

been received from Shri S. S. Vasan:—

"Under article 101(4) of the Constitution, I humbly request I may be granted leave of absence * * * because of my illness."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri S. S. Vasan for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

No hon. Member dissented.

Permission to remain absent is granted.

RE AWARD OF KUTCH TRIBUNAL

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमान्, मुझे एक निवेदन करना है। आज यहां प्रधान मंत्री जी थीं। अखबार में श्री एस०एन०द्विवेदी जी का बयान आया है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने गलतबयानी की है यह कह कर के कि प्रसोपा कच्छ के संबंध में जो पंचनिर्णय विगौरह है उस पर उनके साथ है। श्री एस०एन० द्विवेदी ने प्रधान मंत्री के बयान का खंडन करते हुए यह कहा है कि जब यह मामला पंचनिर्णय के लिये जा रहा था तब भी हम इसके विरोध में थे और इस समय भी हम पंचनिर्णय मानने के विरुद्ध हैं। तो मैं चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी की गलतबयानी पर उनके विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रश्न उठाने की अनुमति दी जाय।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Her attention will be drawn to it. Now we take up the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Mr. Kaul.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—

continued

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I address myself this morning to one aspect of our

232 RSD.—4

foreign policy, namely, Vietnam. The President in his Address has stated that the most dangerous of the sources of conflict and tension lie in Vietnam and West Asia. He said: "Government are convinced that the tragic conflict in Vietnam can only be resolved by political and not by military means. Government have, therefore, consistently appealed for an unconditional stoppage of the bombing of North Vietnam as the first step towards a peaceful settlement." Now, my submission, Sir, is that this phrase "stoppage of bombing of North

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Vietnam" has created a great deal of confusion. In the past when Prime Minister Nehru addressed this House and the other House on international questions, the phrase that he used and the policy that he advocated in areas where tension was prevailing and where war-like steps were being taken, was that there should be a "cease-fire." The correct approach to the problem would have been for the Government of India to have stated that there should be an immediate cease-fire and that it should be followed up by a conference of all the parties concerned in this matter.

Having made my position clear on that point, I wish to draw your attention to certain remarks made by U.S. Defence Secretary, Mr. McNamara before the Senate Committee in Washington, a report of which appeared in "The Times", of London recently. He stated:

"The facts that there are few really important targets left unbombed in North Vietnam and that the country's economy is largely agrarian make it unlikely that any increased bombing could cause North Vietnam to collapse."

Then, he goes on to say,

"The American bombing of the North has so far put out of action

[Shri M. N. Kaul]

about 70 per cent of the country's electricity generating capacity; most of the large oil depots have been destroyed, but imported diesel generators are providing all essential electrical services and the North Vietnamese have been able to meet their minimum fuel needs

Most, if not all, of the industrial output lost through the American bombing has been replaced by imports from Russia and China"

Those who have watched the trends of developing opinion in America are now quite clear that there is almost a universal feeling in that country that it was a mistake on the part of the American Government to have landed troops in Vietnam and fought land battles with Asian peoples. That mistake is admitted. But the tragedy is that no steps are taken to correct that first mistake. Instead, the old policy of bombing North Vietnam out of existence is being pursued more vigorously than ever before. In this connection, I would like to point out that the United States has not calculated the historical traditions of the Vietnamese people. They have been an unbeatable race, as it were. Neither China nor America can suppress them. By their recent offensive, they have shown that they could overnight, as it were, attack as many as 39 provincial capitals and more than 70 district capitals in the entire region of South Vietnam. Now it is clear that there is no question of defeating the Vietnamese. I would like to use the word "Vietnamese", and not North Vietnamese", because I consider that it is an issue between the people of Vietnam as a whole and the United States. The Americans are now clearly admitting that it is impossible to defeat them in the conventional sense. You may resort to unlimited use of American resources and defeat them in the long run in those areas which they have now occupied. But they will revert

to the jungles and from there they will fight to the last man. That point has now been driven home completely in America but still they are going on with their old policy. I read in the papers this morning that President Johnson was in consultation with the ex-President, Mr. Eisenhower, for over six hours but they saw no solution. If you analyse the American opinion, they are almost unanimous in their own minds, whether clearly expressed or not, that somehow they should get out of this trouble spot. The only thing that is holding up immediate action is the question of prestige, that the American prestige will fall, that it will be said all over the world "Here is a small country like Vietnam that could withstand the entire might of America." I suggest that our Government should take up this matter and pursue it more vigorously than has been done hitherto, if not on military grounds, at least on humanitarian grounds, because it is a tragic phenomenon. Whom are they defending? Are they defending Asians or are they containing China? If they are containing China, that will not prove a good proposition, if they succeed in destroying a bulk of the Vietnamese people by prolonging this war, because I feel that the Vietnamese people themselves are a bulwark against the expansion of China in this region. The time has now come when you should unite Vietnam, come to the conference table and settle the issue and give up all false notions of prestige. I recall here the words which Mr. Churchill used when he was the Prime Minister in peacetime at the time of the Egyptian crisis. There was a great feeling in the Conservative Party that Churchill was taking a soft line in regard to the then situation in Egypt. Churchill came to the House and defended his action and in that statement he used a famous expression when he said "You cannot support prestige by folly". I think that clearly applies to the American approach today. It is clear that they

are lost, as it were, in the jungles of Vietnam and they see their folly but are unable to correct the tragic situation because their prestige comes in the way. Surely the American prestige is not such a brittle phenomenon that it will vanish into thin air if they take a correct line on Vietnam. I recall that I was in England as a student at the time when the Irish negotiations were going on. De Valera at that time said that he will not negotiate on any basis except that Ireland should be a Republic. Lloyd George replied that he was not prepared to negotiate on any basis except that Ireland should be a Dominion. There was no settlement on the basis of negotiations. Ultimately De Valera used a phrase which has become famous in diplomatic history. He said "Our respective positions have been stated and understood. We are coming to London." The respective positions of America, of Vietnam and of all the parties are on record. There is no question of laying down any pre-conditions. The issue is that there should be immediately a conference without conditions of any kind whatsoever and the entire issue should be hammered out at that conference. The issues can be hammered out provided the Americans do convey their decision to Vietnam that they will by arrangement withdraw their troops from Vietnam. That assurance should be given. I do not for a moment suggest that Americans should march out of Vietnam one fine morning. What I suggest is that they should meet at a conference table and a phased programme of the withdrawal of American troops should be drawn up and the entire Vietnam as was envisaged by the Geneva Agreement of 1954 should be reunited under a common leader.

I feel this is perhaps the last experiment that a European or an American power will land troops in Asia. Mr. Eden tried that in 1956 when he landed in conjunction with France troops in Egypt and that was as it were the last adventure of the

British Empire. Similarly, I feel that having regard to their experience, as we watch the American public opinion, at no time in future will they ever land American troops and go into battle with an Asian country. That policy, whoever thought of it, was a tragic policy, it has yielded no dividends and America is in deep waters over the whole matter. Therefore we should use our best efforts in whatever way it is possible to impress upon the American Government the sheer necessity because of the situation that has now arisen to come to terms with the Vietnamese people. Now the Americans themselves admit that such a defeat as they have suffered in various areas in South Vietnam would not have been at all possible if the sympathy of the people of South Vietnam had been with the American point of view. It is now apparent that the police, the civilian population and other elements help in various ways the forces from North Vietnam, Vietcong or whatever you may call them. We have got to look at it from that point of view that this mess has to be cleared up and the issues should not be confused by various arguments which have no relevance, for instance, by remaining in Vietnam the Americans are containing China. That I think has now been proved to be a fallacious argument. I am not suggesting for a moment that they should discard their theory quickly of their presence in the waters of the Pacific and other positions that they occupy. All that I say is that presence in certain strategic areas is one thing and direct intervention by foreign troops and American troops in an Asian country is something which has miserably failed. Except troops from South Korea and some Australian troops and some token forces from New Zealand, there are no other troops from any country who are fighting with the Americans. Madam, I repeat that the sole issue now after all these military conflicts and all kinds of conflicts has boiled

[Shri M. N. Kaul.]

down to the issue of prestige. In order to buttress prestige all kinds of arguments are being advanced. A policy has failed. They should clearly confess that it has failed and it is no use pouring limitless resources into Vietnam. Look at it. What is the result? All kinds of complications have arisen for America in the economic field because large resources are being blown up. They are not, therefore, able to aid the impoverished regions of the earth. This Vietnam war has not only had consequences for Vietnam. It is having consequences all over the world, for Asian, African and other developing countries, because the American resources are being consumed in war-like endeavours when these resources could have been utilised for giving constructive aid to Asian, African and other countries. I feel that whatever little prestige, if at all, America will lose in coming to terms with Vietnam, they will gain greater prestige and glory in the years to come, if they decide to stop this war and the resources thus saved are utilised for developing the other regions of the world. Thank you.

श्री महाबोर दास (बिहार) : माननीया मैं सगौरव श्री राम निवास मिर्धा के धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ। राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने दिनांक 12 फरवरी 1968 को संसद के दोनों सदनों की संयुक्त बैठक में जो भाषण दिया वह सारगर्भित और सराहनीय तथा लाभकारी है। साथ साथ मैं इस अवसर पर भूकम्प आदि तथा बिहार की रेल दुर्घटना में पीड़ित, व्यक्तियों के प्रति संवेदना प्रगट करते हुए दुःख अनुभव करता हूँ। इस अवसर पर मैं मध्य प्रदेश में हुई उम दुर्घटना को नहीं भूल सकता जिसमें हरिजन और सवर्णों के बीच दंगों में हरिजनों की क्षति हुई है और हरिजन मारे गये हैं। मध्य प्रदेश में संयुक्त सरकार के आने के तुरन्त बाद ही जो दुर्घटना हुई है, जो अमानुषिक अत्याचार हरिजनों

पर किया गया है, उनको जिस तरह से मारा गया है उसके उपचार के लिए यह किया गया है कि हरिजन-सर्वर्ण दंगों के लिए न्यायाधीश नियुक्त कर दिया गया है। अरे, न्यायाधीश के पास जाने के लिए हरिजन के पास पैसे कहां? वह तो थाने तक नहीं पहुंच सकता। न्यायाधीश के समक्ष उतनी चीजों को जमा करना, उतने रुपये को खर्च करना उनके लिए संभव कहां?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock. The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

श्री महाबोर दास : माननीया उपसभापति महोदय, मैं कह रहा था कि मध्य प्रदेश में जो हरिजन-सर्वर्ण दंगा हुआ है, उसके तथ्यों में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि न्यायाधीश की नियुक्ति हो गई है, किन्तु मैं सिर्फ यह बनाना चाहता हूँ कि अभी जो संयुक्त दल की सरकार बनी उससे वहां की माइनारिटीज को, अल्पसंख्यकों को, एकदम असहायता मालूम पड़ती है, उन्हें मालूम पड़ता है कि वे असुरक्षित हो गये हैं। तभी इस प्रकार का दंगा हुआ है और हरिजनों को तबाही हुई है। न्यायाधीश की नियुक्ति का अवसर जो हरिजनों को मिला है उसका कारण यह है कि उन्हें डर हो गया है, भय हो गया है कि सरकार का जो वर्तमान एडमिनिस्ट्रटिव सेटअप है, थाना वगैरह है, उसमें उनकी सुनवाई नहीं होगी और इस लिए उन्होंने मिमांड किया कि न्यायाधीश नियुक्त हो।

श्री को० सो० बघेल (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या आपको यह मालूम है कि न्यायाधीश की जांच की मांग हरिजन भाइयों की ओर से की गई थी जिसे मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने तत्परतापूर्वक स्वीकार किया है ?

श्री महाबोर दास : वस्तर में आदिवासी हैं, मैं तो हरिजनों की बात कह रहा हूँ। वह तो राजनीतिक बात थी, उसको ले कर हम कुछ नहीं कह रहे हैं, हम तो सोशल बात कह रहे हैं। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि न्यायाधीश की नियुक्ति की हरिजनों ने किन परिस्थितियों में मांग की। वह अमहाय थे। उन गरीबों के पास पैसा नहीं, सहारा नहीं, बद्धि नहीं। तो उनके लिये सरकार क्या मदद कर रही है। क्या उनको वकील दे रही है क्या उनको धन की मदद दे रही है। क्या हर तरह की चीजों की मदद पहुंचा रही है। ताकि हरिजनों ने जो मांग की है उसको पूरी तरह से साबित कर सके और कोर्ट के समक्ष अपनी सारी बातें रख सकें। वस मैं इस सम्बन्ध में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ। साथ ही साथ यह अवश्य कह देना चाहता हूँ कि वहां के हरिजन अमहाय अवस्था में आ गये हैं। आप आदिवासियों की बात कहते हैं मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हरिजनों को जितनी डिमएविलिटीज है उतनी आदिवासियों को नहीं हैं, आदिवासि अछूत नहीं समझे जाते हैं, आदिवासी से छग्राछू नहीं मानते, आदिवासी से मंदिर-प्रवेश को नहीं रोकते। यह फर्क आप अच्छी तरह से समझ लें। वास्तव में हरिजनों के प्रति आपका ध्यान क्यों आकर्षित कर रहा हूँ। इसलिये कि त ही असहाय अवस्था में हैं। तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इस ओर ध्यान दें कि वह धन के अभाव में, बुद्धिमान और अच्छे वकील के अभाव में, कहीं अपना केस न रख सके और उनका केस कहीं हार में न बदल जाय। उनका नुकसान जान-माल का हुआ और कहीं फिर उनको हार का मुंह

न देखना पड़े। तो, उपसभापति महोदया, इस अमहाय अवस्था में पड़े हरिजनों के लिये क्या कुछ आर्थिक मदद की व्यवस्था होगी।

यह तो एक मध्य प्रदेश का उदाहरण है। मेरे बिहार की ओर चलिये। बिहार में युनाइटेड फ्रंट की गवर्नमेंट हुई तो क्या हुआ। पहले कांग्रेस अवर्नमेंट में दो मंत्री हरिजनों के रहते थे और एक कैबिनेट मंत्री अवश्य ही हरिजन होता था लेकिन जब यह सर्वदलीय सरकार, संयुक्त-दल की सरकार, बनी तो बिहार से हरिजन कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर गायब। कोई हरिजन कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर के योग्य नहीं रह गया। या तो वहां अयोग्यों को टोली थी या हरिजनों को उन्हीं दुनकार कर नकाल दिया, उन्हें यह मौका नहीं दिया कि सर्वदलीय सरकार बना रहे हैं तो जब कांग्रेस रिजिम में कैबिनेट में एक स्थान हरिजन को मिलता रहा है तो कम से कम एक स्थान तो उसे कैबिनेट में दें। वह भी नहीं दे सकते हैं। तो ये दो उदाहरण आपके सामने बताना चाहता हूँ जिससे कि यह पता चल जाये कि ऐसी सरकार में हरिजन अपने को अमहाय समझते हैं।

