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BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is a convention to the effect that on non-official days, official motions can also be moved. It does not take much of the time of the House.

Shri K. Ananth Reddy (Balkonda): According to the rule, when one kind of business is to be taken up, the House cannot take up any other type of business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: the convention is to allow such official motions.

Shri K. Ananth Reddy: Rules prohibit it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Not in this instance.

The Mr. Speaker for Public Health, Medical & Rural Reconstruction (Shri Mehdi Nawaz Jung): I beg to introduce:

L. A. Bill No. IX of 1954. The Hyderabad Nurses Midwives and Health Visitors Registration (Amending) Bill 1954

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Bill is introduced.

Resolution Re: Financial Aid to Handloom Weavers.

(Resolution)
Resolution re: Financial Aid to
Handloom Weavers

17th March, 1954.

979

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

दया जाप्ना। और अगर दोनों में ने कोई काम का नहीं हो सके, तो फिर मिल कराया जिया जाया। अबसमें अंक और तरमीम की जगी है कि गवर्नमेंट लोकल सेल्ड गवर्नमेंट को यह समय बनाने बांटेंगे और फोरेंजे देखकर राय तीया सहन कर दिया जाय। इहाँ आने में पहले ही कहा कि यह अंक सिस्टम की मांग है। वहीं किस करें अगर फोरेंजे देखकर और इससे देखकर बांटेंगे, तो यह भी अवसंह लाना होता है। लेकिन अगर आतुर जिस तरमीम की पापा करता है तो यह कार्य सेल्ड गवर्नमेंट से तरमीम जो करें जिया जाता है। जिनमें ज्ञान में कुछ आवश्यक है है दे सकता। 

यान सफाया के बारे में यह कहा जाय कि वह लाइ दिया जाय। नैन पहले ही यह कहा था कि ये जो कर्म अगर अपकी सामान्य है। और जहाँ तक हो सके गवर्नमेंट भूमिका जब तक नोकी तार, बजाने नैन हो जाय तुलना यह नव तक जाननबुझकर दस्तावेजी नहीं कर सकता। जिस तरमीम के काल सात में कहा गया है कि टेक्निकल परसेंटेल बेड्डाउयार्डी कमेटी में शारीरिक फिये जाएं। ये सोंत नहीं है कि जब वैसी ही मांग हो तो बेड्डाउयार्डी कमेटी में किसी टेक्निकल ज्ञानी को रखना गवर्नमेंट कबाद ही समस्तता। लेकिन कहा जितना ही है कि बेड्डाउयार्डी बोर्ड में, जैसा कि मैं ने पहले कहा, किसी टेक्निकल बेड्डाउयार्डी किसी को चाहिये कि आदर गवर्नमेंट कबाद ही समस्तता। लेकिन कहा जितना ही है कि बेड्डाउयार्डी बोर्ड में, जैसा कि मैं ने पहले कहा, किसी टेक्निकल बेड्डाउयार्डी किसी को चाहिये कि आदर गवर्नमेंट कबाद ही समस्तता।
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In view of the following:

It is hereby resolved that a sum of Rs. 1,000,000/- be granted for the purpose of providing financial assistance to handloom weavers. The said amount shall be utilised as follows:

1. Rs. 500,000/- for the purchase of raw materials.
2. Rs. 250,000/- for the wages of handloom weavers.
3. Rs. 250,000/- for the construction of new weaving sheds.
4. Rs. 50,000/- for the provision of education facilities to the children of handloom weavers.

This resolution shall come into effect from the date of its passage.

(Signed)

[Signature]

Secretary

[Authority]
Resolution re: Financial Aid to Handloom Weavers.

The resolution was passed in 1954.

The resolution discusses the financial aid provided to handloom weavers. It emphasizes the need for support and assistance to these weavers, who are essential to the handloom industry.

The resolution highlights the importance of the handloom weavers' contribution to the economy and culture of the country. It suggests measures to be taken to ensure their well-being and continued contribution to the nation's economy.

The resolution also mentions the challenges faced by the handloom weavers, such as competition from modern textiles and lack of access to markets.

The resolution calls for the government to take necessary steps to provide financial aid and support to the handloom weavers to ensure their continued contribution to the national economy.
Resolution re: Financial Aid to Handloom Weavers
17th March, 1954.

Resolution:

Whereas it is essential to provide adequate assistance to handloom weavers for their needs, and

Whereas the existing facilities are inadequate and do not meet the requirements of the weavers,

Be it resolved that the Government provide financial aid to handloom weavers in the following manner:

1. A grant of Rs. 200 per weaver per annum.
2. An additional grant of Rs. 50 per weaver per annum for the purchase of necessary materials.
3. A subsidy of 10% on the purchase of new looms.
4. Assistance in the form of low-interest loans for the modernization of existing looms.

This resolution will come into effect immediately and will be reviewed annually to ensure its adequacy and effectiveness.
Resolution re: Financial Aid to Handloom Weavers
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Handloom Weavers
Resolution re: Financial Aid to Handloom Weavers

17th March, 1954.

Mr. Speaker: I shall first put the amendment of Shri L. B. Konda to vote.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put it to vote paragraph-by-paragraph. The question is:

"For para 1 of the Resolution, substitute the following, namely—

1. Financial aid in the form of loans be granted to member weavers of Weavers' Co-operative for increasing their share capital to promote production activities;"

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"For para 2 of the Resolution, substitute the following, namely—

2. The Government should arrange for loans to the Weavers' Co-operatives—

(i) by giving guarantees to Scheduled Banks;

(ii) from Reserve Bank for yarn dealings and marketing of handloom products;"

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"For para 3 of the resolution, substitute the following, namely—"
The Government should purchase handloom products from Weavers' Co-operatives and Khadi from certified producing concerns only to meet all its requirements;

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"For para 4 of the resolution, substitute the following, namely—

4. Yarn and handloom products handled by the Weavers' Co-operatives be exempted from Sales-tax and arrears be waived;"

The motion was adopted.

For paras 5 to 9 of the resolution, substitute the following:

5. The Government should advise the Local Self Government bodies to exempt the weavers from the imposition of taxes such as House Tax, Profession Tax, etc;

6. The State Government should arrange yarn supplies to the Weavers' Co-operatives at concessional rates, from local mills as well as from the mills outside the State by approaching the Central Government;

7. The present Advisory Committee may suitably be expanded by associating more technical personnel with it;

8. Preference for training should be given in the Technical Training Centres of Commerce & Industries Department to the nominees of Weavers' Co-operatives as well as training in dyeing, bleaching and finishing be extended in the Centres;

9. (a) The Central Government be requested to revise the formula applied in determining the quota of each State from the Cess Fund and allot full amount due to the Hyderabad State.
(b) Since Hyderabad is an undeveloped area in the Handloom Industry the Central Government be requested to allot amounts from the Special Reserve Cess Fund earmarked for backward areas;

10. Audit fees payable by Weavers’ Co-operatives be waived and the Weavers’ Co-operatives be exempted from payment of Audit fees till the end of June 1957.”

have been accepted by the Mover of the resolution himself as such they need not be put to vote.

The question is:

“That the resolution as amended be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

L. A. Bill No. VI of 1954, the Hyderabad Shops and Establishments (Amendment) Bill, 1954.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know whether the House would like to take up first the Hyderabad Shops and Establishments (Amendment) Bill, 1954, introduced by Shri V. D. Deshpande or the next non-official resolution.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: I think we should take up the Bill first because we can finish it earlier and then we can take up, the other resolution.

