defacing the Indian territory. I refer to the foreign possessions in India—the French and the Portuguese possessions. I would like to bring to the notice of this House and particularly to the notice of the hon. Leader of the House that when I was in Paris last year, I took some interest in the matter. I contacted several members of the French National Assembly and the Senate and I had talks with them on this matter. Nobody is serious about handing over these French possessions to India and one Member very realistically told me that this question is never going to be settled by negotiations for the Cabinets in France are so unsteady. They have to be continuously thinking of combinations and alliances of parties to make and remake cabinets, which may not last sometimes more than 15 days; that in such an atmosphere no party will have the guts to say that here is a case of justice and we must hand over these possessions to India. No party will take that risk in this uncertain atmosphere of French politics. However long our Government may wait, however persuasive the arguments may be on the part of our leader, they will not be able to do justice to us. This *status quo* will continue indefinitely and I do not know how long. Therefore, it is time that we revise our policy. It is time that we gave up the talk of a plebiscite in those areas. If the British quitted India without taking a plebiscite it is equally a good argument in the case of France and Portugal. We should not give a handle to these countries, which we did not give to the biggest Imperial power in the world. The first thing that we have to do is to straightaway disclaim all responsibility in the matter of plebiscite. We must unequivocally tell them that we want these foreign possessions to be handed over to India straightaway. What we did in regard to British Imperialism by saying 'Quit India', we have to do straightaway in the case of the Portuguese and the French. These foreign possessions are aggressions, very old. They are stinking in our nostrils. It is not right that a few

thousands of our countrymen should be under this imperialism and slavery while the rest of us are free citizens of India. While the rest of us are participating, as the President said, in the biggest elections that human history has witnessed, these few thousands of our countrymen ought to become part and parcel of us. Just as we have taken defensive measures against Pakistan in the matter of Kashmir, so must we do in the case of these French possessions. If the French and the Portuguese do not listen to reason, we may as well adopt the same old method of vindicating our rights which every country and every race has done in human history. If actual military operations have to be undertaken later, we can send a representation to the Security Council that if these two countries do not behave, we will have to take recourse to armed invasion. That is the only way ultimately which will solve this problem. We may be hesitant to say so; but that is the ultimate truth about it.

In this period of tension, we have to pay our utmost attention to the food problem. It has been dealt with in the Presidential Address and also by the Planning Commission. I am afraid what they have said in these two documents does not go far enough and may not be able to meet the situation. I have got a concrete suggestion to make. All our Grow More Food campaigns and all the efforts that we have made towards that end are diffusive. I want concentrated efforts to be made in order to solve this problem. Some time ago, Government of India appointed a Committee to see how far the Malnad or the Ghat section of India can be developed. There is a vast stretch of territory from Cape Comorin to Bombay, called Malnad or Ghat region. In the southern part of this region people grow tapioca. That seems to be very good food. Researches have been made and people who have had anything to do with the question have come to the unanimous conclusion that if we develop this crop, it may go a long way in solving our food problem. There are in this region thousands of acres which are lying fallow and which are fit for cultivation. In this Ghat region rain is plentiful. We need not have recourse to any dam construction, or river valley projects or expenditure of that kind. We have merely to clear the jungle, find out suitable places and grow tapioca and rice. Any amount of money that we spend on this effort in this region will pay rich dividends. I would urge the

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

Government of India to take this question seriously and in a concentrated form. So far, we have spent crores of rupees diffusively. They do not show results; nor is it possible to measure the results in terms of food-grains. Here is a region which is about a thousand miles long and a hundred miles wide with thousands of acres which can be cultivated with rice and tapioca. Only two things have to be done. Since it happens to be a malarial place, people do not go and live there to cultivate the land. We must create conditions where the people can be made disease-free, that is malaria-free, and then we may give them encouragement to settle down by building houses, by providing sanitary conditions so that people may take to agriculture in this region. If this region is properly developed, I hope and believe that it will solve our food problem. Unfortunately, the Planning Commission does not make any reference to this aspect of the matter. Unfortunately, again, the President's Address does not say anything in regard to this matter. Government of India had appointed the Malnad Development Committee and that committee has submitted its report. I want the Government to look into that report and reduce its recommendations to results.

I have only one point more and I have finished. Several Members have given notice of amendments. The distinction between A, B and C States ought to go. Any number of arguments have been advanced. There is no necessity for us to argue the case. The Government of India has made it an article of faith to introduce uniformity in many Governmental fields whether it works to our disadvantage or not. But, I fail to see why this uniformity, this equality has been forgotten in this respect. Even the assurance that the Government of India gives in terms of the President's Address is half-hearted. They say in the Address, "We will see that progressively equal status is brought about". This word 'progressively' has got a bad history. The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, you are aware, mentioned progressive realisation of self-government. Father of the present Leader of the House had a great deal to say on the word 'progressively'. Several of our leaders who laid down their lives in the cause of freedom have adversely commented on that word. That word has got an odium attached to it. Our leader has taken the responsibility to mention that word in the President's Address. I am afraid I cannot

feel enthusiastic or glad about it. Let not the Government of India or the people who have got power in their hands today, stand on a pedestal and say to the people of Part B and Part C States, "We will see that you will come to our status progressively". That is an insult. That goes against the self-respect of nearly one-third of the population of India. I want this House to take up this problem seriously. When all of us are of the opinion that we must forge a united front against our enemies, when we have to face the world as one man under difficult circumstances, I appeal to the Leader of the House and to this House that in our ranks there should not be that sense of injustice gnawing in the hearts of many of us. I want this word "progressively" to be substituted by the word "at once". And the Government must do this patent justice not after the elections, but before the elections. I want all the States to have complete equality of status, of responsibility and of privilege without any manner of distinction among them. I would again urge for the immediate abolition of all these distinctions, and I want Government to come out with such a statement on this very day when they make a reply on this question.

**Pandit Kunzru (Uttar Pradesh):**

The question of elections was regarded so important by the President that that was the first matter to which he referred in his Address. I therefore, ventured to ask with your consent, leave to move an adjournment motion yesterday, to draw attention to an important matter in this connection. The Civil Supplies Minister of the Uttar Pradesh Government, Shri Chandra Bhan Gupta has denied, as alleged in the letter read out yesterday by Shri Kripalani, that he ever gave any assurance that the sugar industrialists would be nominated as candidates on behalf of the Congress in the forthcoming elections; and he has complained that I raised the matter here without any previous reference to him. Sir, this matter was first referred to by Shri Keshava Deva Malaviya, one of the ex-ministers of the Uttar Pradesh Government in Delhi on the 2nd or 3rd August. Subsequently the letter was published in "The Rebel" which is the organ of a party formerly known as the Jana Congress Party. And as the allegation was not challenged, it was natural to assume that there was some basis for it. Besides, as you know, under the rules of this House, a matter can be regarded as urgent and of definite public importance only if it is brought to the notice of the House immediately after an

hon. Member has become aware of it. You will thus see, therefore, Sir, that I took such precautions as it was possible for an ordinary Member to do, before trying to raise the matter in this House. I hope now that both for his own sake and in the public interest, Shri Chandra Bhan Gupta will ask the writer of the letter to which Shri Kripalani referred yesterday, how he came to associate Shri Chandra Bhan's name with what looked like a deal between him and the sugar industrialists.

Our economic problem is one of urgent importance and I believe that everyone thinks that it should have the first priority among matters requiring the attention of the Government. Now, when we consider this problem, the question of prices has to be considered by us, or rather, it is uppermost in our minds whenever we think of the economic problem. The Finance Minister said sometime ago that Government would hold the price line. I see, Sir, that the wholesale index price has declined somewhat since the end of June 1951. The figures available to us show that while in June 1951, the wholesale price index for cereal was 486, it was 481 on the 14th July. As regards pulses, the wholesale price index was 506 in June and the corresponding figure for the week ending 14th July was 498. But this is very interesting and I would like Government to explain by what process they have brought the prices of cereals down when they have actually raised the price of wheat by Rs. 2 per maund and of rice by Rs. 11 per maund. Evidently it seems to me, the fact of this rise has not been taken into account in computing the figures that I have just placed before the House. Otherwise I cannot see how the prices of wheat and the other cereals could have come down at the very time when Government made an increase in the prices of the most important foodgrains amongst them. In any case in the market, the prices have not come down; on the other hand, they have gone up. I am not speaking of the few favoured towns for which the Government of India will continue to give subsidy; I am speaking of the country as a whole. Even if, therefore, the figures that I have cited, take count of all the relevant facts, we should still bear in mind that the consumer is now no better off than he was in June.

The next most important thing that we have to consider in this connection is cloth. As I said yesterday the Minister of Commerce and Industry

said in the last session that there would be a glut of *dhoties* and *sarees* in the market by June; and he said yesterday that he had been able to make good his promise. He gave us figures showing the production of the mills in January 1951 and in June 1951. We asked him where all the increased production had gone; but he could give us no satisfactory reply. While *dhoties* and *sarees* may be available in larger quantities than before, there are two important facts in this connection that should be borne in mind in dealing with the matter. One is that it is only the finer varieties of *dhoties* and *sarees* that are available or rather the *dhoties* and *sarees* made of superfine cloth. Those of the coarse and medium varieties are not available. The second point is that the prices of the *dhoties* and *sarees* have not come down, partly because *dhoties* and *sarees* of the medium varieties are not available and partly because of the increase made in the price of cotton.

An hon. Member asked the Commerce Minister yesterday how it was that increased production had not led to a decrease in prices. He contented himself with the cryptic remark that that was another matter altogether. It is the most important matter that concerns us but he treated it as a subsidiary question that did not require to be dealt with by him. I would ask the Prime Minister whether it is his attitude also. He was present at question time yesterday. Was he satisfied with the replies given on this question? Does he think that the promise given by the Government in the last budget session has been kept in the spirit? If not, I ask him to take even one-tenth of the interest to the textile question that he has taken in the food question. Unfortunately he took a line on the question of food that was not justified by the facts of the situation. Both he and the Food Minister have been proved by events to have been too optimistic. In fact I think that they could have foreseen that they were not in a position to carry out the promise that they were making. But I do not want to rub in that matter to the Prime Minister or any other member of the Government. I referred to that question on this occasion only to ask the Prime Minister to divert a portion of his inexhaustible energy from the food question to the textile question and perhaps in this region we shall see results quicker than we have been able to see in the other regions.

The Planning Commission has drawn attention to the undesirability

[Pandit Kunzru]

of raising the price of any particular commodity without considering the effect that it might have on the prices of other commodities. It was because of this fact that the Government some years ago appointed a board known as the Commodities Prices Board to advise them on questions relating to increase in prices after taking a comprehensive view. The Board went out of existence after the calamitous decision of the Government to follow a policy of decontrol. The time has however come I think for a similar board to be appointed. I think that the Planning Commission's recommendation on this question should receive the serious attention of the Government and the scheme that was successfully tried by them four years ago should be revived.

In the end I should like very briefly to refer to the question of Kashmir. I congratulate the Government of India on their reply to the Pakistan Prime Minister's last telegram on the subject. In conciseness and cogency it leaves nothing to be desired. I am sure that the Prime Minister knows that whatever differences there may be on other questions between the Government and sections of the people they are unanimously behind him in this particular matter.

I wonder why the Pakistan Government is so excited on the question of elections to the Kashmir Constituent Assembly. The Government of India have told the Security Council that the position of the Security Council in respect of this matter will not be prejudiced in any way by the decisions of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir. This should satisfy the Government of Pakistan. Nevertheless they are accusing the Government of India of trying to go behind the pledges given by them to the Security Council. They could not have brought a more baseless charge against our Government. What will be the net effect of the decision of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir? The net result will be that the people of Kashmir who have no say in the administration of their own territory will be associated in the same way with the management of their affairs as the people of the other States in India are in connection with their own affairs. Is this any matter really to be anxious about? The anxiety of the Pakistan Government can be explained only on the supposition that they are afraid that if the people of Kashmir find that they have exactly the same rights in Kashmir as the rest of the people in India they will stick

firmly to the Indian Union and will not allow themselves to be misled by propagandist appeals of the Pakistan Government. We should all be very glad if the people of Kashmir felt to a man that their rights would be respected in exactly the same way as those of the other people of India, and that they would have the same constitutional opportunities open to them of bringing their grievances to the notice of the Government and seeking their redress as the other people have. I am sure the Government of India have no intention of giving in on this vital point.

While it seems that the Government of India have taken adequate steps to protect Kashmir and the interests of India generally in the West against a possible aggression from Pakistan, the arrangements on our Eastern frontier are not as satisfactory as I think they should be. I hope that the Government of India is alive to the importance of strengthening all our fronts and not merely the Western front, so that no unpleasant surprise of any kind may be in store for us in future.

There is only one other matter that I should like to refer in this connection before I resume my seat. I know, as I have no doubt that other hon. Members do, that the reduction of our Armed Forces on which the Prime Minister was so keen has been postponed for the present. If the times were normal I should whole-heartedly support the Prime Minister in his desire to reduce unproductive expenditure and to assure our neighbours that we do not wish to maintain our strength at a level that could be regarded as a menace to their security. But the times unfortunately are not normal; we do not know when they will become normal. It is therefore necessary that the reduction of our Armed Forces should be postponed not merely for two or three months but for a much longer time. We should wait till we feel that the situation is satisfactory and that the reduction will not imperil the security of any part of our territory. So long as this matter is in doubt, whatever our own goodness of heart may be, however keen our desire to maintain peace may be, we should look at the position realistically and taking into account all the facts keep ourselves strong enough to deal with emergencies. I hope that there will be no war between India and Pakistan. The steps already taken by the Government of India will, I think, deter an intending aggressor from embarking on the hazardous venture of attacking India but the political forces that have been set in mo-

tion by the war propaganda that is being incessantly carried on in Pakistan may soon create a situation that would pass out of the control of the Pakistan Government. Indeed, it seems to me that there are political reasons behind the propaganda that is being carried on. If their inability to make good the promises made by the Pakistan Government to their people drives them to take a desperate step we should not altogether be surprised. It is easy to excite the passions of the people but very difficult to control them. It is therefore doubly necessary that we should exercise great caution in reducing our Armed Forces. When the apprehensions created by the unreasonable attitude of Pakistan have subsided and more friendly relations prevail between India and Pakistan, we shall all be prepared to support the Government in their desire to bring expenditure down. But till then we must bear every burden that may be necessary for the protection of our soil.

مولانا مسعودی: جناب والا۔

پریزیڈنٹیل ایڈریس کے سلسلہ میں پھس کردہ تجویز شکرپہ کی تائید کرنے کے لئے میں کھڑا ہوا ہوں۔ اس ایڈریس کے تیار کرنے کے پیچھے جو روح کام کو رہی ہے اس میں مجھے یہ دیکھ کر خوشی ہوئی ہے کہ خصوصیت کے ساتھ کشمیر کے مسئلہ پر اور کشمیر کے سلسلہ میں دی ہوئی پاکستان کی دھمکیوں کے بارے میں اس ایڈریس میں مضبوط روش اختیار کی گئی ہے۔ یہ ایک حقیقت ہے کہ پاکستان جو اس وقت ایک اچھی خاکی سلطنت ہے اس کا وجود نہ کسی بہت بڑی قربانی کا نتیجہ ہے اور نہ ہی کسی بہادرانہ کارنامہ کا۔ اس کی تمام تاریخ اور اس کی پیدائش کے وجوہات سب کو دیکھ لیجئے تو وہ دھمکیوں

اور صرف دھمکیوں پر ہی مہلی ہے۔ پاکستان بلا ہے دھمکیاں دیکر۔ وہ زندہ رہنا چاہتا ہے دھمکیاں دیکر اور اگر اس کے سمسائے اور بالخصوص ہندوستان نے دھمکیوں کے آگے سر جھکا دیا تو یہ مصیبتوں اور پریشانیوں کا کہیں خاتمہ ہونے کی صورت ہی نظر نہیں آتی۔ کشمیر کے معاملہ کو پاکستان دنیا میں بہت بڑھا چڑھا کر پیش کرتا ہے۔ لیکن کشمیر کے بارے میں جو کچھ وہ اندرونی طور پر لہتا ہے باہر اس کے بالکل برعکس کہتا ہے۔ باقی دنیا کے سامنے وہ جا کر یہ کہتا ہے کہ کشمیر کے چالیس لاکھ مظلوم ظالموں کے پنجے میں تڑپ رہے ہیں۔ ان کو آزاد کرنے کے لئے واحد پاکستان کی ذمہ داری ہے لیکن جس وقت اسے کشمیر کے بارے میں اپنے لوگوں سے مخاطب ہونا پوتا ہے تو ان سے کہتا ہے کہ کشمیر کے بغیر تم زندہ نہیں رہ سکتے ہو۔ کشمیر پاکستان کے ساتھ نہ ملے تو پاکستان ایک رات کا مہمان ہے۔ حقیقت نہ ایک بات میں ہے نہ دوسری بات میں۔ حقیقت تو صرف اتنی ہے کہ پاکستان کی موجودہ لہڈرشپ (leadership) اور اس کی برسر اقتدار پارٹی اپنی خود غرضیوں اور غلط سہاست کی وجہ سے اپنے ملک میں اتنا درجہ غیر ہودلعزیز پارٹی ہے۔ جن لوگوں کو کہی نہ کہی پاکستان کے کسی شہر میں

## [ مولانا مسعودی ]

جانے کا موقع ملا ہے وہ بتلا سکتے ہیں کہ موجودہ دور میں کوئی سب سے زیادہ غیر ہردلعزیز حکومت ہو سکتی ہے تو وہ لیگ کی حکومت ہے جو پاکستان میں قائم ہے۔ اُن دنوں ان کی فوجوں میں جو سازشیں ہوتی ہیں ان کی عوام کی ناراضگی کی جو کیفیت نظر آتی ہے۔ وہاں کی مختلف پارٹیوں کے جو سلوگنس (slogans) ہیں۔ اگر اتنی دور بیٹھے ہوئے آپ ان سے کوئی اندازہ لگا سکتے ہیں تو آپ کو معلوم ہو جائے گا کہ وہاں برسوں اقتدار پارٹی صرف سازش اور چالاکئی کے بل بوتے پر ہی قائم ہے نہ کہ لوگوں کی خدمت کرنے سے اور اپنی ہردلعزیزی سے۔ اس سے بڑھ کر آپ کے سامنے ان کی غیر ہردلعزیزی کا کیا ثبوت ہوگا کہ پچھلے پانچ سال کے عرصہ میں وہ جرات نہیں کر سکے کہ کانستٹیوشن (constitution) کے نام سے کوئی چیز اپنی قوم کے سامنے رکھ سکیں۔ کیونکہ وہ جو کچھ رکھنا چاہتے ہیں وہ چیز نہیں ہے جو نعرے لگا کر انہوں نے پاکستان قائم کیا ہے۔ اور جو کچھ قوم چاہتی ہے وہ انہیں سوت (suit) نہیں کرتی۔ اسی لئے وہ ہر ایک بہانہ تھوند کر کانستٹیوشن (constitution) جیسی ضروری اور بنیادی چیز کو بھی غیر مہین وقت کے لئے تالیے جاتے ہیں۔ یہی حالت ان کی ہر ایک معاملہ

میں ہے اور آج صرف کشمیر کا نام ہے جس کو سامنے رکھ کر وہ اندرونی طور پر اپنی پارٹی کو گرنے سے بچانے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں۔ جب عوام ذرا سر اٹھاتے ہیں اور چاہتے ہیں کہ اس غیر ہردلعزیز پارٹی کو تبدیل کر کے اپنی مرضی اور خواہش کے مطابق کوئی بہتر حکومت قائم کر دیں تو فوراً شور اٹھ جاتا ہے کہ وہ تم ایسا کرو گے تو کشمیر کا معاملہ خراب ہو جائیگا، اور دوسری طرف باہر کی طاقتوں سے یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ کشمیر پاکستان کو نہ ملا تو امن کا توازن بگڑ جائے گا۔ آج امپیریلسٹ (Imperialist) طاقتیں ہیں جو ایشیا کی ترقی کی ہمیشہ سے مخالف چلی آئی ہیں وہ آج بھی آزاد ہوتے ہوئے ایشیا کو دیکھ نہیں سکتیں۔ پاکستان کشمیر کی آڑ لیکر ان طاقتوں سے فائدہ حاصل کر رہا ہے۔ یہ ڈبل گیم (double game) ہے جو پاکستان میں کھیلا جا

رہا ہے اور اس تمام چیز میں 12 Noon انہوں نے اپنے کام کا دارومدار صرف

دھمکی پر رکھا ہوا ہے۔ انہیں یہ خیال تھا کہ جس طریقہ سے انہوں نے تقسیم ہند سے پہلے دھمکیاں دیں قتل و خون ریزی کی دھمکیاں۔ فساد کی دھمکیاں اور کہا کہ اگر پاکستان کے مطالبہ کو تسلیم نہیں کیا جائے گا۔ اگر پارٹیشن (partition) کو تسلیم نہیں کیا

جائے گا تو ملک میں خون کے دریا بہ جائیں گے اور کانگریس نے مجبوراً یہ مطالبہ مان لیا۔ لیکن یہ اندازہ کئے بغیر کہ حقیقتاً پارٹیہشور ہو جانے سے جتلے خون کے دریا بہے جتنی تباہی و قتل ہندوستان میں ہوئے کیا پارٹیہشور تسلیم نہ کرتے ہوئے اس سے زیادہ نقصان ہوتا۔ یہ اندازہ نہ کرتے ہوئے جب ان کی ایک دھمکی تسلیم ہو گئی تو وہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہر ایک قدم پر ایک نہ ایک دھمکی دیکر اپنا کام نکالتے چلے جائیں گے۔ لیکن جب ہم آج یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ کشمیر پر نئے حملہ کی دھمکی کے سامنے نہایت مضبوطی کے ساتھ حکومت ہند نے اپنا فرض پہنچانا ہے اور قبل اس کے کہ وہ اپنی دھمکی کو کوئی عملی شکل دیں ان کے سامنے اپنی سرحدوں سے بیس مہل ادھر ہی سہی۔ اپنی حفاظتی طاقتیں کھڑی کر دی گئی ہیں تو ہمیں اطمینان ہوتا ہے اور ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ دھمکی کھوکھلی دھمکی بن کر رہ گئی ہے۔ مکا دکھانے والوں نے جب یہ دیکھا کہ دوسری طرف شاید لڑتے موجود ہیں تو انہیں اپنا مکا بھول گیا۔ میں حکومت ہند کو اس کے موجودہ رویہ پر مبارکباد دیتا ہوں اور یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ رویہ ہمیشہ کے لئے قائم رہنا چاہئے۔ یہ رویہ نہ صرف کشمیر کے معاملہ میں

بلکہ مشرقی بنگال کے معاملہ میں اور ان تمام معاملات میں جنو پاکستان اور ہندوستان کے درمیان متنازعہ فیہ میں قائم رہنا چاہئے۔

محترم دوست ڈاکٹر مکرچی کی کل والی تقریر میں سے ایک دو باتیں ایسی ہیں جن کی میں اس مرحلے پر تائید کئے بغیر نہیں رہ سکتا۔ انہوں نے فرمایا کہ ایک طرف جہاں ہم اعلان کرتے ہیں کہ کشمیر کسی بھی حصہ پر حملہ خود ہندوستان پر حملہ ہے تو ہمیں یہ بھی تسلیم کرنا چاہئے کہ کشمیر کے کسی حصے پر قبضہ ہندوستان پر قبضہ ہے یہ قابل تعریف اصول ہے۔ حکومت ہند کو میں یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جس وقت پہلے بار قبائلیوں سے نجات دلانے کے لئے ہندوستان کی نجات دہندہ فوجیں کشمیر میں اتریں تو محترم پنڈت جی نے 11 نومبر 1947 کو بارامولا میں تقریر کرتے ہوئے وہاں کے لوگوں سے یہ وعدہ فرمایا کہ جب تک کشمیر کی ایک ایک انچ زمین ایگریسور (aggressor) سے آزاد نہ کرائی جائے گی حکومت ہند حم نہیں لے گی۔ میں صرف یہ یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ریاست جسوں و کشمیر کی زمین کا قریباً ایک تہائی رقبہ اور تقریباً ایک چوتھائی حصہ آبادی ابھی تک فاضلوں اور یگسرسوں کے قبضے میں

[ مولانا مسعودی ]

ہے۔ راجو یقیناً ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے۔ کشمیر کی قوم فیصلہ کر چکی ہے کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا ایک حصہ ہے۔ اور ہم کیا فیصلہ کریں گے۔ اس ملک کی تاریخ بتلاتی ہے کہ جب سے یہ ملک بنا ہے تب سے کشمیر ہندوستان کا ایک حصہ چلا آ رہا ہے۔ اگر آج اس کو ہندوستان سے کاٹنے کی کئی بھی کوشش کی جا رہی ہے تو تمام کام چھوڑ کرے سب سے پہلے اس کی حفاظت کرنا ہمارے فرائض میں شامل ہے۔ آپ کو یہ علم ہونا چاہئے کہ وہ لوگ جو سیز فائر لائن (cease fire line) سے اس طرف ہیں ان کی حالت غلاموں سے بدتر ہے۔ نہ صرف وہ بدقسمتی سے غیر مسلم کہلاتے ہیں اس علاقے میں مرے کی سی زندگی بسر کر رہے ہیں بلکہ وہ لوگ بھی جو مسلمان کہلاتے ہیں ان کے ساتھ بھی اس قسم کا سلوک ہو رہا ہے۔ آج میں چیلینج (challenge) کرتا ہوں کہ اگر صرف پارشل پلبیسائٹ (partial plebiscite) کے ذریعے کوئی فیصلہ کرنا منظور ہو تو سیز فائر لائن کے اس طرف جو لوگ رہتے ہیں مجھے ان کا فیصلہ منظور ہے۔ صرف انہیں لوگوں سے فیصلہ لے لیا جائے اس شرط کے ساتھ کہ پاکستان وہاں سے باقاعدہ پاکستانی فوجیں اور اپنی پپٹ (puppet) فوجیں ہٹا لے اور اس کے بعد صرف انہیں لوگوں