माननीया उपसभापति महोदया, अब मैं इस ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि इन दिनों भारत के नागरिक तेजी से बदलते हुये दौर से गुजर रहे हैं और विश्व की परिस्थिति भी नाजुक दौर में है। मैं राष्ट्रपति महोदय की इस भावना का पूर्ण आदर करता हूँ कि महत्त्वपूर्ण राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं को दलगत राजनीति से ऊपर रखा जाना चाहिये। मेरी आशा है कि सरकार राष्ट्रीय हित और महत्व के प्रमुख मसलों पर सभी दलों के नेताओं के साथ बैठ कर विचार करने और उनकी सलाह लेने के लिये तैयार रहेगी और सभी दल सहयोग दे कर भारत को सफल बनायेंगे।

भारत की तरक्की के लिये हमें रचनात्मक परिश्रम करना ही होगा तभी हम सत्य रूप

श्री महावीर दास

से जनता की सेवा करने और राष्ट्र को शक्तिशाली बनाने में सकल हो सकते हैं।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने ठीक ही उल्लेख किया है कि भारत की मित्रता का सम्मान बहुत से देश करते हैं। मैं जनवरी में राउंड दि वर्ल्ड टूर पर जब गया था तो अमेरिका और यूरोप आदि देशों का दौरा किया, वहाँ मैंने जनता में पाया कि भारत की मित्रता के प्रति उनका आदर-भाव है और वे भारत के विकास को चाहते हैं। साथ साथ हमें अच्छी तरह से यह भी मालूम है कि सोवियत समाजवादी गणतंत्र संघ के नागरिक सदा हमारी वृद्धि चाहते हैं। यह सब सद्भावना हमारी राष्ट्रीय नीति एवं सिद्धान्त के कारण ही है कि हम "शान्तिपूर्ण सह-अस्तित्व" को पक्के विश्वास के साथ मानते हैं और तदनुसार चलते हैं।

हमारी सीमाओं पर बराबर खतरा बना हुआ है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में कोई भी रचनात्मक कार्यकर्ता और राष्ट्रीय हितचिन्तक कभी नहीं चाहेगा कि राष्ट्र की कोई भी चीज, राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति, किसी आन्दोलन द्वारा नष्ट की जाय और उत्पादन में रुकावट पैदा हो तथा बच्चों की पढ़ाई में ढील पड़े। राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्तियों को बड़े पैमाने पर नुकसान पहुंचाया गया है। मैं तो अभी संस्थाओं से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस ओर सतर्क रहें और ऐसे कार्यों और तत्वों को सहयोग न दें जो राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्तियों को नष्ट करने की भावना को शक्ति प्रदान करे।

आए दिन राज्यों में राजनीतिक अस्थिरता चिन्ताजनक है। हम उसकी ओर से मुंह मोड़ कर बैठ नहीं सकते और मेरा विश्वास है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार मौन दर्शक के रूप में देखती नहीं रहेगी। हम यह नहीं समझ पाते हैं कि पश्चिमी बंगाल में दिनांक 14 फरवरी को जो विधायकों ने हंगामा पैदा किया और

राज्यपाल पर गद्दी फेंकी क्या वह वैधानिक अधिकारों का दुरुपयोग नहीं कहा जायगा ! विधायकों को मान्य अधिकार है कि वे सदन में बैठ कर वैधानिक रीति से किसी सरकार को अपदस्थ कर दें या किसी कानून को रद्द कर दें। परन्तु आये दिन विधायक जो प्रदर्शन कर रहे हैं उससे राष्ट्र के अहितकर तत्वों को और राष्ट्र के शत्रुओं को ही प्रोत्साहन मिलता है। विधायकों द्वारा नियम कानून और परम्परागत प्रतिष्ठा का हनन होना चिन्ता का विषय है और भारत सरकार को इस ओर गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिए। मैं बिहार के विधायकों की सराहना करता हूँ जिन्होंने उतावलापन और नियम के विरुद्ध कोई हंगामा नहीं किया और सरकार के परिवर्तन में वैधानिक उपचारों को अपनाया बिहार सरकार के परिवर्तन का राजनीतिक कारण ही नहीं है बल्कि राज्य की आर्थिक परिस्थिति बहुत दूर तक बिगड़ गई थी जिनका कर्ज कांग्रेसी सरकार ने 18 वर्षों में नहीं किया उतना अधिक कर्ज यू० एफ० सरकार ने दस ग्यारह महीनों में लाद दिया है और केन्द्रीय सरकार से जो रुपये अकाल पीड़ितों की सहायता के लिये भेजे थे उन्हें पूरा खर्च न कर कई एक करोड़ रुपयों को दूसरे मदों में खर्च कर दिया गया है जिससे प्लेनिंग को धक्का लग सकता है। मैं व्योरे में नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि ये सारे तथ्य बिहार विधान सभा के बजट अधिवेशन में आयेंगे ही और जनता को जानकारी मिल ही जाएगी।

पश्चिम बंगाल में जहाँ यू० एफ० सरकार थी उसके राज्यकाल में लाखों मजदूर बेकार हो गये उत्पादन बन्द होने लगे, नक्सलबाड़ी कांड से यह मालूम होने लगा कि भारत के एक एक नागरिक बन्धत्व की सम्भावना को त्याग कर एक दूसरे को लूटने और हत्या करने में वीरता का अनुभव करते हैं। वहाँ इस प्रकार की दुःखद भावना पैदा की गई जिससे सम्पूर्ण भारत के निवासियों के साथ अमानुषिक व्यवहार हुआ। इनमें बिहार के उत्तर प्रदेश के अतिरिक्त अन्य राज्यों के भी लोग थे जिनको

लूटा गया। इस प्रकार की प्रवृत्तियों से राष्ट्र को कमजोर बनाने की ही मशा हो सकती है और बाहरी शत्रुओं को हसने का मौका देना ही कहा जा सकता है। हमें हर कार्यों को वैधानिक तरीका अपना कर ही करना चाहिए। आम चुनाव में वैधानिक तरीके के अन्दर जो मत पड़े उनसे तो कई एक राज्य की कांग्रेसी सरकारों को हटा दिया और कांग्रेस शान्त हो स्वीकार करती रही। इसी प्रकार विधान को मान कर ही चलना भारत के हर नागरिक और दल का कर्तव्य है और इसके विपरीत आचरण करना चिन्ताजनक है...

उपसभापति आपका वक्त समाप्त हो गया। समाप्त कीजिये।

श्री महावीर दास तीन चार मिनट और। राष्ट्र को मजबूत बनाने में राष्ट्रीय चरित्र की नितान्त आवश्यकता है। एक एक व्यक्ति को अपने आप नैतिकता और अनुशासन के बन्धन में बंध कर कानून का पूर्ण आदर करना चाहिये।

आये दिन भाषा विवाद को लेकर जो वातावरण राजनैतिक दल वाले बना रहे हैं वे न तो संविधान का आदर करते हैं और न राष्ट्रीय चरित्र के निर्माण में युवकों को और जनता को सहायता पहुँचाते हैं। भारतीय संविधान ऐसा लचीला है कि किसी प्रकार के आन्दोलन की गुंजायश ही नहीं है। कोई भी कानून जो बन जाता है उससे लाभ न होने पर संशोधन करने में कोई कठिनाई नहीं है। अतः भाषा को लेकर जो कानून बने हैं उसका पालन किया जाना चाहिये और कठिनाइयों के उत्पन्न होने पर संशोधन किया जाना चाहिए न कि आशकाओं के आधार पर संविधान और कानून का अनादर करना चाहिए। मेरा झी एक यह भी सूझाव है कि देश और विदेश के लोगों को भारत के किसी स्थान पर जाने और किसी चीज़ को समझने में कोई कठिनाई

नहीं हो इसके लिये दूकानों पर, सड़कों आदि पर जो साइन बोर्ड हैं वे तीन भाषाओं में लिखे जायें—हिन्दी अंग्रेजी और स्थानीय राजभाषा ताकि अंग्रेजी के द्वारा अंग्रेजी समझने वाले, हिन्दी के द्वारा हिन्दी समझने वाले और स्थानीय भाषा के द्वारा स्थानीय भाषा समझने वाले पढ़ लें।

भारत की प्रगति की ओर जब हम देखते हैं तो पाते हैं कि 1950-51 में कुछ टैक्स रेवेन्यू जहाँ 6,267 मिलियन थे वे बढ़ कर 1967-68 में 36,058 मिलियन हो गये और नॉन-टैक्स रेवेन्यू जहाँ 1950-51 में 1,541 मिलियन थे वे बढ़ कर 8,342 मिलियन हो गये। ये आंकड़े समूचे भारत के हैं जिसमें केन्द्रीय सरकार, राज्य सरकार आदि हैं। और इसी प्रकार सम्पूर्ण भारत में 1950-51 में जहाँ Combined Revenue expenditure of the Centre, States and the Union Territories के अन्दर non-developmental interest में 5,087 मिलियन थे वे बढ़ कर 1967-68 में 25,023 मिलियन हो गए तथा डेवलपमेंटल साइड में 2,175 मिलियन से बढ़ कर 17,341 मिलियन हो गए। अतः भारत सदा प्रगति पथ पर बढ़ रहा है।

भारत कृषि प्रधान देश है। कृषि और इरिगेशन के लायक जमीन 480 मिलियन एकड़ है जिसमें 390 मिलियन एकड़ भूमि पर ही उपज होती है। शेष 90 मिलियन एकड़ भूमि को उपजाऊ बनाया जाए तो खाद्य के अभाव की समस्याओं का हल निकालने में बहुत अधिक सहायक सिद्ध हो सकता है।

खनिज पदार्थों का महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्र दक्षिणी बिहार दक्षिणी पश्चिमी बंगाल और उत्तरी उड़ीसा है। आज तक जो विकास हुए हैं उनमें और अधिक विकास करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं यह देख रहा हूँ कि तृतीय योजना काल में जो इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रंथ हुई है वह 68 प्रतिशत है और इस ओर वृद्धि लाने की

[श्री सहाबीर दास]

बहुत अधिक आवश्यकता है। इसे हम बेरोजगारी की समस्याओं को हल करने में बहुत आगे बढ़ सकेंगे और हमारे जो बेकार इंजीनियर हैं उन्हें भी हम काम पर लगा सकेंगे।

(Time bell rings)

मैं एक मिनट में एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। पहले तो मैं पुनः राष्ट्रपति महोदय के प्रति आभार प्रकट करता हुआ उनके प्रति धन्यवाद के प्रस्ताव का अनुमोदन करता हूँ, साथ ही साथ सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि बढ़ती हुई अनुशासनहीनता और राष्ट्र विरोधी तत्वों की ओर ध्यान दें तथा पढ़े लिखे हरिजन, आदिवासी लोगों की बेकारी को खास तौर पर और सभी पढ़े लिखे युवकों की बेकारी को आम तौर पर दूर करने की योजनाएं बनाएं जिससे राष्ट्र की बेकारी की समस्या को हल करने के साथ साथ पढ़े लिखे युवकों के ज्ञान का लाभ देश में उठाया जा सके। धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Banka Behary Das. Fifteen minutes please.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, in the Address of the President we find no positive steps advocated by him to see that all those areas that are either with Pakistan or with Peking China are reoccupied by India. There are two methods for regaining those areas, number one by peaceful negotiations, and number two by force. As far as peaceful negotiations are concerned, we know that Pakistan or China is not in a mood to carry on a dialogue with us, I mean a purposeful dialogue, so that the territorial integrity of this country is preserved. As far as the second aspect of the question is concerned, the President of India, in his Address, has not spelt out at all the positive steps that the Government

of India wants to take in the coming months and years to see that all those areas, which are still under the occupation of Pakistan or China, are recovered. In this connection I want to mention about the Kutch dispute and the Award that has been given now. Now the Award has created a stir not only in Gujarat but throughout the country, and it seems from the statements of the Prime Minister in the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting and also in the other House that she is thinking in terms of accepting that Award. Now this Government within these twenty years has failed to preserve the territorial integrity of this country. I am not going into all those aspects regarding Pakistan or Kashmir or China, but here I am more interested about this Kutch award. I am astonished to hear from the Prime Minister who in a statement has said that perhaps the Praja Socialist Party is a little bit soft as regards acceptance of this Award. I may say from the floor of this House that the P.S.P. is not prepared to accept the decision of the International Tribunal. In this connection I want to refer to certain books which will help us in clarifying the position, and to make up our mind. And it seems arguments are being advanced in this country from the Treasury Benches and also from certain persons, who are very important and have their place in this country, that the Award of the Tribunal must be accepted as we were committed to setting up of the tribunal. But I want to plead here that the Award of the Tribunal is not of a mandatory character. India is free either to accept it or to reject it, and in this connection I want to quote from a famous book "International Arbitration—Law and Practice" by J. L. Simpson and Hazal Fox—it is on page 250 of the book—where they have said

"The general rule that judgment or award of an international tribu-

nal is final and binding upon parties is, subject to qualification, universally accepted, but it may on certain specific grounds be treated as null and void."

It further goes on to say that a judgment or an award is void, "if the tribunal has clearly exceeded the bounds of jurisdiction conferred upon it expressly or by implication." Leaving aside other political leaders, the Prime Minister in the course of her statement has clearly stated that the Tribunal set up to go into the dispute had exceeded the bounds of jurisdiction and that political aspects, to a certain extent, had influenced its decision. And here Mr. Chagla yesterday in the course of his speech also said that certain enclaves which were under India had been granted to Pakistan according to this Award because of geographical considerations. Here I want to plead with the Government that the Tribunal set up on the basis of common consent of Pakistan and India, of course under pressure from the British Government, had clearly exceeded its limits. It had also gone beyond the reference made to it. The Tribunal had no jurisdiction to consider political aspects. It is not a political body. It was not a neutral body brought in look to the preservation of peace in this sub-continent. It was a body brought in just to demarcate the boundary according to the old maps. They were only to demarcate the boundary between India and Pakistan as far as Sind and Kutch areas are concerned. So beyond that scope this International Arbitration Tribunal had no power. It had no power to go into other aspects. I am told that in the Award it has been categorically mentioned that in the interest of preservation of peace, they were going to say that this part of the territory should go to Pakistan. But there is no question of the Tribunal being concerned with the question of the preservation of peace in this area because they are only concerned

with the very limited question of demarcation of the boundary.