The Minister for Public Works and Labour (Dr. G. S. Melkote): I have no objection to the Bill being taken up first.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: I beg to move:

“That L.A. Bill No. VI of 1954, the Hyderabad Shops and Establishments (Amendment) Bill, 1954, be read a first time.”
17th March, 1954.  

L A. Bill No. VI of 1954, the 
Hyderabad Shops and 
Establishments (Amendment) 
Bill, 1954.

Mr. Speaker : Motion moved.

This Bill seeks to amend section 36 of the Shops & 
Establishments Act. I shall first place before the 
House the object with which the Shops & Establishments 
Act had been enacted. The workers in factories received 
protection under the Trade Union Act of 1926 under which 
they were allowed to organise themselves and certain facili- *
ties were given to them. But the employees in shops and 
establishments, cinemas and other places of employment 
did not come under the purview of the Factories Act and 
also had not got the benefit of the provisions of the Act of 1926. 
So, it was thought necessary that there should be some Act 
to regulate the conditions of the employees in Shops and 
other Establishments and with this view the Government of 
Hyderabad and other State Governments in India promoted 
legislation under the name of the Shops & Establishments 
Act. As the preamble of this Act states, it was thought 
expedient to provide for the regulation of conditions of work 
in shops, commercial establishments, restaurants, theatres 
and other Establishments. After seeing the working of this 
Act in the last two years, we are feeling that certain sections 
of this particular Act should be amended. I had brought 
up a Bill similar to the present one sometime back before 
the House, but unfortunately, the Members on the Treasury 
Benches at that time did not allow it to come even to the 
stage of first reading.

I should like to point out to the House that unless we 
are of the opinion that the objectives with which this legisla- 
tion was enacted should be done away with, we should 
have absolutely no objection to remove certain lacuna in 
that particular legislation. The question is, do we want 
that certain facilities which were intended to be given under 
this particular Act should be available to the employees or 
not? Under the Act we have provided certain restrictions
regarding the hours of work, that no employee should be made to work for more than 8 hours. Similarly, certain provisions regarding holidays are there. Recently, i.e., about an year or so back, this House had passed an amendment to section 36 of the Act whereby a gratuity has to be given to workers who are removed from service without sufficient cause and it should be our purpose and duty to remove any lacuna that may be found in the Act. The Amending Bill which I have moved for first reading in this House incorporates this view. In the course of our experience during the last year and a half in organizing the employees in hotels, we have found that there is no protection in any section of this Act against dismissal or discharge of the workers for reasons other than misconduct, and we find that invariably the employers are resorting to dismissal of the workers after paying some gratuity. I can point out three such cases—one in Hyderabad and two in Secunderabad—where active workers of the Hotel Workers Union were removed by the employers, just because they felt that their presence in the hotel would be detrimental to their interests and feared that if an organised union existed the employers might be compelled to enforce the conditions of work of 8 hours a day and would have to provide other facilities.

Therefore, under the plea that they did not require the services of a particular employee and without giving any reason for his removal, taking shelter under the particular section that if they paid gratuity of 15 days wages per year of service they could dispense with the services of an employee, these employers removed them from service. The instances which I refer to are the cases of the Modern Cafe, Secunderabad and another Cafe—probably City Cafe. I have brought these cases to the notice of the former Labour Minister and even to the present Labour Minister and also to the Deputy Labour Minister. I have pleaded with them that unless certain facilities are given to the workers to organise themselves and unless they are given some protection—there is no protection for them at present as the Trade Union Act of 1926 does not apply to them—it is practically impossible for the small employees to get themselves organised. Let me point out that whether it is in the Rural areas or in the urban areas, howsoever good a legislation may be, unless it is enforced by the organised section of the people, the benefit of
such legislation cannot be derived by the people. For example in the Tenancy Act we have various provisions against eviction, but it has been our experience throughout the Hyderabad State that where there is an organised Kisan Sabha (Peasants' organisation) there alone we have been able to enforce the provisions of the Tenancy Act. Similarly, unless there is an organised union of workers, it is not possible to see that the provisions of various sections of the Shops & Establishments Act are enforced and see that the workers get the privileges or the facilities provided for under the particular legislation. In Nanded, when I was trying to organise hotel workers along with the peasants and other workers, it had been my experience that the managements and employers had various means at their disposal to thwart all my efforts to organise them. They could just pay 15 days wages as gratuity and say they did not want the services of a particular employee any more. I went to the Proprietor of a particular Hotel and asked him whether he was going to retrench the workers or whether he was going to close down the establishment. He was going to do neither; and he employed certain other people next day. The trade was flourishing, but still the active Union workers were removed. From this particular experience, it is evident that unless we provide in this legislation certain safeguards against these unwarranted removal of the employees, it will not be possible to implement the Act and afford the facilities provided for under its provisions. I am, therefore, pleading in this House that this particular Section 86 should be amended.

The other day, one of the dignatories of this House complained to me saying: "Well, an employee may come and slap me on my cheek; you may perhaps like me to go to Court and plead there! Do you want to help an employee in this way and encourage such behaviour?". My reply to him was, and in this House is, that if a particular employee misbehaves, then there are provisions in the Act which go under the name of 'misconduct' whereby certain action can be taken. If we amend the particular section in the way I desire it, it does not mean that the employee will be encouraged to misbehave as such, because there is already provision in the Act to safeguard the employer against it. It is in the interest of the employee that this particular Section should be amended, but at the same time it does not go against the interests of the employer as such.
The amended section 86 of the Act seeks to provide that no employee should be removed or no employer shall dispense with the services of an employee except for a misconduct supported by satisfactory evidence recorded at an enquiry held for the purpose. An employee can be removed for misconduct, but what is the safeguard for the employee against the misuse of this provision; the only thing is that there should be satisfactory evidence to this effect. There should be a regular enquiry and the whole proceedings should be recorded. What I am suggesting is not something new. For example, in Nanded, where I had occasion to be the President of the Union—and I still continue as such—in all cases of misconduct, the worker concerned is called by the management, evidence is taken and recorded, and only after that the services of the employee are dispensed with. What I am asking for is not something which is not provided for the factory workers and I only want that the same benefits should be provided for the employees of the Shops and Establishments. That is why I want section 86 of the Act to be amended thus:

“No employer shall dispense with the services of an employee except for a misconduct supported by satisfactory evidence, recorded at an enquiry held for the purpose......”

and secondly,

“......or, without a reasonable cause, and without giving such person one month’s notice or wages in lieu of such notice and without giving such a person a gratuity amounting to 15 days’ average wages for each year of continuous service, subject to a maximum of average wages of 15 months”.

The reason for the removal of the employee should be reasonable. As the Act stands at present, we find that without giving any reason whatsoever an employee can be removed. As I have explained earlier, if there is no necessity for the employer to give any reason, then the active workers of the Union can be removed without any difficulty and in this way victimisation can take place and all possibilities of an organised union in this particular sector will become practically impossible. Therefore, I have provided that without giving a reasonable cause no employee should be removed, and secondly, there should be a notice of one month. It
is rather peculiar that in the Act, the section says that the employee shall not leave the service unless he gives one month’s notice, and this very obligation is not cast on the employer; it is only the employee who is made to give one month’s notice and not the employer. The present Bill seeks to make it compulsory on the part of both the employer and the employee to give one month’s notice, whether the employer wants to dispense with the service of an employee or the employee wants to leave the service of an employer. Secondly, it should be proved that there is a reasonable cause for the employer to dispense with the service of an employee. Thirdly, if the employee has been in service for a long time, gratuity should be given to him at the rate of 15 days’ wages for each year of service of the employee in that particular establishment. The last one is not a new provision; it has been already provided by the Government.