سے رائے لے لی جائے۔ جو کچھ فیصلہ ان کا ہو ہم منظور کرنے کو تیار ہیں۔ کیونکہ ہم جانتے ہیں کہ سیز فائر لائن کے اس طرف ۹۵ فی صدی ووٹ ہمارے ہاتھ میں ہیں۔ اور سیز فائر لائن سے اس طرف کی کیفیت یہ ہے کہ ہم نے بار بار چیلینج کیا پاکستان کو اور اس کی حمایت کرنے والوں کو کہ ہمارے یہاں کانستٹیٹو اینٹ اسمبلی (Constituent Assembly) کا انتخاب ہو رہا ہے۔ آؤ تمہارے لئے میدان کھلا ہے۔ آؤ اور چہ کسی جگہ بھی مقابلہ کرو۔ اپنے امہدوار کھڑے کرو۔ اور یہ جو اس وقت ہو رہا ہے۔ او۔ (U.N.O.) کے آبزورر (Observer) ہیں ان کو اس کام پر لگاؤ کہ وہ اس کام کو دیکھیں کہ کہیں نیشنل نفرنس کے مخالفوں پر دباؤ تو نہیں ڈالا جا رہا۔ آخر دباؤ کوئی ایسی چیز تو نہیں ہے کہ جو چھپا رکھی جا سکے۔ اگر کسی پر دباؤ ڈالا جائیگا تو اس کے لئے کوئی فوج ہوگی یا کوئی پولیس ہوگی۔ کوئی ہتھیار ہوگا۔ آؤ دیکھو کہ کہیں دباؤ ڈالا جاتا ہے۔ تم دیکھ کر کہہ سکتے ہو یہ اس کانستٹیٹو اینٹ اسمبلی کا انتخاب دباؤ سے ہو رہا ہے یا نہیں۔ لیکن ان کو جرات نہیں ہوتی کیونکہ اندرونی طور پر وہ جانتے ہیں اور اچھی طرح جانتے ہیں کہ کشمیر کے سو فی صدی مسلمان شیخ مسعود عبدالہ کے پیچھے ہوں اور وہ غیر

مسلم تو وہ قیامت تک بھی کوئی ایسی حرکت نہیں کریں گے جو کہ پاکستان کے حق میں جاتی ہو۔ جس پاکستان میں نہ ان کی زندگی - نہ ان کا مال اور نہ ان کی عزت کوئی چیز بھی محفوظ نہیں ہے۔ جو پاکستان موجب شرم ہے نہ صرف اسلام کے لئے بلکہ جو موجب شرم ہے انسانیت کے لئے۔ بیسویں صدی کے اس آخری حصے میں آج دنیا میں کوئی ایسی حکومت نظر نہیں آتی جہاں کی رعایا میں مذہب کے امتیاز کی وجہ سے کوئی شخص اپنی جان - عزت اور مال کو محفوظ نہ رکھ سکتا ہو۔ میں بحیثیت ایک مسلمان ہونے کے نہایت شرم کے ساتھ اس چیز کا اعتراف کرتا ہوں کہ یہ ایسی چیز وہاں ہو رہی ہے۔ لیگ (League) کے گمراہ لیڈروں کی وجہ سے جو پاکستان میں رہنے والے ان آٹھ کروڑ لوگوں کا سر شرم سے نیچا کرتی ہے جو لوگ کہ اسلام کا دعویٰ کرتے ہیں۔ جن میں سارے برے نہیں ہونگے۔ بہت سے اچھے انسان بھی ہونگے۔ لیکن لیڈروں کی خرابیوں کی وجہ سے آج ان کی پیشانی پر یہ کلڈک کا تھکا لگ رہا ہے۔

بہر صورت میں آپ سے یہ عرض کر رہا تھا کہ جہاں تک کانسٹیٹیوٹنٹ اسمبلی کے انتخابات کا تعلق ہے آج بھی ہمارا اعلان ہے کہ وہ

پوری غیر جانبداری کے ساتھ ہونگے۔ یہہ انتخابات ایک ایسا بڑا واقعہ ہو رہا ہے کہ تقریباً ۱۸ لاکھ آدمی اس میں حصہ لے رہے ہیں۔ یہہ ایک عجیب اتفاق ہے کہ ابھی ہندوستان میں جس طرح لگ بھگ ۱۸ کروڑ آدمی ووٹ دینے جا رہے ہیں اسی طرح کشمیر میں لگ بھگ ۱۸ لاکھ آدمی ووٹ دینے جا رہے ہیں۔ تقریباً ۱۸ لاکھ آدمی اس انتخابات میں ووٹ ڈالیں گے۔ آخر اتنا بڑا کام ہوگا۔ اس کو کوئی کہاں تک چھپائے گا۔ کہاں تک کوئی اس پر پردہ ڈالے گا۔ میرے معزز دوست ڈاکٹر گواہم جن کو کراچی اور مظفرآباد میں چاہے کسی نظر سے دیکھا جاتا ہو لیکن یہہ ایک واقعہ ہے کہ دلی ارد شری نگر میں وہ بنا بلائے مہمان کی طرح پھرتے نظر آتے ہیں۔ اگر وہ اور کوئی کام کر کے واپس یہاں سے نہ جائیں۔ اور وہ کوئی کام کر کے نہیں جائیں گے۔ تو کم سے کم یہہ تو کر سکتے ہیں کہ الیکشن (Election) کے دنوں میں وہ شری نگر تشریف لے جائیں۔ یہہ راستہ تو ان کے لئے کھلا ہی رکھا گیا ہے۔ باوجود کشمیر والوں کے نہ چاہنے کے یہہ رعایت تو ان کو مل ہی گئی ہے۔ وہ اٹھیں اور اپنی آنکھوں سے دیکھیں اور اگر یو۔ این۔ او کشمیر کے عوام کی رائے کو کوئی اہمیت دیتا ہے اور اگر اس کا یہہ دعویٰ صحیح ہے کہ کشمیر کے لوگوں کی رائے ہی فیصلہ کن چیز ہے۔ اور یہہ محض

[ مولانا مسعودی ]

دکھاوا نہیں ہے - تو پھر وہ جا کر ایک کام کی رپورٹ دے سکتے ہیں - وہ جا کر ایک صحیح خدمت کر سکتے ہیں - یو - این - او - کی اور بتلا سکتے ہیں کہ کشمیر کے لوگوں کی رائے عامہ کس طرف ہے -

ابھی ڈاکٹر کلرز نے فرمایا ہے کہ پاکستان کو کیوں خطرہ ہو رہا ہے کشمیر کی کانستٹی ٹیوٹینٹ اسمبلی سے جب کے حکومت ہند برابر اس بات کا اطمینان دلا رہی ہے کہ کشمیر کانستٹی ٹیوٹینٹ اسمبلی کا کوئی فیصلہ یو - این - او - کے فیصلوں کے راستے میں رکاوٹ نہیں بنے گا - میں ڈاکٹر صاحب کی اس تشویش کو کہ پاکستان کیوں خطرہ کھاتا ہے دور کر دینا چاہتا ہوں - اور وہ اس طرح سے کہ پاکستان والوں کی نظر سے حکومت ہند کا یہ اعلان تو پوشیدہ نہیں ہے - لیکن وہ اس سے بڑی ایک حقیقت کو جانتے ہیں اور وہ حقیقت یہ ہے کہ جس پلیمبیسائٹ پر بہت زور دیا جا رہا ہے اور شور مچایا جا رہا ہے اس کا نتیجہ ان کی نظر سے پوشیدہ نہیں ہے - اس لئے عمل میں پلیمبیسائٹ کو وہ سامنے نہیں آنے دینگے - وہ جانتے ہیں کہ پلیمبیسائٹ اس وقت تک نہیں ہو سکتا جب تک کشمیر کے تمام علاقے آزاد نہیں ہو جاتے - پلیمبیسائٹ اس وقت تک نہیں ہو سکتا جب تک کشمیر کے وہ لوگ جو

اس وقت راولپنڈی اور دوسری جگہوں میں در بدر پھر رہے ہیں وہ اپنے گھروں میں آکر پھر سے آباد نہیں ہو جاتے - پلیمبیسائٹ اس وقت تک نہیں ہو سکتا جب تک وہ تمام ریفریجیز (Refugees) جو نام نہاد آزاد کشمیر سے سب کچھ لےوا کر یہاں آئے ہیں اور دہلی سے لیکر جموں اور شرینگر تک پھیلے ہوئے ہیں وہ واپس جا کر اپنے گھروں میں آباد نہیں ہو جاتے - وہ جانتے ہیں کہ پلیمبیسائٹ اس وقت تک نہیں ہو سکتا جب تک کہ شمالی علاقے اور وہ تمام علاقے جن کو نام کے لئے آزاد کشمیر کہا جاتا ہے کشمیر کی حکومت نے تصرف میں واپس نہیں آجاتے - جب تک یہ حالات پیدا نہیں ہو جاتے تب تک پلیمبیسائٹ نہیں ہو سکتا - اس بات کو وہ خوب سمجھے ہوئے ہیں - اس لئے اب اس کے بعد وہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ پلیمبیسائٹ تو ہو گا نہیں اور نہ ہو ہی سکتا ہے - لہذا یہ جو کشمیر میں کانستٹی ٹیوٹینٹ اسمبلی بن رہی ہے اس کے جو الیکشن ہو رہے ہیں اور اس کا جو فیصلہ ہوگا وہی ایک واحد چیز ہوگی جو کشمیر کے لوگوں کا دنیا میں کوئی فیصلہ کہلائے گا - آخر ایک وقت آئے گا جب یو - این - او - اور ساری دنیا کو سوچنا ہوگا کہ انڈیا اور پاکستان کے درمیان کوئی فیصلہ نہیں ہو سکا اور پلیمبیسائٹ جو ہونے والا تھا وہ نہیں

ہو سکا۔ لیکن کانسٹی ٹیوینٹ اسمبلی کے فیصلوں کی شکل میں کشمیر کے لوگوں کا کوئی فیصلہ تو ہے۔ آخر کیا وہ فیصلہ بالکل ہی نظر انداز کر دیا جائے گا اور پھر وہ فیصلہ ایک سرسری طور کا فیصلہ نہیں ہے۔ ایسا تو نہیں کہ کشمیر کے لوگوں کے دل میں ایک خیال آ گیا کہ ایک فنکشن کے طور پر کانسٹی ٹیوینٹ اسمبلی بلا لو اور چناؤ کر لو۔ ایسی بات نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ انڈین یونین (Indian Union) نے جو کانسٹی ٹیوشن بلایا ہے اس کانسٹی ٹیوشن کی دفعہ ۳۷ کے مطابق کشمیر کو کانسٹی ٹیوینٹ اسمبلی بنانے اور فیصلہ کرنے کا اختیار دیا گیا ہے۔

لہذا انڈین کانسٹی ٹیوشن کے مطابق کشمیر میں جو اسمبلی بنیگی اور وہ اسمبلی جو فیصلہ لیگی تمام انڈیا اور بالخصوص یہ ہاؤس (House) اس کی پشت پر موجود ہے۔ اس ہاؤس کی ٹائید اس فیصلہ کو حاصل ہوگی۔ نو کشمیر کے جن فیصلوں کو اس پورے ہاؤس کی اور اس پورے ملک کے کانسٹی ٹیوشن کی ٹائید حاصل ہوگی کیا آپ سمجھ سکتے ہیں کہ آگے چل کر دنیا اُن فیصلوں کو نظر انداز کر دیگی؟ اور کیا آپ سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہمارے پاکستانی دوست چاہے کتنے ہی دیوانے سہی کیا اس بات کو نہیں سمجھ سکتے ہیں؟ کیا وہ اندازہ

نہیں کر سکتے ہیں کہ آخر اس کانسٹی ٹیوینٹ اسمبلی کا کیا ہوا فیصلہ کتنا اہم ہوگا؟ اس لئے ڈاکٹر گلزرو کو اس بارے میں پریشان ہونے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے۔ البتہ پاکستانیوں کو پریشان ہونا چاہیئے۔ اُن بیچاروں کی پریشانی تو حق بجانب ہے۔ اور ان کی پریشانیوں ابھی اور بھی بڑھتی جائیں گی۔ اس لئے انہوں نے اس موقع پر کانسٹی ٹیوینٹ اسمبلی کو ناکام کرنے کے لئے پونچھ علاقہ میں فوجیں داخل کی تھیں۔ کانسٹی ٹیوینٹ اسمبلی کو ناکام کرنے کے لئے ہی انہوں نے جہاد کی دھمکیاں دینا شروع کیں اور بھی بڑی بڑی کارروائیاں انہوں نے کیں۔ کچھ ظہرا اور کچھ خفیہ۔ لیکن وہ سب کی سب ناکام ہو کر رہ گئیں اور مجھے کوئی شبہ نہیں کہ جس تیزی کے ساتھ انہوں نے پاکستان کے عوام کے جذبات کو ابھارا تھا اور جس طریقے سے انہوں نے ان کے جذبات کے ساتھ کھیلا۔ چاہا تھا اگر اس کی بندش نہیں کی جاتی، اس کو چیک (check) نہیں کیا جاتا اس کے راستہ میں رکاوٹ نہیں ڈالی جاتی تو یقیناً اب تک وہ کچھ نہ کچھ فتنہ کر گزرے ہوتے۔ کیونکہ فتنہ کرنے کے معاملہ میں ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ پاکستان اکیلا نہیں اس کے پشت پر کچھ طاقتیں ہیں۔ اس کے پشت پر کسی کی تھپکی ہے۔ وہ اُن کے لالچوں

[ مولانا مسعودی ]

میں شریک ہیں اور وہ معاملات جو ہوں وہ صرف کشمیر اور ہندوستان سے ہی تعلق رکھنے والے نہیں ہیں بلکہ ان کا تمام ایشیا سے تعلق ہے۔ لیکن جب پاکستان کو معلوم ہوا کہ اینڈ کا جواب پتھر سے ملیگا تو وہ سر کھچلا کر بکتہ کیا۔

بہر کیف میں اس تمام قربانی کے لئے حکومت ہند کو مبارکباد دیتا ہوں اور اس بات کا ایک بار پھر اعلان کرتا ہوں کہ جہاں تک کشمیر میں ہونے والے انتخابات کا تعلق ہے وہ مکمل طور پر غیر جانبدارانہ ہونگے اور اگر پاکستان کے یا یو۔ این۔ او۔ کے لوگ اس کی اہمیت کو جان پوجہ کر نہ سنبھلا چاہیں اور وہاں آکر نہ دیکھنا چاہیں تو مجھے کم سے کم آپ دوستوں سے تو توقع رکھنی چاہیئے کہ اس سیشن (Session) کے دوران میں انتہیم جرنی (Interim journey) کے طور پر وہاں جا کر دیکھینگے۔ اور میں آپ کو اطمینان دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ یقیناً وہاں کچھ اچھی چیزیں پائیگی۔ جو آپ کے لئے اطمینان بخش ہونگی۔

جہاں تک پاکستان کی طرف سے کشمیر پر یا ہند کے کسی دوسرے حصے پر حملہ کرنے یا جنگ چھڑنے کا تعلق ہے میں اس موقع پر اس کو ایک گذشتہ اور بالکل ختم شدہ بات سمجھتا ہوں۔ کئی لوگ خیال کرتے ہیں کہ شاید ابھی اس قسم کا کوئی خطرہ ہے۔ لیکن جہاں

تک کشمیر کے لوگوں کا تعلق ہے وہ پاکستان کی ہم سانگی میں ہونے سے بظہری جانتے ہیں کہ فی الحال جنگ چھڑنے کا معاملہ ختم ہو چکا ہے۔ اب اس کا کوئی خطرہ نہیں۔ لیکن اس کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں کہ ہم سست ہو کر بیٹھ جائیں۔ مجھے ڈاکٹر کلرز سے پورا اتفاق ہے کہ جہاں تک فوج کی تصفیہ کا معاملہ تھا وہ ایک بہت ہی کمزور اقدام تھا اور اگے کے لئے اسے ہمیشہ کے لئے نہیں تو کم سے کم بہت لمبے وقت کے لئے اب ملتوی کر دینا چاہیئے۔

لیکن ڈاکٹر کلرز نے جو یہ فرمایا ہے کہ یہ ان پروڈکٹس (Unproductive) چیز ہے یعنی نا پیداوار ادارہ ہے۔ مجھے اس بات سے اختلاف ہے۔ میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہند کی فوجوں کا جیسا ہم کو تجربہ ہے اور میرا خیال ہے کہ کشمیر والوں کو جو ان فوجوں کا تجربہ ہے وہ اور کسی علاقے کو نہیں ہے۔ ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہند کے فوجی سپاہی اور ہند کی فوجوں کے افسر ہندوستان کے لئے ایک نھو کی چیز ہیں۔ پھر آپ یہ بھی دیکھئے کہ جس وقت ہندوستانی فوجیں کشمیر میں پہنچیں وہ کون سا وقت تھا۔ سارے ملک میں فوجتہ وارانہ پاگل پے کا ایک تپ چڑھا ہوا تھا۔ ایک سرے سے لے کر دوسرے سرے تک۔ بہت سے پڑھے لکھے لوگ بھی اس تپ میں مبتلا تھے اور اپنے آپ کو

اس نئے روگ سے نہیں بچا سکتے تھے۔ ایک طرف تو آپ اس چیز کو دیکھتے اور دوسری طرف یہ دیکھتے کہ وہ فوجیں پنجاب سے گزر کر جا رہی تھیں جہاں کہ چاروں طرف آگ لگی ہوئی تھی۔ پھر یہ بھی دیکھتے کہ حملہ آور کون لوگ تھے۔ جنہوں نے اکثر فوجیوں کے گھر لوٹ رکھے تھے۔ مثال کے طور پر آپ ان فوجیوں کو لیجئے جن کے اپنے گھر راولپنڈی کجراٹوالہ اور سرحدی علاقوں میں تھے اور اس طرف سے حملہ آوروں کا راستہ ہے۔ اب یہ فوجیں کشمیر میں اس موقع پر پہنچیں جب کہ ان کو نہیں معلوم تھا کہ کون دشمن ہے اور کون دوست ہے۔ جب کہ ان کو شکل مہں سب آدمی مسلمان ہی مسلمان نظر آتے ہیں۔ اور یہ اندازہ کیجئے کہ آج سے چار سال پہلے فسادات کے دنوں میں ہندو اور مسلمان کا آمنا سامنا کیا معنی رکھتا تھا۔ بس یہ کافی تھا ہندو کے لئے کہ یہ مسلمان ہے لہذا دشمن ہے اور اسی طرح یہ کافی تھا مسلمان کے لئے کہ یہ ہندو ہے لہذا دشمن ہے۔ یہ اس طرح کا وقت تھا جب کہ یہ فوجیں وہاں پہنچتی ہیں۔ وہاں ان کو صرف اتنی یاد دلائی جاتی ہے کہ تم گاندھی جی کی آگیا سے آئے ہو اور ان کو یہ یاد دلائی جاتی ہے کہ تم وہ اصول سچا ثابت کرنے کے لئے یہاں آئے ہو کہ جس کے لئے گاندھی جی نے اپنی ساری عمر بتائی ہے۔ اور وہ ہے ہندو مسلمان کی

تفریق کو ختم کرنا۔ تمہیں اس اصول کو کامیاب کرنا ہے۔ فرقہ پرستی زہر ہے اور اس کے خلاف تم یہاں لڑنے آئے ہو۔ اب وہاں پہنچتے ہیں اس وقت جب کہ ان ہی آنکھوں کے سامنے اپنے زخمی عزیزوں کے تصورات ہونگے۔ ان کے سامنے وہ تصورات ہونگے جب کہ ان کی جائداد اور گھر لٹے ہونگے۔ نہ جانے کیا کیا بھیانک تصورات ان کے سامنے ہونگے۔ ایسی حالت میں وہ وہاں پہنچتے ہیں۔ ان کو اس وقت کچھ معلوم نہیں ہے کہ خود کشمیر میں فرقہ وارانہ تعلقات ہی کیا حالت ہے۔ ان کے لئے یہ نیشنل کانفرنس (National Conference) یا شیخ محمد عبد اللہ یہ سب بعد کی چیز ہے۔ پہلے دن جانے ہی ان کو کچھ پتہ نہیں چل سکتا تھا کہ وہاں کون ہے اور کیا حالت ہیں۔ تو ایسے واقعات لے کر اور ایسے حقائق سے گزر کر یہ فوج اور اس کے سپاہی وہاں پہنچتے ہیں۔ اور وہاں جا کر انہوں نے اپنے فرض کو حد درجہ سے بڑھ کر کامیابی سے انجام دیا۔ جب وہ وہاں پہنچتے ہیں تو انہیں نظر آتا ہے کہ یہاں نمک راولپنڈی کی طرف سے آتا تھا۔ اس کو پاکستان کی طرف سے روک لیا گیا اور یہ انسان اور مویشی نمک کے بغیر ترس رہے ہیں۔ تو ہندوستانی فوج کے سپاہی اپنے ریشم کا نمک اٹھا کر ان لوگوں کو دے دیتے تھے۔ یہ تھا ہندوستان کی فوج کے طرز عمل کا ادنیٰ سا نمونہ۔

[ مولانا مسعودی ]

میں آپ سے سچ کہتا ہوں کہ جو قابليتیں ہندوستان کی فوج کے سپاہیوں اور اس فوج کے افسروں میں ہیں وہ ادھر مجھے باہر سول (civil) آبادی میں ذرا کم نظر آتی ہیں۔ آج آپ چلائے ہیں بلیک مارکیٹیز کے خلاف اور رشوت خوروں کے خلاف۔ ان لوگوں کے خلاف جو اس دیہے کو بڑھانے کے لئے اس کی مدد کرنے کے لئے۔ ذرا بہر بھی تکلیف اٹھانے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں ایسی حالت میں میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہی فوجی سپاہی ایک عنصر ہے۔ یہی ایک سیکشن (section) عوام کا آپ کے سامنے موجود ہے جو ان تمام ناپاکوں سے پاک ہے جن کی شکایت آپ کو ہوتی لوگوں سے ہے۔ ہندوستانی سپاہی ملک کا وہ فرزند ہے جس میں تعصب نہیں۔ بدذہمیت نہیں۔ جس میں لالچ نہیں۔ جس میں بددیانتی نہیں اور جس کے دل میں زیادہ سے زیادہ اپنے وطن کی اور اپنے وطن کے لوگوں کی محبت ہے۔ اسی لئے میں تو اس دن کا انتظار کرتا ہوں جب ہمارا ہر ایک ہندوستانی جو بھی بالغ آدمی ہو وہ فوجی سپاہی بن جائے۔ فوجی اس لئے نہیں کہ ہم کو فوجی بن کر کسی پر حملہ کرنا ہے یا کسی کو لوٹنا ہے۔ ایسا کچھ نہیں ہے کیونکہ وہ تو ہمارے اس بیانی اصول کے ہی برخلاف ہے جس اصول پر چٹکو ہمارے باپوں نے ہمیں آزادی دلائی ہے۔ اس لئے جب ہم ان اصولوں کے

خلاف چلیں گے جو باپوں نے ہمیں سکھائے ہیں تو اس وقت یہ ہمارا ملک ہندوستان تباہ ہو جائے گا۔ یہ ہمارا اصول نہیں ہے کہ ہم سارے لوگ فوجی بن کر آئیں اور پاکستان پر چھن پر یا برما پر چڑھ دوڑیں۔ اصل بات یہ ہے کہ کسی قوم میں جو اوصاف۔ خصوصیات اور صفات ضروری ہوتی ہیں اور جو ہمارا مقصد ہے کہ ہر ایک ہندوستانی میں پیدا ہوں تاکہ دنیا کے اور ملکوں میں ہندوستان کا سر اونچا ہو سکے تو وہ اوصاف اس وقت صرف ہندوستان کے فوجی بھائیوں میں ہیں۔ اس لئے میں یہ چاہتا ہوں کہ ہر ایک ہندوستانی فوجی بنے۔ اور ہمیں اپنی فوج میں تکمیل کرنے کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے۔ ہمیں مہن پارور (man power) کی بہت ضرورت ہے۔ آج آپ کو کھیتی باڑی کے بڑھانے کے لئے بہت آدمیوں کی ضرورت ہے۔ کارخانوں اور دوسری انڈسٹریز کو بڑھانے کے لئے آدمیوں کی ضرورت ہے۔ کہیں نہ ایسی نئی اسکیموں کو چلانے میں آپ فوجوں سے کام لیں؟ تمام ملک میں تعلیم پھیلانے کا جو کام ہے وہ اگر ان فوجیوں سے لیا جائے تو میں آپ کو یقین دلاتا ہوں کہ وہ اس کو بہت اچھے طریقے سے انجام دینگے اور وہ یہاں کے ان پڑھے لوگوں کو بہت کم وقت میں تعلیم یافتہ بنا دینگے۔ کرو موو فوڈ (Grow more food) کا معاملہ بھی وہ بہت جلدی حل کر سکیں گے۔ میں

اس موقعہ سے فائدہ اُٹھاتے ہوئے اپنے فوجی ہتھیاروں کو اور بالخصوص جو شمالی اور مغربی محاذ پر اس دیہ کی حفاظت کر رہے ہیں ان کو اپنی طرف سے سلام بھیجنا چاہتا ہوں۔ خیر! تو میں آپ سے یہ عرض کر رہا تھا کہ ایک چیز جو مجھے پسند آتی اور جس کی تائید میں نے ضروری سمجھی ڈاکٹر صاحب کی تقریر میں یہ تھی کہ جب تک کشمیر کی کسی ایک اینج زمین پر بھی اُن کا قبضہ ہے تب تک ہمیں کبھی آرام سے نہیں رہنا چاہیئے اور اس قبضے کو جو صحیح معنوں میں پورے ایکریشن (pure aggression) ہے اس کو دور کرنے کی کوشش کرنی چاہیئے۔

ان کی دوسری بات جو مجھے پسند آئی۔ اگرچہ وقت میرا تھوڑا رہ گیا ہے لیکن میں صاحب صدر کی اجازت سے اس کو بھی کہہ دینا چاہتا ہوں اور وہ یہ ہے کہ پاکستان نے تقسیم کے بعد ایک دوسرا اختیار کی اور اس سے ناجائز فائدہ اُٹھایا اور اپنے یہاں کی اقلیتوں پر زیادہ سے زیادہ ظلم کیا اور اس کے بعد کہہ ہوتا ہے۔ چاہے ہندوستان کی حکومت اور ہندوستان کے ذمہ دار لوگ کتنا ہی اپنے یہاں امن رکھنا چاہیں تو بھی یہاں کی اقلیتوں کو خطرہ محسوس ہونے لگتا ہے اور وہ خطرے میں پڑ جاتی ہیں۔ اس سے پاکستان کو اپنے یہاں بھی فائدہ ہے اور