Two arguments have been given. One is that they base their decision on the old maps with India and Pakistan about the territories called Kutch and Sind. The other argument or basis that is mentioned in the Award is that there was some intensive activity on the part of Sindhis in this area of 300 square miles. We did not refer that matter to the Tribunal or ask whether the Sindhi people of Pakistan had intensive activity in those areas. That was not the concern of the Arbitration. The Tribunal was clearly going beyond its scope when they referred to the enclaves, and to the question of preserving peace in this area. Their only limited function was to judge according to the old maps that were there either in the possession of Pakistan or in the possession of India and to demarcate the boundary and to categorically state whether these 300 sq. miles should be with India or Pakistan. Madam Deputy Chairman, here I see that the Government of India has expressed its resentment to a certain extent because it has stated that the Tribunal had gone beyond its scope. I bank on the authority—that I referred to. I can bank on other books on the subject of international tribunals and I can say that this Award has gone beyond the references given to the Tribunal and so it is absolutely null and void and India is free to reject the Award. I want to plead with the Government to reject this Award. In this connection I want to refer to another book. It is by L. Oppenheim on "Disputes, war and Neutrality" volume II. On page 28 and 29 of that volume it has been stated:

"There seems to exist no provision of a general nature for solution of controversies arising out of allegation of a party that an arbitral award has been rendered in excess of the powers conferred upon the arbitrator and is therefore null and

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

void.... There is nothing inherent in the nature of arbitral awards to render them final, beyond possibilities of appeal."

I am basing my arguments upon these authorities to show that this Award of the International Tribunal is absolutely null and void and is not binding on India. Madam Deputy Chairman, beyond that I am not going to say anything just now about Kutch.

Next I would like to say that in the President's Address nothing specific has been mentioned about the foreign policy of the Government. The Address only states that they are having good relations with the different countries of the world, whether they be the Soviet bloc or America or Germany or France or England. But I want to plead here that it is high time that India thought of developing its Asian policy. There was a time, a glorious era, when India got some stature and that was soon after her attaining independence. That stature was there when India convened the Asian Conference which was held in Delhi. To a certain extent that stature was there when we had the Bandung Conference also. But after the Asian Conference and the Bandung Conference this stature of India had gone away, it had gone down throughout the world. Whether we admit it or not, that is the position. We have to admit that position. We are not equal to the Soviet Union or England or America in any way. Our image has gone down and to a certain extent it has been tarnished not only because of our failure to give a clear-cut foreign policy either in the U. N. or in the Security Council but also because of the fact that we have not been able to handle the internal affairs of the country in a proper manner. The moment a railway wagon is burnt, the moment a railway station is burnt, the moment a name plate is demolished, the moment a car which carries number of plate of interna-

tional numerals is destroyed, the image of India is also to a certain extent destroyed. The moment we got with a begging bowl to other countries to bring food for the millions in this country, and that too after twenty years of independence, the image of India is tarnished. The moment we cannot take a proper attitude of neutrality and non-involvement either in the affairs of Vietnam or in the affairs of West Asia, our image to a certain extent is tarnished. I am not going into all these aspects here and now. But one thing I want to say. India should be satisfied with this position. Her old image cannot be recreated in the world. India's image cannot be properly created in the world unless India is militarily strong and also economically strong. But till we reach that position we must be satisfied with having very friendly relations with our neighbours and with developing an Asian policy of our own.

Madam Deputy Chairman, as you know, after these 20 years a vacuum is being created in the Asian continent. The Britishers are gradually winding up their whole show from Asia because of their economic difficulties. They are also going to quit Singapore and Malaya. Of course, the Americans are trying to fill this vacuum that is being created. But I know they will not be able to fill up this vacuum that is now being created in this continent. I say this because the nationalism that has grown up in these countries of Southeast Asia and other regions will not tolerate any outside power, whether it be the imperialists or the Communists, to come and fill this vacuum. So, the attempt of India should be to develop friendly relations with the other Asian countries so that all these powers, whether of the Communists or the imperialists, may not come and fill up this vacuum. Is India prepared to play that role? If India is not prepared to play that role, then I again warn the Government that China which is the greatest contender in this area will fill up this vacuum.

She is trying to fill up this vacuum. Of course, during the last one or two years she has got a set-back. China got a set back in the East African countries. China has already got a set-back in West Asia and in Cambodia and in other countries also. But China is always trying to create its own sphere of influence so that it can become an alternative force and fill the vacuum that is created now because of the withdrawal of the British and because of the failure of the Americans who will have to beat a hasty retreat from these regions. So the only question that arises now is this. When psychologically the Asian nations are prepared, when psychologically the South East Asian countries have developed an anti-Chinese feeling for the last one year, when the situation in Indonesia has changed, when the situation in Cambodia has changed, when the situation in Siam is going to be changed, it is now for India to take up the leadership; not leadership as a big brother or an elderly brother which other countries always dislike because we know in this world even small nations with a few millions also think themselves to be as great as either India or USSR or America. When I say that we will have to fill up this vacuum I do not say that we should fill up this vacuum as a big brother or as an elderly brother but along with other countries who are trying to be non-aligned, who are not going to play a subservient role to either of these powers, we should sit together both at governmental level and also at the people's level and we should try to see that we all become friends and fill up this vacuum so that either the Americans or the Communists whether of the Russian brand or of the Peking brand, or the Britishers do not stage come-back and fill up the vacuum. And this can only be done if India develops an Asian policy of its own and tries to have friendly relations with all these countries. I would again say here that the President's Address ought to have spelt out all these aspects of our foreign policy so that India which is already in an inferior

position in this world can at least play its role in the Asian continent, so that all these countries in the Asian continent can be friended and we along with them live in peace in this continent. Thank you.

डा० धनं प्रकाश (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

माननीया उपसभापति महोदया, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण को बड़े गौर से पढ़ने के बाद मैं इस परिणाम पर पहुँचा हूँ कि बहुत सी समस्याएँ ऐसी हैं जिनका इस अभिभाषण में कोई जिक्र नहीं है। लेकिन कुछ समस्याएँ हमारे सामने हैं उनका विशेषकर अभिभाषण में जिक्र है। हमारी दोनों सीमाओं पर दो शत्रुओं का खतरा बना हुआ है, इस खतरे का जिक्र तो बराबर चलता आ रहा है। लेकिन हमारे देश में जो आन्तरिक खतरा है उसका इस अभिभाषण में कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं है। मेरा अपना विश्वास यह है कि आज इन दो शत्रुओं के खतरे को छोड़ कर भी यदि हम गम्भीरता से विचार करें तो देश के अन्दर जो खतरा है वह बहुत ज्यादा भयानक है और इतना भयानक है कि अगर समय रहते हमने उसका इलाज नहीं किया तो न लोकतन्त्र कायम रहेगा, न स्वाधीनता ही कायम रह जायगी और न मानवता की हम रक्षा कर सकेंगे।

अभी अनेक सदस्यों ने प्रकाश डाला है देश की परिस्थिति पर। आसाम में 26 जनवरी को जो कुछ हुआ अगर हम गम्भीरता से विचार करें तो उसकी तह में हम पायेंगे कि चाइना और पाकिस्तान का हाथ है। जो लोग पाकिस्तान से आकर वहाँ आबाद हो गये हैं इस बात की कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि किसी तरह से आसाम आसामवालों का रह जाय और बाकी प्रान्तों के जो लोग हैं वे विदेशी समझ कर वहाँ से निकाल दिये जायें। यह घटना मामूली घटना नहीं है। उसमें क्या हुआ, कितनी हानि हुई है यह सब आप जानती हैं और इसलिये मैं उसका जिक्र नहीं करूँगा। मगर उस घटना का जिक्र इसलिये कर दिया है

[डा० धर्म प्रकाश]

कि उसकी तह में एक बहुत बड़ा षड़यंत्र है और अगर उसका तुरन्त उपाय नहीं किया गया तो निकट भविष्य में उसका दुष्परिणाम हमारे सामने आने वाला है ।

इसके अतिरिक्त बंगाल में जो कुछ हो चुका है और अभी भी जो हुआ है 14 फरवरी को वह इतना शर्मनाक है कि हम दुनिया में अपना सिर ऊंचा नहीं कर सकते । विधान मंडल के अन्दर हाथापाई होना, राज्यपाल के ऊपर आक्रमण करना, उनको चोट पहुंचाना, यह सब हमारी इस रीति नीति का बहुत बड़ा सूचक है कि हम कहां जा रहे हैं । जो लोग ऐसा करते हैं वे यह कहते हैं कि हम राष्ट्रीय हैं और व राष्ट्रीयता का दम भरे तो मैं समझता हूं कि हमें धोखे में है और वे तो हमें धोखा दे ही रहे हैं । मैं ऐसे लोगों को अराष्ट्रीय ही नहीं बल्कि देशद्रोही कहता हूं जो हमारे जनतन्त्र के साथ खिलवाड़ कर रहे हैं ।

इसके अलावा अभी आपने देखा कि नेपाल से मिली हुई बिहार की सीमा पर, उत्तर प्रदेश और बंगाल की सीमा पर इन तीनों प्रान्तों में क्या कारनामे हुये हैं, कितने लोग पकड़ गये हैं । वहां माओ-त्से-तुंग के फोटो और उनका लिटरेचर काफी तादाद में पकड़ा गया है । तो मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि यह जो बाकायदा एक षड़यंत्र काम कर रहा है इसका लक्ष्य क्या है । अगर हम दृष्टिपात करे तो हमको सब मालूम हो जायेगा । आज हम विएटनाम का नाम लेते हैं, दूसरे देशों का नाम लेते हैं । यह तो खुनी हुई चीज है और यह अभी पेपर्स में निकल भी चुका है कि विएटनाम में जो कुछ हो रहा है उसकी योजना पीकिंग में बनाई गई और माओ-त्से-तुंग के महारथियों ने बनाई है जो कभी फेल होने वाली नहीं है । यह उनके दिमाग में है । वे इससे पहले भी जापान में ऐसा कर चुके हैं और दूसरे देशों में भी ऐसा कर चुके हैं । मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि

यह खतरा मामूली खतरा नहीं है । यह ठीक है कि इस खतरे का सामना करने के लिये हमारी सेनाएं सीमाओं पर हैं, मगर आपने देखा कि रक्षा मंत्री ने राज्य सभा में और लोक सभा में हमें जो जानकारी दी उससे यह पता चलता है कि पाकिस्तान की स्थल और हवाई सैनिक शक्ति दुगुनी हो चुकी है । ऐसी स्थिति में कभी भी कोई घटना घट सकती है । राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कहा है कि हम मित्रता चाहते हैं । हम सदा से मित्रता चाहते आये हैं । हम कब चाहते हैं शत्रुता ! लेकिन ताशकन्द समझौते के बाद आज तक कोई ऐसी मिसाल है जब पाकिस्तान ने मित्रता के लिए कदम उठाया हो ! मैं आपसे सिर्फ यह निवेदन कर दूं कि अगर समय रहते हम इस तरफ ध्यान नहीं देंगे तो शायद भयंकर परिणाम हमारे सामने बहुत जल्दी आने वाले हैं । बाहर के खतरे के मुकाबले में यह खतरा सब से बड़ा है और इसलिये मेरी तो यह राय है कि अगर ये हरकतें बढ़ती हैं तो कोई कारण समझ में नहीं आता कि जहां लोकतन्त्र से खिलवाड़ होता है, संविधान का अपमान होता है राष्ट्र ध्वज और राष्ट्रगान का अपमान होता है वहां ऐसे लोगों को क्यों न जेल की हवा खिलाई जाये और क्यों न उन पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया जाय जिससे ऐसी हरकतें वे न कर सकें ।

दूसरी बात मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर सामाजिक क्षेत्र की थोड़ी सी कहना चाहता हूं । पिछले वर्ष के अभिभाषण में जो करोड़ों प्राणी हैं अपने देश के जिनको हरिजन और आदिवासी आप कहते हैं उनका जिक्र तक नहीं था । इस बार उन्होंने जिक्र किया है और जिक्र किन शब्दों में किया है :

“हमारे समाज के अब तक के अविकसित वर्गों अनुसूचित जातियों, अनुसूचित आदिमजातियों और पिछड़ी जातियों की सामाजिक आर्थिक उ सरकार के लिए अत्यंत रुचि और चिंत

का विषय रहा है। हालांकि उनकी उन्नति के लिए बहुत कुछ किया गया है, तो भी सरकार यह जानती है कि बहुत कुछ करना बाकी है। इस लिहाज से भी, हमारी इस समस्या का आखिरी उत्तर हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था के जल्दी समुन्नत होने में ही निहित है।”

अब जरा शब्दों पर आप गौर कीजिये। इसमें सिर्फ ये शब्द हैं कि “सामाजिक आर्थिक उन्नति सरकार के लिये अत्यंत रुचि और चिन्ता का विषय रहा है”, और साथ में यह भी कह दिया कि “बहुत कुछ किया गया है।” अगर मैं यह पूछन लगू कि क्या किया गया है और चिट्ठा यहां रख दिया जाय सदन के सामने तो पता लग जाय कि यह किया है। मुझे जानकारी है इस बात की कि समाज कल्याण विभाग प्रयत्नशील है इस बात के लिये कि एक नेशनल कौंसिल बना दी जाय जो ऐडवाइस दे गवर्नमेंट को कि यह करना चाहिये, या न करना चाहिये। सदन में या गवर्नमेंट में कोई सज्जन ऐसा है जो अपने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर यह कहे कि इस समस्या को हम नहीं जानते। आपके सामने बड़े-बड़े उदाहरण आते हैं भयंकर परिणाम देखने में आते हैं, लोगों को कत्ल किया जा रहा है, लोगों को सताया जा रहा है, पढ़ने नहीं दिया जा रहा है, पानी नहीं पीने दिया जा रहा है। ये सब घटनाएं आपसे सम्बन्धित हैं। तो मैं आपसे एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूं—विस्तार में इसलिए नहीं जाता कि शायद घंटी बज जाय—कि जिस समय भारत का पार्टीशन हुआ उस समय आपने देखा कि पश्चिम से और पूर्व से कुछ लोग हमारे यहां आए और हमने अगहदा एक पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय कायम करके करोड़ों नहीं अरबों रुपया खर्च करके उस समस्या का समाधान किया और आज भी वह

पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय कायम है जबकि गिने-चुने लोग विदेशों से इधर आते हैं, उन्हें बसाने की समस्या आती है लेकिन ये शरणार्थी जो सदियों से आपके कारण शरणार्थी बने हुए हैं, जिनके ऊपर आपने अत्याचार करके पददलित बनाया हुआ है उनके अधिकारों का अपहरण किया हुआ है, यह समझ में नहीं आता कि उनकी समस्या को आप राष्ट्रीय समस्या क्यों नहीं मानते। मैंने समाज कल्याण विभाग की मीटिंग्स में अक्सर यह कहा कि कम से कम पहले आप इसे नेशनल प्रायोरिटी तो मानें, राष्ट्रीय समस्या तो मान लें, तब इसके हल का उपाय सोचें। आप सोचते हैं कि कहीं कुवां बनवा दिया, कहीं स्कूल खोल लिया, दो-चार नौकरिया दे दी, इससे भला हो जायगा। यह सदियों की समस्या है और इसको बहुत ही विचारपूर्वक किसी योजना के अधीन हल करना चाहिए। हमारा नियोजन चल रहा है, तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं समाप्त हो गईं, मैं पूछता हूं कि क्या पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं बनाने वाले अपने सीने पर हाथ रख कर यह कह सकते हैं कि हमने उनके कल्याण के लिए कोई योजना बनाई? कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं है, योजना में कोई जिक्र नहीं है, योजना में कोई रुपया उनके लिए नहीं। अब चौथी योजना बनने जा रही है इसमें भी सफाया होगा। कहा यह जाता है कि हमारे पास रुपया नहीं है। आपने खुद इसमें जिक्र किया है रूस का, अमरीका, और दूसरे देशों का राष्ट्रपति जो ने अपने अभिभाषण में जिक्र किया है कि इनसे हमको अरबों खरबों रुपए की मदद मिली है, अनाज की मदद मिली है और अगर नहीं मिलती तो हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था को खतरा होता। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि आप बड़े-बड़े आडम्बर बनाने के लिए, बड़े बड़े कल-कारखाने लगाने के लिए भीख माग सकते हैं कर्जा ले सकते हैं और इतना

[डा० धर्म प्रकाश]

कर्जा ले सकते हैं कि उसका सूद भी आप आसानी से भ्रदा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। तो मैं नहीं समझता कि कौन सा कारण ऐसा है कि इन सदियों के सताए हुए, पददलित लोगों के उद्धार के लिए आप कर्जा नहीं ले सकते और भीख नहीं मांग सकते। आज बहुत से कन्द्रीज ऐसे हैं जो आपको मानवता की रक्षार्थ देने को तैयार हैं, इसलिए देने को तैयार हैं कि वे मानव बनें, दानव न बनें नहीं तो याद रखिए—मैं पिछली दफा भी कह चुका हूँ—बहुत जल्दी इसी साम्यवाद के और इसी षडयन्त्र के जो देश में चल रहा है अगर ये शिकार हुए तो न यहां शांति रहेगी, न मानवता रहेगी, न धर्म-कर्म की चर्चा रहेगी न चोटी और जनेऊ रहेंगे, न नमाज और रोजा रहेंगे, सब समाप्त होकर रहेगा इनके द्वारा जिनको आप उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से देखते हैं। 20 साल से यह चर्चा का विषय रहा है फिर क्या कारण है कि इसे राष्ट्रीय समस्या नहीं मानते, गवर्नमेंट क्यों नहीं इसके लिए एक विभाग खोल दे, क्यों नहीं रुपए का इन्तजाम करे जिससे इनके खाने-पीने की, रहने की, स्वास्थ्य और शिक्षा की सारी समस्याएं हल की जा सकें। मुझे विश्वास है कि गवर्नमेंट देश के हित में, अपने हित में, मानवता के हित में और लोकतंत्र के हित में अगर सिसियर है तो उसे झक मार कर ऐसा करना पड़ेगा अन्यथा इस समस्या का हल नहीं होने का।

कुछ समस्याएं हैं जिनका अभिभाषण में वास्तव में कोई जिक्र नहीं है मिसाल के तौर पर मद्यनिषेध का जो स्वर्गीय बापू का स्वप्न था। आज मुझे कहते हुए शर्म मालूम होती है कि एक-दो प्रान्तों

में हमारी कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट ने इतनी ढील डाल दी है कि चाहे जितनी पियो, हालांकि जब प्रतिबन्ध लगा हुआ था तब भी, लोग कहते हैं कि गलियों में मिल जाती थी, नालियों में मिल जाती थी। शराब की खुली छूट भी कहीं-कहीं हो गई है। राजधानी में, जो गवर्नमेंट की नाक के तले है, शराब के कारण आपने देखा है 1 जनवरी को क्या क्या उत्पात मचा था। मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि नशाबन्दी के बारे में अभिभाषण में कोई जिक्र नहीं है जबकि होना चाहिए था। हम बापू की शताब्दी मनाने जा रहे हैं, बापू की शताब्दी से भी ऐसा ही खिलवाड़ होगा जैसे त्योहारों में हुआ करता है या और जयन्तियां मनाने में हुआ करता है। सिर्फ कुछ करोड़ रुपए की आमदनी की खातिर ही उस पर प्रतिबन्ध नहीं लगाते। आपको मालूम है कि जो शराब पीते हैं उनका जीवन कैसा बन जाता है। जहां शराब नहीं मिलती वहां लोग स्पिरिट पीते हैं, और जहरीली चीजें पीते हैं। आपने पत्रों में पड़ा होगा कि मद्रास में कितने लोग मर गए और क्या किया उन्होंने।

श्री ओम् मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर) :
वार्निश।

डा० धर्म प्रकाश : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आपको इस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहिए और इसमें इसका जिक्र आना चाहिए था।

इसके अलावा देश में एक और समस्या है। 20 साल के अन्दर आपने देखा है कि गली-कूचे में लोग भीख मांगते

फिरते हैं। भीख कैसे लोग मांगते फिरते हैं एक जो बहुत हट्टे-कट्टे हैं और कुछ साधू के बेश में होते हैं कुछ अपना हाल ऐसा बना लेते हैं कि दया आ जाय। मैं ये समस्याएं इसलिए सामने रख रहा हूँ कि हम समाजवाद का नारा लगाते हैं, समता और समानता के गीत गाते हैं लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि जब कड़ाके की सर्दी पड़ती है तो इसी दिल्ली में बहुत सी मौतें इसलिए हो जाती है कि उनके तन पर कपड़ा नहीं और साया नहीं कि वे लेट कर सो सकें। ऐसे लोग मरे हैं, पेपर्स में निकला है। तो मैं आपसे पूछता हूँ कि इन भिखमंगों के लिए क्या गवर्नमेंट के दिल में कोई दर्द नहीं है, क्या कोई प्रतिबन्ध लगा कर ऐसा नहीं कर सकती कि जो अपाहिज हैं उनके लिए एक आश्रम जैसा बना दिया जाय जहां उन्हें रोटी-कपड़ा दिया जाय, और जो हट्टे-कट्टे हैं उन्हें काम दिया जाय, नहीं तो जेलखाने भेज दिया जाय। इसमें साधू भी आते हैं गैर-साधू भी आते हैं।

इसके अलावा एक प्रथा जो सदियों से हमें कलंकित करती आई है—खासकर महिला समाज के लिए—वह है वेश्यावृत्ति। मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरफ न ध्यान है, न इसका कोई जिक्र है। समाज कल्याण विभाग की तरफ से महिलाओं में कुछ काम होता है, कुछ इधर-उधर भागी हुई स्त्रियाँ, या अपाहिज या अनाथ स्त्रियाँ मिलीं तो कोई आश्रम खोल दिया। क्या हमसे इतने बड़े समाज का जो कलंक है वह धुल जायगा। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव है कि वेश्यावृत्ति बन्द करने के उपाय फौरन काम में लाने चाहियें। मैं एक सुझाव भी देता हूँ, मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इस पर ध्यान दे और वह यह है कि एक ऐसा कानून बना दे कि अमुक आयु तक कोई औरत वेश्या न बन सके और कोई

व्यक्ति साधु न बन सके। इस समस्या का भी समाधान गवर्नमेंट को करना पड़ेगा अन्यथा हमारा नारा, नारा ही रहेगा, समाज अस्त-व्यस्त रहगा और मानवता नाहि-नाहि करती रहेगी।

अन्त में मैं उपसभापति महोदया को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने मुझे मौका दिया यह सब कुछ विचार करने के लिए अन्यथा जैसा चल रहा है वैसा चल रहा है। मुझे आशा है कि मैंने जो सुझाव दिए हैं उन पर सरकार गौर करेगी। मैं आपसे एक बात कह करके बैठना चाहता हूँ कि जितने लोकतंत्री दल हैं उनको परस्पर मतभेद भुला कर इस समय एक होने की आवश्यकता है। तभी आप उस अशान्ति से मुकाबला कर सकेंगे जो आपके देश में पैदा हो चुकी है। अगर अलग अलग अपनी अपनी ढपली, अपना राग अलापते रहेंगे तो यह खतरा बढ़ कर रहेगा और इसकी रोकथाम करना गवर्नमेंट के बस में नहीं होगा, गवर्नमेंट अपने को असहाय पायेगी, जिस प्रकार कि मद्रास में हुआ। इसलिए मैं अपील करता हूँ कि जितने लोकतंत्री दल हैं अथवा जो स्वतंत्र लोग हैं और लोकतंत्र में विश्वास करते हैं, वे लोकतंत्र की रक्षा के लिए, शांति की रक्षा के लिए एक हो जायें, यही मेरा अनुरोध है।

श्री महाबीर दास : एक इनफारमेशन आपको दे दूँ कि वेश्यावृत्ति खत्म करने के लिए कानून बन चुका है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Telugu?

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY: (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, may I with your permission speak in Telugu?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you speak in that language, you must give the English script of your speech.

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY:
I shall give it afterwards.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may pass it on.

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY:
All right.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is going to speak in Telugu. I hope the speech will not exceed fifteen minutes.

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY:
It will not.

*[Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks moved by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Mirdha.

The steps the Government of India are taking to defend our borders from our enemies deserve all appreciation. But I feel that complacency is a dangerous thing in the matter of national security. Hence eternal vigilance is called for regarding the security of our nation. Eternal vigilance not only on the borders but also inside the country to curb the fifth column activities is very essential. We cannot and should not forget the fact that agents of Pakistan as well as Chinese Agents are active in our country trying to disrupt our economy as well as endanger our security. Hence the stress on this aspect of national security. I am confident that our Armed Personnel are capable of defending our country in case of emergency.

The President's Address rightly lays stress on the agricultural production aspect. Greater production can be achieved only by supply of enough fertilisers and good seed and enough credit to the farmer. The farmers like the Jawans are prepared to undergo any amount of hardships to produce more in order to feed the

nation. But at every level of procuring credit, getting fertilizers in time the farmer is encountering any number of difficulties from the bureaucratic machinery that is controlling the administration today. I am glad that now at least the necessity of giving a remunerative price for the agricultural produce has been recognised. It is this incentive that will make the farmer to exert his utmost to produce more.

The latest varieties of high-yielding seed are giving good results, thanks to the research scientists in this field. My own experience of cultivation by my family is that these high-yielding varieties give us nearly thrice the produce that we get by other ordinary seeds.

The Government of India must give top priority for production and supply of electric power to the farmers, no matter what the cost is. Electricity supply to the farmers should not be made a matter of loss and profit like a commercial concern. If we take any advanced nation like the U.S.S.R. or America they have given top priority for expansion of electricity along with education. Andhra State is mainly an agricultural State. It produces rice and supplies to other States also. From 1962 up to today it has supplied 16 lakhs of tonnes of rice to the Central Pool. Why then is it that the Government of India is not prepared to spend more money on the Nagarjuna Sagar Project, so that more foodgrains can be produced? Even in this year's allocation of funds to Andhra Pradesh I learn the Government of India is cutting down Rs. 20 crores. Is it a penalty for supplying the much-needed rice? The Government of India must not cut this allocation of funds from Rs. 57 crores to Rs. 37 crores to Andhra Pradesh. Moreover, if the Centre can give a loan of Rs. 10 crores per year purely for the development of schemes for food production, Andhra Pradesh can supply one lakh of tonnes of rice extra every year than the preceding year to the Centre.

*[] English translation of the Telugu speech as given by the hon. Member.

[Shri Y. Adinarayana Reddy.]

Madam, the country is facing any number of troubles like the Bengal crisis, the Assam troubles, the border troubles with Pakistan and China, the Naga and Mizo troubles. In addition to all these troubles the language trouble has done greater damage to the entire country. The language trouble is the creation of certain fanatical forces both pro-Hindi and anti-Hindi. Greater responsibility lies on the shoulders of the Hindi protagonists because no language can be forced down the throats of an unwilling section of the people even if they are a small minority and non-Hindi people are not a small minority. I am one who believes that we must have a national language and that national language can be only Hindi. But at the same time I cannot agree with those who want to give a go-by to English. To say "do away with English" is nothing short of madness. English is a world language. Not only that. More than 60 per cent of the books on Science and Technology in the world are in English according to recent statistics, with Russian books having 20 per cent, and no other language in the world has more than 5 per cent of these books in their own language. When such is the case, who loses by decrying English? It is not the English language that suffers but it is we who will suffer by giving up a universal language.

Added to this some people in Hindi areas went to the extreme by removing the universal numerals and replacing them with Devanagary Numerals. It has been published in some weeklies that some Central Ministers also have changed their car numbers from universal numerals into the Devanagary numerals.

Then the other extreme is the attitude of the Madras Government which is not acceptable to any of us. Provocation results in retaliation and it is not good for either side.]

232 RSD.—5

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Do you not accept the three language formula?

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY: I want that to be implemented.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: What about the resolution passed by the Assembly?

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY: I am talking in Telugu. If I reply in Telugu, you would not understand.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Madras): There is a Minister who knows Telugu.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are many Members also who know Telugu.

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY: Some opposition Members also know Telugu.

*[Any language can grow only when it has the capacity to adopt simple words from other languages also. If such simple words like "Railway Signal" have to be translated into Hindi or any other language, and pronounced "Dhumasakata Gamana-gamana Suchi Lohapatti", then it is the limit for language fanaticism. If language is not for understanding one another, what for is a language?]

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): In which book?

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY: It is the translation that has been made.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Nowhere. (Interruption).

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY: Please do not interrupt me. Let me finish.

[] English translation of the Telugu speech as given by the hon Member.

[Shri Y. Adinaryana Reddy]

1 P.M.

*[The crux of the language trouble seems to be regarding the recruitment to the Central Services. Then it should not be difficult to solve the issue because the Central Government can easily fix the quota of Central jobs for each State on an equitable basis having the population as the basis. The present issue specially concerns the student population very much in the South and one has to deal with them very delicately. Hence the Government of India must take up the issue and see that the three language formula is strictly implemented by all States and the problems of recruiting the Central Services is decided upon as early as possible.]

Now, Madam, the creation of a new machinery like Lokpal and Lokayukta may be good in themselves. But I wonder what has the present administrative machinery been doing all these 20 years. We are trying to create a new administrative machinery to enquire and set right the wrongs committed by the old bureaucratic machinery. I doubt very much whether this will not add to the already top-heavy administrative machinery that we are having, spending more than 50 per cent. of our national income in maintaining it. Today we are having more jobs and officers than the nation can bear. Still in every department the work is pending. Why is it so? We are not going into these things thoroughly. We are only trying to touch the outer crust of these problems and difficulties in running an efficient administration and not talking the core of the problem.