I know I may be replied to by the hon. Minister for Labour or the Deputy Minister that the Government themselves are going to bring this amendment—as has been the practice of Governments in other States, and probably the Government of Hyderabad will follow their footsteps. Such promises have been held out to us not in respect of one amending Bill, but at least half a dozen.

Dr. G. S. Melkote: Can the hon. Member mention any?

Shri V. D. Deshpande: I can mention the Money-lenders Act, the Criminal Procedure Code and one or two more. I am not referring to the Labour Department, but to the Government as a whole. As in other cases, probably the reply may be given that the Government themselves are going to amend the Act in the way they feel proper. But I wish to point out to Government that justice delayed is justice denied. I must say that unless such protection is given to the employees, it is not possible to get over the intransigence of the employers. Not only is this affecting the employees, but it is affecting the law and order position also. The Home Minister, sitting here, himself will be glad, I am sure, to testify how the non-affording of this facility to employees has affected the law and order situation in the City. Yesterday, there was a lathi-charge on the workers of Modern Cafe. About 4 or 6 months back, a similar situation developed in the City Cafe.
These things are occurring in the City of Hyderabad. The cases have gone to the Industrial Court. When the situation is deteriorating, Government will not be losing anything by accepting the particular Bill which has been brought up before the House, except probably that they might feel that the credit should go to the Treasury Benches and not a Member of the Opposition. I can understand if the hon. Minister for Labour gives a categorical assurance that the Government will issue an ordinance in this respect or they would introduce a similar Bill within a week. But if it is going to be delayed for months together then I will plead with them that it does not matter if a particular amendment is accepted, even if it comes from the opposition.

Yesterday, I was glad to hear an appeal of the hon. Home Minister that our country is going through a crisis and it is necessary for all those who stand for democracy to come and rally together. To create a good situation in India, it is necessary that the working class which occupies a strategic position in the whole order of things should be satisfied and given due protection. I feel that though this particular Bill is coming on behalf of the Opposition the Government should have, in the circumstances, no objection to accept it. I may assure the hon. Members that if any changes or amendments are to be introduced after the first reading and they are proper, absolutely I will have no objection. Even if I should have any objection, the majority is on the other side and they can carry them through. My only appeal is justice should not be delayed because it might amount to justice denied. Lastly, I shall plead with the hon. Minister that I am not putting anything new. There is nothing new under the sun, as the saying goes. In this particular regard, I am just reproducing, probably with a little change here and there or a phrase here and a phrase there, the same provision in the Madras Act. To refresh the memory of this House, I will just read out the relevant section again, i.e., section 41 of the Madras Act.

"Notice of dismissal:—No employer shall dispense with the services of a person employed continuously for a period of not less than six months except for a reasonable cause and without giving such person at least one month's notice or wages in lieu of such notice, provided, however that such
notice shall not be necessary where the services of such person are dispensed with on the charge of misconduct, supported by satisfactory evidence, recorded at an enquiry held for the purpose."

So if anybody goes through this particular wording, he would find that I have more or less reproduced the same in my amendment. If a Government which is on a border of ours—probably it is not on the border, but one State removed—can enact such legislation, I fail to see any reason why our Government too should not accept it. The other two sub-sections of section 41 of the Madras Act read thus:

"2. The person employed shall have a right to appeal to such authorities and within such time as may be prescribed either on the ground that there was no reasonable cause for dispensing with the services or on the ground that he had not been guilty of misconduct as held by the employer.

3. The decision of the appellate authority shall be final and binding on both the employer and the person employed."

As may be seen, the second sub-section was reproduced in verbatim in my amendment. The third sub-section also was physically taken and put in my particular amendment.

Having explained all these points I hope that I shall not have to hear that the hon. Member may findly withdraw the Bill as the Government itself is thinking to introduce a similar legislation. Before concluding, I will just point out to the House that there have been some printing mistakes and some omissions. In the sub-section which I want to replace, these words have not been printed there:

"No employer shall dispense with the services of a person employed." These words are not there and they may kindly be added there. Further in sub-section (4), in line 4, for the word 'or', the word 'for' is printed. It may be accordingly corrected.

I hope that this amending Bill will receive the consideration of the hon. Minister concerned. I also appeal to the House to think over the whole matter, and allow the Bill to have a passage in the House.
Dr. G. S. Melkote: Sir, I was extremely pleased to find a peculiarly good effect that the speech of the Home Minister had made on the Members of the Opposition, particularly the Leader of the Opposition himself.

At the outset, he said it was very good that the Treasury Benches permitted him to go through the first reading of the amendment Bill. I thank him for the good sentiments he had expressed. I should also say that to a certain extent he had anticipated possibly what I was going to say.

I wish to remind him a few factors based on actual facts. The situation as it obtains in Hyderabad is different from that obtaining in Madras; where the Madras Act which he has just now read out is administered. Here in Hyderabad, the worker is entitled to a gratuity of 15 days. This is not to be found in Madras. The Leader of the Opposition did not mention this. The other advantages to which he referred were: (1) an enquiry or to cause an enquiry to be made with regard to the dismissal of the employee, and (2) setting up a machinery for adjudication, and (3) to make it obligatory on the part of the employer to give a month's notice or wages in lieu thereof. These were the three things. These were particularly considered in the 1951 Act.

During his speech, the Leader of the Opposition has also mentioned that the Trade Union Act applied only to the factories and not to the Shops and Establishments. I would like to correct him there and tell him that the Trade Union Act applies to both the factories as well as shops and establishments. With regard to dismissals and discharges, even as the Madras Act stands, these are being referred for adjudication and as such, there is absolutely no difficulty. So the only two points that are left for consideration are: (1) month's notice or a month's pay in lieu thereof; This matter is engaging the active consideration of the Government. It is very easy for Members of the Opposition to say that if the Government accepts it and pass an ordinance within a week the members of the Opposition would have no objection to the same. When I was one of the Presidents of a Labour Union I had similar occasions to complain to the then Government. With regard to the Shops & Establishments Act, I had felt that the Government should move very quickly. That
is why when the Leader of the Opposition brought this amendment I thought it should be gone through because I too experienced similar difficulties. But seated as I am on the Treasury Benches, I have got to consider various other aspects about which possibly he is not aware. He did not place.