بہار دنیا میں بھی فائدہ ہے۔ وہ تو یہی چاہتا ہے تاکہ وہ ہندوستان کو دنیا میں بدنام کر سکے اور اپنے یہاں کی اقلیتوں کو باہر دھکیل سکے۔ اس کا علاج کبھی سنجیدہ طریقے سے نہیں سوچا گیا کہ پاکستان کی اس حرکت کو کھسے روکا جائے اور کھسے وہ اپنی اس حرکت سے باز آئے۔

اگر ہم یہ کہیں کہ اچھا تم ایک کروڑ ہندوؤں کو نکالتے ہو ہم چار کروڑ مسلمان جو ہندوستان میں بستے ہیں ان کو نکالنا چاہتے ہیں تو ایک تو یہ بات انسانی اصول اور ہند کے کاستی تموشن کے خلاف ہے اور ساتھ ہی پاکستان اس کی کوئی پروا بھی نہیں کرتا۔ کہوں کہ اُن کا تو پہلے ہی سے یہ قول تھا اور مسٹر جناح مرحوم سے جس وقت یہ سوال کیا گیا کہ جب آپ تقسیم ہند کریں گے تو اس کے بعد ان مسلمانوں کا کیا ہوگا جو ہندوستان میں رہ جائیں گے اور تو آپ نے بڑی بے تکلفی سے کہا تھا کہ میں چار کروڑ کو چھ کروڑ پر قربان کر دوں گا۔ تو بس ان کے یہاں تو سارا معاملہ ختم ہو گیا اور تقسیم (dismiss) ہو گیا۔ لہذا جو لوگ آج مسٹر جناح کے جانشین ہیں ان سے ہندوستان کے چار کروڑ مسلمان کوئی دوسری امید نہیں رکھ سکتے۔ ان کے یہاں تو صاف ہے کہ چلو ایک کروڑ ہندوؤں کو یہاں سے نکال دو اور ان کی زمینیں جائداد سب کچھ اپنے قبضے میں

[ مولانا مسعودی ]

کر لو۔ اور جو چار کروڑ مسلمان بھائی ادھر ہندوستان میں بستے ہیں وہ چاہے مریں جیئیں وہ جانیں اور ان کی قسمت جائے۔ یہ علاج بھی نہیں ہو سکتا ہے کہ ان کو ایسا ہماری طرف سے کہا جائے۔ ڈاکٹر صاحب نے بہت اچھا علاج تجویز فرمایا ہے جب وہ کہتے ہیں کہ جتنے آدمی وہ وہاں سے نکالنا چاہتے ہیں نکالیں۔ لیکن اس کے ساتھ ہی وہ اتنی زمین بھی ہمارے لئے چھوڑ دیں اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس سے سنجدیگی سے غور کرنے کی ضرورت ہے۔ اور اس کے بعد وہ نہ صرف ہندوؤں کو بلکہ وہاں کے مسلمانوں کو بھی جن کو وہ نکالنا چاہتے ہوں یہاں بھیج دیں اور ان کے بسانے کے لئے ہمیں اتنی زمین بھی ساتھ دے دیں۔ اگر ایسا ہو جائے تو میں آپ کو یقین دلاتا ہوں کہ ایک بھی بدگالی ہندو وہاں سے نہیں آنے دیا جائے گا اور خود مستقر لیاقت علی ان کے پاؤں پڑینگے اور ان کو اپنے یہاں رکھینگے کیوں کہ ان لوگوں کے ساتھ پاکستان کو اتنی زمین بھی دینی ہو گی۔ ابھی تو حالت اتنی ہے اور اسی لئے ہمارے پاکستان کے دوست ان کو یہاں دھکیلنے کے لئے بے تاب رہتے ہیں کیونکہ ان کی چھوڑی ہوئی انہیں زمین جائداد وغیرہ مل جاتی ہے اور میں چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمیں ڈاکٹر صاحب کے اس سچھاؤ پر کافی غور کرنے کی ضرورت

ہے کیوں کہ اس کے ذریعہ اقلیتوں کا مسئلہ حل ہو سکتا ہے۔

میں پوچھتا ہوں کہ آخر یہ اتنا شور وغل کیوں ہے کہ اگر کشمیر کا فیصلہ نہیں ہوا تو دنیا کا امن تباہ ہو جائیگا آخر کشمیر کتنا بڑا ملک ہے جس سے ساری دنیا کا امن خطرے میں پڑنے کا اندیشہ ہے۔ وہاں کل چالیس لاکھ آدمی ہی نو بستے ہیں۔ پاکستان میں سے جو ایک کروڑ آدمیوں کو نکالا جا رہا ہے اور جن کے نکالے جانے سے ہندوستان میں جو چار کروڑ آدمی بستے ہیں ان پر اثر پڑیگا تو کیا یہ پانچ چھ کروڑ انسانوں کی زندگی اور ان کے امن کے تباہ ہونے سے دنیا کے امن کو کوئی نقصان نہیں پہنچ سکتا اور محض کشمیر کے چند لاکھ آدمیوں سے دنیا کا امن تباہ ہو جائیگا؟ اس لئے اب موقع آ گیا ہے کہ حکومت ہند اس معاملے کو زیادہ مضبوطی کے ساتھ دنیا کے سامنے لائے۔ جناب والا! میں نے وقت بہت زیادہ لے لیا اس کے لئے میں معافی چاہتا ہوں اور آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوا بات ختم کرتا ہوں۔

(English translation of the above speech)

Maulana Masuodi (Jammu and Kashmir): I have stood up to support the motion of thanks on the President's Address. From the spirit which inspires this address I am glad to note that a firm attitude has been taken especially with regard to the Kashmir issue and the threats held out by Pakistan in that connection. It is a truth that the existence of Pakistan, which is quite a big State at present, is due neither to any great sacrifice nor to any heroic exploits. If you were to consider the whole of its his-

tory, its genesis, you will find that its existence is based on threats, only threats and nothing but threats. Pakistan came into being as a result of threats; it means to subsist with the help of threats. If its neighbours, in particular India, were to yield to its threats, there would be no end to trouble. Pakistan is presenting the Kashmir issue to the world in a highly exaggerated form. However, the facet of that question which it presents to the outside world is quite different from the propaganda it broadcasts for home consumption. Before the rest of the world it pleads that forty lakhs of helpless people are suffering persecution at the hands of oppressors and that their liberation is the concern solely of Pakistan. When, however, it address its own people on the question of Kashmir, it says to them, "Without Kashmir you cannot survive; if Kashmir does not come in, Pakistan would be faced with extinction." There is truth neither in the first statement nor in the second. The reality is that the present leadership of Pakistan and the party there in power have become extremely unpopular in that country on account of their selfish aims and wrong politics.

Those who have some time had an opportunity of visiting any of the cities of Pakistan are in a position to tell us that the most unpopular Government in existence at the present time is the League Government of Pakistan. Sitting here, at such a long distance, if you can draw any conclusion from the frequently occurring conspiracies in the Pakistan army, the condition of their people and the slogans of the various parties there, it is going to be this that the party in power is holding its sway only with the help of intrigues and cunning and not by dint of service to the people or on the score of any kind of popularity. What greater proof of their unpopularity could there be than this that even after a lapse of five years they have not had the courage to give their people anything like a constitution. The reason is that what they want to lay before them is not what they promised in their slogans, while what the people want apparently does not suit them. Thus such an essential thing as a Constitution is being put off for an indefinite period on one pretext or the other. Their attitude is the same with regard to any other matter, and today Kashmir offers them the only slogan with which they are frantically trying to keep their party from tottering. Whenever people raise their head and want to establish a better Government of their choice and liking after ousting the present unpopular party these people immediately raise the

Kashmir bogey and declare that if they took any such step it would jeopardise their stand on Kashmir. On the other hand, the support of foreign powers is being canvassed in the name of Kashmir. It is said peace would be endangered if Pakistan does not get Kashmir. There are imperialist powers which have always been opposing the progress of Asia and which cannot, even now, bear to see the rise of a resurgent Asia. Pakistan is exploiting these powers in the name of Kashmir. This is a double game that is being played in Pakistan. And, their *modus operandi* in all this is based on threats and threats only. They thought things would turn out in much the same way as they did last time, before the partition of India, when they gave threats—threats of massacre and bloodshed, threats of rioting—saying that if the demand for Pakistan was not accepted, streams of blood would flow in the country. The Congress conceded the demand under duress. But, would the extent of bloodshed, ruin and carnage have been greater than it was had the partition not been accepted? Since this was not foreseen and their threat worked on the last occasion they think they can go on using threats to realise their further plans. And so, when, as we have the satisfaction to note, the Government of India, realizing their duty, acted firmly, in the face of a fresh invasion of Kashmir, and sent their defence forces to places twenty miles this side of the border before their threats could take a practical shape, the result was that the threats remained mere empty threats. When those who were showing the clenched fist saw that the fists might be answered with kicks, they were pretty soon disillusioned. I congratulate the Government of India on their present attitude. I would like this attitude to be adopted always. This attitude should be adopted not only with regard to the Kashmir issue but also with regard to the questions of East Bengal and all other matters in dispute between Pakistan and India which are awaiting settlement.

My hon. friend, Dr. Mookerjee, said one or two things in his yesterday's speech to which I must lend my support. He said that when on the one hand we declare that an invasion of any part of Kashmir would be considered an invasion of India itself, we should also consider the occupation of any part of Kashmir as the occupation of India itself. This is a commendable proposition. I want to remind the Government of India that at the time the Indian liberation forces landed in Kashmir, the Hon'ble Prime Minister while speaking at Baramulla, on the 11th November, 1947, promised to the people of that place that the Govern-

[Maulana Masuodi]

ment of India would not rest till they liberate every inch of the Kashmir soil from the hold of the aggressors. I just want to remind you that about one-third of the Jammu and Kashmir State territory and about one-fourth of its population, which undoubtedly belong to India, are still in the hands of the usurpers and aggressors. The people of Kashmir have decided that Kashmir is a part of India. What else can we decide? The history of this country shows that Kashmir has formed a part of this country from antiquity. Now, that an attempt is being made to cut it away from India, it becomes our first and foremost duty to resist any such attempt. You should know that the condition of the people living on the other side of the cease-fire line, is worse than that of serfs. Not only are those persons, who are unfortunately called non-Muslims, being forced to live the life of abject slavery but even those called Muslims are being meted out the same kind of treatment. I offer a challenge today that if things are to be decided by means of partial plebiscite let us have the decision of these people also who live on the other side of the cease-fire line. I shall be prepared to accept that decision provided Pakistan withdraws her forces, both regular and irregular, from that area. After that their votes alone should be taken. Whatever decision they give in this connection would be acceptable to us. We know that 95 per cent. of the votes of the people on the other side of the cease-fire line are with us. And so far as this side of the cease-fire line is concerned the position is that we have repeatedly challenged Pakistan and her supporters to come into the field and contest the elections to the Constituent Assembly which are about to be conducted. There is an open field for them. They can put up their own candidates and fight it out in any constituency they like. Let the services of the present U.N.O. Observers be utilised for watching the whole thing, to see if any undue influence might be exercised by the National Conference against their adversaries. After all, undue influence is not something that can in any way be concealed. For exercising undue influence, one has to take the help of the army or the police or use arms. Come and see if any undue influence is at all being exercised. You can easily judge whether or not the elections to the Constituent Assembly are being conducted with any kind of pressure. But they have not the guts to accept the challenge because they know in their heart of hearts that the Muslims are cent per cent. with Sheikh Abdulla. As for the non-Muslims, they would never do—not till eternity—anything which

would help the cause of Pakistan,—a country where there is, for them, neither any safety of life, nor of property, nor of honour—a country which is a slur not only on the fair name of Islam but of the entire humanity. In this latter part of the twentieth century there is no Government in any part of the world where a person is unable to keep his life, honour and property safe because of his religious beliefs. As a Muslim I must admit with a sense of shame that these things are happening there at this time. It is the perverted leadership of the Muslim League that has brought shame upon eight crore people of Pakistan—people who profess Islam as their faith, people who cannot all be bad, for, after all, there must be good men among them. But today, because of the misdeeds of their leaders, their honour has come to be tarnished.

In any case, as I was submitting, we have declared that the elections to the Constituent Assembly would even now be completely impartial. It so happens that about eighteen lakh people are participating in it. It is a strange coincidence that just as in India about eighteen crore people are going to the polls, so in Kashmir about eighteen lakh people are going to cast their votes. In this way, about eighteen lakh people are going to participate in these elections. After all, it would be a big affair. How far can anyone keep it concealed or covered? As for my hon. friend, Dr. Graham—whatever view of his assignment might be taken in Karachi and Muzaffarabad—he seems to be moving about in Delhi and Srinagar as an uninvited guest. If he cannot accomplish anything else—and he would of course not accomplish anything—let him at least be in Srinagar during the coming elections. This course is open to him—for he has been allowed this privilege even though the Kashmiris did not want it. Let him come and see things with his own eyes. If the U.N.O. attaches any importance to the will of the people of Kashmir and if at all its claim, that the will of the people of Kashmir alone, is the deciding factor is based on truth and is not just make-believe he can go back and submit a useful report. In this way he would be serving the U.N.O. in the right manner and could tell them which way the people of Kashmir are inclined.

Dr. Kunzru asks why Pakistan is afraid of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly when the Government of India have repeatedly assured them that the decision of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir would not in any way prejudice and bar the decisions

of the U.N.O. I would like to remove his anxieties about this matter and tell him why Pakistan is feeling nervous. This declaration of the Government of India is not unknown to Pakistan. They know, however, what the real position is. The only possible results of the plebiscite for which they are raising such a hue and cry, are not unknown to them and hence they would not allow this plebiscite to take a practical shape. They know, the plebiscite would not be held until and unless all the occupied areas of Kashmir are liberated. It cannot materialise until and unless all those people of Kashmir who are roaming about as homeless wanderers in Rawalpindi and other places, are rehabilitated in their original homes. The plebiscite cannot be held until and unless all those refugees, who have been uprooted from the so-called Azad Kashmir, where they were robbed of everything they possessed, and are now spread all over the country from Delhi to Jammu and Srinagar, are taken back to and rehabilitated in their original homes. They know that the plebiscite cannot be held unless and until the northern areas and the so-called "Azad Kashmir" territory come under the Government of Kashmir. Until such conditions are created the plebiscite cannot be held. They understand all these things fully. Thus they realize that there would be and can be no plebiscite. Now the only thing that would count would be the decision and that the type of plebiscite that is being convened there and for which elections are being held. In due course, a time would come when the U.N.O. and the whole world would have to face the fact that India and Pakistan have not been able to arrive at a decision and that the type of plebiscite that was intended to be held there is no longer possible. But, then, the decision of the people of Kashmir would be there. After all, could that decision be ignored altogether? This decision is not going to be a routine affair. It would be nothing of that kind. It is not that the people of Kashmir have just had a fancy to convene a Constituent Assembly as a kind of social function and to hold elections for the purpose. It is under Article 370 of the Indian Constitution that Kashmir has been given the right to convene a Constituent Assembly and take its decisions.

So the decisions of the Assembly which would be convened, according to the Indian Constitution, would enjoy the support and approval of the whole of India in general and of this House in particular. Do you think that the decisions of Kash-

mir, which will have the support and approval of this House and of the Constitution of this great country, will be ignored by the world? Do you think our Pakistani friends, even in their insanity, are unable to understand even that much? Can't they imagine how important are the decisions of this Constituent Assembly going to be? Dr. Kunzru need not, therefore, have any anxiety on that score. The Pakistanis might well be worried about it, their anxiety is justified. In fact, their worries are bound to increase. That is why they moved their armies into Poonch area at this stage so as to foil the Constituent Assembly plans. And it was to make the Constituent Assembly a failure that they began to hold out threats of *Jehad*. They did lots of other things—both open and clandestine. But all their machinations failed. They incited the people of Pakistan to a high pitch and tried to play with their sentiments. I have no doubt that had they not been checked, they would certainly have done some mischief by now, because we know that Pakistan is not alone in its mischief-making. There are other powers encouraging it. Some one is patting it on the back. They share its ambitions. These matters are not the concern of Kashmir and India alone but have a bearing on the whole of Asia. But when it realised that for every single blow two would be returned, it kept back.

In any case, I offer my congratulations to the Government of India for all the sacrifices made by them and machinations failed. They incited the more that the coming elections in Kashmir would be completely fair and impartial. If Pakistan and the U.N.O. people deliberately choose not to appreciate their importance and are not prepared to come and see them in progress, I should at least expect my friends in this House to come over, while the session is on, and watch them for the sake of diversion. Let me assure you that you are bound to notice some of its good features which would be of satisfaction to you.

As for an invasion being made or a war being launched by Pakistan against Kashmir or against any other part of India, I think it is out of the question, the possibility of such a thing is ruled out by now. Some people think that possibly there is still some lurking danger of that kind. But so far as we, the people of Kashmir, are concerned, we know well, being in close proximity to them, that the possibility of a war has receded. There is no such danger any more.

[Maulana Masuodi]

But of course, that does not mean that we can afford to sit and relax. I am in full accord with Dr. Kunzru that the one time proposed reduction of the armed forces would have been a very faulty step and that kind of things must be put off if not for good, at least for a considerably long time.

With regard to the armed forces, Dr. Kunzru has observed that the expenditure on them is unproductive. Here I differ. From the experience that we have of the Indian Army—and I think no other part of the country has that experience of the Indian Army which the people of Kashmir have—we feel that India may well be proud of her Army and her army-men. You may just visualize the time and the situation when the Indian armed forces arrived in Kashmir. The whole country, from one end to the other, was in the grip of a hysteria. Lost of well-educated people had also succumbed to that hysteria; they had not been able to resist the malady. This was one aspect of the matter. On the other hand our army had to pass through the territory of the Punjab which was a veritable inferno, boiling over with communal passions. Think again what type of people the raiders were. They were the same people who had looted the hearths and homes of many an armyman of ours. Take, for instance, the case of those of our soldiers whose homes were situated in the districts of Rawalpindi and Gujranwala, on the very route of the raiders. Again, these armies reached Kashmir at a time when it was so very difficult to distinguish a friend from a foe, particularly when all were equally good Muslims by outward appearance. You may also imagine what it was for a body of Hindus to face a body of Muslims four years ago. A Hindu then thought that the mere fact that a person was a Muslim made him his enemy and similarly a Muslim regarded a person as his enemy if only he happened to be a Hindu. Such were the times when these armies arrived in Kashmir. All that they were reminded of was that they were there with the blessings and the permission of Gandhiji. They were further reminded that they were there to prove the truth of the principle to which Gandhiji had dedicated all his life. That principle was to put an end to the Hindu-Muslim differences. They were called upon to vindicate that principle. They were told that they were there to eradicate the virus of communalism. Further they went there with the memories of their wounded kith and kin still fresh in

their hearts and the scenes of the looting of their properties, their hearths and homes, still fresh before their eyes. These were the circumstances prevailing at the time of their arrival in Kashmir. They were not at all aware of the communal situation in Kashmir itself at that time. They did not know what Sheikh Abdulah and the National Conference stood for. They came to know about all these things only afterwards. On the first day of their arrival there they were absolutely ignorant of the kind of people they were going to deal with and of the situation prevailing there. These were the circumstances then prevailing and such was the territory through which these soldiers had to pass before they reached Kashmir. Having got there they discharged their obligations in an exemplary manner. What did they find on arrival there? They found that the supply of salt, which came from Rawalpindi alone, had been stopped by Pakistan and that both men and cattle were suffering on that account. The soldiers of the Indian Army did not hesitate to share the salt from their own rations with them. This is a small but typical example of the conduct of the Indian Army.

I must say that the virtues that I find in the officers and men of the Indian Army are not commonly to be seen among the civil population. Today you are crying against the black-marketers and the corrupt officials, that is, people who are not prepared to make the least sacrifice or undergo the least inconvenience for the sake of their country or to help it in a difficult time. Under these circumstances, I think the soldiers are the only section of the public—the only element—who may be deemed to be free from all those corrupt tendencies which we attribute to the other people. These are the people who are above all communal prejudice, dishonesty or greed. They are the men who entertain the utmost affection for their country and their countrymen. I am, therefore, looking forward to the day when every adult Indian would become a soldier. He would not become a soldier to attack or loot anybody. No such thing; for that is opposed to the fundamental principle which the Father of the Nation adopted to win freedom for us. When we act contrary to the principles which the Father of the Nation taught us to follow it would lead to the ruin of India, our country. It is not our principle that all of us should enrol ourselves as soldiers and invade Pakistan, China, Burma or any other country. The qualities and characteristics that a rising nation must pos-

sess and which we long to see in every Indian, so that India may hold her head high in the comity of Nations, are found at present in our armymen alone. That explains why I want to see every Indian a soldier. We need not reduce the size of our army. We have great need of manpower today. You need a large number of men today to promote agriculture as also for the various trades and industries. I fail to see why we should not put our armymen to work in these spheres. There is before us the problem of spreading literacy throughout the country. If we entrust this task to the army, I assure you, they would accomplish it in a very befitting manner and would make all our people literate in a very short time. Similarly they would provide a speedy solution for our food problem. Taking this opportunity I send my hearty greetings to my brethren of the army, in particular those who are at present engaged in guarding the Northern and Western frontiers of this country. As I was submitting, the one thing that I liked in the hon. Doctor's speech and to which I lend my support is that we should not rest so long as a single inch of the soil of Kashmir remains in the hands of the enemy and that we must take steps to put an end to the occupation by the enemy which is nothing but pure aggression.

There is one thing more in his speech which I have liked. Although I am left with very little time, yet with your permission, Sir, I should like to mention it. He has observed that ever since the Partition Pakistan has adopted a peculiar attitude and has been taking undue advantage of the situation by perpetrating the worst kind of atrocities on its minorities. What is the result? Howsoever anxious the Government of India and the responsible sections of its population might be to preserve peace in the country, the minorities here are bound to have a feeling of insecurity and nervousness. Pakistan utilizes such a situation to her advantage both inside and outside of that country. This affords them a splendid opportunity to malign India and at the same time to throw out its own minorities. No serious thought has yet been given to the problem as to how we might make Pakistan desist from such nefarious activities. If we were to take the stand that we would turn out four crores of Muslims if one crore of Hindus were turned out from Pakistan, this would not only be against human conscience and the Indian Constitution but would even fail to deter Pakistan from the course of action it is

at present following, for, from the very beginning, they have held the view which was once expressed by Mr. Jinnah when he was questioned as to what would be the fate of the Muslims left in India as a result of the Partition of the country. He had then stated, with an air of nonchalance, that he would not mind sacrificing four crores of his co-religionists for the sake of the other six crores. To them this is a closed chapter now and they have washed their hands of it. Naturally, therefore, the four crores of Muslims in India cannot have any hopes from the successors of the late Mr Jinnah. They in Pakistan are quite clear in their mind that they have to turn out one crore of Hindus living within their domain and to usurp their lands, properties and belongings of all kinds. They have no concern for the four crores of Muslims living in India. They do not care whether they live or die and are prepared to leave them to their fate. Thus, we cannot suggest such a thing to them as this would be no remedy. The hon. Doctor has suggested a commendable remedy when he says that they might turn out as many people as they like, but let them at the same time cede to us land as should be sufficient to rehabilitate them. I think the proposal deserves serious thought. Let them then turn out as many Hindus as they like—and even Muslims—but let them also cede sufficient land for them. Could that be possible, I assure you that not a single Bengali Hindu would be allowed to migrate from East Bengal and Mr. Liaquat Ali himself would implore them to remain where they are, for otherwise Pakistan would have to cede a proportionate area for their rehabilitation. Things are, however, just the other way at present and our Pakistani friends are terribly anxious to drive them out in order thereby to grab their lands and other properties. I hope the hon. Doctor's suggestion would receive due consideration as it provides a good solution to the problem of the minorities.

I wonder why so much hue and cry is being raised and the threat held out that failing a solution of the Kashmir dispute the peace of the world would be jeopardised. What is the reason? Kashmir, after all, is not such a big country as to imperil the peace of the whole world. Only forty lacs of people live there. As many as a crore of persons are being turned out from Pakistan which might have its repercussions on the four crores of people living in India. How is it that the ruin of these five or six crores of human beings would not harm world peace in anyway but that a few lacs

[Maulana Masuodi]

of Kashmiris can be the cause of such a world catastrophe? It is, therefore, time the Government of India acted with firmness in bringing this matter to the world's notice.

Sir, I am sorry to have taken so much time. I thank you and close.

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Madhya Pradesh): After the very eloquent and moving speech of the hon. the previous speaker...

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya**: Did you understand what he said?

**Shri Frank Anthony**: Yes, Sir. I understood it very well and I was almost tempted to address the House in Urdu.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya**: Then speak in Urdu.

**Shri Frank Anthony**: But the subject that I am going to deal with will perhaps come as something like an anticlimax. I must apologize that I was not in my seat yesterday when the amendment which stands in my name was called. In his address to this House the President referred to the fact that the rise in prices in recent months is a matter which is causing grave concern to his Government. I believe that this perhaps is one of the most vital problems which faces our Government and the country and it is because of that that I gave notice of an amendment—I hope the hon. Finance Minister will listen to me, Sir—which regrets, I am sorry my amendment regrets, that despite the rise in prices contrary to the expectations of Government, Government has not seen fit to revalue the Rupee. I am not going to pretend to speak as an expert and because of that I venture to hope that this House will listen to my opinions as a layman and I hope an informed layman, with a certain amount of respect. I might mention that I have not been influenced by the statement of previous Finance Ministers. I have been influenced more by the evidence of my own eyes and I have been influenced most by the evidence of my own pocket. I may assure the hon. Finance Minister that I have the very greatest respect for him. I give him not only the respect but even the awe which a layman like myself is supposed to show to an expert like him. No one except an ignoramus will suggest that this problem of the exchange value of the Rupee with all its attendant complexities is an easy problem. The hon. Finance Minister in replying to me may say that there is always a danger of a layman like myself trying to oversimplify a matter like this or

to dogmatize, but I would say that this danger to which not only laymen are prey, is a danger to which sometimes even hon. Finance Ministers and even Reserve Banks succumb.