Only one minute about Vietnam. It will be quite appropriate on our part to congratulate the heroic people of Vietnam who are fighting for their freedom against the monstrous

and barbaric warlords of America. Even after these recent events and after fifteen years of hanging if the American militarists do not understand the strong will of the people of Vietnam to live as a free country, then nobody on earth can save the warlords of America from going the way of Hitler and Mussolini. I hope that President Johnson will realise at least now that however big and powerful an army he might have, the will of the freedom-loving nation as a whole cannot be conquered by bullets and bombs alone. It is good that our Prime Minister made it clear that a solution can be possible for the Vietnam war only when the Americans stop bombing unconditionally and it is a God-sent opportunity for President Johnson to pull out of the Vietnam war.]

(The hon. Member there began
(speaking in English))

One word in English about Sheikh Abdullah. I have not written it in my script here. Sheikh Abdullah has been released now that the emergency is over and he could not be kept in detention. That we understand. But today what is the nationality of Sheikh Abdullah? Is he claiming himself to be an Indian citizen? He does not claim that he is an Indian national. It has been recently published—I received it today and somebody asked him at an interview, "Are you an Indian national?" And his reply was, "I am not going to reply to this question". That means he is not accepting that he is an Indian national. When he is not an Indian national, I do not see any reason for the Government to keep him in India at all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Yashoda Reddy. In Telugu?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, it is rather embarrassing for me to take the chance immediately after my

*[English translation of the Telugu speech as given by the hon. Member.]

friend from Andhra Pradesh who has spoken in Telugu. I must confess that I am going to speak in English for this simple reason. Whatever I want to say, I would like my friends to understand. And the second reason is why I am going to speak in English is this. With all the tolerance they have they say of my hon. friends for all the 14 languages, I could see their restlessness and impatience when a Member was speaking in Telugu.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS No. no.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): I strongly repudiate this statement. We were so glad but then our desire was that that sweet language must come also out of a sweet mouth.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Madam, I know that Mr. B. K. P. Sinha is a very chivalrous man. But sometimes his chivalry is out of place. This is not the place for him to pay a compliment to anybody, even if it were myself Madam, at least deduct two minutes from my time.

Madam, at the fag end of the four days' Debate on the President's Address I do not know what I should speak. But whatever is just uppermost in my mind about two or three problems, I would like to place my comments on.

First of all I would like to refer to the Rann of Kutch and the International Award. I am doing this, Madam, after two speeches, one, the brilliant speech of Mr. Chagla yesterday which was much appreciated by everybody, and the reference to it made by Mr. Banka Behary Das. Madam, we all feel sorry at the results of the Award given by the International Tribunal and I do feel that just like the Kashmir matter the echo of it is found in Kutch. Both the times Pakistan in its design and strategy and the results it got both the times have been the same. Both

the times the Government of India in its very idealistic state of believing that justice will be done went to the International forums and both the times our International Judges have been extremely generous in handing over the property that did not belong to the other party, but which belonged entirely to India. Now the question is not whether we have been wise enough to allow this matter to go to the International Tribunal. The time for such a question was at the time when it was referred to the Tribunal. It was at that time we should have said that we should not go. But Parliament in its wisdom did allow the Government of India to go and place this matter before the International Tribunal. And, Madam, when we did go, we absolutely said that whatever may be the decision, right or wrong, we are going to abide by it.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHAN-
DARI: Even this much has been said, "right or wrong".

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Maybe the words are not exactly these. But we said that whatever may be the decision we will abide by it. The only point now to be considered is, should we or should we not accept this? My feeling is that though morally injustice might have been done, today we cannot back out from it for many reasons. Much as I feel that they are giving away a portion of our land—and I think I am as patriotic as my hon. friends on the other side or this side. It hurts me still for a variety of reasons I would say we should not wriggle out of it.

Madam, yesterday the honourable Mr. Chagla said that it is more a political decision than a judicial decision. Maybe he is right. I think he is right. But are we to question whether it is a political decision or a judicial decision? Once a decision is given it is a decision, and we ought to have known that we would get only a political decision and not a judicial

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]

decision. (*Interruption.*) Are we going to compare ourselves with Pakistan? Is Pakistan going to be a standard for us? I leave it to the hon'ble Member to decide.

AN HON MEMBER: Are you distressed?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am as much worried as you are. Still I only appeal to my friend to accept it, excepting that if there are some factors which the Government of India may find after going through the full award they may place before Parliament and then we may question it. Otherwise it is a question of morality and international dignity and we have to accept this international decision however distressing it may be for us.

But, Madam, I would like the Government of India to know that they have never learnt a lesson. But will we ever learn it? That is my trouble? About Kashmir we knew and everybody cautioned but what did we learn? Second time again we have committed the same mistake. At least now let the Government of India realise that hereafter we should rely entirely on our own strength, economic and military, to defend our own frontiers. Let us not place our just causes at the fickle patronage of our International Tribunal. That is all I have to say in this connection, Madam.

One word about West Bengal. I welcome the decision of the Government of India though very belated; it should have come much earlier. The way things were going on in West Bengal is no credit to any party. It was no credit to any Government. It was no credit to our proclaimed principles of democracy. Whether it was the Congress or the other parties, the way they handled the affairs of West Bengal has been a matter of shame. Madam, I am not here to discuss the whole background and the political situation. But I would like to say one or two things.

Madam, whatever might be said about the Governor, Mr. Dharma Vira, one thing which certainly hurts me is the way he was sneaked into the Legislature to place his Address. He should have realised that the things were against him. I am not saying who is right or who is wrong. But certainly it was not dignified for the head of the State to sneak into the assembly.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): He was over-zealous.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am not commenting. It hurts my sense of dignity and decency that the Governor of a State should have done that. Why I have brought up this question of West Bengal is because West Bengal is under the Central Government.

In this connection I would like the Government and Parliament to consider one point, and that is about the privileges of the Legislature and the duties of the Presiding Officer. I am not here to condemn or praise the actions of the Speaker, I have no right to do that. But when Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said, "Here was a man who just upheld the principles of democracy. Here was a man who did everything to keep up the banner of democracy flying", all that I have got to say is that I beg to differ from him. The least I can say is that the way the Presiding Officer behaved was not dignified either for the Assembly or the Parliamentary democracy. We have to examine one or two things here. Here one gentleman arrogated to himself the powers which were not in him to put an end to all the democratic principles, the working of the Legislature and the right of the elected representatives in the State from functioning. Madam I would like the Government of India and Parliament to see whether we can do anything about it. Here in India the powers of the Speaker, we know, are more or less the powers of the Speaker of the House of Commons. He can adjourn the House in the House of Commons only on two occasions, that is,

if there is no quorum or if there is very disorderly behaviour. In the rules of the Lok Sabha there is the special power of the Speaker to adjourn the House *sine die* also but no specific clarification has been made. And because of the Lok Sabha's rulings the Speaker in the States also have been adjourning the House *sine die*. This power to adjourn the House *sine die*, the Speaker of the West Bengal Assembly has used in such a way where we know what the results are. I would only appeal to the Government and Parliament to look into these things and see whether we can do anything, whether to codify, or not to codify. I am not worried whether today it is the Congress Government or tomorrow it is going to be a non-Congress Government. But you cannot put the whole Legislature to ransom, or the Parliament, for that matter. Otherwise, tomorrow somebody may take into his/her head to say that this is going to happen and nothing will be allowed to oppose it. Therefore, Parliament has to look into the whole thing. If the Government of India, the Law Ministry or even the Secretariats of both the Houses could sit together and evolve some sort of solution in this matter, I think it is a thing which should be looked into.

Lastly, Madam, I did not want to say about one problem which has been in my mind, that is, language. But there are two reasons which impel me to speak on this issue. The friend who spoke just before me and the presence of Mrs. Gandhi have made me refer to this problem.

Madam, I have heard for the last five days, and more than half the number of Members who spoke in this House invariably referred to the language question, to the Official Languages Act, that was passed in the last session and to the results which have happened thereafter. Madam, before I comment on that, let me say, I condemn all the actions of the students and the political goondas who are taking this occasion, whether it

was in Madras, whether it was in Andhra or whether it was in Mysore, to do damage to the lives and property of the people.

Madam, I would like to take this opportunity to make a sincere appeal to my young friends in the South that if they want to achieve anything they should not resort to violence. It is not by violence that they are going to achieve anything. It is only by trying to convert the hearts of the people who are here that they will achieve anything. It is not by force but by pleading their case in a better way that they will achieve what they want. Here I would like to say one thing about the Chief Minister of Madras. How did he allow the national flag to be burnt and the Constitution to be burnt? I know he has arrested those responsible for it. But it is the responsibility of the Chief Minister of a State to see that these things do not happen. In this connection, I must congratulate the Prime Minister of India for one thing. When the Chief Minister of Madras said "Don't come to my State", one of our other Ministers hesitated, but Mrs. Indira Gandhi did not hesitate and she went there. And I congratulate her for that. That is the way to face a situation. If you are convinced of yourself, if you are convinced that you are with the people. She did the best thing. Now that she is here, I must congratulate her. She has done a very good thing.

In this connection, I would like to ask "Are we here to judge the students?" We, Members of Parliament, talk in terms of principles and pious platitudes. But how did some Members behave when the President came to address both the Houses of Parliament? Shameful. (Inter-*ruption*). Whoever it was; we know better. They talk about the law and order situation in the country. They come here and say. "The students have done this. The political parties have done this, they have defied that" and so on. But what did hon. Members of Parliament do, the so-called

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

Leaders of big parties, who have spent absolutely all their lives in Parliament? It was worse in a way than defaming the national flag. It was worse, I can say, than burning the Constitution, because boys might have been misled, but there is no excuse for Members of Parliament who have insulted the dignity of the Parliament and the Head of the State. Madam, I am very much hurt by this. (Interruption.) Madam, when some facts are said, people come out with curious reactions; and I can only say that it is the guilty conscience that pricks their mind, nothing else.

Madam, let me come back to the language question. It has worried me a lot. The hon. Prime Minister and the Home Minister know that for almost 20 days—morning, noon and night—I appealed to them. “Please do not rush through this Resolution” Madam, I do not know whether I am proud of it or not, I was a bit indisciplined when I did not vote for the Resolution. But it gave me a consolation that I knew that I was doing something right. Today, the Chief Ministers of the Southern States—even the Chief Minister of Andhra and of Mysore and Madras and other people—are appealing to the Government of India to go in for an amendment, or at least to keep the working of the Resolution in abeyance. But what has surprised me is why this thing did not come earlier. Why were they not aware of it earlier? I heard for the last four days many number of Members criticising the Resolution. But why did they not do it earlier? How much trouble we would have saved. Even now it is not too late if they can only try to convince people and bring about a consensus of all parties, which they should have done much earlier. When I appealed to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister last time to at least postpone the voting on the debate by three or four days so that they could get the Chief Ministers of

the non-Hindi States together and try to get a compromise, neither did they listen, nor would the Hindi friends allow them . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Let me finish. I have waited for four days. So what hurt me most was that when I appealed to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, they agreed with me, but they said they had to yield to political pressures. Madam, are we going to rule this country with political pressures or by practical politics? Madam, one thing which I must bring to the notice of the Prime Minister, is, she was very sympathetic, but it hurt me very much when she went to Rae Bareilly immediately after the Parliament session and said, “Why are you people in U.P. and Bihar worried? Why are you agitating? It is under your pressure that we brought in the amendment?” . . .

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No no; not pressure.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: May be not pressure, but at least “to please you we brought this amendment.” I am prepared to bring and show the quotation. I am speaking now subject to correction. Madam, I want to bring to your notice that in the South, it gave to our people a feeling that because of the pressure from the Hindi people, these things could not be done. And there is no denial of the fact that there was pressure. I know the reactions of the people in the Hindi States. Now, Ganga Sharan Babu is one of those people whose sincerity for the cause of Hindi cannot be doubted. He was reasonable, tolerant and he knew the implications and what was going to happen. He knew that he should carry the non-Hindi people with him. I am saying that because I appreciate that kind of attitude

It is not the attitude of people who say, "No, we do not want English." Madam, when they say 'imposition of English on them' I may tell them that there is difference between imposition of Hindi and what they call 'imposition of English'. When you impose Hindi, it is a new language for us . . .

श्री हरद्वर पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश):
एक सवाल आपसे पूछा है। जो राष्ट्रीय ध्वज जलाया गया और राष्ट्रीय गान का बहिष्कार किया गया, उस पर आपका क्या रिएक्शन है?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY:
Madam, he did not understand my English.

मैंने बताया मुझे शर्म आ रही है, दुख हो रहा है और और जो कुछ किया है उन लोगों ने उसको हम कंडम कर रहे हैं। मगर आपको अंग्रेजी नहीं मालूम है। मैं यह पहले बोली कि हमारा देश हो, स्टेट हो, चोफ मिनिस्टर हो, स्टूडेंट हो, पोलिटिकल गुडा हो, जिसने यह किया उसको मैं कंडम कर रही हूँ।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश): आप हिन्दी में बोला कीजिय ताकि सब समझे।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY:
हिन्दी में बोलूँ तो आप का समझ में नहीं आयेगा।

Madam, what I wanted to say was that if you ask us to learn Hindi, it is imposition but when we ask them to retain the knowledge of English it is not imposition of the same nature. That is the suitable difference that they must note. We are asking them only to retain English which they had been having for so many years, till such time we could be proficient in Hindi and it could become a link language. But what did U.P. do? "Remove English, including the typewriters." And what has Madras done? Not that I appreciate what Madras has done, I do not appreciate

it, but that was the only way to make you people understand, and that was the only way to make you realise their feelings. Otherwise, you would not have realised to this extent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY:
I cannot wind up without developing my argument. Otherwise they will misunderstand me.

I said I did not appreciate what Madras has done. I do not appreciate anybody saying, "We do not want Hindi." But I do appreciate their action to this extent that if they had not gone to this extreme extent, people in Delhi would not have realised the feelings of the non-Hindi people. To what extent you must appreciate it. That is my opinion.