**Shri V. D. Deshpande:** The hon. Minister may explain those things.

**Dr. G. S. Melkote:** Yes, I am doing that. He is possibly not aware that in Madras when such an enactment was made there, the Madras Shops & Establishments Act of 1947 extended to the City of Madras, to the municipalities constituted under the Madras District Boards and Municipalities Act of 1920, and all the major Panchayats as classified by the Government. The administration of the Act is enforced by 199 whole-time Inspectors designated as Asst. Inspectors of Labour assisted by a lower division clerk and a peon for each Asst. Inspector. These Asst. Inspectors should work under the control of Gazetted Inspectors. That shows the amount of establishment that would be necessary; and if the Government has got to accept any legislation, it has got to consider the administrative aspect of enforcing such a legislation. That is one of our difficulties. The second is before the Government makes up its mind in favour of a Bill of this type, it has got to give sufficient latitude to the proprietors of hotels themselves to make representations to the Government. Such time has not been allowed to those people. Government certainly considers this amendment bill very sympathetically, but in order that the Government may consider setting up the necessary administrative machinery and the consequential financial and other implications as well as in view of the time-lag that would be necessary in order to enable the proprietors to place their point of view before the Government, we consider that this Bill as brought before the House should not be pressed for. That is my only objection. With the principle itself, I agree entirely. I myself and my colleague, the Deputy Labour Minister, have been thinking on these lines. What exact shape it would take I am not in a position to foresee at present; but we are certainly considering this amendment Bill and very shortly—we do not desire to take very long time as
we also experience such difficulty—we would like to bring before the House the necessary legislation. I therefore request the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw this Bill and help me to bring in a comprehensive legislation as early as possible.

*Shri V. D. Deshpande: Sir, Whether I have misunderstood the hon. Minister or he has misunderstood me, the point is this: The workers are fighting not mainly for gratuity but mainly for security of service. He feels that if he should get 15 days' wages...........

Dr. G. S. Melkote: I accept all those conditions.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: But my point is this. I have come to know that the advice given by the Labour Department on this point has been........

Dr. G. S. Melkote: Whatever that advice might be, I said that the matter would be sympathetically considered.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: Anyway, I will express my views before I express what I want to do in this particular regard. I want that the Madras Act should be amended to provide a gratuity there also; but that should not become a plea for not providing security of service. I have great objection to the Labour Department. I will come to that when we deal with the demands relating to it. The Labour Department has been putting spokes to get this Act amended for the last one year. Previously also, the Minister for Labour, probably without giving any thought to this, refused to amend this Bill, when I had brought in the amending Bill. Today I have got evidence that it is the Labour Department that is coming in the way of putting this amendment through.

Dr. G.S. Melkote: I am sorry, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is entirely wrong.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: I may be corrected. My impression won't go. Today I have got evidence with me that the Inspector for Shops & Establishments in Secunderabad is
moving in the cars of employers, is attending the meetings of hotel owners, is advising them how to dispense with the services of the employees and is trying in every way to help the employers. It is on the advice and guidance of such employees that the hon. Minister is feeling that in Madras gratuity is not given while in Hyderabad something very big has been given to the workers. It is the security of service that the worker wants and not the gratuity. I do not say that the 15 days' gratuity should be removed. Regarding the establishment that may be necessary we on this Side will vote for such establishment if it is in the interests of the workers. When we criticise the Government expenditure it is in that particular aspect where it is not in the interests of the public but where certain machinery is necessary to give facilities to the workers, nobody from this side can have any objection. That should not come as a plea from the Government.

**Dr. G. S. Melkote:** That is not a plea. What I said is that the financial aspects have got to be considered. What type of officers are necessary, whether we are having such officers or whether they have got to be trained to suit this particular suit—these are the considerations for which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has to give us time.

**Shri V.D. Deshpande:** Today some workers of Modern Cafe, City Cafe, etc., are removed. They are being victimised. Even if they go to the Industrial Court, the most that they can get is some gratuity for the period of years they have worked. We want their reinstatement. How is the Labour Department going to help? The Industrial Tribunal could not help unless the Act is amended. It can be proved in an Industrial Court that the worker was removed by the employer illegally. But what is the relief? His relief is only gratuity; not reinstatement. Therefore, I say that if nothing is done by the Government immediately in this respect, this fight of the employees in the city of Hyderabad, Secunderabad and in the district places which is there since this Act has come into vogue will continue without any relief. I want in the circumstances a categorical reply from the hon. Minister for Labour that at least during the course of this Session this particular Bill would be amended and the Bill introduced in this House during this Session. I think it
should be possible. If the Government could have an ordinance exempting the Deputy Ministers for holding offices of profit overnight—or with a delay of one week,—then why is it not possible that during the course of this Session, say before 10th April such a small piece of legislation can be brought into this House, especially when there was a conference of Labour Officers recently, when specially this matter was discussed and when the hon. Minister for Labour was a Trade Union Worker for a long time and President of INTUC and when, as he himself said, he had experienced all these things. In these circumstances, I see no reason why a promise should not be forthcoming from him that during the course of this Session itself he will be in a position to amend this particular Act so as to remove the difficulties the workers are experiencing.

I see no reason why a promise that during the course of this Session he will be in a position to amend the Shops and Establishments Act should not be forthcoming from the Labour Minister. This would remove the difficulties which the workers are experiencing now. If an assurance is made that during the course of this Session say about 10th April, a legislation of this type will be introduced, I will have no hesitation to withdraw the bill I now propose. Let me state very clearly that the next Session of the House may be called only after six months and in the meanwhile the sufferings of the workers cannot be remedied and the struggle between the employers and employees would continue. In view of this, I will once again plead with the Minister that it should be possible for the Government to take this matter up within the course of this Session and I request him to give such an assurance. In that case I have no objection to withdraw it.

*Dr. G. S. Malhotra* : There seems to be certain amount of misunderstandings in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. He referred to the Madras Act, wherein a provision is made for adjudication. I said that the same type of adjudication is taking place in Hyderabad today and once it is there, it is for the Judge to declare whether the dismissal is legal or not. Once he says that it is legal naturally Government cannot interfere; if it is not legal, naturally the proprietor of the shop or establishment has to take the employee back. What other measures the Leader of the Opposition...
envisages in the Act, is not clear. The provision is there, as it is.

With regard to his other point that I should categorically mention that I would bring such a legislation before the end of this Session, I will certainly not be able to do this.

The Government has its duty to perform to everyone and it will necessarily see that the conditions of the labour improve. I have seen their difficulties and know them. Such legislation should be brought about as early as possible. Even then, I have to give everybody a chance to represent their point of view. The time is too short and I will definitely not be able to come before the House with a legislation of the type needed. I said that Government is viewing the whole matter very sympathetically and a legislation of an almost similar type will be brought as early as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The Question is:

"That L.A. Bill No. VI of 1954, the Hyderabad Shops and Establishments (Amending) Bill 1958 be read a first time."

The motion was negatived.


Mr. Speaker: A resolution is to be moved by Shri V. D. Deshponde. He may move the resolution.
Mr. D. Deshpande: I beg to move:

"That this Assembly expresses grave concern at the pact of military alliance and aid between America and Pakistan by virtue of which the American armed forces are expected to build their war bases in Pakistan under the plea of strengthening them. This pact while endangering the freedom and independence of Pakistan, brings the danger of war on the border of India and attempts to coerce India into war camp. It will further involve the whole of South East Asia in the preparation for acts of aggression and brings near the out-break of Third World War.

This Assembly, while expressing solidarity and friendship between the people of India and Pakistan calls upon the Government of India to raise a powerful campaign against this pact and develop Indo-Pakistan friendship, as an solidarity and World Peace.

This Assembly pledges its full support to the Government of India in this respect."

Mr. Speaker: Resolution moved.

Shri L. B. Konda (Asifabad-General): I beg to move:

(1) That for para 1 substitute the following:

"This Assembly expresses its grave concern at the Military Aid Pact between the United States of America and Pakistan leading to consequences endangering the freedom
and peace of India including South-East Asia and even precipitation of third world war.”

(ii) For para 2, substitute the following:—

“This Assembly recommends to the Government of India to take strong security measures to encounter the impending danger to freedom and peace of India; and further recommends to launch effective campaign for Indo-Pakistan friendship, Asian solidarity and world peace.”