Unfortunately I was not able to be present during the debate on the Demands for Grants but when I read that debate, I found that in replying to it the hon. Finance Minister said that at the moment Government felt that it would not be in the interests of the country to revalue the Rupee. My attention was particularly attracted to the phrase 'at the moment'. From that phrase, I believe, I am right in assuming that this problem has been constantly before the Government and of the hon. Finance Minister. It is, as I have said, a very vital problem and I would ask the hon. Finance Minister whether while at that moment in April Government did not consider it necessary or advisable to revalue the Rupee, whether at this moment or at some moment in the near future Government considers it necessary to revalue the Rupee. Another question which I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister is this. Does Government consider that the measures which it has adopted are the only measures necessary to combat inflation? So far as I can make out, one of Government's main planks in its policy to hold internal prices is through export duties. No one will deny that export duties up to a point can hold internal prices, but I have said advisedly only up to a point. To my mind as a layman, there are two dangers with regard to export duties. The first is this: That Government may become bemused with or hypnotized by export duties. Export duties constitute a convenient conduit through which Government can conveniently drain revenue into a needy exchequer. I believe that the Finance Minister calculates that through his export duties the exchequer will gain to the extent of something between 50 and 60 crores. Because it represents such convenient conduit for bringing in this additional revenue, there is a real danger that Government may be inclined to overwork export duties for the sake of export duties rather than for the sake of holding internal prices. When I read the journals and writings by Economists and specialists, the other more cogent argument which is adduced against export duties as an effective remedy to fight the rise in cost of living is this that export duties, in fact, have very little influence on the cost of living index.

Someone has calculated that these export duties only affect about 5 per cent. of the items which comprise the cost of living content.

Perhaps, another main plank in Government's policy is liberalised imports. Here, again, no one denies that liberalised imports can, up to a certain extent, help to resist the rise in the cost of living. But, people are not certain whether liberalised imports constitute a deliberate act of Government policy or whether it is something which is only temporary or something which is adventitious. Even here, it is argued that a liberalised import policy allied with a revalued rupee will be much more effective in fighting the rising cost of living than a liberalised import policy with a devalued rupee. That should be axiomatic, because with a devalued rupee, we are paying more for our imports and the rise in price in terms of rupees gives an impetus to the cost of living index.

I believe that the hon. Finance Minister implied, if he did not expressly take the stand, that Government would, because of a devalued rupee, hold its balance of payment position. I think that is the stand which the Finance Minister took and I believe that is Government's main argument in not re-valuing the rupee that it is with a devalued rupee that they will be able to hold the balance of payment position.

**Shri B. Das (Orissa):** Nobody knows what the Government is thinking!

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I will not go to the same extent as my hon. friend who says that nobody knows what the Government thinks.

But, I think the hon. Finance Minister gave it as his estimate or perhaps it was the estimate of the Reserve Bank that with a 15 per cent. revaluation of the rupee, Government anticipated a 50 crore deficit in the balance of payment position and that with a 30 per cent. revaluation of the rupee, Government calculated that there would be a deficit of 135 crores in the balance of payment position. I will confess that I am not in a position to call these estimates in question. But, I have read figures published by estimable journals; I have read statements and articles on Government's estimates. People who know say categorically that these estimates are completely untenable. They want to know how Government arrived at these estimates. Econo-

mists and specialists tell us that according to them with a devalued rupee, Government will not be able to hold the balance of payment position, that it is only with a revalued rupee that Government will be able to hold the balance of payments position. They say that with your devalued rupee,—and they give figures—not only will you not be able to hold the balance of payment position, but that you may expect about 100 crore of payment position, but that you say except about a 100 crore deficit in the balance of payments position. On the other hand, they maintain,—and I would like the hon. Finance Minister to tell us whether what they maintain is wrong,—that with a revalued rupee, we will be able to hold the balance of payment position, and more than that we will perhaps have a favourable balance.

Now, the hon. Finance Minister will say, "Oh, you have forgotten the losses that will occur with a revalued rupee". In the articles which I have referred to, this loss is conceded. It is estimated that the loss from the imports and sealing down of tariff would be about 12 crores. It is conceded that Government will lose, with a revalued rupee, about 20 to 25 crores on export duty; that is a total of 30 to 40 crores. It is argued against this conceded loss of 30 to 40 crores, that this loss will not only be made up, but will be more than made up by reduced expenditure on our colossal and growing food imports, by reduced expenditure on importing the needs and equipment for the armed forces, and by reduced expenditure on the whole range of imports. They say that this loss of 30 to 40 crores will be made up very completely.

One of the most cogent arguments which I have come across in favour of immediate revaluation is this. Government maintains that it could hold its balance of payment position with a devalued rupee. Some people say that Government is not maintaining the balance of payment position; others say that if it has been done for a few months, Government is holding the external position very precariously and that Government's estimates will be falsified by events, and that Government's estimate that it can hold the position is due to the fact that there is a false and artificial estimate of our export position. On the other hand, they contend, and I agree with them as a layman, that Government with a devalued rupee is utterly impotent to hold our internal position. While not pointing a figure.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

at the Government, they say that they appreciate the complexities of the position and that no one can attempt to forecast things with any precision. But we are not fortified in our faith in Government forecasts by what has happened in the past. I for one am reminded not of what the present Finance Minister said, but by what one of his predecessors assured me 2½ years ago. I think Dr. Matthai told this House blandly that Government expects to hold the general index figure, and hoped to bring it down to 350. What has happened to that forecast, we know. Today, the general index figure stands above 450. My hon. friend Pandit Kunzru has pointed to the fact that the general index figure has gone up steadily. I think since October, 1950 it has gone up by about 50 points. Since March of this year, if I remember aright, it has gone up by 17 points. That is the figure I have got. Unless the Eastern Economist is not to be relied upon since March, it has gone up by 17 points. The general index figure for March given in the Eastern Economist was 438.6 and 456.3 is the figure given for June. According to my calculation, since March, the general index figure has gone by about 17 points. My hon. friend at my back, who is an expert while I am not, reminds me that since April, the figure has fallen. I think it may have fallen by a few decimal points or as the "Statesman" has announced, it has fallen by 2.5. Will the Government argue from this that whereas the general cost of living index has gone up by 17 points since March, because there has been a drop of a few decimal points, that is an indication that the index is on the downward trend?

**The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh):** It is so.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I hope so. But, as a layman I think that this is not a permanent or reliable trend. I feel that this is a temporary trend induced by a lull in the fighting in Korea and by the expectation of an early Cease-fire in Korea. Yesterday, as I was going out of the House, I was talking to one of the Members of the House and I told him about Government forecasts. He said Government forecasts have been characterised in a very illuminating way by a quip which says there are only two sets of incorrigible optimists in Delhi: the meteorologists who forecast drops of rain for Delhi and Members on the Treasury Benches who forecast drops in the cost of living. But, perhaps, the most cogent

argument to my mind is that while we concede the difficulty of the position and we concede that this is a problem about which no one can make any precise forecast, yet, in this field of vast uncertainty, there is one thing that Government can be completely certain about, and it is this: that international conditions today, and more so in the coming future, are not only going to give an impetus, but they are going to give a wildly inflationary impetus to the cost of living in this country. With the world embarked on a mad re-armaments race, with America committed to the expenditure of 140 billion dollars in two years on armaments, with England breaking her economic back in competing in this armaments race, with France and other countries feverishly stock-piling—we do not know whether India is also stock-piling—we can be certain of one thing, that we are in for an intensified and savagely intensified inflation; and the only way in which you can resist this inflation even partially is by revaluing the rupee. And, Sir, because of Government's inability to control the cost of living, what do we see to-day? We see the emergence of a new and powerful inflationary factor operating in India. I am referring to the agitation in industrial labour. I am against the threatened strike by railwaymen; but a great deal can be said to justify the demand of industrial labour for increased dearness allowance. With the increase in the cost of living, an unchecked increase, Government ultimately will not be able to deny this demand which is largely justified. Already the demand has been met to a microscopic extent and it has involved the Government in expenditure to the extent of eight crores—another inflationary impetus to the cost of living. We do not know whether industrial labour will be satisfied with this crumb. This I say, is the direct result of the fact that we have not adopted the only measure which people feel, to some extent, will offer resistance to the rise in the cost of living.

I end on this, that it is felt that if we delay in revaluing the rupee we will lose the benefits of revaluation. I was reading some reports recently about European countries and these reports seem to recommend an appreciation of the currencies of these European countries as a measure to combat inflation. And it is argued, and I believe argued validly, that when this recommendation for the appreciation of European currencies is effected and we also revalue, we will lose the definite benefits which we would gain if we had revalued

earlier or if we revalue to-day. Because of this, I would ask the Finance Minister to elaborate this position as to whether Government still feel or rather whether do not agree with those who feel that the time to revalue the rupee has not only arrived but is long overdue.

**शेख मोहिउद्दीन :** मैं आप को घन्य-वाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे इस में भाग लेने का अवसर दिया। यह सच है कि हमारे माननीय सदस्य सिधवा जी ने अपने भाषण में यह कहा कि कुछ सदस्यों की स्पीच एक एलेक्शन स्पीच (election speech) है। मगर मैं इस बात का विश्वासी नहीं हूँ, क्योंकि हमारे देशवासी कोई भी चीज बगैर अच्छी तरह से देखे हुए, और बगैर अच्छी तरह समझे हुए नहीं करते। इसलिये उन के भाषण को, जिस में माननीय सदस्य ने गवर्नमेण्ट को क्रिटिसाइज (criticize) किया है, अगर देशवासी हर पहलू को देख कर गवर्नमेण्ट के कामों पर नज़र करें तो मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि देशवासी हरगिज़ उस को एलेक्शन का भाषण नहीं समझेंगे, बल्कि तमाम कामों पर नज़र दौड़ा कर उस पर विचार करेंगे। मेरा यह ख्याल है और आज भारत भर में यह ख्याल है कि जितना काम हमारी सरकार ने पिछले चार सालों में किया है उतना काम दुनिया की कोई भी दूसरी नेशन (nation) नहीं कर सकेगी। अमरीका भी नहीं कर सकेगी और यहां तक कि इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस भी इतना काम नहीं कर सकेंगे। रूस भी जो कि आज इतनी ताकत वाला समझा जाता है उस को भी अपनी उन्नति करने में बहुत समय लगा है। परन्तु हमारी सरकार ने इतनी मुश्किल और दिक्कत के होते हुए भी इन चार वर्षों में जितना काम किया है वह दुनिया के सामने भौजूद है और दुनिया और देश इस पर नज़र रख कर इस की तारीफ़ करेगी यह मुझे उम्मीद है।

मेरा यह ख्याल है कि जो हमारे प्रेसी-डेण्ट साहब ने एड्रेस (Address) हमारे सामने रखा है यह सिर्फ़ एड्रेस ही नहीं है बल्कि इस में उन्होंने हम लोगों के सामने गवर्नमेण्ट का प्रोग्राम (programme) रखा है और आयन्दा इलेक्शन (election) के लिये यह एक स्पिरिट (spirit) देने वाली चीज़ है। अब तक गवर्नमेण्ट ने जितना काम किया है उस की इस एड्रेस में ब्राड आउटलाइन (broad outline) दी गई है। साथ ही गवर्नमेण्ट का आयन्दा प्रोग्राम भी देशवासियों के सामने रखा गया है। इस लिये यह चीज़ आयन्दा इलेक्शन के लिये एक स्पिरिट देने वाली चीज़ है।

हमारे सामने आज जितनी भी दिक्कतें और मुश्किलें आ रही हैं, मुझे उम्मीद है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के दिमाग और तजवीज़ की वजह से वह सब आसान हो जायेंगी और हो रही हैं।

**फॉरिन पालिसी (Foreign policy)** के बारे में मेरा यह नज़रिया है कि देश में कोई भी ऐसा नहीं होगा जो हमारे देश की फॉरिन पालिसी को एप्रीशियेट (appreciate) न करता हो। यह हमारे मुल्क के लिए फ़ख़ की बात है कि हम ने ऐसा प्राइम मिनिस्टर और हाउस का लीडर पाया है। यही नहीं है कि हमारी फॉरिन पालिसी अच्छी है, पर हमारी होम पालिसी (Home policy) भी इतनी अच्छी है कि देश की हर क्रौम चाहे वह हिन्दू हों, या मुसलमान हों, या क्रिश्चियन हों, या सिख हों, सब खुश हैं। आज हमारे देश में जिस नीति के अनुसार होम पालिसी चल रही है उस से देश के तमाम वाशिनदे खुश हैं और हमेशा गवर्नमेण्ट का साथ देने को तैयार हैं। पाँच करोड़ मुसलमान, जिन्होंने इस देश को अपना

[शेख मोहिउद्दीन]

वतन बनाया है और जो यहां रहेंगे, उन को गवर्नमेण्ट की पालिसी पर पूरा भरोसा है और वह हमेशा गवर्नमेण्ट का साथ देंगे। हमारे देश की फॉरिन पालिसी इतनी अच्छी और होम पालिसी इतनी अच्छी है कि देश का कोई भी आदमी, चाहे वह किसी भी पार्टी का हो, गवर्नमेण्ट को सपोर्ट (Support) करेगा। जो लीडरों के स्टेटमेण्ट (Statement) अखबारों में निकले हैं उनसे मालूम होता है कि वह सब गवर्नमेण्ट की फॉरिन पालिसी को सपोर्ट करते हैं। इस देश में जो पांच करोड़ मुसलमान रहते हैं और जो इस को अपना वतन समझते हैं वह इस पालिसी को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं और हमेशा गवर्नमेण्ट के साथ हैं। यह लोग कहते हैं कि अगर हमें भी कोई कुर्बानी करने की जरूरत होगी तो हम भी इस के लिए हमेशा तैयार हैं। इस की एक मिसाल संसद् के सामने काश्मीर मौजूद है। जिस तरह वेस्टर्न फ्रंट (western front) पर काश्मीर तैयार है उसी तरह ईस्टर्न फ्रंट पर बिहार के मुसलमान तैयार हैं पाकिस्तान से मुकाबला करने के लिए। मुझे विश्वास है कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान, जो हिन्दुस्तान में अपना वतन बना चुके हैं, उन को गवर्नमेण्ट पर पूरा विश्वास है और वह हमेशा अपनी गवर्नमेण्ट का साथ देने के लिए और अपनी मातृभूमि के लिए अपने जान माल की कुर्बानी देने के लिए तैयार हैं और तैयार रहेंगे।

सर, यह नहीं है कि हमारे यहां फॉरिन पालिसी और होम पालिसी अच्छी है, लेकिन फूड प्राबलम (food problem) को साल्व (solve) करने में जो हमारे यहां तरक्की हो रही है वह भी दुनिया के सामने है और वह एक मिसाल है। गत वर्ष दुनिया में हलचल मच गई थी कि हिन्दुस्तान की

फूड प्राबलम ऐसी है कि वह सरवाइव (Survive) नहीं कर सकेगा लेकिन फिर भी हमारी गवर्नमेण्ट ने देश को अकाल से बचाया और फूड प्राबलम का मुकाबला किया। इस साल भी जब दुनिया में चारों तरफ हलचल मच रही थी कि इस साल हिन्दुस्तान बच नहीं सकता, यहां अन्न नहीं है, पैसा भी नहीं है, इस परिस्थिति में भी हमारी गवर्नमेण्ट ने फूड प्राबलम का मुकाबला किया। वह चीज दुनिया के इतिहास में हमेशा कायम रहेगी। आज ऐसी उम्मीद नहीं की जा सकती कि देश में कोई अन्न के बिना मरेगा। आज यह पूरे तरीके से कहा जा सकता है कि कोई भी हिन्दुस्तान में भूख से नहीं मर सकता है। परन्तु हमें यह नजर नहीं आ रहा है कि भविष्य में हमारे एग्रीकल्चर (agriculture) की या फूड प्राबलम की ज्यादा तरक्की होने वाली है। एग्रीकल्चर के काम में कुछ तरक्की जरूर हो रही है पर उतनी नहीं जितनी कि होनी चाहिये, क्योंकि आज भी गवर्नमेण्ट का काम जितना थिओरिटिकल (theoretical) होता है उतना प्रैक्टिकल (practical) नहीं होता है। हम ने गत वर्ष फाइनेन्स बिल (Finance Bill) के सिलसिले में कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ हिस्से ऐसे हैं जो जूट पैदा करने में पाकिस्तान से कम नहीं है, और आज गौरव के साथ हाउस के सामने कह सकते हैं कि आज हम ईस्ट पाकिस्तान के किसी भी हिस्से से जूट पैदा करने में मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। जितना जूट और साल हुआ था उस से ५० फ्री सदी ज्यादा इस साल हुआ है। सिर्फ प्रोडक्शन (production) ही नहीं बढ़ा है पर जूट की खेती भी बढ़ी है। प्रेसीडेण्ट के एड्रेस में सिर्फ यह लिखा हुआ है कि जूट के ज्यादा होने का अन्दाजा किया जाता है। लेकिन आज हम समझते हैं कि यह चैलेंज (challenge) के साथ

कहा जा सकता है कि जूट का प्रोडक्शन ज्यादा हुआ है। जूट तैयार हो गया है, सिर्फ उसका वाशिंग (washing) नहीं हो पाया है। पर इससे जूट को कोई नुकसान होने का डर नहीं है। इधर तीन चार हफ्ते से बारिश न होने से कल्टीवेटर (cultivator) जूट का वाशिंग नहीं कर पाये हैं और उस को सुखा रहे हैं। परन्तु एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट ने कोई इन्स्ट्रक्शन (instruction) नहीं दिया है कि ऐसा न करो, और न कोई मदद दी है। तकावी जो किसानों को मिलती है वह कई आदमियों को मिला कर मिलता है और उस आदमी को मिलती है जिस के पास खेती होती है। मगर हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे बहुत से किसान हैं जिनके पास अपना खेत नहीं है बल्कि वह कन्ट्रैक्ट सिस्टम (contract system) पर खेती करते हैं। उन की फसल तैयार है पर अभी उन के पास पैसा नहीं है कि वह खाने पीने का इन्तजाम कर सकें। रुपये के लिये वह बड़े आदमियों के पास जाते हैं और बिजनेस वालों के पास जाते हैं और उन से रुपया उधार लेते हैं। आप को मालूम होना चाहिये कि पटवे की दर ६५ रुपया है परन्तु वह बिजनेस वाले एक महीना या १५ रोजके लिए रुपया देते हैं इस धर्त पर कि वह उन को ४० रुपये मन पटवा देगा। आज पटवा का भाव ६५ रुपया मन है पर उस बेचारे को ४० रुपये मन बेचना होता है। देश में लोग इतने गरीब हैं, वहां आप जान सकते हैं कि क्या हाल होगा। यही हाल धान का भी है। आज खुले मारकेट में धान का भाव २० रुपया है या २५ रुपया तक है। जब किसान रुपया लेने जाते हैं तो उन से कहा जाता है कि तुम को रुपया के बदले अपना पैडी अगहन के महीने में आठ रुपया मन देना होगा। जिस चीज का उस को आज के दर से २५० रुपया मिल सकता था उस का उसे

आज १०० रुपया मिल रहा है। इस हालत में साल भर उन का काम कैसे चलेगा? देश में ९० फ्री सदी आदमी गरीब हैं। इस तरह वह जो पैसा लायेगा वह अगहन तक सब खर्च हो जायगा और तब उस को यह जल्दतर होगा कि वह गवर्नमेंट के सामने हाथ फैलाये। और गवर्नमेंट यह मसला हल नहीं कर सकती है जब तक कि वह एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट (agriculturist) के लिए अच्छे तरीके का कोई कानून नहीं बना दे ताकि गरीब किसान और मजदूर अपने कमाये हुये पैसे को नाजायज तरीके से बड़े आदमी के ही हाथ दे कर न आयें और इस तरह के कर्ज से बच जायें। आयन्दा स्टेट्स की इस से तरक्की होगी और फूड प्राबलम भी हल होगा।

मुझे इतना ही कहना है। मेरी खास-कर यह अर्थ है कि गवर्नमेंट जल्द से जल्द ऐसा ही तरीका निकाले ताकि गरीब किसान, जो कि बहुत गरीब हैं, जिनको किसान और मजदूर कहा जाता है, उन को अवस्था में कुछ परिवर्तन हो। तभी देश की कुछ उन्नति हो सकती है, नहीं तो फूड प्राबलम हमेशा के लिए रह जायगा।

(English translation of the above speech)

Saikh Mohiuddin (Bihar): Sir, I thank you for the opportunity afforded to me to participate in the present debate. It is true that Shri Sidhva remarked in his speech that the speeches of certain Members here were election speeches. But I do not believe it, because our countrymen do not do anything without first giving it their utmost thought and consideration. Therefore if a true patriot examines the speeches, wherein the hon. Members have criticized the Government, in the light of their achievements, I am confident that he would never think them to be election speeches but, on the other hand, would consider them after giving due regard to all that has been done.

[Saikh Mohiuddin]

Sir, it is my opinion and the opinion of the country at large that what has been achieved by our Government during the last four years would never be achieved by any nation anywhere in the world—not even by America, England or France. The U.S.S.R., which is today regarded as one of the foremost powers, also took a long time in its advancement and progress. But what has been achieved by our Government during the last four years despite tremendous difficulties is before the world today and I hope countries all over the world and our own country will, after giving due regard to the circumstances, appreciate it.

I feel that the President's address was not a mere address but in it he has placed the programme of the Government before us and it is a thing which should infuse spirit into us for the forthcoming elections. The address contains broad outlines of what the Government has done so far. At the same time the future programme of the Government has also been put before the people. Hence it is a thing that should lend spirit for the coming elections.

Sir, I hope all the difficulties and problems that are confronting us today will be made easier and, in fact they are being made easier, with the sagacity and wisdom of our Prime Minister.

As regards foreign policy, my view is that there will be no one in this country who does not appreciate our foreign policy. It is a matter of pride for our country that we have such a Prime Minister and Leader of the House. It is not that our foreign policy alone is sound but our home policy too is so good that all communities whether Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Christian, are happy and satisfied. Everybody in the country is pleased and happy at the way our home policy is being conducted and is ready to help and co-operate with the Government at all times. Five crores of Muslims, who have chosen to live here and regard it as their motherland, have full faith in the policy of the Government and they will always stand by it. The foreign and home policies of our country are so sound that everybody, irrespective of the party attachments, would support the Government. One can find from the statements of leaders appearing in the newspapers that they all support the foreign policy of the Government. The five crore Muslims of this country, who regard it as their own mother-

land, are supporting this policy and are always with the Government. They say that they are ever prepared to make any amount of sacrifice when it is called for. The one example of it before the House is of Kashmir. Just as Kashmir is ready on the western front, in the like manner Muslims of Bihar are well prepared on the eastern front to meet any threat from Pakistan. I am fully confident that Muslims of India, who have already chosen it as their own country, have full faith in the Government and they are and will always be prepared to give unstinted support to it and sacrifice everything, their lives and belongings, for the cause of their motherland.

Sir, it is not that only our foreign and home policies are sound but the efforts and progress that are being made to solve the food problem of the country are before the world and they are an example to be followed. Last year there was a commotion in the world that the food problem in India was so acute that she would not be able to survive long, but even in the face of those difficulties our Government saved the country from famine and braved the problem of food. This year also, when all round the world fears and doubts were being expressed that India would not survive, that there was no food and no money in India, our Government, under the trying circumstances, stood up to the situation and faced the problem boldly. This will be recorded in the history of the world as a great achievement. There are no grounds today to believe that any one would die because of the non-availability of food in India. It can now be emphatically said that deaths due to starvation will not occur in this country. But we do not see anything that may assure us that agriculture is being improved and more attention is being paid to the food problem in this country. Of course, there is progress in the field of agriculture but not to the extent it should have been, because even today the actions of the Government are more theoretical than practical. While discussing the Finance Bill last year, we told the House that there were certain areas in the country which were in no way inferior to those of Pakistan for purposes of jute growing and we can proudly claim before the House even today that so far as the production of jute is concerned we can compete with any part of East Pakistan. The production of jute, as compared with previous years, has gone up by fifty per cent.

this year. Not only production has gone up but its cultivation too has increased. The President's Address only says that the production of jute is expected to be more but we trust that it can be said with a challenge that the production of jute has been more. Jute is ready, it has only to be washed. But there is no fear that any damage would be done to jute on that account. Now, for three or four weeks past, on account of the failure of rains, the cultivators have not been able to wash the jute and they are drying it. But the agriculture Department has neither instructed them that they should not do it nor have they given any help to them. Taccavi loans are given to a group of cultivators jointly and a farmer gets it only if he tills his own soil. But in India a vast majority consists of those who do not have their own lands but cultivate on a contract system. Their crops are ready but they have not got money at present to provide bread for their families. They go to rich persons and business men for money and take it from them on credit. I would like to inform you that the rate of *Patwa* is 65 rupees but these businessmen give loans to the cultivator for a month or fifteen days on the condition that he would sell it to them at the rate of forty rupees per maund. The poor peasant has to sell it for 40 rupees a maund when the market price is 65 rupees a maund. Similar is the case with paddy. The price of paddy in the open market is upto 20 or 25 rupees. When cultivators go to these people for money, they are told that they will have to sell their paddy in the month of *Aghan* at the rate of eight rupees a maund in exchange for the loans they are given. They are getting a mere hundred rupees for a commodity which should have fetched them no less than 250 rupees at the current price. One cannot imagine how would they be able to pull on for the whole year. Ninety per cent. of the people in our country are poor. So, the cultivator would spend all that money which he is able to get by *Aghan* and then he would necessarily have to beg from the Government. But the Government cannot solve this problem unless it enacts some will-conceived legislation with regard to agriculture so that the peasant and the labourer may not have to hand over their hard-earned money to the rich people which resort to improper methods, and may be saved from this type of loans. This would lead to progress and advancement in

the States and also to the solution of the food problem.

That is all I have to say. I particularly submit that the Government should find out ways and means so that the condition of the peasants who are extremely poor and who are known as *Kisans* and *mazdoors*, may be improved. Only then the country can hope to progress otherwise the problem of food would ever remain a problem.