Now, Madam, if to-day Madras does not take to Hindi and by any chance, the other Southern States also do not take to Hindi, and people in the North give up English, how are you going to have a link language? Should we not have a link language? Now about the three-language formula, our Andhra Assembly has unanimously agreed to it. But which State in the North is having this three-language formula? Which State will have it when you say that for the Central Services "You learn English or Hindi as you like." Which fool will learn three languages? No person with any sense will learn three languages unless you say that compulsory knowledge of both English and Hindi is necessary. I do not love Hindi less than I love English, nor do I love English more. But if you want to retain the unity of the nation, you must make both the languages compulsory, otherwise, there cannot be unity in the country. Madam, people condemn Madras, but I will ask the Prime Minister,

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

who is sitting here, and the Home Minister, "Why do you permit number-plates on cars with Hindi numerals? Why don't you take action? I think under the Motor Vehicles Act and the Constitution, it is illegal to have number-plates with any form of numerals other than the international numerals. But, what is the Government doing? Right in the Home Ministry, right on the Home Minister's car, you see Hindi numerals. I am only saying that you have no guts and you only want to yield to political pressure and satisfy some fanatics, whether Hindi or English. If you want to defy your own rules and regulations, how are you going to check the illegal actions of the people in burning the Constitution and the National Flag in the States? Change the rules if you want but do not allow anything which is against the rules. If the Home Minister's car carries a Hindi number-plate, how are you going to question the illegal acts elsewhere? (Interruption.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: That is all I wanted to say, Madam.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Madam Deputy Chairman, our country is facing a number of problems and it was expected that the President in his Address would suggest some ways and means to solve them. But unfortunately the President in his Address, has not indicated how to solve all those important problems that are faced by the country. Madam, whether it is the food situation, whether it is industrial production or whether it is a question of national unity and integrity, we have to face a number of problems. It has been mentioned by the President that there is improvement so far as food production is concerned. No doubt there is a tremendous increase in food produc-

tion but what about the prices of foodgrains? I must say that in spite of the bumper crop this year, the prices of foodgrains have not been brought down. Even now the foodgrains are being sold in the market at higher prices. Ultimately the poor people in this country have to suffer. Whatever good results we had in the sphere of agriculture, they were due to the good weather that we had in this country. Of course, I am fully aware of the efforts made by the Government also but if we become complacent, perhaps it will not be possible for us to produce good results in the future as we have been able to do this year, because the weather may not be as favourable as it has been this year. Therefore, the Government should not be complacent and it should try to persevere in this matter and take every possible step, whether it is in the matter of irrigation, providing better seeds, manures and fertilisers, or in some other matters. In all directions efforts should be made so that food production continues to be good every year. Then mere production of foodgrains is not enough. Efforts should also be made to bring down the prices. Even though there has been a bumper crop this year, we have retained the food zones. I think as long as we are retaining these zones or the zonal system, it will not be possible to bring down the prices of foodgrains. We note that in certain States the prices of foodgrains have tremendously come down and the Government has intervened or stepped in to procure or purchase foodgrains so that the prices of the foodgrains do not come down below the floor price. On the other hand, there are certain other States where we have to pay higher prices for the foodgrains. Therefore, I would suggest that these food zones should be abolished immediately.

The next question is about unemployment in this country. Some years back we were informed that there was unemployment only among the

uneducated people and we were always advised that the younger generation should pay more attention to technical and scientific education. But when the students have spent their invaluable time and money in studying technical and scientific subjects, we find today that a large number of engineers are unemployed. The number of unemployed engineers is going up every year. The live register which is maintained by the Employment Exchange throughout the country gives the following figures. In December, 1965, the number of unemployed engineers on an average was 17,004. In June, 1966 it rose to 18,894. In December, 1966 the number was 25,389 and in June, 1967 the number was 27,945. This only indicates that there is still large-scale unemployment among the educated and technical personnel. A suggestion has been made in certain quarters that with a view to check unemployment among the engineers the admission to the engineering and science colleges should be restricted. But I this problem. On the contrary, scientific and technical education should be freely given to all those people who want to have it.

Then, Madam, the question of language was discussed in this House. A number of Members have referred to this problem. During the last Session I had mentioned that the question of Hindi is not so important. The question of paramount importance is the unity and integrity of this country. If you want to maintain the unity and integrity of this country, then it is essential to get the support of the non-Hindi speaking people. What do we find here? As was pointed out by Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, all the four States in the South are opposed to the policy of the Government. What the Government should have done before bringing forward the Bill and the Resolution on the language question is that it should have tried to contact all the parties to the language dispute, all the political parties and

tried to evolve a common policy which would have been acceptable to all the concerned persons. But instead of doing so the Government and the Prime Minister have yielded to pressure after pressure. When there was pressure from the Hindi-speaking people, the Prime Minister yielded to them. When there was pressure from the non-Hindi speaking people, the Prime Minister yielded to them. Therefore instead of having one very good and cogent policy, so far as the language issue is concerned, we have yielded to each and every person and ultimately the Government and the Prime Minister could not satisfy anybody. Now what should be the policy today? I would suggest that a round table conference of all those persons concerned and the representatives of all the political parties in this country should be convened as early as possible. Otherwise it will be very difficult for us to maintain the unity and integrity of this country. Some people have suggested that Sanskrit should be made the official language. It has been pointed out by others that Sanskrit is a dead language. Whether it is dead or not, I do not want to enter into that controversy. But I must point out that Sanskrit was never the people's language. It was a language spoken by one or two per cent of the people. In this country the people's languages were Pali and Prakrit. Sanskrit was never spoken by the people. On the contrary I will say that Sanskrit was utilised to enslave the majority of the masses in this country. Therefore Sanskrit can never be the official language of this country.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Pali?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: It does not matter. You can have Pali or Prakrit but that will also not solve the controversy over this question. If you want to solve the language problem, if you want to maintain the unity and integrity of the country, you must have the three-language formula and that is the only solution in the present circumstances.

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

The controversy cannot be resolved by having Sanskrit or Pali or Prakrit as the official language. It is not enough to say that we should have the three-language formula but effort should be made honestly first by the Hindi speaking people to implement the three-language formula in practice. The three-language formula was there since the last ten years and the non-Hindi speaking people have tried to implement it. You go to Kerala and you will find a number of young children speaking in Hindi and they can compete easily with the children from the Hindi-speaking areas. But may I ask, how many Hindi-speaking people have learnt any other language than Hindi—be it Marathi, Tamil or Bengali? The Hindi-speaking States have never tried to implement it. Therefore, if you want to solve the language problem, if you want to maintain the integrity of the country it is essential that you should have the three-language formula. That is the only possible solution at the moment.

I would refer to another question and that is regarding the Kutch Award. We are greatly shocked to hear the Award of the Tribunal. Of course some Members have said that since this dispute was referred as per agreement to the Tribunal, for arbitration, it is not desirable now to go back on our promise and so we should try to accept the Award. I would like to ask, who had agreed to refer this question to the Tribunal? It was only the party in power because of the brute majority it had at that time, the Government agreed to refer this issue to Tribunal. So far as the Opposition parties were concerned, all were opposed and they said that this dispute should not be referred to the Tribunal. It does not matter now. Once it was referred, the Award has been given. But we have to see now whether this Award is judicious or not. In my humble opinion the Award is of a political nature and not of a judicious nature

and therefore it is not binding on India that it should accept this Award. What is the basis of the Award? As it has been mentioned by the Chairman of the Tribunal, the basis of the Award was the extent of sovereignty over the area on the eve of independence. It is quite clear that at the time of independence when this country was divided into two sovereign States of India and Pakistan, this area came to India. Therefore when this area came to India and was with us for the last 15 years, till the controversy was raised by Pakistan. It means that this country had sovereignty over that area. Therefore, when our sovereignty was over the area, there can be no other Award except that it belongs to India. Therefore, when the basis of this Award was the sovereignty exercised over that land and if it is proved that India exercised that sovereignty, then it must be said that the Award is not judicious and not a proper one. It is also mentioned in the Award that if the decision is not taken as it has been taken, then perhaps there might be a threat to peace and tranquillity in that area. This is what the Chairman of the Tribunal has said in the Award. So it means that the Chairman was more worried about the peace and tranquillity in that area and not about the legality of India's position and therefore, I would suggest that the Award is not based on any legal finding or it is not a judicious one and it is only a political Award and therefore I would submit that this should not be accepted.

When the Award on Kutch has gone against India, most of the persons say here that it should not be accepted. What about the Mahajan Commission's Report? That Commission was appointed to go into the border disputes between Maharashtra and Mysore. I can say that the Mahajan Commission's Report is more arbitrary than the Award on Kutch.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): No.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: If Members go through the report, they will find that it most arbitrary, unprincipled, illogical and contrary to the relevant facts and documents on record. Whatever yardstick the Commission adopted in the beginning of the report, he could not stick to that later in the same report. This is what the Commission has said:

"No formula can be rigidly implemented and there can be no scientific approach in such matters."

So they did not want to adopt any proper or scientific approach. This has been mentioned in the report.

Later on the report says:

"On a proper construction of the charter appointing the One-Man Commission the inference is clear that the Commission has been told to settle the disputes principally on the ground of linguistic considerations as the States in India have been broadly re-organised on that basis".

So in the beginning of the report the Commission says that the principle should be the linguistic principle but having said that, at the next moment, the Commission has discarded that principle and given a different Award. So the Mahajan Commission's report is most arbitrary and not a judicious Award. We have faced two or three elections in that disputed area and on each and every occasion the people there have clearly indicated that they want that area to be merged with Maharashtra. So there should be no difficulty in merging that area with Maharashtra. What should be the solution to this border dispute? We tried to solve the border dispute between Kerala and Madras by adopting the Pataskar formula—that is—the village should be the unit, that there should be contiguity between two different areas and the language spoken by the majority of the people in that area should be considered. These principles were set

out by Mr. Pataskar and he very easily solved the problem. The same could be applied here, namely, the language of the majority of the people living in the area, whether the area is contiguous with other areas, etc. All these factors should be taken into consideration and the problem should be so solved. The Congress Government has stated that they will try to find a national consensus to solve this problem I am glad that they have so decided but in trying to solve this dispute, they should see that no injustice is done to Maharashtra.

Finally I would bring to the notice of the Government the atrocities perpetrated against the Scheduled Castes in this country. During the past four or five days, several Members have spoken here but not a single Member has referred to the problems of the Scheduled Castes. Are we to understand that it is the mentality of the Caste Hindus here in the House that even when people belonging to the Scheduled Castes are being murdered brutally and when there are riots in Madhya Pradesh and in U.P., no Member is going to refer to that question? I would like to say that the Government should pay attention to this problem also and try to solve the problem of the Scheduled Caste people.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Baharul Islam from Assam.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM (Assam): I am very thankful to you for giving me this opportunity but I hope you will kindly give me full time because I come from Gauhati town where the riotous incidents took place.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The full time is fifteen minutes.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: I associate myself with the thanks offered to the President for his Address to us and proceed with my speech and in it, as the time is short, I shall con-

fine myself only to the incidents that took place in Gauhati on the 26th of January last. The incidents that took place in Gauhati on the Republic Day have drawn the attention of the people of the country and different versions have been given by different sets of people as to the nature of the incidents and the causes thereof. I condemn with all the force at my command what has happened in Gauhati and Bijoynagar on the last Republic Day. As a matter of fact all sections of the people including students' organisations have condemned it. I shall now give you a very brief idea about the nature of the incidents that took place on the 26th of January last. There was a procession that started at Judges' Field where the official National Flag was going to be hoisted. The students tried their utmost to see that the flag was not hoisted, and failing that they took the procession on to Fancy Bazar via Gauhati thana. There also, near the Goenka Traders, they tried to bring down the National Flag. At that time a trader fired three blank shots. At this the students became afraid and they were dispersing. Here my findings are very similar to the findings of the special representative of the Statesman. After passing the Gauhati thana the processionists entered the Fancy Bazar area. Near Gauhati Traders a trader fired three blank shots. The fire unnerved the mob and it withdrew. Shop-owners and their servants appeared and said that they would beat back the mob. There was panic as word spread that Marwaris were going to beat the students. So the mob now arrived with sticks and bars and surged forward, but again halted. The shop-keepers' men started throwing brickbats, which fell on the police and the mob alike. At this stage a report got round that Marwaris had attacked and beaten some Assamese. At several points trucks, cars and jeeps were set on fire by the mob. Arson and looting

were confined to a few streets in Fancy Bazar, Athgaon and the cycle factory.

The town of Gauhati covers a lot of territory. The curfew area was 20 square miles. The area where riot took place was less than one-tenth of it. Most of the shopping areas were not touched by the rioters, who did not dare to enter the Marwar area of Fancy Bazar. Only the fringes were attacked. Some areas belonging to industrialists were set on fire on the eastern part of the city, and one man was assaulted. The rioting in the residential areas was confined to setting trucks, cars and jeeps ablaze. All vehicles belonged to traders and industrialists. There was no rioting anywhere else in Assam and there was no loss of life. There were no incidents after the 26th of January.

It appears from what I have said above that the immediate provocation for the disturbances was given by the blank fires and by the throwing of brickbats by the traders and their men at the processionists, and the miscreants and the bad elements utilised the opportunity. I do not blame the traders for their acts; they had to do that in self-defence.

According to an up-to-date official report, as revealed by a staff reporter of the Assam Tribune, the loss has been estimated at Rs. 85,02,167. The break-up is as follows: Number of families affected—544; of which 29 are Assamese, mostly traders. Number of vehicles damaged—59. Number of houses damaged—184. Number of petrol pumps damaged 12. Number of factories and workshops damaged—17. Number of show houses damaged—1. Central Government property damaged—nil. State Government property damaged—2. State P.W.D. offices. Apparently, the above amount of loss does not include the value of

properties looted. The total loss would certainly be more than that figure of Rs. 85,00,000. Let me come to the causes as to why the attack was directed against traders. The above-mentioned 544 affected families, of which 29 were Assamese, were traders. The reputation of traders in Assam is very low. People believe that they are responsible for blackmarketing, hoarding, artificial scarcity and the consequent high prices, that they take advantage of all natural calamities, such as flood, drought and the like, and that they exploit human miseries and sufferings. The proceedings of the Legislative Assembly show that a lot of grievances arising out of their anti-social conduct have been made by M.L.As. Government have been taken to task for not taking adequate action against them. The local newspapers also have focussed public attention on this.

There has also been frustration among the educated unemployed youths of Assam regarding employment in public as well as private sectors. The traders, almost all of whom are from outside Assam, seldom employ local people. The tea gardens, mostly owned by Europeans before independence, used to employ local people. Now the tea gardens are owned by Indians from outside Assam. They seldom employ local people.

Naturally therefore the Assamese youths are frustrated. Further, their minds as well as the minds of the other people of the State were exercised over the question of reorganisation of Assam. On that fateful day their fury was directed against the traders and industrialists of Gauhati. These traders are both from inside and outside Assam, of course mostly from outside Assam.

Now in support of my contention I beg to read a few lines from Hamdi Boy who is admittedly a non-Assamese, published in the Statesman of February 10, 1968. He says:

"Although the recent riot in Gauhati must be viewed in the context of the general tendency towards violent agitations all over the country, it was different from other disturbances elsewhere in one important respect: the consideration for human life and national property shown by the violent mob.

Nobody was killed or seriously wounded in the deplorable incidents on Republic Day; nor were State or Central Government installations attacked.

In Gauhati however, victims of the riot were members of the higher caste and this fact has importance of its own. Almost all those who were attacked and whose properties looted were industrialists and traders.

To some extent the misdemeanour of the Gauhati rioters has its roots in the fact of Assam being one of the lesser developed States in an under-developed country.