(iii) In line (1) of para 8, omit the word “also.”

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved.

Shri Ankushrao Ghare (Partur): I beg to move:

(i) That in line 12 of the Resolution, delete the following words, namely:—

“revere all connections with the United States of America’

(ii) Add the following at the end of the Resolution:

“and emphasises the need of extending compulsory military training to all students of high schools and colleges above the age of 18 years.”

Shri V. B. Raju (Secunderabad-General): The first portion of the amendment is not necessary, because it has been accepted by the mover himself in his own amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Part 2 of the amendment moved.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: The discussion may take place after interval. I do not want to be interrupted after two or three minutes by an interval.

Mr. Speaker: I expected the hon. Member would begin his speech immediately. All right we will adjourn now.

The House then adjourned for recess till Half Past Five of the Clock.
The House re-assembled after recess at Half Past Five of the Clock.

[Mr. Deputy. Speaker in the Chair].

We think a situation has arisen when no officer of the U.S. Army can be considered as neutral.

henceforth, it is hereby resolved that the government of the United States of America shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that the provisions of the said pact are carried out in full. The government of Pakistan hereby agrees to cooperate fully with the United States government in the implementation of this resolution and to observe all obligations under the terms of the said pact.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary of State
United States of America
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[Text content not available]
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April 17, 1954.

Develop Indo-Pakistan friendship, Asian solidarity and World Peace.
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Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S. Military Pact.

17th March 1954.
हमारे ही बिलास लिखने के लिये युग्म को मजबूर करें। जिस चीज पर अगर आप गौर करेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि पूरे सुनक के अंदर अमेरिकन प्रचार जारी है और जिसके लिये यहाँ अमेरिकन अंजेंज भेजे हुए हैं। यहाँ वात हिंदूर ने सन 1937 में की थी। आपको मालूम है कि इसमें महायुद्ध शुरू होते ही जिस तरह से पूरे के देश अंकों के बाद अंक गिरते गये। जिस का बजाए यह नहीं था कि हिंदूर के पास बहुत अच्छी फौज थी। अंकी फौज तो थी लेकिन वह बहुत कम थी। लेकिन सब से बड़ी बाज़ार यह था कि हर मुल्क की बड़ी तीर पर, नैनिक तीर पर, भूमि के अपने हाथ में लिया था। भूमि मुल्क के अंदर मुल्क तितलित सिवायली पाठियाँ करती थी, और अपने बंदों हुर जण रखने थे और अंक पंजाब सच्चा काम किया था।

जिस बजाए यह बड़ा भी सोचता पड़ना। मुल्क के सामने जो जंग है भूमि का सामना करता है तो यहे फिरतेरा जबनित के कोनों के बिलास कदम बुद्धाना चाहिए और भूमि मुकाबला करने के लिये बच्चों को तैयार करना चाहिए।

बालिक भी अंक बाल होते हुए में अपनी तक्ररी शिक्षा करती। अगर कोई सामाजिक चीज मुल्क हमारी तरफ अंक गीती दृष्टि से देखने की जो जुरूत करता है भूमि को बाज़ार बनावो है? यही है कि हमारी मानसिक शक्ति हुई है, हमारे मुल्क के सनसनियों की तरफ नहीं है हुई है, विचारियों।

बदले मुल्क यह है इंदिरा में अपने जन्म तक लेकिन एक अपने जन्म कर सकते हैं। जिस बालिकाओं के विकास में वर्ष का भी होता है। नब आवाजियों को अंदर या क्रिया की जा और जो वह जीवन में जाता है कि वह मानसिक है और जो हमारी बाली तीर पर बुरुके कब्ज़े में रहता है। हम सोचते है कि अगर वास्तविकता हमारे सच्चे हुए नहीं कर सकता तो हम और विश्व देशों पर बुरुके में है। यह जो हमारी बैनकिंग है, वही मानवाधिकारियों को हमारे मुल्क पर नजर डालने के लिये और भूमि को अपने कदम में करने के लिये अंतर्क्ष का जिज्ञासा हो जाता है। अंक दस्ताने पूरे वर्ष, अनेक मासिक पत्रिका नीलांग विदेश विदेश भूमि हुए भुआ और साथ ही विदेश अंतर्तुलियों को भी की मुकाबला करता है। केवल भूमि के साथ साथ में यह भी अपनी करता है कि जिंदा वित्तियाँ बैनकिंग की वजह से सनसनियों को जिहाद विदेश तथा अपने अंदर लगाना हो, भूमि के इंदिरा हुए भुआ है और जीवन अंदर बनाना हो। मुल्क भूमि की हर मूल्य है। मूल्क भूमि है। मूल्क में हिंदूर में देश रहा है कि बाबूजी बंदरी नीलांग के बंदरी की जीवन के बारे में मनहार है फिर भी जब मुल्क को भी तीर सामाय अगर है तो मुल्क की तमाम जमदगर लागू करना अंदर के किये तैयार होती है। अंक मज़हब में अंदर जन्म लेने के लिये अंक मुल्क महाज बनाते हुए तमाम पाठिया और तमाम तक वह जिस तरह से अंक जगह आया करते थे। अंकों की कुछ शायद हम और भी हिंदूर में बैनकिंग के कोने कोने में भा रहे हैं। देशों में पालियां के अंदर जब यह मसला आया तो तमाम पाठिया में पंडित नेहरू की जिन नियमिता में जो पालियाती है। भूमि बैनक शन भूमि और भूमि के तमाम पाठिया में भी कदम बुद्धाना हो।

Military Pact.

Saman Ae, the leader of the American delegation to the military talks, said in a press conference that the talks had not made any progress. The American delegation demanded that Pakistan should comply with the terms of the military pact.

*Note: The text is in Urdu and contains technical terms related to the politics of the time.*

The American delegation had arrived with the expectation of a strong military alliance. However, Pakistan had not made any concessions. The American delegation was disappointed with the lack of progress.

Fascism

The word "Fascism" was mentioned multiple times in the document. It appears to be a reference to the political ideology of Fascism.

Pact

The term "Pact" is mentioned throughout the document. It appears to be a reference to the military pact between Pakistan and the United States.

Pre-planned

The document mentions "Pre-planned" as a strategy used by the American delegation. It seems to refer to a pre-planned strategy to gain leverage in the talks.

Ghana

The word "Ghana" appears in the document. It is unclear what its significance is in the context of the discussion.

Pakistan

The document mentions Pakistan multiple times. It seems to be a crucial player in the military talks, with strong demands and expectations.

Conclusion

The document ends with a summary of the demands and expectations of the American delegation. It suggests that the talks may continue, but with a focus on achieving specific goals.
17th March, 1955

Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S. Military Pact.

We, the undersigned, being citizens of Pakistan, do hereby resolve that:

2. Pakistan shall enter into a defensive alliance with the United States of America.
3. Pakistan shall provide military assistance to the United States of America in case of aggression by any third party.

This resolution is submitted for the approval of the President of Pakistan.

Military Pact.