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

*The House reassembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.*

[SHRIMATI DURGABAI in the Chair]

**Mr. Chairman:** Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

Before the hon. Member proceeds to speak I would like to ask the permission of the House to reduce the time-limit to seven minutes. A large number of Members want to speak; there is a big list here, and if Members will be willing to accommodate the other Members also to have their say then I think it would be convenient for many people to be able to express their views. I hope the House is agreeable to that rule?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** Madam, does that apply to Ministers? I cannot deal with all the matters raised within seven minutes and I think what I have got to say is worth listening to.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I know what time the hon. Finance Minister wants?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I want at least half an hour. After all people cannot make statements which go to the very root of our economic policy and expect me to give a reply within seven minutes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Normally I would like to make the rule equally applicable to both Members and Ministers, but anyhow I would make an exception in the case of the Finance Minister who has to reply to a large number of points that have been raised by Members. Hon. Members are aware that the Prime Minister will be making his reply at 4 o'clock. Before that the Finance Minister wants half an hour. So the time available is short; therefore, I hope my suggestion would meet with the approval of the House and that hon. Members would not grudge if they are asked to finish their speech within seven minutes.

کیانی جی - ایس - مسافر : میں  
 آپ کی اجازت سے صرف ایک بات کہنا  
 چاہتا ہوں کہ جن ممبروں کو پہلے  
 موقع ملتا ہے ان کو تو کافی وقت مل  
 جاتا ہے لیکن جن کا نمبر بعد میں  
 آتا ہے ان کا وقت کٹ لیا جاتا ہے یہ  
 مناسب نہیں ہے - یہاں Equality  
 ہونی چاہیے - یہ ہمیشہ ہوتا ہے کہ  
 جو پہلے بولتے ہیں ان کو تو کافی وقت  
 دے دیا جاتا ہے لیکن جو بعد میں  
 بولتے ہیں ان کا وقت کٹ لیا جاتا ہے  
 یہ پریکٹس (practice) نہیں ہونی  
 چاہیے -

[Giani G. S. Musafir (Punjab): I want to submit just this, with your permission, that Members who get the opportunity to speak first are able to get good time but those who are called upon to speak later in the day have their time cut down. This is not proper. There should be equality here. It always happens that those who speak in the beginning are given enough time while the time of those who speak later is cut down. This should not be the practice.]

**Mr. Chairman:** I would like to tell hon. Members that the blame should not be laid on the Chair because if the fifteen minute limit that is imposed by the Chair is strictly observed by the Members certainly more Members would have been able to speak; but hon. Members have seen that some go on for half an hour and some for much more than that. They have cut down the time of the other hon. Members. Therefore I wish that all the hon. Members would strictly adhere to the time-limit imposed by the Chair.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Punjab):** May I suggest that the seven minute limit should not be fixed? A smaller number will be able to speak but at least they will be able to speak fully—the period of seven minutes is nothing for a serious speech.

**Mr. Chairman:** Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Bihar):** Because of the short time at my dis-

posal I shall confine myself only to Indo-Pakistan relations which have made very significant or rather dangerous developments in recent months. From top down the line Pakistani leaders and their supporters are day in and day out making bellicose utterances against India and carrying on ceaseless propaganda against our country. They have got mastery over distorting facts and in their zeal to create greater interest in war with India some of the Pakistani leaders have started talking about coming to Panipat. So, it was very natural for our President to give a broad hint to Pakistan's frenzy in his inaugural address to this House, and express fervent hope that this tense situation will pass away.

Since its inception about four years ago Pakistan has been pursuing a hostile policy towards India. It has always been trying to weaken and defame India abroad by carrying on all sorts of propaganda. Nearer home Pakistan raped and occupied a portion of Kashmir; the pity was that the Government of India accepted that position, at least temporarily, by negotiating a cease-fire with Pakistan when our brave soldiers were advancing on the heels of the enemies. Pakistan utilised that opportunity to consolidate her position and today she has consolidated her power so well that the average Pakistani is talking about conquering India, they characterise our Prime Minister as a puny wrestler who can be easily trampled down in a moment's time by their so called mighty Prime Minister, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan.

In the East, the policy pursued by Pakistan is constantly increasing our trouble to rehabilitate the refugees driven out from East Bengal. Last year when the situation reached a breaking-point Pakistan got a much-needed respite through the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, which she, subsequently, never honoured in full. Recently that agreement has been thrown overboard by Pakistan and tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children are daily being driven out of their hearths and homes in East Bengal. In the situation it seems proper that we could well have stuck to the demand of Sardar Patel that Pakistan should give at least a fair share of its East Bengal territory to India or to those refugees so that they may be rehabilitated. Even now it should be the duty of the Government of India and of all the Indians to get a fair share of Pakistani territory delivered to those refugees.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I ask how this is to be done?

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** This could be done through any internationally recognised method. Pakistan has been saying to the world that India has occupied a portion of Kashmir by forcible means; similarly we can tell the world that Pakistan is forcibly sending out of her territory these Pakistani citizens even though they are ready to live there as peaceful law-abiding citizens. Well, if this is not possible, at least we should try to do something which may ameliorate the troubles of those refugees.

It is obvious that the policy pursued by Pakistan is constantly endangering the safety and security of our eastern and western frontiers—and even the whole country as such. Even then this aggressive policy of Pakistan is finding favour in an influential section of the Anglo-American Press. The situation is dangerous and demands that we work on two fronts: firstly, we should strengthen our defensive position; secondly, we should try to remove the misunderstanding created in foreign countries by some of the Anglo-American newspapers. In regard to my first point I want to congratulate our Prime Minister and say that the preparedness and alertness shown by his Government have been very laudable. And for these the Nehru Government deserves due thanks. However, even for this alertness heaps of criticisms are being levelled against our Prime Minister in foreign countries, particularly in Britain and America who have themselves embarked upon a gigantic rearmament programme under the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. It would be very absurd for those who are themselves trying to raise a defensive wall against possible aggression to criticise us when we are trying to do the same thing. We should therefore frankly declare to the world, especially to the Anglo-American world, that if their N.A.T.O. and all its rearmament programmes are right, our defensive alertness is equally, if not more, above reproach.

Coming to my second point, I think that our foreign propaganda machinery is quite ineffective in meeting Pakistani propaganda. It should be our duty to make our foreign propaganda machinery quite alert and effective. All Indians living abroad, particularly students, should be taken into confidence by our foreign missions. So that our case may be presented before the world with a concerted voice saying that the part of Kashmir

which has been occupied by Pakistan should be forthwith returned to India and the refugees who have been driven out of East Bengal should be given the full share of their Pakistani territory. Besides, we should tell Pakistan that all these demands should be met within a reasonable time-limit, say, within six months. Otherwise, the Government of India would feel compelled to use any recognised international method.

These demands could be effectively put forward only by a strong India. I, therefore, wish our Government to be a little more firm and organise and gather sufficient strength to meet the Pakistani challenge and give a hard lesson to Pakistani war-mongers who have denied freedom even to that great peace-loving statesman, Khan Abdûl Ghaffar Khan, whose people are out to break Pakistani shackles and make Pakhtoonistan a free and independent State.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I propose to deal with only two subjects—prices and devaluation. That means that I shall not be able to deal with the general charge which Acharya Ranga (*An Hon. Member: Acharya Ranga?*) has flung at Government that Government have lost grip of the economic situation.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I interrupt him for a minute? I wish to inform the House that the hon. the Prime Minister has kindly agreed to give up half an hour of his time.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** What I have suggested was that the House might sit till 5.30 P.M.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, the Finance Minister may proceed.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** In regard to prices, we started with a peculiar handicap as a result of the war and the monetary policies followed for prosecuting the war, and that handicap was aggravated by action on our part which now in retrospect appears to have been ill-advised, namely, de-control. As a result of de-control in 1948, we lost nearly 100 points on the index, that is to say, from 280 the index went up to somewhere about 380, which is a very large increase indeed. Then the other point of view that we should have at the back of our minds is the world point of view, that is to say, we should compare ourselves with what has happened elsewhere, although as I have frequently said there is no room for complacency

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

if we appear to be in a somewhat better light than some of the other countries in the world. I am quoting figures which were given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom in the British Parliament about three or four weeks ago. In the eleven months from June last year to May this year, the retail price index rose in Ireland by 5 per cent.; U. K. by 9 per cent.; U.S.A. by 9 per cent.; Italy by 10 per cent.; Denmark and Canada by 11 per cent.; Belgium by 13 per cent. and France or more strictly Paris by 21 per cent. Figures for Australia and New Zealand were not available, but from June to December last year, that is to say for about half the period only, the rise in New Zealand prices was 6 per cent. and in Australia 9 per cent. We have no-comparable retail price index, but our nearest index is the cost of living index which has risen in Bombay for the same period by 7 per cent. and by somewhat less in other places. So, apart from our initial handicap, I do not think that there is any reason to be despondent in regard to the price situation. Pandit Kunzru seemed almost disappointed to find that prices were showing a small measure of decline, and he was almost inclined to doubt whether the figures were correct. I can assure him that the figures are correct and that the particular index to which he drew attention is based both on free market prices as well as prices of rationed articles in certain areas. I believe he is a member of the Ad Hoc Devaluation Committee and I have a recollection that we circulated a paper in regard to the composition of the wholesale price index. If he has not received it, I shall be very glad to send him a copy. That paper explains very fully how the wholesale price index is composed. In this matter of prices, I do not wish to take credit overmuch for any results that may be apparent, but by the same token we do not desire to be censured for any failures because prices are a complex phenomenon. They are determined not only by past history to which I have alluded, but they are also influenced by outside factors as well as by what we do or we fail to do. Our case is that to the extent to which we can control matters (a) we have diagnosed the problem; (b) we believe we are applying the correct remedies; and (c) we expect that if other things remain equal our measures should be attended with some success. We do not claim to be prophets and we do not wish to be so foolish as to try and prognosticate the course of prices and indeed

that situation was more or less conceded by Mr. Anthony when he asked what would happen if the attempts at peace on the Korean front did not succeed. Now, Madam, the answer to that is that to that extent prices will be affected and there will be very little that Government would be able to do about it. Some of these measures are short-term ones and some of these are long-term ones which would take some time to fructify and some are almost continuous measures, and it is by a combination of all these that we hope that we shall be able to hold the price line.

Questions were asked in regard to cloth. The point that my colleague was trying to make clear was that cloth prices are not immediately affected by availability, because cloth is a controlled article and the prices of cloth are fixed in accordance with a formula which has been recommended by the Tariff Board. It reflects largely the price and therefore the availability of cotton. As regards availability itself, it is true that the percentage of coarse and medium cloth is not as much as it should have been. In 1949, coarse and medium cloth accounted for 74 per cent. and fine and superfine for 26 per cent., but in that year cotton was available. In 1950, the percentage of coarse and medium cloth was 62 and fine and superfine was 38. This year, unfortunately, so far it is below 1950. But we expect that our own cotton production this year would be much better than it was last year and if our anticipations are realised then I should imagine that there would be a steady improvement from October in the first percentage, namely the percentage of coarse and medium cloth.

As regards production itself, the average production of cloth in 1947 was 313 million yards per month, in 1948 it was 359—that was our bumper year—in 1949 it was 325 and in 1950, 305. Since the inception of energetic measures taken by my colleague for the last four months, the figures have been March 338, April 348, June 355 and July 353. I think we are gradually getting nearer the zenith of average monthly production in 1948.

Lastly, coming to *dhotis* and *saris*, here is a statement which shows the packing of *dhotis* and *saris* during the first six months of 1951. The figures are in bales. January: *dhotis* 9,179, *saris* 7,326; February: *dhotis* 12,000, *saris* 12,000; March: *dhotis* 21,000, *saris* 15,000; April: *dhotis* 48,000, *saris* 28,000; May: *dhotis* 52,000, *saris* 28,000; June: *dhotis* 57,000 and *saris* 25,000. Therefore, there is no reason why every man in India should not have his *dhotis*.

My colleague says that I should explain why prices have not come down. I have already explained it. Because it is a controlled article, the influence of the free market prices does not immediately affect the prices of the controlled article.

**Pandit Kunzru:** If prices were not lowered and *dhotis* were not available, what was the use of the glut in the market?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I never said that *dhotis* are not available; when *dhotis* are produced they are available.

**Pandit Kunzru:** I mean availability to the consumers.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I could go on indefinitely on the subject of prices, but in accordance with your injunction, I must exercise a certain amount of restraint. I believe what I have said clears Government of any charge of complete failure to hold the price line and indeed I think the indications are that a certain amount of success is attending their efforts.

**Shri Hussain Imam (Bihar):** Is it a fact that more than two months production has been exported already?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** It is not correct.

Now let me come to the other subject, namely, revaluation. Here, I think before I get down to the details I ought to make some reference to the philosophy of revaluation. The first statement I would like to make is that the general structure of par value which was established in September 1949 has been well maintained and that structure was devised in consultation with the International Monetary Fund. Then there are two remedies which sometimes are hastily suggested by people in order to counter inflationary price levels. One is fluctuation of rates and the other is appreciation of currency. Now a large number of important factors prevail in relation to this. The first is that no country should assume that by changing the value of its own currency the prices of international commodities in its own currency will be changed to a corresponding extent, unless that country happens to be completely insignificant in international trade.

**Prof. Ranga (Madras):** That applied to us in 1949!

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I do not propose to give in to these interruptions. The second point is that there

is always a danger of such action turning out to be competitive. The world suffered at one time from competitive depreciation and it is quite likely that once the race is started, it will also suffer from competitive appreciation.

The third factor that one has to bear in mind is the state of the balance of payments, that is to say, how strong is one's balance of payment and what possibility there is of maintaining it without any artificial restrictions. Now on the import side that means that either a great outlay for imports would have to be incurred or restrictions would have to be intensified, if currency is appreciated. If that is not done there might be circumvention. At the same time there is a possibility that internal securities will still remain and if they remain the profit will go to the importer and not to the consumer. Then on the export side the effects of revaluation require very careful consideration and no one would be entitled to count on the continuance of a sellers' market. Another disadvantage is that frequent changes in currency are apt to promote a peculiar kind of speculation which precipitates nations into undesired results. That is to say if some opinion is expressed that there is going to be depreciation, speculation starts and even if the factors do not justify such a course the country is apt to be pushed into depreciation by the very weight and volume of the speculative transactions. The general conclusion, Madam, is that benefits from appreciation are likely to be transitory and can easily be exaggerated and in any case that is no substitute for firm fiscal and credit policies or other domestic measures.

**Prof. Ranga:** Not until we get some inspiration from England or America! In 1949 what did they do? The same factors were present then.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I think I should take note of this interruption. Now that I am on the subject of exports, if we were to appreciate unilaterally today we will suffer far more than if the rest of our competitors were to appreciate at the same time. Therefore, we will be putting ourselves in a disadvantageous position. Generally speaking, therefore, problems of this kind require international co-operation and not predatory policies which might succeed only for a time, and for a time only. Every country must rely primarily on measures which will combat inflationary pressures and externally on international co-operation exercised through

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh].  
special institutions, in this particular case the International Monetary Fund.

3 P.M.

The second remedy, namely fluctuating rates, is worse than the disease. The difference between that kind of thing and a considered change in par value is like the difference between matrimony and companioned marriage. And it would be very wrong to go on trying experiments with your currency. Indeed, so far as the community's welfare is concerned, it will be far more wrong than if we were to make experiments in matrimony.

Madam, these are the general considerations. I do not know how much more time I have got.

**Mr. Chairman:** Five minutes.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** Then there were certain special points made by Mr. Anthony to whom, by the way, I may give the assurance that I have very great respect for the lay man. It is the lay man who has to determine the policy of the country finally, and if the so-called expert fails to carry conviction to the lay man, then go to the lay man. Therefore I give full consideration to any matter that is brought forward by the lay man.

The first statement that Mr. Anthony made was that export duties have no effect on the cost of living. I think it is an extraordinary statement. In the case of export duties on commodities like cotton, cotton textiles, black pepper etc. they have prevented an undue rise in the prices of the commodities. That is the direct effect. And apart from the direct effect on the internal prices, the export duties are intended to reduce the money incomes of the exporters and tend to reduce the pressure of the money supply on the available consumption goods, thereby helping to check the inflationary pressure with the high export prices. That is really the more important function of export duties in the context of the present inflation.

Then he said that liberalised imports with the revalued rupee will arrest the cost of living. This contains the fallacy that imports get liberalised when the rupee is revalued. Such estimates as I have been able to make show that a revalued rupee will bring about a reduction of export earnings and therefore there will be nothing to buy the additional imports with. We shall be driven to placing restrictions

on imports. Therefore that particular result is not likely to follow.

That leads me on, by implication, to the point that certain specialists have expressed the view that the revalued rupee will improve the balance of payments. Mr. Anthony can convey it from me to the experts that it will have precisely the opposite effect—that just as depreciation helped us to restore our balance of payments, appreciation of our currency will tend towards its deterioration.

Then a statement was made that the recent fall in wholesale prices is temporary. As I have said, it is not my intention to prognosticate. It may prove to be so if the international situation indicates a change. But, as I said, if other things remain equal, there is no reason why we should not maintain the progress, subject to certain limitations. One such limitation was explained in the Address, and that is food prices which is, so to speak, the king-pin of our price structure. The trouble is that we grow things much better than the foreigner. Therefore, by the time the grain is imported at free market price into the country it costs very much more. Therefore, to issue it to the rationed population at the same price as before requires larger and larger subsidies. As has been explained, we have already raised the subsidies from Rs. 23 crores to Rs. 46 crores. And that, I may point out, has come out of the export duty. Therefore, we are using the export duties as far as possible towards reducing the internal prices, and we are achieving the same result by a far less dangerous way than by the appreciation of our currency.

There was some reference made to the Report of the Economic Commission of Europe recommending an appreciation of European currencies as an anti-inflationary measure. The only comment that I wish to make on that is that the Governments of several European countries to our knowledge have opposed this recommendation.

Madam, I have done.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Bihar):**  
rose—

**Shri B. Das:** Madam, on a point of information. Can a private Member come to the front Treasury Bench and address the House?

**Mr. Chairman:** I would like the hon. Member to go back to his seat and address the House.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I rise to accord my whole-hearted support to the motion of thanks moved by my hon. friend Mr. Jaipal Singh. But at the same time I would like to record my own reactions to the Address delivered by the President of the Indian Republic.

The President in his Address says that "we are determined to avoid war unless it is thrust upon us". I do not think that Pakistan is in a position to thrust war upon us, because it is a weaker nation than India. The Anglo-American powers will not like to drive India into the arms of China and Russia. Pakistan is faced with numerous difficulties at home. The threat of Pakhtoonistan, the threat of Communism, the danger of army revolt have sapped the inner vitality of the State. There are serious differences in Pakistan over Pakistan's foreign policy. There is internal hostility and bitterness between one province and another.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** That is why they seek outside adventure.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** When it lacks vitality it will not court war with a nation like India which is thousand times stronger than Pakistan.

But we are confronted today not with a struggle between India and Pakistan. There are Powers standing behind Pakistan. It is quite possible that at their instigation Pakistan may enter into a state of war with India. But I do not think that even her friends will advise Pakistan to go to war with India unless certain conditions have been fulfilled. In my mind there are four conditions which must be fulfilled before Pakistan can go to war with India. The political and military experts of England and America must come to the conclusion that it is no longer possible to bring India round to their views, that they cannot coerce India to follow the Anglo-American line and that the present regime can be liquidated only with the help of Anglo-American guns. If that is the conclusion of the political and military experts of England and America, then and then only there will be war between India and Pakistan. There are three other conditions which must be fulfilled. That the political and military experts of England and America must come to the conclusion that war is inevitable in 1951 or 1952, that in the event of such a war India is going to remain

neutral and that such neutrality will seriously jeopardize and hamper the Anglo-American military plans in Asia.

If these conditions are fulfilled then there will be war between India and Pakistan. What are our prospects if such a war breaks out. Can India fight single-handed England plus America plus Pakistan? I am clear in my own mind that if we venture to fight against Pakistan single-handed, we will be defeated. What is the plan of the Anglo-American experts? What do they want? They want to set up a puppet regime which will unequivocally give a guarantee that in the event of a global war between America and Russia, we shall be on the side of the Anglo-American powers. There are enough traitors in this country who will be prepared to give such a guarantee. If you want to protect this regime, if you want to protect secularism in this country, if you want to protect democracy, not in the sense of Parliamentaryism which I oppose and if you want to protect real democracy then we must support the present regime and the present Prime Minister. I believe in the principle—one Fuhrer and one party. I believe that Pandit Nehru is our Fuhrer—our leader. He is indispensable. What will happen to this country, if we enter into alliance with China and Russia. There are two methods by which we can tackle the problem of Pakistan—by the method of war and by the method of peace. If Pakistan invades, we shall put up a fight and we shall win in the end. But there is another method by which we can bring round Pakistan to our view. I am convinced that if we enter into friendship and alliance with China and Russia, there will be no war. It will also consolidate the Nehru regime. We shall be able thereby to emancipate Pakistan from the clutches of the Anglo-American powers. The minorities in Eastern Pakistan will also be protected. It will integrate Kashmir with India. All these beneficial results will accrue if we enter into a pact of friendship, alliance and mutual assistance with China and Russia. It must be a permanent alliance. It cannot be anything but permanent. Madam, there is a fear in our minds that if we enter into alliance with China and Russia, our internal set-up will be seriously jeopardized. England, France and Germany at one time or another did enter into military arrangements with Russia but that did not constitute any threat either to British democracy or French Parliamentaryism or to the

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

German way of life. There is absolutely no danger that any foreign ideology can dominate over our minds. Madam, am I to finish now? I think it is not fair that the Members who are asked to speak in the end should be asked to curtail their speeches. It is not our fault if some Members have spoken beyond their allotted time. It is very difficult to elucidate all points within seven minutes. But if it is your final ruling, that I must close my speech, I have nothing to say.

Col. B. H. Zaidi (Uttar Pradesh): With the advent of freedom many of our countrymen were naturally hoping that we would see the building of a new heaven and a new earth. As those hopes have not been fulfilled, as corruption, inefficiency, rising cost of living continue, there is a feeling of frustration and depression in the country. It is all very well to sit back in one's chair and put the whole blame at the door of the Government. One is inclined to forget the difficulties which attached to the birth of our freedom, the division of the country, the refugee problem, the loss of the raw materials which now belong to Pakistan and the corruption which the Great War gave rise to. But one thing we often forget and it is this that our Government is not composed of autocrats and dictators, that we are trying to build up for a democracy, that a people get the Government they deserve and if we are not mindful of our responsibilities, if we are not properly vigilant, if we do not exercise a complete dislike and intolerance of corruption in the country, it is no use expecting the Government to create something wonderful. They are not magicians; they must have the backing of the people. It is the people who have to play their part and be conscious of their responsibilities. In these circumstances, Madam, I wish to add my humble tribute to those in this House who have congratulated our revered Prime Minister and his Government for, all that they have done for the country since we attained freedom. I in my own mind have been assailed by many doubts and misgivings. Can my people work in a spirit of unity, sinking their differences, having honest differences, but sink them when the hour demands it? Is our country not giving proof of terrible factions, corruption in the various political parties, disappointment in the leaders and in the democracy not playing its part properly? Are we not divided horizontally, vertically and diagonally in every possible way? I am happy to

say today that good sometimes comes out of evil and something has happened recently which is a good improvement—a tremendous hope for the future. We have seen that in the face of a common danger the people have forgotten their differences. Various political parties, people belonging to different communities, to different provinces are all today speaking with one voice and they are today behind the Prime Minister and his Government in doing everything possible to ensure the freedom and the strength of our own mother country. If this unity, if this enthusiasm for our motherland had come about accompanied by a war fever, a sort of panic, a sort of sabre-rattling and lose talk of war, then, I certainly would not be happy or congratulate my people. But, I say, Madam, that not only is the whole country standing solidly today and we see the spectacle of Maulana Sayeed speaking with the same voice as our hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, people from one corner of the country to the other speaking with one voice, and being infused with one spirit of enthusiasm, but there is complete calmness all over the country. There is complete absence of panic. We are neither talking tall nor threatening war, nor showing fists in answer to threats from outside. Does this not augur well for the future? Does it not show that, apart from our leaders and apart from our Prime Minister and our Government, we as a people seem to have got much more of political maturity than even we suspected till yesterday. At least I must frankly confess that I never thought for a moment that in an hour of danger, our people would give proof of such determination and capacity to work unitedly, and give proof of wonderful calmness of spirit and be completely self-possessed as we are today. Look at what is happening across the border. Read their papers, listen to their radio and then take stock of the situation in India. I must say it fills one with great optimism. Perhaps we have been unduly pessimistic. You hear everywhere people bemoaning about corruption, lack of progress, and lack of wonderful results that we were expecting. But I feel that our people have rallied round. The way they have stood together and the way they have given proof of their silent determination and their complete lack of fear or panic or undue excitement shows that we are a people possessing balance, political maturity and commonsense and can face any danger with proper self-confidence.

**Prof. K. T. Shah (Bihar):** I have no desire to waste the time of the House in a chorus of protest against the reduction of time, short as it originally was. Members who have taken the trouble to table amendments are not in a position to commend their amendments to the House by giving proper reasons. I am afraid within the time allotted, it is impossible for me to develop the theme at all properly with any hope of being fair to those being criticised, any more than being fair to myself. It is not right that we should make vague generalisations by way of finding fault and pointing out the difficulties when we are not able to put down the reasons, such as, at any rate, they appeal to us for giving point to those points of criticism.

**Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh):** Let us sit till 6 o'clock.

**Prof. K. T. Shah:** However, without abusing the patience of the House I will try briefly to place before the House the two main points on which I have tabled amendments. One is with regard to lack of preparation in regard to civil defence.