The process of alienation becomes worse because all instruments of change and progress—the capital, techniques and organisation—are under the control of people from outside the State.

The young industrialists and businessmen in Assam whose family origins lie in Rajasthan have over the years tried to 'Assamize' themselves by learning the State language. But they have failed to endear themselves to the local people; they still strike up attitudes which create irritation."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What are you reading from?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: I am quoting from Hamdi Boy's statement in the Statesman of February 10, 1968. Just few more lines.

"It is noteworthy that the industrial units attacked by rioters were

[Shri Baharul Islam]

those about which rightly or wrongly the Assamese have a feeling that they discriminate against local applicants in the matter of appointments and against local employees in the matter of retrenchment."

SHRI TARKESHWAR PANDE: There are three parts of the question.

Please explain why 26th of January was selected. Why? Was there any conspiracy?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Unless he yields you cannot interrupt him.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: I am not yielding

SHRI TARKESHWAR PANDE: Why was the National Flag burnt?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not yielded. Please sit down.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: About the National Flag I will speak later on.

SHRI TARKESHWAR PANDE: What was the Government doing when looting and burning were taking place?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: It is untrue to say that the victims were all outsiders. It is also untrue to say that the miscreants were all Assamese. There were non-Assamese also and they were of different communities too.

It has been alleged that the incidents were pre-meditated and planned and that Mr. Chaliha was behind them. It is a flight of imagination to say so. If they were pre-planned and incited by Mr. Chaliha, the disturbances would have spread all over, throughout the State, and the outsiders driven out. There are outsiders not only in Gauhati but in all towns of Assam, and even in the villages inhabited by the Assamese people. Mr Chaliha, 4 P.M. arrived in Gauhati on the 27th and immediately called a meeting of all political leaders and

traders who were the victims and sought advice as to how best the situation could be controlled. The situation was controlled the very same day and there have been no incidents at all after the 26th January.

It is said in some quarters that the Gauhati disturbances were the result of a parochial outlook of the Assamese people.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you reading from something? Or is it your speech?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: It is my own speech, Madam. It is said in some quarters that the Gauhati disturbances are the result of a parochial outlook of the people of Assam? Pray why do you single out Assam? Why give a bad name and then condemn her alone? What is now happening elsewhere in India? I do not commend parochialism or localism. I hate it. It must be uprooted if India is to survive as a nation, as one nation.

Should we blame our youths and students alone if they misbehave or if they are guilty of certain anti-social activities? Before we do so, let us search our own hearts. How are we, legislators, behaving on the floor of Legislatures? Is it not reprehensible to assault a Governor or a Speaker in the Legislature? Before we condemn anybody, it is high time we parents improve ourselves before we proceed to improve our children

I have said that the fury of the miscreants at Gauhati was directed against the antisocial activities of some traders. I shall be failing in my duty if I do not say that political parties are also responsible for such activities. If political parties do not stop accepting donations from traders, the latter will naturally try to recompensate it by black-marketing and by charging high prices, and that too with our connivance. The result is that the victims of such activities are the people. And the frustrated people at times take

the upper hand and also take the law into their own hands. Things move in a vicious circle.

Then what is the remedy? The remedy lies in removing the causes of friction and for that the entire trade should be taken over by the State or by cooperatives.

An hon. Member of Parliament of the Jan Sangh who visited Gauhati after the disturbances smelt communalism in the causes of the incidents. Another hon. Member of Parliament of the same party thought it wise to say that Shri Fakhruddin was the patron of the Lachit Sena. My advice to them is to read Assam's history and study Assamese society. The Assamese people hate communalism and they have rejected the suggestions of these hon. Members. Thanks are due to the people of Assam.

Yet another hon. Member of Parliament has said—and he is of the Swatantra Party—that Assam's Chief Minister, Shri B. P. Chaliha, has invited the separatist movement of the Ahoms. What for? Is it to bring about his own ruin or to dig his own grave? Before such remarks are made one should know in what high esteem these leaders are held by their people.

Regarding the failure of the local administration on that fateful day, it is true that the local administration at Gauhati temporarily failed to stop the miscreants and to give protection to the victims. But to the credit of the Government there it must be said that first of all, the disturbances were restricted to a very small part of the city.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Marwaris?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: As a matter of fact, Marwaris are there in all the towns of Assam, also in the villages. These disturbances were not allowed to spread to the other parts of the State though as a matter of

fact, the situation in the whole State was volatile. Secondly there has been no loss of human life and few injuries were caused. No Central Government properties were damaged at all. Only two State P.W.D. offices were damaged. The incidents were stopped on the 28th itself and there have been no incidents beyond that day. The Government has already transferred the concerned officers in order to restore confidence among the victims and they have already ordered a judicial inquiry into the whole thing by a High Court Judge.

I may inform hon. Members that the situation is not yet absolutely normal. In order to ease the situation and to make it absolutely normal certain things have to be done. I came from Assam only the night before last, soothing words to the victims and constructive suggestions as to how to restore the shaken confidence and to bring about the lost amity between the different communities are necessary. A large number of communities live in Assam. In fact I would say that a larger number of communities live in Assam than in any other State of the Indian Union. We should help these people to live together in peace and amity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Islam, I do not think you will have the time to finish all those pages that you have now in your hand.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: I have to say a few words on certain other points also. But in view of the shortness of time I will not dwell upon those points.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you finished?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: Yes, Madam?

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Madam Deputy Chairman, I regret that I have not been able to be present in the House during all the speeches. I have heard a few

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

and I have heard several more while sitting in my office. For the rest I have tried to go through the records and notes which are kept by our officials. I cannot say that any very new points had been raised. As usual hon. Members from the opposite side have offered various criticisms. It is their right to do so and I always welcome their assertion of this right. But I would welcome it even more if these criticisms were accompanied by certain positive solutions and suggestions which could be carried out or alternative programmes of action. We have to think of what we stand for. We stand for and we are striving for a firm democratic base for our country. Mention was made by one or two speakers just now of lawlessness or of taking law into their own hands by people, whether they be students or other people. I think the time has come when everyone of us has to indicate exactly where we stand on this important national issue. Do we stand for the method of discussion and debate in institutions which are there for this very specific purpose, such as the Houses of Parliament? Or do we stand for these issues being taken to the streets of our cities and our villages? I think a very clear answer should be given by our Members of Parliament and by all responsible citizens of our country.

AN HON. MEMBER: By the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Certainly, by the Prime Minister and I am standing here to say so as far as I am concerned and I have said so on various occasions before also, and I do not think, Madam, that anybody can accuse me of having gone to settle any problem outside on the street or with my fists. (*Interruption.*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, please listen.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We have heard some passionate speeches

in this House on this occasion. But I have not really heard a very passionate denunciation of these particular methods which one sees being used all around us. One might say that I am stating the obvious and I am one who does not like stating the obvious. But sometimes it becomes necessary to do so, especially when one sees the ghastly and macabre incidents which had taken place in Ranchi, in Meerut, in Gauhati, Calcutta, Madras, Madhya Pradesh and other parts of our country. We have heard here that some people were aggrieved or they wanted to draw the attention of the Government. Madam, I have listened very carefully and I have failed to understand what argument has been proved by the burning of trains, by the murder of people, by the looting of shops. We just now heard an hon. Member from Assam. I have the greatest affection for the Assamese people. It is a small State which faces problems perhaps far more complex than any other State in India. As the hon. Member has said, it is a region where many different races, religions, tribes, all inhabit together and it is not easy for them to get on together. But whom have the Assamese people convinced and of what have they convinced them by the looting of those particular shops? Have they convinced those people who do not wish to be in Assam that there is a place for them in Assam? I personally, with my limited understanding may think that they have done the opposite.

Similarly with regard to language, those who have agitated for Hindi here have harmed the cause of Hindi and those who have agitated against Hindi in the South have certainly also harmed their cause. So it is not only an ideal which I am putting before this House but a very practical proposition that by these methods we are not furthering the causes which these particular groups may have at heart. They may be right causes or wrong causes, I am not discussing that now. I am only saying that the parti-

cular cause then becomes that much weaker.

My friend, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy said that we are getting pressurised. I am very sorry to hear this. I have certainly not said that I felt pressurised. On the contrary I am one of those whom it is exceedingly difficult to pressurise. Some of our biggest leaders have sometimes wanted me to do things but I have regretted and not allowed myself to be pressurised. For some stubborn streak in me I have not yielded. Therefore, I have no intention of yielding to any kind of pressure. During the language discussion I have clarified my position here and in the other House and I shall do so again, which is, that for some reason some people felt that a situation was being created which was going to bring fresh difficulties. This was not so as far as the Bill was concerned and it was not so as far as the Resolution was concerned. Therefore we wanted to clarify the situation. The hon. Member said that English would not be an imposition on the Hindi-speaking people. Madam, I think that it would be an imposition on any Indian except a very very small number of us who have had an opportunity because of better financial situation, because of the way in which we lived, to receive a particular kind of education. But for the vast masses of India it is an alien language and it is difficult for them to learn. We cannot escape this fact. Whether anybody tries to pressurise or not, we have to see facts. Whether somebody is putting them in front of us or not, we have to discover the facts and realities of life. I do not want to go into this language argument because I think I have spoken twice on it at length here before. But one thing does strike me as rather strange. It is the very voices which were raised on behalf of the Bill, which were trying—if I may use Shrimati Reddy's word again—to pressurise us to bring the Bill before Parliament in order, as they said, to fulfil the assurances given by two previous Prime Ministers to the South, those are the very

voices which now ask. Why did you bring the Bill? On the contrary it was the people of the Hindi-speaking areas who said, don't bring this Bill but we felt that we were in honour bound to fulfil the assurances given by the previous Prime Ministers to our brothers and sisters of the South even if this made us unpopular. And it was made very clear to us that this would not be a popular move; even then we felt that the Bill had to be brought. Now objection has been taken to the amendment that was made. I can assure this hon. House and I can assure all the people from the non-Hindi States that had I for a moment thought that any amendment was going to increase the burden on the non-Hindi speaking people, I would never have accepted it, no matter what, but I did not think that it made any difference. What difference it made was not to the people of the North, South, East or West; it made a difference to those hard working officials of the Central Government who thereby had an extra burden put on them of having to provide translations. This was really the only matter but even at that time, even when the discussion was going on, I remember distinctly that the Home Minister said—I do not remember whether he said so in both Houses but he did say if in the other House—that whatever burden or difficulties were felt to have come about because of the Resolution could easily be sorted out by sitting together. From the very beginning, at no time has he said nor has any member of the Government said, no, we are not going to discuss this matter; even if there is any difficulty they have to bear it. What the Home Minister did say was that whenever you try to do something, new some difficulties will be faced. The difficulty really is on all us. I can assure hon. Members from the South that the type of Hindi that is now spoken is a new language as far as most of us are concerned. It is certainly new to our village people in the U.P. I know only about U.P., I cannot say about other people.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

People who come from the villages—for instance our domestic staff who come from the rural areas—have extreme difficulty in understanding the sort of language that goes for Hindi. For them it is as new as they would feel in learning Marathi or any other language. Any language which is going to be the national language is going to put a burden more or less on every citizen of India but if we proceed in the right way then that burden will be only for a temporary and interim period. After that when people are automatically following the three language formula, after one generation when we get enough teachers and the system is accepted and so on, I personally feel sure that there will be no difficulties for anybody and it will just be automatic for everybody to learn three languages and for everybody to be able to understand one another. But those hon. Members who have criticised the implementation are absolutely right. The three language formula has not been implemented.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Only two.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, I am sorry. I stand very firmly on the three language formula. I do not think that we can function with two languages unless we want to have parts of the country not to be closer. Then, of course it is possible, but if everybody is to stay together and work together, if we are to play our role in the international world....

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश):
मगर दो से काम चल जायेगा ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
Madam, I am not yielding.

श्री राजनारायण : जरा आप कृपया
इसको साफ कर दीजिये कि अगर दो
भाषाएं होंगी तो पार्टिशन कैसे हो
जायगा ।

अनेक भाषीय सदस्य : बैठ जाइये ।
(Interruptions)

उपसभापति : आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री राजनारायण : यही पार्लियामेंटी
प्रासेस है । प्राइम मिनिस्टर बोल रही है
कि दो भाषाएं होंगी तो देश टूट जायेगा ।
हमको पूरा हक है यह पूछने का कि आप
जरा इसको एलैबोरेट कीजिये कि देश
कैसे टूट जायगा ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am
on my feet and you must take your
seat. Please take your seat. I would
appeal to Members on both sides that
there should be no interruption while
the Prime Minister is giving her state-
ment in reply.

श्री राजनारायण : अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर
से मफाई मांगी जानी है...

उपसभापति : अभी नहीं, जब उनका
भाषण समाप्त होगा, उसके बाद पूछ
सकते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : वे भाषण करके
चली जायंगी तो मफाई आप देंगी ।

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Bihar):
May I submit that nobody stands up
from here to interrupt the hon. Prime
Minister? Why do you say both sides?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please
sit down.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
Madam Deputy Chairman, I think
that the hon. Member is justified in
the question which he has put because
if there is a misunderstanding on this
issue it should be cleared. Now the
difficulty is this. Which are the two
languages? Some people say that the
two languages should be Tamil and
English. Then what happens? What
language will link Madras to the
States of the North? Therefore, it
is much safer if we stick to the three
language formula not only for the
unity of the country but as I said it is
equally important in today's world
to have links with the outside world.
I want to say only one more word

about the language question, because it is a subject on which people get extremely excited and I think that at this moment it is better not to say any more about it, but allow tempers to calm down. Then, I am certainly willing to sit with anybody who would like to sit—leaders of the North and the South and the different political parties—at a table, square or round or any shape which they like, to discuss this matter, but it is important that before such a conference, we should allow excitement to calm down a little.

Actually I got diverted into the language question because I was really talking about law and order and about discussing these matters on the streets rather than in Parliament or other such forums rather than on the streets. It is also a matter of distress that volunteer organisations are being built up which are drilled and dragooned. I do not know the purpose of these organisations, but there is no doubt that each organization is giving rise to a new one, and all these little private organizations or armies or senas or whatever one would like to call them, are not helping in creating a peaceful atmosphere or an atmosphere in which people of different languages, of different States can live together in peace. Most of them say that they are not doing anything against anybody. If it is so, I am glad, but I think that all of us need to be alert on this matter and see that nothing is done which puts any doubt in the mind of any Indian citizen as to his right to speak his own language, his right to live wherever he wants or work or do business in whichever part of the country he may desire to do so.

One other question which comes up day in and day out is, "Why should the Centre interfere with the State Governments?" I am using these words in quotes. It is rather ironic that some of these voices are those which quite often ask for President's Rule. Quite clearly, hon. Members have some difficulty in accepting the

fact of the contradictions within the different parties which create problems in the States, so that the only way these Governments can be run is by raising the bogey of the Centre. If these Governments fall under their own weight—that is inherent in the contradictions among the various members of the coalition—then it is not very ingenuous of them to raise a hue and cry about the non-existing interference of the Centre in the affairs of these different States.