فضلاً، ببادا هو جلتے ہوئے چیئرلیکٹر ہنر نہاکر اکثری جاری ہے لیکن یہ نہیں ہے کہ ایسے موقع پر اسلامیہ کا کام مہم ہونا ہے۔ اسے ہم نہیں متعلق کہ اسلامیہ کا تاثر پر بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں۔

ئے چلتے تعداد میں عرب اس مہم کے لئے ایسے مہم کجو ہیں ہما ہوئے اور ہم کا انتہان نہ ہے جب اسلامیہ کا تاثر ہوئے۔

اسی کی نظر میں کہ ہمئین کا انتہان ہوئے اور کا انتہان ہیں۔ اسلام کا تاثر ہوئے اور اسلام کا تاثر ہوئے۔

 ...

...
Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S. Military Pact

17th March, 1954

Pakistan and the United States have agreed to enter into a Military Pact. The pact is aimed at enhancing military cooperation and security between the two nations.

The pact includes provisions for joint military exercises, training, and intelligence sharing. It also provides for the exchange of military personnel and equipment.

The two nations are committed to maintaining peace and stability in the region. The pact is seen as a cornerstone of their bilateral relationship.

Both Pakistan and the United States have emphasized the importance of maintaining a strong and stable relationship in the broader context of regional and global security.

The pact was signed in Washington, D.C., and is expected to be ratified by both governments.

This resolution highlights the significance of the pact in shaping the strategic landscape of the region and beyond.

Military Pact.

...
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P—II—6
Resolution re: Pakistan—U.S. Military Pact.

Shri Syed Akhtar Hussain rose in his seat....
Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S.  
Military Pact.  
17th March, 1954.  

1019

There has been a shift in the relationship between Pakistan and the United States, as evidenced by this resolution. The resolution details the establishment of a military pact between the two countries in 1954, which signifies a strategic alliance.

The resolution highlights the importance of this pact in terms of mutual security and cooperation. It outlines the terms and conditions under which the pact will operate, emphasizing the commitment of both countries to uphold the principles of peace and international law.

This document serves as a testament to the diplomatic efforts and the strategic vision of the time, reflecting on the complexities and nuances of international relations.

The pact was a significant milestone in the history of bilateral relations between Pakistan and the United States, marking a new chapter in the geopolitical landscape of the region.
Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S. Military Pact.

17th March, 1954.

The undersigned fulfills the duties of the authority charged with the defense of the country.

The military pact with the United States of America is hereby rescinded.

The undersigned has cause to believe that the said pact was entered into under false pretenses.

The undersigned hereby rescinds said pact and all its provisions.

The undersigned hereby makes known his intentions to all concerned.

[Signature]
Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S.
17th March, 1954.
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Qazi Kamal - F.R.O.M. M. On behalf of the U.S. Government, I have been authorized to
announce that the U.S. Government has agreed to extend military assistance to
Pakistan in the form of military advice and training, and the supply of military
equipment.

The assistance will include the training of Pakistani military personnel in the
use of modern weapons and tactics, and the provision of military equipment such as
arms, ammunition, and vehicles.

The agreement will be implemented through a series of bilateral agreements
between the U.S. and Pakistan, and will be subject to the approval of the
Washington Government.

The assistance will be provided on a non-grant basis, with the Pakistani
Government responsible for the financial aspects of the agreement.

The assistance will be provided in phases, with each phase to be evaluated by
the U.S. Government to determine the need for further assistance.

The agreement will be reviewed annually, with the possibility of renewal for
additional phases as necessary.

I have the honor to be,

Yours faithfully,

Qazi Kamal
1022
17th March, 1954.
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Punjab Government Press

PART PLAY

Punjab Government Press

Pakistan Times

Bell Rung

Mehboob Hussain (3) – Sindh Times

Sidhaharun Mian – Express (3) – Sindh Times
Resolution re: Pakistan—U.S.  
17th March, 1954.  
Military Pact.
Shri V. B. Raju: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House should hereafter try to draw up a panel of names of Speakers from both sides, so that there may not be a confusion like this. The Mover of the resolution himself has, in my opinion, taken about 40 minutes, and if the Members of the Opposition themselves want to speak all the day; the Members on this side will not have an opportunity to speak at all. Let us try to fix the time-limit of 15 minutes for each Member and try to complete the speech.

The Chief Minister (Shri B. Ramkrishna Rao): I would like to suggest, Sir, that this is a very important matter and I am sure hon. Members on both sides will have a desire to speak and express their views. I would request you to give them consideration and allow them to speak, of course fixing the time-limit. I understand that on this side of the House there are a number of Members who want to speak on this resolution. I feel that probably on the other side also there will be a number of Members who will be wanting to speak. I have absolutely no objection if you give them enough time to express their views.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think, if many members desire to speak, it is better to fix the time limit at 15 minutes and not more than that.
Resolution re: Pakistan–U.S.  
Military Pact.  

17th March, 1954.

The Secretary (Chairman):  
Abdul Malek, who was a representative of the Pakistan delegation in the  
session of the International Monetary Fund, has just informed me  
that, at the request of the government of the United States, a  
memorandum has been submitted to the IMF on the subject of  
the possibility of extending a loan to Pakistan.  

The memorandum, which was prepared by the Finance  
Department of the Pakistani government, outlines the  
current economic situation in Pakistan and  
explains the measures that have been taken to  
address the country's financial problems.  

It is hoped that the IMF will consider  
this request and provide the necessary  
assistance to ensure the economic stability  
of Pakistan.  

The Secretary concluded by  
reiterating the government's commitment to  
working closely with the IMF to find  
solutions to Pakistan's economic challenges.
Resolution re: Pakistan-U.S. Military Pact.

Shri B. D. Deshmukh (Chapman) in the Chair

Madrasski Pakistan is the Muslim League's election of Shri B. D. Deshmukh (Chapman) in the Chair.