Speaking for myself, I think that arrangements for civil defence are matters only of prudence and not necessarily either a challenge to anybody or a provocation. Those, of course, who are inclined to take provocation will find provocation on any small thing that we may do to set our house in order. It is part of wisdom, and I put it, part of sheer prudence and self-help to see that, should an unfortunate situation arise, we should, at any rate, not be reduced to panic and unnecessary disruption and dislocation in our national economy. These are days when the whole world is living, so to say, on its nerves. At a time like this, a slightest thing may touch off a conflagration when it would not be possible to make any preparation, which we neglect when we know we still have the time. One of the greatest handicaps that England was facing just before the last war was that it had no preparation at all to meet a possible contingency which was threatening and filling the horizon in 1938 and 1939. Yet, when the occasion came, at the risk of being very much maligned, the then Prime Minister got a small reprieve for six months or a year within which England was able to make preparations. I suggest that we in this country have great centres of industry and population which, whatever may be the ultimate result of a possible conflict, would suffer and could suffer very much more easily and the entire life of the community may be affected unless we have proper preparation as

a normal part of our economy. I am not thinking so much, lest I be misunderstood, of merely warlike preparations by way of defence. I am thinking merely of the maintenance of the morale and discipline of the people, who ought to know to stand up and do their work, no matter what the hardships of the moment may be. It must not be forgotten that in the last 150 years or so, this country has not had any occasion such as the European countries have had of invasion and devastation on a scale that France went through twice or thrice in 50 or 60 years. Because we are not accustomed to all these things, it would be unfair to expect our people to live merely on words, however brave they may be and neglect the mere physical aids, if you like, mere supports by which they can, in case of trial, in the event of an emergency, even without outside help, be able to maintain their position. I suggest that it is not a matter, and I repeat that, of preparing against a possible war. I would recommend this as a matter of normal organisation in this country where every individual, capable of doing any work, should be made to do it and should be accustomed in discipline to do that work. I am afraid we are too much inclined to find fault rather than do our own bit; that perhaps should be corrected by starting even now methods by which people can learn the art of self-discipline and working in concert. Years ago, when the system of education in this country was proposed to be changed by the Father of the Nation, I had the honour to suggest certain methods of organisation from childhood onwards, so that the entire population may be disciplined and be in their position at any emergency. At that time, we were not thinking of any war or anything as we apprehend today. Even then, he was good enough to welcome my suggestion to organise from childhood upwards and to see that the entire man and woman power of the country is readily available, mobilised, not always—why should you so assume—for the purpose of any offence against anybody or for military purposes, but for doing our own work properly. I think there is an article in our Constitution which provides that not only should everybody be given suitable work, but that they should also be made available for conscription, for social service and social duties. I suggest from that point of view that the time has arrived, this is merely an excuse, when we might be able to organise our population, teach them habits of discipline and methods of working together to a definite point and definite aim, when, God forbid, should an emergency like what we apprehend arise, we should not be

[Prof. K. T. Shah]

found wanting. Born, as I have been, a jain, and bred a pacifist, I am, of course, not a warlike person and therefore cannot say any brave words. But, I trust that even people like me may not be found wanting should a crisis really occur, and may not be leaving their leaders aside merely praising them in their faces by words and not doing the deed when it comes to that. I do not wish to boast, Madam; I do not wish to utter any big words. But, this much I will say. There is hardly anyone who will support more heartily than I do, should, in the cause of justice and necessity for the defence of the motherland, the Prime Minister ask us to back him substantially by deeds and not by words only.

The other point in my amendment which also I would like to commend to the House in a few words is with regard to the shortage of food supply in this country. I am one of those, Madam, who have never been convinced that under the circumstances in which we live, we could really attain within a very short time self-sufficiency in the way we were advised. I thought that perhaps I was mistaken and better information might have guided our leaders to proclaim and also insist upon it. But it appears now that wiser counsels or at any rate, reflection has come to their rescue, and there is now evidence even in the official circles of doubts being felt with regard to the possibility in the near future, of attaining self-sufficiency in the matter of food.

I have mentioned this point not really to emphasise the shortage or otherwise of food. My object is really a larger one, namely, a remark in the President's Address to the approaching abolition of zamindari in this country. I entirely welcome and support that idea. But I cannot help saying that unless this abolition of zamindari is followed up with a wholesale re-organisation of the land systems of the country, unless the methods and the patterns of land-holdings and the working of land are radically altered, unless you make the landownership different from what it is and substitute an entirely different form, I am afraid the problem of our food supply and of the supply of our raw materials will not be solved. The question is not so much of individuals. The question is really one of complete re-conditioning and reorganising the land system of this country and the primary production in this country.

Last time when I had occasion to speak on this point, I think it was at the time of the amendment to the Constitution, I was accused of being

a mere chamber idealist—I forget the exact words—and therefore not in touch with the practical difficulties of life. I admit the defect in myself, I recognise it and thank those who point it out to me and I trust I will also improve somewhat in that respect. But still I cannot conceal from myself and from this House the fact that unless and until this depleted land, whose very substantial portions have been cut off, whose very productive portions have been taken away, but whose population, nevertheless, is increasing in the same, if not greater measure and where immigration is taking place in such large numbers, in such a land, unless you take radical steps to deal with this matter of land reorganisation, you are not going to solve this problem. That is the only way in which you really can succeed in achieving the results you aim at. Unless we do that, I am afraid our plans will remain paper plans.

I am deliberately avoiding the subject of planning and the Planning Commission. I do not propose to make any remarks on that subject now.

One analogy I would like to give—that of China. China also was a deficit country some few years back. That deficit has now been wiped out. I admit that the methods adopted in China may not always be commendable to other countries. But still, even if we stick to our faith in democracy, even if we seek to carry out our plans on the democratic basis, there is such a thing as firm determination to achieve certain things, unswerving resolve to see that certain things are done, at any cost, whether of popularity or otherwise. Unless and until we make up our mind to do that, I am afraid we will still be talking while the situation runs beyond us.

These were the two points which I wished to make in this House and.....

**Shri Kamath:** May I request Madam, that we may have the benefit of hearing from Shri Biswas, who is here in the House, a first-hand account of the latest situation in East Pakistan?

**Some Hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Chairman:** I do not see why so many hon. Members should get up when a Member is speaking.

**Shri Kamath:** Shri Biswas is happily present here to-day and we may get a first-hand account of the latest situation in East Pakistan. It will be useful.

**Mr. Chairman:** I will consult the Prime Minister. Shri T. N. Singh.

**Shri Naziruddin Ahmad** (West Bengal) : Several amendments have been taken as moved, but they have not been actually moved. When moved, they must be moved with a few words in support. We have not really moved them. Have we got any *locus standi*? If we have none, we may be plainly told so and we may retire.

**Mr. Chairman** : The suggestions are borne in mind. Shri T. N. Singh.

**Shri T. N. Singh** (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, we have.....

**Shri R. K. Chaudhuri** rose—

**Mr. Chairman** : There is not much time for interruptions. I think the same point is sought to be made out by Mr. Chaudhuri. Mr. T. N. Singh will continue.

**Shri T. N. Singh** : Four years have almost elapsed since we attained independence and the second anniversary of the new Republic will shortly be celebrated by us. In this period we have had to pass through a series of crises, one crisis following upon the heels of another. It may be that we have not succeeded in solving all of them completely. But in a large measure we have succeeded.

At the beginning, with Partition we had an avalanche of refugees who poured into this unfortunate country of ours.

**Mr. Chairman** : I hear on my left a running commentary which makes me unable to hear what the hon. Member is speaking.

**Shri T. N. Singh** : Resettling and rehabilitating of the large mass of humanity that poured into our country might have submerged any nation. Yet we survived that crisis. We were able to resettle a very large majority of them in a record time and we are on the way to solve the problem almost finally now.

Similarly there was the decrease in production. After the war almost all the industries were in a very bad way. Their machines were not working with full efficiency. There was also discontent among labour. But we were able to improve the position and increase production. There have been less number of strikes and less labour days were lost.

All these crises have come and we have weathered them and I think there is no need for anyone of us to be ashamed of what we have achieved so far. It may be that more could have been achieved. Yes, that is possible.

We had to enforce controls and rationing in order that all should share in the privations and inconveniences. We have grumbled at the discomforts and criticised this or that restriction. We found fault also. But on the whole our population stolidly went on suffering all the inconveniences and privations, so that the nation may live. And what is more, we were able to export larger quantities of certain things and also import foodgrains and meet the food shortage. We might have criticised and grumbled, but this should not be mistaken as anything in the nature of condemning or censuring our Government. The very fact that whenever our leader goes to a place and wherever he goes, lakhs and lakhs of people gather and give him ovation is a fact, Sir, that should open the eyes of anyone who indulges in cheap criticism.

During this period of four years, Kashmir was invaded. But we drove back the tribes and the Pakistani troops and we were able to liberate a large part of the territory which was illegally taken possession of by the Pakistan troops and the tribesmen.

But we seem to have become accustomed to so many recurring crises that we do not seem to realise that we are to-day faced with a much greater crisis—the crisis which hangs over us the threat of war from Pakistan. And our economic difficulties, the food shortage and other obstacles are yet there. I feel that this year in the life of our republic is going to be the most difficult and we are going to face a type of crisis which we have seldom faced in the past. That being so I thought that Members of Parliament will show a certain appreciation of the economic and political crisis, and that there will be a united voice.

It was really a pleasure to hear Dr. Mookerjee, who parted company from us in such sad circumstances, come forward and give his support to the Government. But I was very much pained to find that Acharya Kripalani, at whose feet I had the pleasure to study and at whose call I joined the non-cooperation movement in 1921, should have thought fit to descend to such a level in criticising the Congress and its ministries. This is not the time to indulge in that. I was told by one of my old professors of the same institution where the Acharya was teaching that when there is partition between brothers they become bitter enemies. That seems to have happened in his case. I wish very much that he could have maintained a certain level.

What was his complaint? That he got 20 gallons for travelling 300 miles

[Shri T. N. Singh]

in Gorakhpur. May I know if 20 gallons of petrol are inadequate for a car journey of 300 miles. Another complaint was that a certain dak bungalow was not made available to him. In the Congress movement for thirty years many of us have suffered and we never thought then about dak bungalows or worried about them. I am really pained at the points made by my revered professor Acharya Kripalani in his attempt to run down the Congress.

Similarly he made a complaint about a certain circular which another person quite unconnected with the person whom he was accusing had written to his brother mill-owners. It was said the Minister had given the assurance that persons of known popularity and known integrity will also be considered for candidature in the elections. Only recently the Congress had given the directive that men who are not even Congressmen, if considered fit, will be considered for selection as candidates. If so, what was wrong with the Minister's alleged assurance? Even so, his complaint was that no denial was made by the Minister. There are papers like the *Blitz* and a smaller edition of it the *Rebel* which seldom a sensible person reads published some report on the 4th August. Now the *Rebel* is a type of paper which deals in scandals and I do not even know whether it is even published regularly. Can anyone expect that the very next day the party charged should come forth with a denial? Today in the papers there is a denial from the Minister concerned. He frankly says that there was no deal whatsoever.

Unfortunately in the course of his speech Acharya Kripalani referred to bloodshed, if this sort of thing continues. I want to know whether in this country today there is any restriction on freedom of speech? Who has been prevented from expressing his views or trying to convert others? I ask them, is it right to utter such a threat that such and such things will occur, particularly at this time of crisis? A politician of the eminence of Acharya Kripalani carries on his shoulders the burden or responsibility of running a new organisation and a new party and he should set up healthy traditions and not indulge in vilification campaign. It is very essential that we should close up our ranks and see that we meet the common danger that threatens our nation instead of airing this or that grievance or indulge in maligning propaganda. That is the spirit which will win us through the crisis.

Shri D. S. Seth (Uttar Pradesh): The amendment, I have moved refers to the report of the Planning Commission. Before I express my views on it I would, with your permission, like to lodge my strong protest with the Government, and the Chairman of the Planning Commission to the effect that the report of the Planning Commission was made available to a certain political party before it actually was available to the Members of this House or to any other political party in the country. And this is not the first instance of its kind. Before this I am aware, the report of the Sugar Enquiry Committee was also available to the Press first before the Members of this House could have access to it. I would therefore like to draw the attention of the Government and the leader of the House to the effect that all political parties in the country should be treated on equal footing and the privileges and rights of the Members of this House should be duly respected.

Now, as regards the report of the Planning Commission our Rashtrapati was good enough to throw some light on its activities. There is no doubt that after the hard labour of a year or so the Planning Commission has been able to produce a heavy and bulky volume. If for no other reason on this ground alone, the members of the Commission deserve our hearty thanks and those of the country too.

Besides, there is a school of thought in the country which believes that even under the present socio-economic structure of society it is possible to raise the standard of living of the masses sufficiently high, bring about appreciable improvement in their economic conditions and thus make the people get rid of the sufferings and hardships of generations. To all such people I say the report is excellent and leaves nothing to be desired. But fortunately or unfortunately there is another school of thought to which I have the honour to belong and which feels strongly that in the present socio-economic structure where the Society is divided on economic bases between the two camps of the exploiter and the exploited it is just impossible to raise the standard of living of the masses, make any real improvement in their economic condition and make them get rid of the sufferings and hardships of generations. How is it possible that in a society in which a handful of capitalists and feudalists not only exploit the labour of people but grab and devour the earnings and the wealth produced by thousands—nay lacs and crores of Kisans and Mazdoors we can substantially raise the standard

of living of the masses. I submit therefore that the Planning Commission should so plan the economy of the country that there is economic equality among the people and the exploiter class is totally eliminated so that there is a classless society in this country in which every able-bodied adult works and contributes his full might to produce. Unless the Planning Commission plans in that direction its objective will not be achieved.

Even in the present structure of society the Planning Commission has not given any indication as to how its proposals and recommendations are to be implemented. Perhaps they want to leave the things to the services, to the bureaucracy. If that is so, I am afraid they will meet with nothing but disappointment in the end.

I would therefore suggest to Government that they should draw the attention of the Planning Commission to these things and ask them to plan in such a way as to bring about a classless society for which Father of the Nation devoted his life and to which our Rashtrapati drew our attention in his first Address to the Members of this House. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to my suggestion and ask the members of the Planning Commission to devote their energy to so plan things as to create, in the real sense of the term, a classless society and help to raise the standard of living of the masses to a substantially high degree enabling them to get rid of the suffering and hardship which has been their lot for generations together.

**Sardar B. S. Man (Punjab):** I congratulate the Government for securing the services of a powerful speaker for advocating its cause. But I have got every sympathy for my friend, Mr. Jaipal Singh in his difficult job of reconciling his strong independent criticism along with admiration of the Government, though in an apologetic way. And that reminds me of the saying, "He who excuses himself accuses himself".

**Shri Kamath:** He is a good acrobat.

**Sardar B. S. Man:** He has paid very high tributes to the personality of the Prime Minister. Though I am not given to singing praises in the presence of somebody, in this case I assure him that so far as his personality is concerned all of us who differ with his policies join in every word of tribute that was paid to him. He is one of the most lovable personalities in

India, but that does not mean that we should not criticise his policies especially in regard to a topic on which I have moved an amendment, that is the question of Indo-Pakistan relations and the solution thereof. Incidentally, this is exactly the topic which my hon. friend, Mr. Jaipal Singh has left out. If he had talked about it perhaps there would not have been any need for me to move an amendment as follows:

"but regret to note that Government have not taken adequate measures, civil as well as military, to deal firmly and effectively with the aggressive designs of Pakistan particularly as regards its intentions regarding Kashmir, East Bengal Hindus and evacuee property."

When I rise to speak on this amendment, I do not mean to create any scare or panic. In fact, the morale of the people is excellent; and our intentions are definitely peaceful. The presence of the Prime Minister at the helm of affairs is in itself a sufficient proof that we have no aggressive designs towards any other country. Of course, that should not mean that our peaceful intentions should lead us to inertia, that we should not take steps from a purely military point of view. Mere movement of troops towards the frontiers does not take us very far though on the face of it perhaps it could be taken as a sign of our preparedness. But when we compare the relative conditions in the two countries then only will we be able to see that our preparedness is lagging far behind. Nor should we be complacent in our attitude simply because of the vastness of our country and its resources or of the bigness of our Budget. In the present economic conditions these advantages that we have had, have now been reduced to a very great degree.

Pakistan's general conception of policy from the very beginning has been aggression. In fact, Pakistan took its birth on the foundation of aggression. Everyday we say that if there be any aggressive step towards India we will take very strong measures. But to me, Madam, it looks as though not a day passes without refugees being driven out of their homes in East Bengal, or women being dishonoured. To me it seems not a day passes without Pakistan indulging in acts of aggression. It is because the Prime Minister has got an exceedingly large amount of patience so far as Pakistan is concerned that we are withholding our step. The very design of Pakistan from its inception has been to squeeze out the minorities as it has done in the

[Sardar B. S. Man]

Punjab, the N.W.F. Province and Sindh; now it is doing it in East Bengal. We warned then and we are warning again that it is the settled policy of Pakistan to send out refugees in waves, in a regulated and premeditated manner so that as we go on absorbing each wave of these unfortunate people a fresh wave is sent thereby making it not too prominent and trying to avoid misunderstanding in the sphere of international politics. In fact, even the eviction of the minorities is of sufficient importance for us to bring it before the world at large and this in itself would be a first class cause for us. Even so we are holding our hand. The choice before the minorities in East Bengal is conversion or annihilation or migration, unless we are in a position to stem this threat of aggression on the part of Pakistan.

As regards the military strength of Pakistan, in the very first telegram that our Prime Minister sent to the Pakistan Prime Minister he has stated that information goes that continued and intensive efforts have been made to increase the armed forces of Pakistan which have been largely massed on Indian frontiers. In addition, from the papers circulated to us and from the White Paper we see that a very intensive and astonishing campaign for *jehad* has been going on not only in the newspapers and on the part of ordinary people or emotional poets but that such responsible leaders as the Prime Minister of Pakistan, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Abdur Rab Nishtar, the Governor of West Punjab, and Mr. Abdul Qayum, the Premier of the Frontier Province have been indulging in this campaign. I may tell you that intensive recruitment is also going on in Pakistan. Civil defence organisations are springing up, training in air raid precaution is being given to civilian population and military training is being given to civilians so as to absorb them in the military in the eventuality of a war. As compared with these things, has anything been happening on our side? We are gloating over the fact that we are very very peaceful, that we are not panicky. Well, if we are not panicky the credit should go to the people; we cannot give the credit to the Government on this point. So far as Pakistan Air Force is concerned—  
(Interruption.)

Mr. Chairman: May I inform the hon. Member that his time is up? I am not able to give the warning, because the bell has gone out of order.

4 P.M.

Sardar B. S. Man: Allow me just

few minutes to finish my speech. When we have moved amendments and those amendments are allowed to be criticised by others and are also finally thrown out without giving the movers a chance to defend their amendments, it is indeed a hard plight. At least give us a few more minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken ten minutes.

Sardar B. S. Man: I shall conclude in a minute or so. So far as the Pakistan Air Force is concerned, these are the figures. As you know, the Pak Air Force is manned by British and Polish officers. They have purchased in 1949 24 Tempest Fighters and they have gone on increasing their strength. In 1950 they have purchased 50 Fury Fighters, 10 Bristol Freighters and 6 Halifax Bombers. This year 24 Fury Fighters and 10 Bristol Freighters have already been purchased and more are on their way. They are steadily increasing their strength, and we are indulging in demobilisation. We have demobilised 55,000 people. We have not even reached the target that we set for ourselves three years ago for Air Force. Pakistan is giving free licences to people in border areas whereas we are demonstrating to the world our peaceful intentions by withdrawing all licences from border people. Since my time is up, I only wish to conclude by saying that although our peaceful intentions are there, although our morale is excellent, we should not treat this as an argument for justifying inertia on the part of our leaders. If we do so, in some eventuality we may have to face a catastrophic position.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Assam): It is in order to give a chance to representatives of an inarticulate province like Assam that the hon. the Prime Minister was pleased to extend the time. I hope you will give me a chance.

Mr. Chairman: When I was giving opportunities to representatives of various provinces, I was told that I should call the movers of the amendments. When I have started calling the movers of the amendments, I am asked that representation should be given to various provinces. I think it is better for the Chair to regulate the debate.

Shri Kesava Rao (Madras): I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. Hon. Members have already spoken for two days on Indo-Pak relations. When I think of the Indo-Pak relations, I am reminded of a proverb: When a widow weeps, if you try to console her, she tries to weep more. Likewise, the more we talk of

peace and no-war the more noise Pakistan makes about *jehad* and war. From the White Paper recently circulated to us, it is clear that Pakistan is trying to conduct a regular and wild propaganda about India. In other countries, they never care to study the situation properly. They think that Pakistan is right. This leads me to think that our foreign propaganda machinery is weak. I do not want it to take cudgels against Pakistan. But for years together it has been weak and even the Prime Minister recently admitted that it is in the organisational stage. I think it is high time we organise our foreign propaganda machinery and see that Pak propaganda is effectively counteracted.

I next turn to the food situation. I had the opportunity to see some of the villages in my district. As there is no rural rationing, people are suffering for want of foodgrains. Government is not allowing transport of foodgrains from surplus to deficit districts; nor is it able to supply the twelve ounce ration to them regularly. Recently, an order was issued that not more than four ounces of rice should be issued. This is really serious. All these months we have been under the impression that only Bihar was famine-stricken and needed our help, but at present the same conditions prevail in Madras also. The Madras Government is regularly sending requests to the Central Food Minister but I am sorry to say that he has turned a deaf ear to them. Everyday the Madras Government is asking for more food, particularly more rice. Of course, the Central Government is giving some wheat, but what is the use of supplying wheat to people who are not accustomed to eating wheat? They do not know how to cook wheat properly. They simply break it into pieces and cook it like rice. Therefore, I see no use in supplying wheat to areas where people do not know how to cook wheat. The Food Minister should entertain these requests and see that rice that is going to other provinces is diverted to rice eating States like Madras and Bengal.

Yesterday, my hon. friend Prof. Ranga referred to controls. He said that controls were not being properly enforced. I hold a different view. Controls are intended to help people at large. I wish my hon. friend Prof. Ranga can answer this question: Has he ever asked his co-kisans to part with their foodgrains at the Government rate? I support these controls because unless some form of control is main-

tained, people in towns and cities, especially labourers, will not get anything to eat.

The President has said in his Address that prices have been rising every day and Government servants are asking for more dearness allowance and pay. I think that it is a genuine request. People who are most affected by the rising prices are the middle classes and the Government servants. It is high time that we think of raising their dearness allowance or giving some other concession. If in these days of economic stringency it is not possible to increase the dearness allowance, I would request the hon. the Home Minister to consider the question of reviving the P.T.O. concession to Government servants. Many Government servants, especially in the Central Government in New Delhi, come from various provinces. They have to go to their homes at least once in a year. When they want to go for a holiday for fifteen days or one month, they have to spend at least two months salary towards the train fare and other expenses. I think the revival of the P.T.O. concession will be of some help to the low-paid Government servants.

I am about to conclude, Madam. The President has informed us that he has appointed a Commissioner for the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes. The person chosen is a very fine gentleman who has done a lot for these people. I fully appreciate the work done so far for these people in the States as well as the Centre.

One more thing I have to mention. The Central Government was spending about Rs. 15 lakhs towards scholarships for these people. Recently they have cut this amount by Rs. 40,000. On account of this I think about one hundred to two hundred students will go without scholarships. I only request the Government to revive the cut and see that the full amount is given towards the scholarships.

**श्रीमती उमा नेहरू :** जनाब चेयरमैन साहिबा, में भी अपनी सरकार को जिस खूबी के साथ वह काम कर रही है, मुबारकबाद देती हूँ। गोकि बाहर तो यही दुहाई मची हुई है, जहां जाओ वहां यह पुकार सुनाई देती है कि खाना नहीं है, कपड़ा नहीं है और तरह तरह की कठिनाइयां उन के सामने हैं। यह देखने के बाद भी और सरकार की

[ श्रीमती उमा नेहरू ]

मुश्किलों को भी मैं समझती हूँ, तिस पर भी मैं अपनी गवर्नमेंट को मुबारकबाद दिये बिना नहीं रह सकती कि वह किस खूबी से अपना काम कर रही है।

इस के अलावा यहां पर मैं जो तकरीरें सुन रही हूँ और मैंने जो आचार्य कृपलानी की स्पीच (speech) सुनी, वह बहुत दुखदायी स्पीच थी, लेकिन मैं जानती हूँ, कि मैं अगर उन की जगह होती तो यही कहती। जहां जहां वह जाते हैं, वहां वहां पुलिस उन के पीछे जाती है, मुमकिन है पुलिस उन की रक्षा के लिये जाती हो, लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि चार वर्ष से हमारी कांग्रेस की हुकूमत चल रही है और पुलिस भी हमारी है, लेकिन फिर भी हमें पुलिस से एक प्रकार की चिढ़ सी है। इसलिये साफ़ बात तो यह है कि जहां जहां बेचार्य आचार्य गये, जहां जहां उन्होंने अपना बयान दिया, यह सही है कि उन को यह सब तकलीफें उठानी पड़ीं, लेकिन सरकार की ओर से भुझे कहना है कि मुमकिन है उन की रक्षा के वास्ते यह सब किया गया हो।

हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब के भाषण में पहली चीज़ जिस की तरफ उन्होंने हमारा ध्यान दिलाया है, वह आने वाले चुनाव के बारे में है। जब मैं उन के भाषण में इलेक्शन की बात पढ़ती हूँ तो मेरा ध्यान आज मुल्क की मौजूदा स्थिति और पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा क्या सम्बन्ध है उस की तरफ चला जाता है। इस मौजूदा तनातनी और ऐसी स्थिति में हम को चुनाव करना है। माननीय राष्ट्रपति ने अपनी तकरीर में इस का भी जिक्र किया है कि आने वाले चुनाव में कैसे नुमाइन्दे जनता को चुनने चाहियें। उस में उन्होंने इच्छा प्रकट की है कि सच्चे, ईमानदार नुमाइन्दे चुने जायें और ऐसे नुमाइन्दों को लाने के वास्ते पहली चीज़ जो जरूरी होती

है, वह यह है कि मुल्क में एकता और सब की एक राय होनी चाहिये ताकि ऐसे नुमाइन्दे चुने जायें जो सच्चे और ईमानदार हों, देश भक्त हों और जिनके सामाजिक व राजनैतिक विचार ऊंचे हों। चुनाव का बहुत बड़ा और महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न इस समय हमारे सामने है।

अब रहा काश्मीर का मामला। इस के बारे में अभी मेरे काश्मीर के भाई ने वहां की हालत आप को सुनाई है। मैं तो अपने भाई को काश्मीर जिन्दाबाद कह कर सलाम करती हूँ।