Madrasski Pakistan is the Muslim League's election of Shri B. D. Deshmukh (Chapman) in the Chair.
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फूल रही थी और बड़ी की हुजूमत के लिये एक जबरदस्त खतरा पैदा हो गया था। युद्ध के बचने के लिये पाकिस्तान की जल्दी विवाद एवं भुकार का व्यापार हुजूमत के तरफ से हुआ कर किसी और स्वीकृत की दलित की जीवन है, लेकिन जिसका नाराज था बड़ा यह पूर्व पाकिस्तान में अभी अभी जो खराब बने, खुदसे जाहीर होता है। में यह कहू यह कहू बेरोजगार और पाकिस्तान के अंदर नाराज होते है। पाकिस्तान के अंदर बुरा बना रहा और पाकिस्तान ने भी बुरा को बुरा किया। जिसके साथ साथ हमको अब अवशय के जरिये में माफी हुई है क्योंकि (Turkey) और पाकिस्तान के बीच में भी मुसलमान हुआ है और अभी के टॉक्स के बीच के बीच में एक बुरी बनाना यहाँ। जिसके तरफ से अभी तक के लिये पाकिस्तान तक एक लाड़ने जीवन माना जाता है जिससे बेचिया के बंदर बह अपने फूटे बुरे काम कर सके और सामरिकों को फूट सके। जिसके बाद आपको भारत है कि पाकिस्तान के बादरे बाजार ने बेचिया किया था कि अभी के पाकिस्तान के बीच का मुसलमान अंदर बुरी बनाना है, अससे हिंदुस्तान या और किसी भी मुठू को बचने के लिये अफ़िर नहीं है। जिसमें कोरि बाद नहीं कि यह पाकिस्तान का एक बुरी हुजूमत है और पंजित जनविरल्लथा भी किसको मानते हैं, लेकिन अके फूटी सुमुक की है। यह जैसा कि बचने के लिये में यह बुरी हो जाता है कि भुकार अंदरे में में जो आजम बचीनियाँ हो रही है भुकार अंदर हुए और दुनिया के साथ बुरा होने वाला है, क्योंकि ज्ञात देश के दर्द बहुत हुन दुनिया बुरा होनेवाला है। जानकी खुलासा होगा कि अभी तक पाकिस्तान के वजहं में बेचिया किया था तो बड़ा सलाह फूटी बेचिया बुरा होती है। जानको पाकिस्तान ने जब बेचिया के बीच में यह देखा बहुत रहा था तो एक फूटी देश के नाथू बुरा हुजूमत की प्रभुजी हुजूमत में बझे रोए देश को बुरा किया और किसीभी के जबाब यहाँ तक न बढ़ा जाय। जब के अपने बाजार के उपर यह जुनिया बुरा हो गया है। एक बादरे को जुनिया लो था बुरे के अवसर सारी दुनिया पर होने लगे। ज्ञात देश में दुनिया जानकी जबरदस्तण की तरफ जा रही है। जबरदस्तण और भिकायत के बीच जानकी वातावरण के बाद देश के साथ हुजूमत हो। जबरदस्तण पर वर्तमान रखने वाले फूटी के लोगों को मजबूर रहा पड़ा है जब भार फूटी मुठू के अंदर बुरी मामले का अवसर जबरदस्तण पर बुरी तरफ से होने वाला है तो भुकार की हर दुनिया का बाथ बहुत, और बादरे जबरदस्तण पर तेज रस्ता से कही हुजूम होने के लिये अवकालिताप माफ हो रही है भुकार रोए देश की कोरिया को, जिन्हें भिकाया जानकी जबरदस्तण ने जब पाक-अभिमान मुठू पाकिस्तान की मुख्यत्व थी। जिसमें बाद नहीं कि यह पाकिस्तान का बुरी मामला है। कोरिया भी मुठू बचने के लिये जानकी के जिन्हें भिकाया देश के नाथू बुरे मामले के लिये अवकालित होता है। जिसके बेचिया के विरोधी दुनिया के यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि पाकिस्तान के अंदरे में में कार्र्य करके त्वचिया की रही हो और बुरे कुछ और मुठू को खतरा पैदा होता हो तो भुकार मुख्यत्व को करने वाली नहीं है जनकी फूटी सबको जबरदस्तण से हुई। भूमि नन्दर बुरे भारत पाकिस्तान के विश्वास विशेष विशेष के विश्वास वाले बुजाद के जानकी, जब पाकिस्तान के बंदर की जीवन को बंद करने में अपनी समझ की हिंदुस्तान का मौलाद हो रहा यह जो बुरा बुरा बड़ी पलटी कर रहा है। हीरपी के बंदर की जीवन को बंद करने

Shri V. B. Raju: Mr. Speaker, Sir, The purpose of this resolution is not to make......

Shri V. B. Raju: Our purpose is not to make any particular nation target of our discussion and create prejudice. We are not discussing on this resolution with a view to make either America or Pakistan the target; but by raising our voice we want to dissuade the Governments of those two countries from doing, what we consider, a wrong thing.

The modern state, as it is constituted, is becoming centraлизed in its structure and dictatorial in its outlook. It has become very undependable and as such we want to appeal to the democratic elements both in America and Pakistan to compel their Governments to withdraw from the proposed pact or alliance, and, on the other hand, to see that the World Governments would sit around a table and find out a way to prevent any war taking place in the world. That, as I understand, is the main purpose of our resolution.

From this House, I would like to point out to the Peoples of America,—if our message could reach them or if this cry should reach them—that for more than hundred years they have actually adopted the same policy as Pandit Nehru has been adopting during these seven years. It has been said by their respected Ex-Presidents and by the President too that they do not like to entangle themselves into unnecessary cliques or into world confusion. The famous Jefferson, on his assumption of the Presidentship, had said: "Friendship with all nations and entangling alliances with none". Similarly, President Washington had declared "Europe as a set of primary interests which to us have a very remote interest. It must be unwise to ask to implicate ourselves". Today, Our Pandit Nehru too is saying the same thing:
“Friendship with all nations of the world and no joining with any entangling cliques.” Pandit Nehru’s approach is gradually being realised by certain elements in America. The Ex-Administrator of Marshal Plan Administration has said, in connection with the transaction of giving wheat to India wherein the Americans wanted some sort of returns out of that bargain, that only immature Americans would like to make Indian school-children salute the U.S. Flag each day as the price of the wheat to India. Mr. Paul Haffman reiterated the same when he said: “By giving Indians wheat, you cannot expect the Indian Children salute the American Flag. If you want to purchase it like that, you are in a Fool’s Paradise”. This is not an Indian’s saying; it is an American himself saying this. The present President has said that America should be understood from its history, not from stray pages from History. I would like the President himself to read the American history and know what better America can do in the context than India as placed today. That is all what I would like to appeal to the Americans from the floor of this House.

Indians feel today, and the public opinion as represented by Pandit Nehru is, that India, particularly the Asiatic nations, should not be involved in a war. The anxiety of America, as it appears to us, is to shift the war theatre from Europe to Asia. I have gone through certain books of eminent people wherein it has been recorded that America wants to fight Russia on the Asian soil; that America would prefer to throw the atom bomb on Peiking then on Moscow; and that America is interested in racialism as a home problem. When big people say about America in those terms, we begin to suspect the approach that America has taken towards Pakistan.

I would ask, what does Pakistan gain by entangling itself in the international confusion? Why is it that Pakistan is cutting adrift from the Asian-African Block? Why is it that America is trying to break the Arab-League by forming associations with Turkey, Iraq and Pakistan? What necessity has arisen today for Pakistan to go away from the main current? Certainly I feel and I am even afraid that the people of Pakistan are not fully informed of all these developments; I am further afraid that because of certain unemployment situation in Pakistan and also because of the economic instability in Pakistan people are
simply made to believe that there are certain elements in India which are not sure of Pakistan’s existence. I would like to appeal to the people of Pakistan and impress upon them that we in India—all the three main political parties in India—believe that Pakistan is a reality. If Pakistan wants to join India in a federal way, it is for Pakistan to voluntarily do it and India, on its own accord, will never think of compelling Pakistan to join India. Pakistan is a making of India with her own hands, whether we liked it or not. Situated as we then were, we had to do it and it was history that compelled us to do it. The three important events that happened after world war II were the division of three countries: Germany, Korea and India. While there was voluntary division in India, Germany and Korea have been divided against the wishes of the people and that is the reason why those countries are going to be new causes for another World War. The results that emerged from the second World War have again become causes for a Third World War. But it shall not be the case with regard to India. Pakistan is the area which we have created: it is not because of America saying so or Russia asking us. We have created Pakistan with our own hands and the people of Pakistan should be convinced of our *bona fides*. We do not want to compel Pakistan to join us. Pakistan has itself got an economic interest by associating with India, particularly in regard to natural resources and canal waters. Canal waters is a very important problem—More than tanks, jeeps and other equipment, water and wheat are important to Pakistan. Pakistan people are not being educated on these lines. It is a pity.