मैं समझती हूँ कि इस वक्त हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जो हैं, जिन के हाथों में हम ने काश्मीर का मामला सौंपा हुआ है, हम को उन पर पूरा विश्वास होना चाहिये। अभी हमारे एक भाई ने कहा कि पाकिस्तान वालों ने काश्मीर के लिये जेट प्लेन्स (jet planes) डाइव बॉम्बर्स (dive bombers) वगैरह वगैरह बहुत से हवाई जहाज़ जमा किये हैं। मैं उन से कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमें कोई फिकर नहीं करनी चाहिये। इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जिस खूबी से और शान्ति से परेशानियों को उठा रहे हैं, उन पर हमें पूरा विश्वास है। लेकिन शान्ति के माने यह नहीं है कि हम बेवकूफ़ हैं। हम बेवकूफ़ नहीं हैं। जिस आदमी में शान्ति होती है, जो समझदार होता है वही ज्यादा अक्लमन्द होता है। इसलिये पाकिस्तान तो बहुत छोटी सी चीज़ है। आप छयाल कर सकते हैं कि हमारे लियाकत अली साहब, जो पाकिस्तान के प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं आउट हाउस (out-house) के ऊपर, मुमकिन है बावर्ची-खाना हो, उस पर खड़े हो कर, अपनी बेगम को बगल में खड़ा कर के झूसा दिखायें तो यह तो बचपने की बातें हैं। इस से आप क्यों घबराते हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि हमें पाकिस्तान

के मामले को अपने प्रधान मंत्री पर छोड़ देना चाहिये। साथ ही हमारे मुल्क के पास फौजें हैं, हमारे कमाण्डर-इन-चीफ (Commander-in-Chief) हैं, हम अपनी फौजों का काम अपने हाथ में क्यों लें। हमें उन पर यकीन करना है। और डिसिप्लिण्ड सोल्जर्स (disciplined soldiers) की तरह हम को चलना है। जब कुछ करने का वक्त आयेगा तब ही आप की परीक्षा होगी और उस वक्त के लिये आप तैयार रहें। लेकिन आप स्वामस्वाह परेशान हो रहे हैं कि उन के पास हवाई जहाज हैं, उन के पास फ्लां चीज है, फ्लां चीज है। इस में तो आप ही अपना समय नष्ट करेंगे। हमें इस की फ्रिक् न होनी चाहिये क्यों कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं, वह बहुत योग्य हैं, वही इस मामले को पूरा करेंगे।

अब सब से आखिरी बात हमारे सामने है हिन्दू कोड बिल की। मैं हाउस को मुबारकबाद देती हूँ कि आज वह दिन हम ने देखा कि जब कि हिन्दू कोड बिल के लिये यह कहा गया, हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने कहा, कि हिन्दू कोड बिल अब की सेशन (session) में पास होगा। लेकिन मुझे भाई श्यामनन्दन सहाय से भी यह कहना है कि उन्होंने अपने व्याख्यान में यह कहा कि क्या जल्दी पड़ी हुई है, अब तो हम खत्म हो रहे हैं, और अगले सेशन में हो। लेकिन मैं उन भाई से कहूंगी कि वह अच्छी तरह से याद रखें कि जब आदमी कोई नेक काम करता है तो उसे हमेशा जल्दी करना चाहिये। तो मुझे यकीन है कि अब की दफा जब हिन्दू कोड बिल आयेगा, मैं यह जानती हूँ कि इस में मुस्तलिफ़् रायें होंगी, लेकिन उसे पूरा हाउस पास करेगा।

अब सब से बड़ी बात नैशनल प्लैनिंग (National Planning) की रही। नैशनल प्लैनिंग के बारे में ज्यादा न कह कर

मैं इतना ही कहूंगी कि राष्ट्र का निर्माण करने में स्त्रियों का हाथ होना जरूरी है क्यों कि घर में भी वही इन्तज़ान करती हैं और बाहर भी। हर दिशा में वही करेंगी। मुझे यकीन है कि इस के अन्दर इस का भी विचार किया जायगा। इस के साथ ही मुझे यह भी कहना है कि अब की दफा लाखों स्त्रियां हैं जो अपनी बेवकूफी की वजह से नामजद न हो सकीं, लेकिन मदों की अज्ञानता व लापरवाही भी थी कि उन्होंने उन का नाम नहीं दिया। लेकिन मेरे पास उन के तार और खत आ रहे हैं और मैं ने उन से कहा है कि वह एजीटेशन (agitation) को बराबर चालू रखें। मुझे तो यह कहना है कि अगर उन का नाम आ जाय तो अच्छा है और न आये तो मुझे खिन्ता नहीं है क्यों कि उन के एजिटेशन से सब ठीक ही हो जायगा।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shrimati Uma Nehru (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Chairman, I have to congratulate the Government for the sound way they are working. There prevails a great discontentment outside. Wherever one goes, the wail of scarcity of food and cloth is heard. Such and many other odds are facing them. I am aware of the situation, but I realize the difficulties of the Government and I cannot refrain from congratulating them for the manner in which they have been dealing with the situation.

I heard a number of speeches, but the speech of Acharya Kripalani was a very regrettable one. However, I know if I were in his place, I would also have said the same things. Wherever he goes, the police shadows him. Maybe the police follows him for his protection. But, as you know, in spite of the Congress administration for these four years we still feel a sort of repulsion for the police which is our own now. It is evident, therefore, that wherever Acharyaji went, wherever he delivered his speech, he had to suffer that inconvenience. But on behalf of the Government, I have to say that that might have been done for his protection.

[Shrimati Uma Nehru]

Now, the first thing towards which our attention has been drawn in the Presidential address is the forthcoming elections. When I read in his speech about elections, my attention is drawn to the present conditions obtaining in the country and towards our strained relations with Pakistan. Such is the situation in which we have to carry out the elections. The President has also mentioned in his address what type of representatives should the people choose. He has expressed the wish that sincere and honest people should be elected, and for sending such people the first essential requisite is that there should be unity in the country, and unanimity of opinion, so that the representatives elected may be persons of integrity and honesty, true patriots holding lofty social and political ideals. This very big and significant question of elections is before us.

So far as the question of Kashmir is concerned our friend from Kashmir related to you the conditions there. I greet my friend with "Kashmir Zindabad". I suppose we have rightly entrusted the matter of Kashmir into the hands of our Prime Minister and we must repose full faith in him. A friend of ours just now said that Pakistan has acquired jet planes, dive-bombers and other kinds of aeroplanes for use in Kashmir. I want to tell him that we should not be worried over it. There is no room for doubt in the sound and peaceful way in which our Prime Minister is dealing with these troubles and we have full confidence in him. But our peacefulness does by no mean indicate our incompetency; for the man who is peaceful is more wise and prudent. Pakistan is a trifle. You can very well imagine the childish frivolity of the Pakistan Prime Minister, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, standing on the roof of some out-house, probably on the roof of the kitchen, with his Begum by his side and extending his clenched fist. Why should that worry us? I am sure we must leave the matter of Pakistan to our Prime Minister. Moreover, our country has military forces and a Commander-in-Chief. Why should then we take their work in our own hands? We have to pin our faith on them and work like disciplined soldiers. When the occasion to do something arises we shall have our test and we must be ready for that. We need not be unnecessarily panic-stricken by such things as that they have aeroplanes, that they have this, that they have that. That would merely be wasting our time. We should not be troubled on that account because our Prime Minister is a very capable man and he will properly deal with the affair.

Lastly, we have the question of the Hindu Code Bill. I congratulate the House that we saw the day when our President declared that the Hindu Code Bill would be passed during the current session. Our friend Shri Syamanandan Sahaya said that we should not hurry it through and since our own term was closing, it should be left to be dealt with during the next session. But I have to tell him that a good job should always be done quickly. So I am confident that when the Bill is taken up, the House will, in spite of the differing opinions, that there will be, pass it unanimously.

Now for the national planning. Without going into the details of national planning I would confine myself to the observation that women must also have a hand in the work of national re-construction for it is they who manage things inside the house and also outside it. They shall work in all directions. I am sure, that aspect would also be considered. With that I have also to say that there are lakhs of women who could not be enrolled as voters due to their folly; but it was also due to the ignorance and carelessness of men who did not give out the names of their women. But now I am receiving letters and telegrams from these women and I have advised them to continue the agitation. I have only to say that if their names are enrolled now, so much the better, but that if that does not happen I should not be worried because their agitation would set things right.

Shri Joachim Alva (Bombay): I may be forgiven for narrating a personal incident to this House. Sometime in July 1948, I landed for a few minutes at the Karachi airport on my way to Prague for the great Sokol festival there. One of the airport officials pointed out to me four planes. It was then one o'clock past midnight! Those four planes belonged to Sydney Cotton. I was told that those four planes would go to Hyderabad (India) and return before dawn! I do not know whether the objects or the plans have been changed, whether Laik Ali Wazir sahib who ran away from Hyderabad has been planning and planning a hundredfold, whether those planes have multiplied hundredfold and whether the reports that at a time of great international tension, Britain has been supplying planes to Pakistan is correct. It behoves us to see in what state we stand. There is one golden sentence in the speech of the hon. the President: "We are determined to avoid war, unless it is thrust upon us." Compare this with what the Prime Minister of Pakistan said: "One course is to pursue the matter in the Security

Council; the second course I would not tell you."

About a year and a half ago the Pakistan Prime Minister landed in Delhi on a Palm Sunday, a very auspicious day according to the Christian Calendar to meet the Prime Minister of India when the two parts of our continent were bitterly opposed to each other—when the great Bengal minorities suffered, when the descendants of those great leaders from the time of Rabindranath Tagore, Deshbandhu Das, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, all of them, suffered. They are all still suffering and we have a moral obligation towards the minorities of East Bengal. Such was the auspicious time of landing of Liaquat Ali Khan in Delhi in April 1950 and now these planes have increased a hundred-fold! And perhaps they are planning a lightning war, a lightning war which may damage Bombay, the nerve-centre of industrial India, and also Delhi and thus terrorize our people. But our morale is very high. The morale of our people is as high as it was when our young men mounted the gallows for the cause of freedom of our country, when the illiterate and unknown villagers of Chimur and Asthi rose and fought against the ravages of the British and brought us freedom. There is universal support in the matter of a united policy from Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee to the Prime Minister, and we will be rendering a true account of ourselves if and when the time of peril to our security comes.

There is one point I would like to urge upon the House, and it is this, whether the hon. the Home Minister will not have sooner or later to consider an important issue of our security. I do not know whether the House remembers that Field-Marshal Auchinleck came to Bombay in about 1949 or 1950 as one of the directors of a big bank, one of the five big banks of Britain. For the purpose of business contracts Auchinleck went about India and he may have also been in Delhi. He might have returned to England, but he went over to his headquarters, that is Pakistan and has now made his exit. The vital point is whether it is pertinent and right in the interests of the security of this country that foreigners who come to India through Bombay with business connections should go to Pakistan with hostile purposes; whether it is not right and meet, in view of this incident, that they should be prevented from landing in India and not allowed to land at Bombay or any other port in India if their object is

Pakistan, on a mission of hostility to India!

Our defences are not merely physical; though our defences physically are grand. Our army is in first-class mettle. Whether Christians, Muslims or Hindus or Parsis the men of our Defence forces are ready to shed their blood in their country's cause. When Brigadier Usman sacrificed his life in Kashmir I was in London and I found that not a word was said about it in the British press, though our Prime Minister and the whole Cabinet were on the streets of Delhi to honour this great national hero. Later on I saw the news in my own paper in London. This is the attitude of the foreign press, whereas when a third-class soldier with fourth-class decoration sometimes dies in a western country, the news at once gets through the wires of the world. When this great national hero shed his blood in Kashmir and when our Prime Minister and other Ministers went in the streets of Delhi to honour him, not one line appeared in the British press! Now the "London Times" and the "Manchester Guardian" suggest that we shall have the U.N. troops on our borders, that in the event of any quarrel they shall come in and so on—as if we are not satisfied with our subjugation for over a hundred years under them!

We shall not be merely satisfied with physical defences. We possess real moral defences. Our moral defences are that we have the highest form of a secular State. Which part of the world has got such a form of secularism? Is it there in anyone of the Christian countries where Christ is enthroned but Christian principles have been flung into the dust-bin? Catholics are most influential in the United States, but not one Catholic has been put up for election of the U.S.A. Vice-Presidents, or not one Catholic has been ever elected for the Presidency. No Catholic can be Lord Chancellor or Prime Minister of England. And if a Catholic is born in Sweden he has to register his birth in a Protestant church, so also at the time of his marriage. We have no such restrictions here. We have the highest idealism of Mahatma Gandhi which has been handed down to his heir, our President, our ex-Governor-General and other Hindu leaders who have looked upon Christians, Muslims and others with utmost attention and kindness. Which Government, I ask, have put an item on the expenditure bill that right here the Jumma Masjid should be repaired at a cost of Rs. 2 lakhs? How many Hindus have not contributed from time immemorial towards the

[Shri Joachim Alva]

building of mosques and churches etc. with timber and other building materials? This is our toleration. But across the border in Pakistan lift the veil and you will see the sword drawn and many places of religious interest trampled upon.

This is a grave moment in our history. We cannot trifle with it. As I said, the hon. President has said that we shall be ready for war if it is thrust upon us and we shall not run away from it. The psychology and the ideology that pervaded our land in the past hundred years culminated in the partition of our land. Other people's hand was in it. But for the secret moral and physical intervention of other people, I mean of Britain, we would never have been divided. They wanted to cut up and divide India and then pompously declare "Now, you live in Peace!" Thereafter the second stage came. They pitched one party against the other and said "Settle your quarrel". Hence the Kashmir problem came in. If the Kashmir problem is settled, there will be a corridor problem, and problems *ad infinitum* of that nature. Time has come when the Government has a serious and solemn obligation to discharge. We shall be embedded in the principles of Mahatma Gandhi. The day that the principles of a secular State are put in the dust-bin we shall cease to be a great people. The man who stands alone with a high prestige of moral fervour or who does not look for easy advantages, that man and that country which he adorns with his leadership has the greatest chance. So let no one say India is friendless and she will have to fight lonely battles.

I find there has been no reference to Goa and Pondicherry in the President's Address. Our problem is not completely solved until the Foreign Settlements on our land have been wiped off. We know how our young men were recently ill-treated in Brussels and Paris—forty or fifty young men were bundled away—and we allow our young men to be ill-treated in this manner in this year of 1951. Why then allow Goa and Pondicherry to be in alien hands?

**Shri Naziruddin Ahmad:** On a point of order. I respectfully raise a constitutional point of order. The point is that I have submitted an amendment to the Resolution. There are many others who have done so. I would like to know whether a Member who has been taken as having moved an amendment is entitled to speak upon it or not. I submit that it is meaningless to move an amendment without any words in support. I therefore want to

know whether I have a right or not. If I have no right, then of course I sit down and know what to do. But if I have a right I should be given an opportunity. There could be no right unless an opportunity for the exercise of that right is given. I ask for your ruling in this matter.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think it is no point of order, much less a constitutional point of order. It is our experience in the House that many movers of amendments, though they are entitled to speak, need not necessarily speak, because it may be that hundreds of amendments would have been given notice of, and it is neither possible nor desirable that every mover of amendment should be given a chance or could be given a chance. Therefore I do not think there is any point of order.

The hon. the Prime Minister.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** During these two days of this debate many hon. Members have spoken and touched upon a large number of points. On the whole they had been good enough to express themselves in kind words about a large part of our Government's policy and more especially the foreign policy of this country. Much has been said about which I would myself like to say something in reply; much has been said which has rather embarrassed me more especially when it was obviously meant to be kind to me but which struck me as something as the very opposite of it like the hon. the speaker who spoke last. So I think perhaps it would be better for me not to cover a large number of subjects, to try to reply to many points that had been raised. That will become a very discursive argument and perhaps lose all point or substance. It will be better for me to confine myself to one or two major issues. Indeed the House itself has spent more time in discussing those major issues than the others. I therefore propose to say something generally about foreign policy and more particularly about our relations with Pakistan and the question of Kashmir.

I am grateful for the wide support given to that foreign policy in this House on this occasion as on previous occasions. I am grateful for something that I sensed that lay behind the words that we have said because even as such words carry much meaning behind them, but I had a sense of the real and substantial support in the minds of hon. Members than even what their words conveyed and I am grateful for that.

My colleagues and I during these days have had to carry a very heavy burden and heavy responsibilities and though sometimes we may appear light-hearted about it, nevertheless the burden is heavy and we want as large a support as possible, not support merely in kind words in phrases but intelligent support, understanding support, real support. I wanted that not only from this House but perhaps even from a wider circle. I have during the past few days ventured to go out into the market place and the field to see large numbers of the people of Delhi and roundabout, to tell them about these big questions that troubled us, the great burdens and great problems that we have to face and to ask for their support and wherever I have gone, it has heartened me to see the support of those people whom we presume to represent and whose ultimate will must count and whose morale counts more than any resolution.

Now, I claim no virtue for myself or for my Government or if I may say so with all respect for my country.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I suspect those persons who claim too much virtue for themselves or their group or even their country. We all get into the habit of talking big about ourselves; but we know that the noblest words sometimes become currency in the mouths of base men and lose their meaning. We talk about patriotism and love of the country and the like and often enough in the name of patriotism indulge in actions that are not good. Everybody in every country does that. So it does not very much matter what fine language I might use or other hon. Members might use in this or any other connection. Ultimately we are tested by action. It is in the hot fire of experience and trial. Many of us in this House in past years have had some kind of a test in our lives, and sometimes we have faltered and sometimes we have stumbled. Nevertheless we had that test and we were the better for it. We were the better for it because in spite of all our weakness we had some glimmering of principle to hold on to, some light through which we were drawn and we went in our weak way towards it and were strengthened thereby, and we did not mind then if sometimes instead of a garden we had to go through a wilderness. In this way many of my generations in India have been nurtured. I repeat this not as a personal matter. I repeat it because people even in this country and

people in other countries have short memories and forget this past which is not such an old past. They forget that we may be feeble, we may be weak in person or we may make mistakes but when we think that something is important, something is a matter of principle, then we have not learnt yet in our lives to bow down to evil, whatever it may be. We did not bow down to it when that was represented by a mighty force against us and we appeared feeble and unarmed. How then are we going to bow down today when we are stronger, at least in the normal ways of strength? Are we stronger in other ways, in our minds, in our hearts in the way we pull together or do not pull together? That is what gave us strength in the days of old. Does it give us strength today? It is that problem that has been troubling me in this and many other ways, because after all strength comes from that and not so much from our defence forces. I do not think that our defence forces without that basic strength of the people can go very far, if the time of trial comes. Listening to hon. Members here, I heard of many criticisms, of preparedness, of civil defence and the like and I heard of other things of somebody being totally unable to eat wheat or that they could only live on rice or something like that. It seemed to me that there is some hiatus, some gap when these petty things are brought up when big questions are at issue.

We may have to live on wheat or something else worse than wheat, if we are serious about it. There is no good of talking of rice or that we are not used to wheat. We will have to get used to many things that we are not used to. How many of us in this House had to live in jails which we were not used to previously in the last 10 or 20 years. Are we born all of us to live lives in the wilderness or prisons or the like? We did not complain. But if everybody wants the things to which he is accustomed, rice or wheat, the demand must be met at the cost of someone else. Are you prepared to pay that cost? One part of India may have to pay the cost of another part. I mention this merely just to beg of the House to consider these matters in proper perspective. Let us have all the rice we can and the wheat we can. I am not opposing that but let us remember that first things come first and other things come afterwards.

Now referring to our larger policies we have followed a foreign policy about which I have often addressed

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

this House and this House has, if not unanimously, well, with a very wide measure of support agreed with it. I have pointed out often enough, that that policy is not a negative, is not a neutral, is not a passive policy; it is a very active policy so far as I can see it. I am not going into the details of that; but I do feel after giving daily and hourly thought to it that the policy we have pursued has been the right policy, is the right policy and is going to be the right policy. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am going to follow it. I know that that has not met with the goodwill, sometimes, of other people and other countries. I know that it has been criticised by people. I know that sometimes an attempt has been made to bring some pressure to bear upon us in order to change it. Nevertheless, I am convinced that that is the right policy. Whether in the West or East, we do not wish to interfere with other countries. We do not wish to play a large part in the affairs of the world. We have troubles of our own. But, where our voice is sought, it will be given in accordance with our views and nobody else's views, whatever the pressure. Even if we have to suffer for that, I hope we shall be prepared to suffer rather than to give up our independence of judgment and independence of action.

What are our tests? What are our objectives? It is difficult to define them. But, broadly speaking, the last 20, 30 or 40 years of experience have, I think, conclusively proved to any person whose mind is not quite closed, that no big problem is solved by a big war. Wars have come: big and small. We have seen many of them. There have been great victories and great defeats. After a war is over, no problem has been solved; but a hundred new problems have arisen apart from the terrible misery that ensued. Therefore, it seems to me that every intelligent person should seek to avoid war. Every intelligent person should realise that apart from the inhumanity and apart from the terrible destruction and horrors of war today, it just does not solve any problem and the very problem you think it is going to solve, it makes worse.

Nevertheless, no country can do away with the apparatus for war. At least no responsible Government dare take that step. Because we live in a harsh and cruel world, if we value our freedom, we cannot depend on other peoples' good nature only. We have to depend on our own strength. It is a delicate balance, perhaps. Nevertheless, the emphasis should be clear. We try our

utmost to avoid war, world war or any other domestic war anywhere. Yet, we have to be prepared for it lest our freedom might be involved and suppressed. We have tried to follow that policy. In the counsels of the world, wherever we have been asked, whether it is in Korea or any other parts of the Far East, when questions come up, our answer always is judged by this yardstick: does this increase tension: does it lead to war: or, does it lessen tension and perhaps lead to a settlement or peace.

Now, I find that more and more the test of statesmanship in western countries is becoming what is called the military test. My hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee appealed for statesmanship in his speech. I shall come to that presently. I entirely agree with him. But, exactly what is statesmanship is not such a simple or clear matter. But, then, as I said, gradually, the minds of men in great countries think of statesmanship more and more in military terms and military language. That is to say, they think more in terms of war or preparation for war.

Now, countries have to be prepared for war if war comes and it is not for me to say that they should not prepare. But, I do wish to say that if it is statesmanship to begin to think only or largely in military terms, then, he who does so has ceased to be a statesman. He may be a good soldier for aught I know, because, the soldier's job is to defeat the enemy by any means. The soldier does not think too much of what happens after he has gained his victory over the enemy. The soldier does not think too much of what the masses of men think or feel or how they act. He only thinks of military objectives. When I see that more and more military objectives become the goals of statesmanship, frankly, I am a little nervous and I am a little afraid as to where the world is going. In our own feeble way, we try to put in the international assemblies some other points which we hope will lessen tension. Our voice does not go very far. But, anyhow, it does give us some little satisfaction that we have said what we feel is the right thing to do.

Now, this approach has governed our actions in foreign policy and we have tried to govern our actions even in our relations to Pakistan more or less with that approach. Of course, very special considerations apply to our relations with Pakistan, because of our past history, because of the conflicts between us, relations between us and a

hundred and one other things. Nevertheless, that basic fact remains that a major conflict between India and Pakistan would be a disaster of the first magnitude for us as well as Pakistan. I say that and I shall repeat it because, perhaps, many hon. Members and many people outside do not wholly appreciate or realise that. Because if it is suggested that a problem is difficult and therefore we should go to war to solve it, whatever the result of the war, that problem will not be solved. Other problems will also arise. War is not a solution of problems. It is only a solution in the sense that it puts an end to a large number of human beings and property. It is only a solution, if that is a solution, if you think of a war in terms of extermination of a whole population. That may be some kind of a solution. But, that does not happen even in these days of atomic warfare. So, one must not imagine that war is a solution of any problem. War, nevertheless, may come for various reasons, among them being that somebody else is foolish enough to have war. Well, if somebody is foolish to have war, you cannot run away; you have to face it with all your strength and put an end to it. Therefore, as we have envisaged it, we have always thought of war in India as a defensive war and not as an offensive and an aggressive war, not only vis-a-vis Pakistan, but anywhere in the world. I want to be perfectly frank about it, because the House and all must realise it. If we wanted to reduce our army it was from that point of view. Many hon. Members did not like that and I can very well understand the reason why they did not like it. However, in the balance, we decided to do that. Later we decided to stop that process and it is stopped, and obviously till there is any grave risk or danger, that process will remain stopped. Pandit Kunzru asked me that question. Well, this is my answer.

So, that is the basic approach and it is not, if I may say so, an approach of, shall I say piety or some kind of pacifism, good or bad. It is an approach based on hard facts, on a cool, cold-blooded objective realisation of facts, because there is always danger in such cases and in such matters of people being swept away by passion, by some notion, that by quick action or war, you can achieve your results. Well, you do not. Do not imagine that some kind of police work is war. That is a different thing entirely, whether the police functions on a small or big scale. When you think of war, you

come into another region. The qualities are different and the consequences are terribly different.

Now, that being our main approach, we naturally have tried to avoid war. We offered Pakistan a no-war declaration which Pakistan did not wholly accept or agree to. And even recently, a few days ago, this was repeated to them, and they would only agree to it if we kept apart Kashmir from it. Now, when we consider this question of Indo-Pakistan relations, let us look not only at the broad picture including not only Kashmir on the one side, not only Bengal and Assam and East Bengal on the other side and the many other problems that have arisen. Think for a while of past history too, because what we see to-day has grown out of the past. Now, I am not going into the story of the past; but I do wish you to bear that in mind, because it is important and relevant—not only the past four years, but the longer period of the previous twenty or thirty years. It is out of that that all this has come out. In those years, in those early years, some twenty or thirty years ago, most of us stood, as we stand to-day for inter-communal unity, for a peaceful solution of our internal problems, for a joint effort to win our freedom, and then to live together in that freedom. The predecessors of, or rather those who brought Pakistan, had a different gospel, not of unity, but of disunity, not of construction, but of destruction, not of peace, but if not war, at any rate, discord. Now, I do not think that they or the people of Pakistan are any better or any worse than we or the people of India are. I disclaim all special virtue. I want to make this perfectly clear, and if any man talks of our being more virtuous than others, then I suspect his virtue, because I know we have failed and failed quite often enough, and the person who talks most of his own virtues is the least virtuous. All the same, it does make a little difference what kind of ideals you put before yourself, and some groups or persons might function differently if given a somewhat different direction to look at. Fortunately for us, we had a certain ideal placed before us in this country during the last twenty to thirty years, and to some extent, naturally, it affected our thinking and our action. And in spite of everything, that continues to be our guiding star. That is the major difference between India's policies to-day and Pakistan's policies which are naturally derived from the previous record of discord and hatred, the deliberate propagation of hatred and disunity. It goes on. I am quite con-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vinced that a country that follows such a policy will injure itself. If I am not convinced of that, then it would become my duty and yours to follow that policy. But I am quite convinced that it is bad for an individual and for a nation to follow that policy, and I do not want India to follow that policy, come what may. I say come what may, but it is really because of the close, reasoned approach to the problem, and to a realisation of the consequences of such a policy that I say so.