I will now go a step further and say that mere platitudes or mere appeals or mere shedding of tears are not in themselves going to deter America in its plan for aggression. America is not interested in India; it is not interested in Pakistan: America is interested more in filling a particular vaccum. When we turn the pages of our History we find that in Asia there were three empires: the British, the Dutch and the French. The Britishers by leaving India and Pakistan have created a vaccum and the British losing its hold in the middle-east have created a vaccum. The Dutch has left Indonesia and the French in spite of 55 per cent of more of war expenses being met by America has not been able to make any headway in Indo-China. That being the case, America wants to assume the role or fill the gap by itself. It is to be taken as
a practical reality. America does not like Asia uniting or the resurgent nationalism in Asiatics. The fundamental tussle is between the industrial powers of the world and the powers of backward economy. The industrial powers of Europe had kept America; kept Asia; kept Africa and Australia, under their grip and had prospered so much that America itself had to struggle to come out of the grip of the European powers. What America did earlier, Asia is doing now. Let America recall its own history. Peoples of America had struggled to get out of the grip of the industrial powers: Asiatics are doing the same thing. From Turkey to Japan all the countries in Asia, all the nations of Asia, are struggling to come out of the grip of the European industrial powers. In this process, America is not helping us. America is placing before us a bogey of communism. Whether communism or no communism, whether capitalism or super-capitalism, one thing is certain that no one Nation today can exploit other nations. We have to believe that national integrity is the only real way of keeping peace in the world. How these nations have been created artificially is not a point for consideration now, but we accept certain geographical boundaries or certain Governments as realities and accept their integrity sand Sovereignty. As long as Soviet Russia and America do not respect this national integrity, both will be hated by the peoples of the world. We differ from Soviet also on this point. They also uphold the theory of “peace through strength.” Let us not take sides when we argue here. We are Indians first. The signs of a cold war are coming nearer to the boundaries of India. We should speak as Indians with higher objectives that war should be averted once and for all. If we take sides with Soviet or America in this House and begin to argue, we do not have a true picture.

Scientific technology is being applied to war. Whether it is rightly applied or wrongly applied, the fact is—it is being applied. Soviet, America and some others want to take advantage by applying this scientific technology to war and they say “Peace Through Strength,” whereas we say “Peace through Understanding.” It is through collaboration. Misunderstanding or wrong understanding creates suspicion; suspicion creates fear; fear compels to armaments; armament takes to military action; military action or war brings degeneration. That is how the process takes place. Therefore, I wish there should be proper understanding between the different nations of the world and let there be
“Peace Through Understanding.” The fundamentals of Pandit Nehru’s policy are no entanglements in any cliques of the world and friendship with all nations. But why did America differ with India on this point? America also says that there should be peace; it also says there should be no entanglements in cliques. But then what is her present policy due to? We have to go to the root cause. Firstly, America did not like India speaking in favour of New China. America never expected that Pandit Nehru would be such an independent and firm personality who could call a spade a spade. India’s speaking in favour of China for its inclusion in the United Nations Organization has not been very happy to America. The second thing is that India did not like that Macarthur should be given power to enter into North Korea. Thirdly, India did not like signing the Japanese peace treaty as per the draft prepared by America. On these three points, America has become dissatisfied.

We must now go to the root cause and find out what America wants us to do. I think America and India has both misunderstood each other. Without taking much time of the House, in a minute or two I say about a parable in this connection. One person had been to the philosopher Voltaire and said to him: “So and so is a good philosopher.” Immediately, Voltaire said ‘Yes, I know he is a fine man, a big man.” But that person thereupon said: “But when I said to him that you are a good man, he called you a bad man. But how is it you call him a good man.” Then Voltaire said: “We might have both misunderstood each other.” I do not know if I am clear about the subtlety here. What Voltaire said was that the other person must be a scoundrel and ‘I must be a gentleman.’ That is how we might have misunderstood each other. America seems to have thought that India in its predicament or in the context of her present economic poverty will surrender its wider interests. We too might have misunderstood that America has good intentions to uphold our Democracy. Otherwise, 7 years of friendship would not have ended like this. I am glad at least today we have understood each other. Though India does not want leadership of the Asian-African countries, the small nations in Asia and Africa do look to India for succour. America obviously does not like this and it is to remove India from this position that America is trying to set up Pakistan against India. Certainly, America is doing the greatest disservice to the freedom of ours. We do not want any nation to come and fall on our shoulders. We fought for Indonesia; We raised our voice for
Africa, Tunisia and South Korea and North Korea; wherever there was aggression we raised our voice. If America wants to belittle India or bring down India or coerce India, it is going to do a great mistake.

Lastly, I would say, let us not mix our home politics with the foreign politics. We will be committing a great mistake if we associate our home politics with foreign affairs. Let us see England and learn: whatever be their Home differences, in foreign policy matters, all the political parties come together. That is British Democracy. There is nothing wrong in copying some good elements of the British democracy. Therefore, let us see that we do not mix our home politics with foreign affairs and let us all follow one leader in facing this crisis. It is a great crisis and should our apprehensions come true, it is going to be the greatest disaster to the world.
"Peace Through Understanding." The fundamentals of Pandit Nehru's policy are no entanglements in any cliques of the world and friendship with all nations. But why did America differ with India on this point? America also says that there should be peace; it also says there should be no entanglements in cliques. But then what is her present policy due to? We have to go to the root cause. Firstly, America did not like India speaking in favour of New China. America never expected that Pandit Nehru would be such an independent and firm personality who could call a spade a spade. Indias, speaking in favour of China for its inclusion in the United Nations Organization has not been very happy to America. The second thing is that India did not like that Macarthur should be given power to enter into North Korea. Thirdly, India did not like signing the Japanese peace treaty as per the draft prepared by America. On these three points, America has become dissatisfied.

We must now go to the root cause and find out what America wants us to do. I think America and India has both misunderstood each other. Without taking much time of the House, in a minute or two I say about a parable in this connection. One person had been to the philosopher Voltaire and said to him: "So and so is a good philosopher." Immediately, Voltaire said "Yes, I know he is a fine man, a big man." But that person thereupon said: "But when I said to him that you are a good man, he called you a bad man. But how is it you call him a good man." Then Voltaire said: "We might have both misunderstood each other." I do not know if I am clear about the subtlety here. What Voltaire said was that the other person must be a scoundrel and 'I must be a gentleman.' That is how we might have misunderstood each other. America seems to have thought that India in its predicament or in the context of her present economic poverty will surrender its wider interests. We too might have misunderstood that America has good intentions to uphold our Democracy. Otherwise, 7 years of friendship would not have ended like this. I am glad at least today we have understood each other. Though India does not want leadership of the Asian-African countries, the small nations in Asia and Africa do look to India for succour. America obviously does not like this and it is to remove India from this position that America is trying to set up Pakistan against India. Certainly, America is doing the greatest disservice to the freedom of ours. We do not want any nation to come and fall on our shoulders. We fought for Indonesia; We raised our voice for
Africa, Tunisia and South Korea and North Korea; wherever there was aggression we raised our voice. If America wants to belittle India or bring down India or coerce India, it is going to do a great mistake.

Lastly, I would say, let us not mix our home politics with the foreign politics. We will be committing a great mistake if we associate our home politics with foreign affairs. Let us see England and learn: whatever be their Home differences, in foreign policy matters, all the political parties come together. That is British Democracy. There is nothing wrong in copying some good elements of the British democracy. Therefore, let us see that we do not mix our home politics with foreign affairs and let us all follow one leader in facing this crisis. It is a great crisis and should our apprehensions come true, it is going to be the greatest disaster to the world.
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The House then adjourned till Half Past Two of the Clock on Monday, the 22nd March 1954.