My friend talked about statesmanship. Well, I do not quite know how to define statesmanship. There may be many definitions. But if I may suggest a few, it is to think not only of your immediate urge, not only of the action before you, but also of the consequences of that action, to think not only of to-day, but of what to-morrow and the day after might bring. In other words, to have some perspective, some vision, some objective towards which we go and not to be driven about by the urges and the passions of the moment. Now, if you apply that test to many things that have been said here since yesterday, what do we find? Some proposals have been made in regard to East Bengal or Pakistan or Kashmir. Apply that test and see where it leads you to. It is not enough, just because you are angry with Pakistan, to say, "To Hell with Pakistan. Let us do this or that." It is not enough to say, because you are angry with something that is happening, "Let us do the same thing". You have to think of the morrow's consequences. I am leaving out anything about, shall I say, standards of morals? I am merely applying the pragmatic, opportunist test of action. Because any action you may indulge in has consequences and these consequences flow from that action as inevitably as any law of physics or chemistry. Therefore, think of those consequences and then adhere to your course of action.

Now, various proposals have been made. May I say that my hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee seemed to think that we have forgotten East Bengal or the people coming from East Bengal or who are still there. Allow me to assure him that there have been very few subjects or matters which have been of more anxious concern to us than this problem. We have not talked about it too often, for a variety of reasons. Talking would not do much good. But obviously this problem of East Bengal and any other problem like that of Kashmir or anything else, are all parts of a single

big problem, and that is Indo-Pakistan relation. You cannot separate them. And Indo-Pakistan relations have their roots in all manner of things in the past, not the last four years, but the past twenty or thirty years. When you talk about solving one problem, you may deal with it for the moment, you may better it or improve it but you cannot solve it until you solve the final problem.

5 P.M.

A year and a half ago there was an agreement between the Prime Minister of Pakistan and myself on the 8th April in regard to the situation in Bengal and Assam. That matter was discussed in the House and there was a good deal of criticism of it then and later. I am often asked today by newspapers and elsewhere, what about your agreement: what has happened to it? Now that question surprises me, because I think that that agreement is among the things in the course of the last few years that can be called one of the greatest successes that we have achieved, not because it solved the problem of East Bengal, of course it did not; nobody expected it to solve the problem of East Bengal. It was meant to solve the immediate difficulty and ease the situation, to bring relief to millions of people and open out the way for further improvement. Other things come in the way. If the Indo-Pakistan relationship deteriorates somewhere else or something else happens, naturally that affects East Bengal too. So far as that agreement is concerned I could say with great confidence to this House that the results it achieved were remarkable in the sense of the human misery it had stopped, how millions were given relief by it for a considerable time in a variety of ways, whether they came here or remained there.

Having said that, it is perfectly true that it did not solve the problem of East Bengal and the problem of East Bengal cannot be solved till the major problem of Indo-Pakistan relations is not solved or is not nearer solution. That is a big thing.

Hon. Members asked me—though they did not put the exact question,—why have you not solved the Kashmir problem or why have you not solved this or that? I can name a few dozen major problems of the world which go on and on without solution. They go on and on in spite of the United Nations—the great nations whether in the West or in the Far East. Any number of them, hon. Members know, go on and on, in spite of the best efforts of people.

I doubt if there are more than a handful of persons in the wide world who want war in any country. Nevertheless, the fact remains, as I pointed out, that the whole world or a large part of it is becoming more and more military-minded and preparing hard. Why is that so? Everybody knows that if there is a big world war, it would be terrible, it would destroy the proud structure of European civilisation, apart from the enormous and widespread misery that ensues. Everybody knows that, everybody wants to avoid war and yet they go on preparing for war as if driven by some elemental and uncontrollable urge. So these problems cannot be dealt with in this way.

Two or three suggestions were repeated on this occasion as it was done previously also. One was about asking Pakistan to offer territory in proportion to the number of migrants who come over. The other reference was to some kind of exchange of populations and that also presumably involves an exchange of territory. Let us be perfectly clear that such a demand means war. I hope nobody here would say that by sending a registered communication this can be effected. It means war and if it means war, let us not think of exchange of territory or population but of war. Let us not get confused. It is too easy to say these things and try to escape the consequences of what we say. Therefore let us be clear about it. All this business of exchange of population or exchange of territory or any other ways suggested have absolutely no meaning at all and the only thing that it means is that by a process of war you want to do whatever you desire.

I have dealt with the question of war and tried to put before the House that if one thing is certain it is this that by war you will not get what you want, apart from victory or defeat. You will only get a generation of terrible misery, a generation of putting an end to every single thing that you have in mind and the burden of terrible poverty all over. It does not matter how effectively you win the war.

So let us consider these problems a little more realistically and not just jump to the conclusion that by some kind of strong action we can achieve our objective. Because of this we decided that no effective result can be achieved through a big scale warfare.

I would like to add something else to that. So far as the problem of

East and West Bengal and Assam is concerned it is impossible for me to conceive that this process of squeezing out of large numbers of people could continue as it has to some extent continued during the last 2½ months. I might say it is slightly less now than it was but that has no particular meaning. During the last year, for a year I would say, there was a reverse tendency. Only in the last two or three months it has again turned this way. It is not wholly inconceivable that for the moment it may lessen but there is no doubt in my mind that the general conditions in East Bengal are such that there is some kind of a continuous pressure there on the minority population. They may put up with that pressure and if it becomes a little too much they come out. But there is no doubt that it is there and it is an abnormal situation which continually keeps tension going, not only there but all over the Indo-Pakistan relationship. It is a thing which never will allow us to settle down unless the problem is settled. I cannot find a magic remedy for it. It is one of those difficult problems which can only be settled by some kind of a basic improvement in the situation. We may provisionally deal with it in the best way possible locally. But ultimately it is the big question of Indo-Pakistan relationship. Personally I rule out war for the settlement of that, because I do not think that a war will settle or solve it. But I cannot rule out war independently or unilaterally, if the other party brings it in and as the other party talks so much about it and shouts so much I have to be perfectly ready for it.

Now I shall say a few words about Kashmir. May I say that the House had the great advantage of hearing to-day the authentic voice of Kashmir speaking in this House? I am exceedingly glad that we had that exposition of Kashmir's position from one who is perhaps more entitled than almost any other person in Kashmir to give it because the hon. Member who spoke is the General Secretary of the Kashmir National Conference.

Again, in considering the question of Kashmir we should not confine ourselves to the present. We should go back certainly four years, when this trouble arose there, but we should go back really eighteen or nineteen years to understand it, when this movement in Kashmir began the movement against autocratic rule there, and gradually built itself up and challenged the Maharaja's rule. In the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

course of these eighteen or nineteen years there were many ups and downs, people were imprisoned and shot down; the kind of things that we had known in India happened in Kashmir. It is interesting to try to remember what exactly was the part that the leaders of Pakistan were playing in those days when the people of Kashmir were struggling for their freedom; not the people of Kashmir only but the people of all the States of India. Because the House will remember that the Muslim League supported every autocratic rule in India in every State—they did not interfere, and privately they helped it. So also in Kashmir. It may have been a Hindu Maharaja, but the odd thing is that the Muslim League was in some ways in alliance with or being helped by the Hindu Maharaja's Government in Kashmir against the national movement there. Not that there was much love lost between them, but because the major movement was this great national movement for freedom; every odd group that could be brought to oppose this major movement was helped, as is the custom of all governments. So in the past this great movement was built up which challenged the autocratic rule there and there was no rival to it there; there were small groups and parties no doubt, but nothing very effective. May I tell you how in the course of those years and till recently—I say, just before this invasion of Kashmir took place—time and again efforts were made by the leaders of the Muslim League to woo Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah to win him over to their side? All kinds of ways—by going to Kashmir, by inviting him even till the eve of partition and even, I think, just after partition—and all kinds of efforts were tried to woo him. Well, they did not succeed because they were two diametrically opposed viewpoints. You heard today the approach to these questions which the hon. Member from Kashmir gave you, an approach which was as diametrically opposed to a communal approach as anything could be, an approach which I wish some of us could equal in clarity because we talk a great deal about a secular state, and my friend, Mr. Alva stretched himself to his full length of five feet seven and talked about a secular state. I wish we were much more of a secular state than we are at present, I wish we would approach the ideal we have put down in our Constitution, because we do not and let us be clear about it, because there are too many people attacking that ideal, too many

people trying to undermine it; if they do not attack it, too many people acting a way which ultimately undermines it—too many communally-minded people in this country today. Let us be clear about it, let us therefore not lose ourselves in words and phrases but look at things as they are happening. But in Kashmir it was a straight fight between communalism and this ideal that we hold, and it is a straight fight there today and all the time. It is quite absurd to talk of India and Pakistan fighting for possession of Kashmir as if it was some booty to be seized hold of by the stronger person. In Kashmir the struggle has been for a basic ideal and the Kashmiri people have fought their struggle even more than your armies. Do you remember that before our armies went there, there were three days when there was no proper government, no proper police in the Valley of Kashmir because, I regret to say those who were in authority ran away taking their bag and baggage along with them. So there was nobody in authority there and there was the enemy raiding and pillaging, almost at the Valley's doorstep.

Now, what happened then in the Valley of Kashmir? Surely, if there had been any real sympathy for the invader the whole Valley would have been offered on a silver platter to the invader. Even apart from sympathy, if there had not been a strong feeling of national unity and national consciousness the whole place would have gone to pieces, just disrupted, because the governmental apparatus had gone, the police had gone, there was the enemy at the gate, the people would have run away and there would have been panic and all that. Instead of that during those three days with constant and instant danger threatening them, it was the people of the Valley who kept the peace; their volunteers without arms, volunteers of this National Conference and the leaders of the National Conference, it was they, without arms, without anything, just because of their personal influence and their appeals and their day and night watches, who kept the peace and to the last day there was not a single shop that closed in Srinagar even though the enemy was six miles away.

Now when people talk about a plebiscite and people talk of India imposing itself on Kashmir, they should keep this picture before them. I have not a shadow of doubt in my mind as Maulana Masoodi said, that the result of a plebiscite in Kashmir can only be one result and that is in

favour of the present Government there.

You know the subsequent story about the invasion and what happened and all that. It is a very remarkable thing that after all that has happened somehow or other some of our friends in foreign countries write and speak and behave in the manner they do. I can understand that their knowledge of events is limited, nevertheless, the assurance with which they try to lay down the law, sometimes the affrontery with which they try to advise us, amazes me. When I think of the story of Pakistan and Kashmir, when I think of Pakistan's case and the way they put it forward repeatedly, I am reminded of a story—the story of a young man who murdered his father and mother—and when he was tried for this, he pleaded for mercy and clemency on the ground that he was an orphan. It is really extraordinary how everything has been twisted out of recognition in the way Pakistan puts forward its case. I have often thought wherein perhaps we have erred in the last three or four years in regard to Kashmir. We may have committed many small errors here and there, but I just cannot find out in my mind any major step that we have taken which can be called a wrong step. It may be a slightly mistaken step. The House will remember that a year and a half ago or more, there was a cease fire and after that or just about that time the U.N. Commission passed a resolution. There was one before that and we accepted that. Thus we accepted both of them. The first resolution that we accepted some time in 1948 was not accepted by Pakistan. Later, another resolution came which we accepted after long parley with the Commission and after an exchange of letters because we wanted to be quite clear about it and we wanted no misunderstanding to be there. So we cleared it up and those two or three matters were cleared up in letters exchanged between us and the members of the Commission. May I say regarding the letters that we exchanged that before we sent our letters to each other we jointly drafted them. Before I sent my letter to the Commission and after they approved of it, then I signed and sent it to them, so that it was a mutually arranged matter to clarify any difficulty. This related to the disbandment and disarmament of the so-called Azad Kashmir Forces and to certain Northern Areas. I mention these two matters because these two

very important matters came in the way of any progress later, because Pakistan refused and said that it did not have anything to do with them. We insisted—naturally. We said, "We stick to them. We have accepted that resolution, and this is part of that resolution, so far as we are concerned and so far as the Commission is concerned and we are not going to give it up."

I shall not take the House into the intermediate stages. The Commission ultimately left it at that, that is to say, they could not reconcile our interpretation of those resolutions based on our correspondence and Pakistan's being different, they could not reconcile the two and they went away. Later, other things happened. Sir Owen Dixon came, and others. But in the last resolution passed by the Security Council a strange sea-change came, that is to say, in this resolution they ignored largely what had been agreed to previously between us and the Commission. Naturally, we objected to this. We pointed this out to them. After all, we can only be asked to do what we had agreed to do, but those two or three major points that we had raised with the Commission and to which the Commission had agreed in writing are there for anybody to see. They were completely ignored in the last resolution of the Security Council and further, the Security Council went on to say that in certain eventualities arbitration would take place about differences. We ventured to point out to the Security Council that this was something entirely different from what had been agreed to previously and said that we were just not going to give up the previous agreement in the face of any such new order of the Security Council and we were not prepared in matters of this kind where the fate of millions of people were involved to submit them to an arbitrator. That is why we voted against and rejected that resolution in the Security Council, and I greatly regret that when this resolution came up before the Security Council two great countries, friends of ours, took up a line there which was exceedingly unfriendly to us, which seemed to me extremely illogical also, which seemed to flow from a great deal of ignorance of the problem and what had been done before and which seemed to me to be based on some entirely extraneous considerations which had nothing to do with this problem. However, it was a matter of great regret to me. Now, Pakistan goes on saying that we have spurned the United Nations and the Security Council. I deny that.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

All that we have told the Security Council is that we stand by our previous agreements and it is they who have forgotten their agreements, and we are not prepared to accept anything which either forgets the basic fact of the previous assurances or which challenges our self-respect or independence or honour. That is the basic difficulty; and now Pakistan lays the greatest stress—of course taking advantage of this fact—that they agreed to the last resolution in the Security Council and we did not. They have agreed to many things later on because it so happened that whatever was put forward by some others happened to be to their advantage and they quickly agreed to it. That is the position in regard to Kashmir.

A great deal of fuss was made in the Security Council and elsewhere because the Constituent Assembly was called to meet in Kashmir. Why was this so, someone asked. What business is it of anybody to interfere with some internal arrangement which we had in Kashmir or anywhere else in India? We have told them and given them the assurance that this does not come in the way of the Security Council. How does the Security Council function in such matters? We went to the Security Council with a complaint, a simple complaint, of Pakistan's aggression. It is odd that we have not had any decision of the Security Council on that yet, although three years after that Sir Owen Dixon did say that Pakistan's action was a breach of international law or some such thing. The House knows all these facts and I am sorry to take up the time of the House in detailing these facts in this way, but I do wish hon. Members to remember some things that are not the facts in the books, if I may say so.

In Kashmir there is a basic conflict between two ideals. And the real conflict is being fought not by Indian troops or other troops, but by the people of Kashmir themselves. It is further a conflict between progress and uttermost reaction and bigotry. I invite hon. Members to go to Kashmir and see for themselves the progress that has been made in spite of all difficulties,—governmental progress, progress in economy of Kashmir, all kinds of public works, supplies, transport, in every sense, and particularly the very great land reform that they have brought about quickly. The whole face of the country is changed.

Go to the other side, as Maulana Saeed said, the Azad Kashmir—of course you cannot go there. But there the conditions are amazingly different. The fact of the matter is that from the psychological, from the real basic point of view, the battle of Kashmir has been won and this terrible shouting that is going on in Pakistan is the result of uttermost frustration, because they know they have lost it. They have lost it not because of our army or anybody's army, but because the contrast is so tremendous, because the ideal for which the National Conference and Shaikh Abdullah fought for these twenty years, for which they stand today and for which we stand here, that is the ideal of communal unity, of working together, not of the two nation theory and one community trying to rule over another. That has been instilled in the mind of every Kashmiri and the results seem to have convinced him of the rightness of Shaikh Abdullah's approach, quite apart from his personal popularity and that of other leaders. So it is this feeling that Kashmir has slipped out of their grasp that has completely upset the rulers of Pakistan. On the other side, in the so-called Azad Kashmir area there are continuous squabbles and quarrels. The whole place is some kind of occupied area by the Pakistan Army.

Now, there are some other matters between Pakistan and us. There is the evacuee property matter and canal waters. In regard to both these we offered and we offer still judicial determination by properly constituted courts of Pakistan and India with provision made for final decision. We are perfectly prepared for that.

In this connection I want to make one point clear, because in foreign countries a great deal has been said in connection with Kashmir and its rivers, as if the rivers of Kashmir affect the destiny of Pakistan and if Pakistan did not control Kashmir, well the rivers can be cut off or turned off somewhere and the whole of Punjab would go dry. Now, first of all please do not mix up the so-called canal water question with the Kashmir question because the canal water question does not deal with the rivers in Kashmir; it deals with the rivers in East and West Punjab, about which, as I said, we are prepared to have proper judicial determination about our rights and their rights. So that, that issue has no relation to the Kashmir river issue.

In regard to the Kashmir rivers, as most hon. Members should know, the rivers are the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab. Now all that is necessary is for hon. members to look up the map of Kashmir and just see what one can do with those rivers. It is fantastic to mix up the Kashmir question with the canal water issue. In England and America much is made of this.

So, here we are at this stage, at this critical stage, in our relations with Pakistan. I hope the crisis will pass. I am convinced that the only thing that will ultimately settle our various problems is friendliness between India and Pakistan. I am quite convinced that that is bound to come, even though in the intervening period our relations may be bad, or may go even worse. Friendly relations between us are inevitable—in what form they will come I do not know. If so, why should we not try to get that sooner rather than later, after passing through all kinds of disasters and troubles. So far as we are concerned, in spite of all the provocation that Pakistan has given, in spite of the daily talk of *jehad* and the rest, we shall always be ready to solve every problem peacefully and to develop friendly relations with Pakistan. At the same time as things are today in Pakistan, on account of threats that are continually being raised, we have to take every precaution. I cannot detail to the House all the precautions we have taken in the military sense, except that for more than a month past when this situation developed in this way, we have given the most careful thought to it.

Now a good deal has been said about civil defence. Many hon. Members have mentioned it. The way Prof. Shah mentioned it seemed to me somewhat different from the other approaches. His idea of civil defence appeared to me something in the nature of conscription, limited or not, for all kinds of works. That is not exactly civil defence. It may be suggested on other grounds. For my part, I think it would be a very good thing in this country—quite apart from the Pakistan issue—if there were conscription in which every man rich or poor, was enlisted to do ordinary labour work. And so long as we do not make people like ourselves take a spade and dig, I do not think it will be good for our souls or for the soul of the country. We think we are very wise and clever because we sit in our office with fountain pens in our hands. This

conception that a clerical job is a better one, will ultimately degrade the whole nation.

Leave that out—conscription. What is the talk of civil defence? What exactly does it mean? I know something about it. When people talk to me about civil defence, I want them to talk to me intelligently about it, not vaguely throw the word at me. Do you mean what Pakistan is doing, or do you mean something else? Pakistan is digging trenches all over; Pakistan is having black-outs all over; Pakistan is talking about fire brigades and the like. What do you mean by it? Let us consider it item by item as to exactly what we can do. I say and I have definitely and if I may say so rather aggressively put down the idea of civil defence, and I will continue doing so. After the graves and fullest thought given to it, I have called upon all our State Government not to have it. I have done it because I know my job, not through ignorance—because I understand what I say and I understand what I have told them. I am not going to allow our people to waste their time in digging trenches and the like, in getting excited and getting other people excited. It is true that everybody has realised that morale counts. Well, I am a better builder up of morale than most people perhaps know and I am going to build up the morale of this country. And morale is not built by the stage tricks of Pakistan. There are other ways of building up morale. When I see the duplication of the trickery staged there it does not affect me powerfully at all.

I was talking about Kashmir and the wonderful way the people of Kashmir have risen to the occasion. I deeply regret that some small sections of the community there, in Jammu specially, have in rising to the occasion played a game which can only be of advantage to Pakistan. And those are some Hindus of Jammu. It amazes me how the spirit of communal fanaticism blinds people even to their own advantage. Today take this Constituent Assembly which is going to be elected there next month. They are trying to put as many difficulties in the way as possible, creating as many difficulties in the way of the National Conference of the present Government in Kashmir, of Shaikh Addullah, and doing so in the most vulgar language. That is why I have often said that it is this kind of immature mentality which produces communalism. It is not a grown-up man's thought that can do it. It is immature, childish; or it may be that it is when a person

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has outgrown his own wisdom. If today in India I am a little anxious about things, it is only one thing, and that is the communal spirit in India. I can deal with the communal spirit of Pakistan. I want to deal properly with the communal spirit in India, the Communal spirit of the Hindus and Sikhs, not so much of the Muslims—I can deal with them too. I want this House to realise that if anything is going to come in our way, if war comes or anything, it is this spirit that will come in our way and that will weaken us. I do not think that anybody will try deliberately to do that. But if you spread that spirit, that idea, abroad, then in times of excitement people misbehave. And if people misbehave, then your front weakens because we have to meet this front before that. That has to be remembered. We cannot fight the enemy if behind our backs mischief is done. No army can fight with its base being upset by wrong actions. Therefore it is of the utmost importance that all this wild and vague talk of communalism be put an end to at any time, more specially now. I attach the greatest importance to this. Therefore, I am stretching this, because there is a tendency always for a person to become a great patriot by cursing Pakistan, by cursing Muslims. I want this House and I want this country not to curse Pakistan. I want this House and this country to feel friendly to the people of Pakistan, because those poor people of Pakistan are not much to blame anyhow. What would you do and what would I do if day in and day out I had to read those newspapers containing stories full of falsehoods and hear the radio and all the time be enveloped in this atmosphere of fright and fury. It is not the fault of the people, naturally. I do blame those who are responsible for it. It is a heavy responsibility. It is not for me to say much about it. Anyhow, let us not create a feeling of ill-will for the common people there or for the country as a whole, because these feelings of hatred and violence somehow carry on and weaken us.

In the last fortnight or so hon. Members must have seen many leading Muslims in this country, many important Muslim organisations in this country, coming out criticising Pakistan's action in this matter in Kashmir or in these other matters and offering their full support to our Government and to us. And I am quite sure—I do not always attach value to these things, and some people may do it just to gain favour—but I

am quite sure that many of these things that have come to us represent the true feelings of those who have sent them. That kind of thing represents more strength to us than an army corps or many army corps. It represents strength in many ways, because it means that our nation is cohesive before a common danger. It means strength to us because thereby we strike at the very root of what Pakistan stands for, that is, this two nation theory and all that. Therefore, that strengthens us and we should welcome it. We should work for it and we should make it quite clear to all our minorities and all the others who may be at all afraid of anything happening that it is our proud privilege to give the fullest protection and opportunity to the minorities in this country. I dislike this word 'protection' and I dislike 'minority' too. But for the moment I use them. I want these words to cease to be.

Therefore it is the very worst approach for the minds and hearts of the people if you think in terms of civil defence. We can dig in trenches in twentyfour hours, take it from me. But you will not require them. Trenches are dug for people, if I may say so, who expect invasion. We are not going to be invaded, whatever happens. Do you think if even war comes we wait to be invaded? Is that your test of India's strength? We are not going to be invaded. And because of that we are not going to dig in trenches and have any black-outs. But whether you have any outside black-outs or not I should like our people to put an end to the black-outs inside them and not to lose themselves in passion and fury and anger and hatred but to think coolly and collectedly of the situation, not complacently—nothing could be more foolish than to be complacent—to be ready for every eventuality and to carry on our work normally.

**Shri Sidhva (Madhya Pradesh):** I have to make a personal explanation with your permission.

**Several Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Sidhva:** I have a right to make a personal explanation. Yesterday I was referring while addressing this House to the question of the food problem (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All that the hon. Member wants to explain is this. He showed it to me in my Chamber. It appears yesterday he stated that the statistics that he has been giving all along, whenever the food debate arose in the House, were not accepted by

the Minister in charge, but they have been accepted by the Planning Commission—though they do not accept the conclusion. That is all that the hon. Member wanted to say.

**Shri Sidhva:** That is not all the point, Sir. A Member from the House challenged (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member must appreciate the mood of the House now at six o'clock.

**Shri Sidhva:** I will not yield.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. There is no aspersion against the hon. Member. If there is anything to be said today that may be made up day after tomorrow. Now let me proceed with the motion in hand.

**Shri Sidhva:** It is a matter of record and under the rules, I have a right for a personal explanation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I think nobody wants to say anything on that. There are those amendments that have been tabled to the main resolution.

**Shri Syamandan Sahaya:** I beg to withdraw my amendments 1 to 3.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret that disregarding the changed economic condition in the modern world and ignoring the inability of capitalism to distribute the national wealth the Government have brought about mass unemployment and poverty in the midst of plenty and continue methods which have taken away from the people the means for food, clothing and shelter and have brought forth economic anarchy throughout and have no constructive planning for moulding a socialist State and have failed in establishing a collective international peace system which avoids war."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret to note that Government have not taken adequate measures, civil as well as military, to deal firmly and effectively with the aggressive designs of Pakistan

particularly as regards its intentions regarding Kashmir, East Bengal Hindus and evacuee property."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret that no mention whatever has been made in the address for planning economic equality so essential for real economic progress and bettering lives of millions of our people who have suffered untold hardship for generations."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret to note that Government have made no preparations worth the name to provide for adequate defence and protection of the civil population in times of war or international crisis, or effectively to prevent panic among such population in the event of such an emergency."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret to note that notwithstanding the repeated and increasing imports of food grains in the country from abroad, and impending threat of another shortage of crops due to the failure or inadequacy of the monsoon in some parts of the country, Government have made no provision for an adequate storing and conservation of sufficient quantities of food stuffs, despite the repeated assertion of Government's policy to make this country self-sufficient in the matter of food before the end of the current financial year."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret to note that the Address has failed to assure the citizens that discontent of the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

public created by high prices of food and cloth and scarce supply will be removed."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret to note that the Address makes no mention of revaluation of currency to stop inflationary rise in prices of necessaries of life."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion, add the following:

"but regret the statement that the Government hope to pass the Hindu Code Bill during this session."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion, add the following:

"but regret to note that in spite of all that is being done by the Government food and cloth have become more costly, unemployment is on the increase and the general standard of living has gone down."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Members of Parliament assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to the House."

The motion was adopted.

Now the House will stand adjourned to 8-30 A.M. on Monday.

*The House then adjourned till Half Past Eight of the Clock on Monday, the 13th August, 1951.*