Some hon. Members in this House and some people outside the House would like to put the clock back. They would like the Centre to restrict its powers to certain subjects. Two or three subjects, I believe, have been mentioned. What this would really mean would be the abolition of the Constitution. Are these Members seriously contending that the problems of our political, economic and social developments could be solved by making the Centre merely a nebulous concept? Of course, if it serves any useful purpose to lay the blame on the Centre, I can say that our shoulders are broad enough to take that burden also, but it does not. It merely creates confusion in the people's mind. I am the first to say that the only sanction behind law and order should not be the policeman's baton or the soldier's rifle. It has to be the social conscience. But what do we find in this country? We know that the majority of the people want to live in peace, and to pursue their daily routine or their daily business, yet the fact remains that a handful of people are able to get away with their mischief. Why is this? This is either because they are encouraged by some or at least, if not encouraged, they are tolerated and I think that all civic-minded people should look at this question anew and see that no such anti-social actions are tolerated. We should make our opinion very clear on all these issues. We must exercise self-restraint upon even our political objectives. Such restraint can come only if we restore the

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

vision of a democratic India. Every-where we have seen that all other things can be built up. But vision, if lost, is not easy to recover and a people without vision must perish. Political parties exist for the people, not people for parties. This Government, which I have the honour to represent, and I say this in all sincerity, is always willing to work with other parties for the solution of all our major national problems. I think there is no greater challenge or worth while task before the nation as a whole than to make our democracy secure, for I believe that this is the very base of our survival.

There was some agitation from the Left regarding the alleged sins of the Centre and I was surprised that a political party which provides itself on the principle of democratic centralism is today seeking to attack our concept of the Centre. According to the Constitution, the Centre is designed to make for maximum unity, while making the fullest allowance for diversity. It is a very fine balance and we can disturb this balance only at our peril. I am convinced that all those who, because of regional preoccupations, assail the Centre today are acting in a very shortsighted manner and are pursuing a temporary political advantage over the longterm interests of their own States as well as of the country as a whole. But I have little doubt, that had our friends on the Left been in the Centre today, by now they would have moved heaven and earth to make the Centre much more powerful than ever it is.

I should like to deal with some of the criticisms which have been levelled at our economic policies and programmes. Comments were made by my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, as also by his opposite number, there, the hon. Member, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, regarding the general character of the Address. Shri Patel complained that the Address merely narrated general problems without sounding a note of hope, whereas Shri

Bhupesh Gupta felt that we had not set the pace for the year ahead nor given a lead to the nation. Now, what exactly is the purpose of the President's Address? It is not a propaganda piece which lists only achievements. It really seeks to present before Parliament a true picture of the internal economic, political and social situations in the country. And this is what the President's Address did. It presented the major achievements, as also the major problems, which the Government, this House and indeed the entire country has to tackle. It was hoped that these questions would be discussed in an atmosphere of constructive criticism in both Houses. Everyone knows that in the last two years this country has been through a very bad patch. All countries, no matter how rich, how advanced they are, do strike such bad patches. This happens to be a time when there is hardly any country in the world which has not either been through a difficult period or is not in the midst of it today, but as the President has pointed out, we do think that the clouds are beginning to lift. I think they must lift, because the people of this country are determined to surmount their problems and to march ahead towards economic development.

The President referred to the food situation in Bihar where only a few months ago we struggled hard to avert what might have been one of the worst human tragedies because of famine. There are prospects of a record food production of 81 lakh tonnes against Bihar's previous best figure of 74 lakh tonnes, which was achieved in 1964. In this State which went through that agony and distress, which survived the two years of a terribly severe and unprecedented drought, our peasants have toiled and produced seven lakh tonnes more food than the earlier record of the State. What greater tribute could there be to their spirit of fortitude or to their heroism? Can we not be proud of them? Can we not be proud of this old yet ever young Bharat Mata who produces the stuff out of which such

heroes can be made? When the relief works were undertaken last year, we were all very anxious and did our best that they should be so chosen and executed that to the extent possible they would result in a permanent asset for the agricultural production programme. Programmes of all kinds were pushed through during the last year, even while we were struggling with all kinds of difficulties and shortages. We have fortunately had a good karif harvest, for which we are certainly thankful to nature, as one hon. Member just mentioned. I would respectfully say that we should also be thankful for the research which our young scientists and technicians have been doing and for the application of that research to the field. We must also be thankful for the help which the State has given to these people and to the many-sided efforts of our cultivators. In the last karif season 6 million acres were brought under high-yielding varieties as compared to only 4.82 million acres in the preceding year. In the year now coming to a close we expect to cover some 15 million acres of land under high-yielding varieties of seed; 1.45 million tonnes of nitrogenous fertilisers are to be used as compared to just over half a million tonnes in 1965-66. Institutional credit for agriculture has also been expanded and may total something like Rs. 650 crores at the end of 1967-68 as against Rs. 550 crores at the end of the previous year. These are some examples of the stupendous effort which is being made to solve the problem of food. At the same time as the President has cautioned us, we cannot be complacent. We are not complacent, and we do not want to slacken our efforts in any way. We are doing our best to build an adequate buffer stock. The State Governments with the assistance of the Food Corporation are intensifying food procurement all over the country. According to the latest figures available, the karif procurement has so far amounted to nearly 2 million tonnes. But unfortunately

there was a general delay in the sowing last year, and therefore the procurement operations started in earnest only a fortnight ago, a whole month late, but we hope that from now on the work will be expedited.

The hon. Member, Shri Dahyabhai Patel used the words "old widow's wail". I am afraid he was narrating the familiar old tale of woe which is often described by those who are basically opposed to the very process of planned economic development. What comfort can I give to the hon. Member except to suggest that he and his colleagues in the Swatantra Party should persevere in their efforts to come to power at the Centre so that they may have the opportunity to practise economic policies and philosophies which even those who swear by the sacred laws of the market do not practise now. But who is to argue with a neo-industrialists who cannot see the simple fact that beyond the laws of the market, there are millions and millions of hungry and needy men, women and children demanding social justice, who cannot be ignored? This country, Madam, as we are all aware, is faced with an unprecedented situation and I do not think, the Government does not think, that any set of dogmas or slogans, whether of the right or of the left, can succeed in providing an answer to our problems. We must proceed very carefully. We have to create wealth in a poor country with limited resources, and at the same time see that the disparity between the rich and the poor is not widened. We must do this in a background of a rapidly rising population and very rapidly rising expectations of the people. Thus we have endeavoured during the last two decades to put our faith in the efficiency of planned development processes. We believe firmly that there is no other practical alternative to the path which we are pursuing, which is the middle path. We shall persist in it. Difficulties there will be in every sector, in the

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

agricultural sector, in the industrial sector, in the public sector and indeed even in the private sector. But these difficulties can and must be overcome intelligently and within the broad framework of planned economic development. My personal opinion is that, for anyone to regard the laws of the market as sacred would be as disastrous as to listen to those who think that the economy could be organised in terms of a monolith.

In a few days the Budget will be presented and that will give hon. Members and the Government an occasion for a detailed review and discussion of our economic problems and policies. However, I should like to refer briefly to a problem which was raised by an hon. Member in my presence and which is agitating the minds of all of us here and outside. That is the problem of unemployment and specially of unemployment amongst young people. In the President's Address the problem was stated with the utmost clarity, sincerity and frankness. Government is carefully examining the range and extent of the problem, specially that of unemployment amongst young engineers. I have asked the Planning Commission to look into this matter, to urgently, undertake a study of the matter. I think that the President put the problem in its true perspective when he linked it to the growth and development of the economy as a whole, at a rate and level which would absorb the growing population as well as the growing number of people who are now coming out of our universities and colleges. In the meantime whatever lies within the power of the Government will be done to ameliorate the difficulties and to put right the maladjustments. It is hoped that when economic activity picks up as a result of better agricultural production and the consequent quickening of the process of development, the employment situa-

tion will show significant improvement.

An important question raised by one of the last speakers was that of the under-privileged sections of the community. He is not present here now and I do not know what other Members have said, but for myself I can certainly say that there has been no occasion when I have not dealt with the problem, whether speaking here or outside, because it is a problem which is constantly before us, and again it is one of those facts which we simply cannot ignore. I do not want to deal with this problem from a partisan point of view, but when people specifically lay the blame on our party, it is only right that I should put the facts straight. It is our party more than any other which took up this problem right from the beginning, which has kept it in the fore, and which is taking steps to see what can be done to help these people, within the limits of our resources. It is true that much that should have been done has not been done and I fully agree that our efforts should be intensified. But my Government is committed to intensifying these efforts and doing whatever it can for our brothers and sisters of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and of those areas which are known as the backward areas. But here again the problem cannot be solved by simple devices or slogans. Fundamentally it is not merely a problem of changing social attitudes, that in itself is very important, but also of providing the necessary economic wherewithal for their economic and social uplift.

Now, in the realm of foreign policy, the two questions—on the one side we are blamed for referring to these questions, on the other side hon. Members opposite refer to them themselves so that one has to reply—the two questions which are constantly with us are the problems of Vietnam and West Asia. These have attracted much attention.

We are concerned with Vietnam because any situation which exposes instability in South East Asia is of concern to us. We have made our views very clear. Unfortunately, they seem to irk the hon. Members, both from the left and the right. We, none the less, adhere to that position as we think that it is the only possible position. We have always believed that there cannot be a military solution. All the later events have proved that our assessment is correct. That is why we have held that the first step should be the stoppage of bombing of North Vietnam and after that, other steps can be considered.

With regard to West Asia also, we have consistently striven for the acceptance of the principle that no one should profit from or retain the fruits of aggression and that every State has a right to exist in peace and security. I do not propose to deal with the wider problems of our foreign policy whether they relate to Pakistan or China because the situation has not really changed since these questions were last debated in this House. Some hon. Members would like us to be more tough and others to be less tough. But we think that we should pursue our own middle course. In brief, I want to say that we do welcome friendship but friendship must be in consonance with our national interests.

Since our President addressed Parliament, Madam Deputy Chairman, an important event has taken place. I refer to the Award made by the International Tribunal in Geneva in respect of the determination of the boundary between Gujarat and West Pakistan. I have already made a brief statement on the subject. Many remarks have been made here. I have listened to them with great attention and those I have missed, I have read them with great care. But I am sure, you will understand, Madam, that while the Award is under study, it would not be proper for me to say anything

more at this stage. I would, however, like to take this opportunity to request our friends in Pakistan not to get excited, nor attribute any motives to us.

One matter which was mentioned was about something which our friends from the PSP have said. It seems that reports have appeared in newspapers that I said something about the PSP's view. There is a misunderstanding about this. I mentioned various parties. But I did not mention the PSP in this because earlier on, I had said this took place at another meeting that I had not yet met the PSP leaders. I only met them after that particular meeting was over. Thus there was a misunderstanding and some people thought that I had given the views of the PSP. At that time I did not have them.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy said something—I am sorry to have to go back to the language question for a minute—about my Rae Bareilly remark. I have already tried to clarify that I did not say that at all.

May I conclude, Madam; by reiterating my unlimited faith in the basic goodness, decency and wisdom of our people? It is by the exercise of these qualities that our nation can progress, overcoming its many difficulties and set-backs. If any political party in the country can promise the people continuous advance all along the front without any set-backs, difficulties and disappointments, I should like to say that it probably does not know what it is talking about. I am anxious, and I think it is in the country's interests, that we should evolve a common denominator of approach, of understanding and of co-operation on every issue of major national importance and I shall certainly continue to try for it.

There is one matter which I forgot to mention which several hon. Members have mentioned here. I think it is extremely important. It is what

[Shrimati Indra Gandhi.]

attitude do we all take to our national emblems, whether it be the national flag, the national emblem or the National Anthem? These do not belong to any one part of India, they do not belong to any one political party. Once the country has accepted them as national emblems, they are the symbols of the dignity of the nation. What is a flag? You can say, it is a mere piece of cloth. And yet it is a piece of cloth for which countless people have given their blood and their lives. And it is this which gives it dignity. It is this that we honour the flag. The question is not merely of the colour or the cloth. It is what the flag stands for. Therefore, I think that all parties and all people should come to some understanding on these basic issues and see that there is no disrespect shown to national emblems.

In the meantime, Madam, we in this Government shall continue to persevere in our endeavour in the firm conviction that India is going forward and will go forward, perhaps slowly but none the less surely and steadily.

Thank you.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीयों, मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जनतंत्र के बारे में काफी हमको सबक दिया। जनतंत्र केवल वाणी नहीं है, जनतंत्र कर्म भी है और अगर कर्म नहीं है केवल वाणी है, तो वह जनतंत्र नहीं है। इसीलिये दुनिया के सभी बड़ों को देखा जाय, चाहे बुद्ध को देखा जाय चाहे गाँधी को देखा जाय, उन्होंने यही कहा है कि बुद्ध और श्रीर आचरण के मेल होना चाहिये। अगर बुद्ध के अनुकूल आचरण नहीं है आचरण भ्रष्ट है आचरण के अनुकूल बुद्ध नहीं है तो बुद्ध छलन है। प्राइममिनिस्टर साहिबा 30 जनवरी को वाराणसी क्यों गईं? प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा...

उत्सभापति : सबान पूछिये।

श्री राजनारायण : प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा 30 जनवरी को वाराणसी क्यों गईं जब कि वाराणसी के विद्यार्थी, वाराणसी की जनता, वाराणसी के अधिकारी यह कह चुके थे कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा यहाँ न आएँ...

उत्सभापति : आप बैठ जाइये।

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : अरे भाई, आप तीन पार्टी बदल कर आए हैं, यहाँ लेक्चर देते हैं। तीन पार्टियाँ बदल चुके हैं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I find that there is nothing in what Mr. Rajnarain has said and it needs no clarification. I proceed. I shall put the amendments to vote.

श्री राजनारायण : क्या इसका स्पष्टीकरण नहीं होगा माननीया?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

2. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while dealing complacently with the food situation, the Address has, surprisingly, failed—

(i) to announce the removal of zonal and other barriers to the free movement of food-grains and foodstuffs throughout the country which had been imposed by reason of an acute shortage that no longer persists;

(ii) to announce the end of the policy of compulsory monopoly procurement;

(iii) to propose concrete measures which would provide incentive to the farmer to

increase production in order to cope with the rising population.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while referring to the need for raising the efficiency of State sector enterprises, the Address has failed to declare (a) the acceptance of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission which are devised to make these enterprises function more efficiently by giving them maximum autonomy from interference by the politicians and bureaucrats in office, and (b) a readiness to restrict the establishment of new State enterprises.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while referring to the question of reorganisation of a border State like Assam, no reference whatsoever is made in the Address to the deplorable attack on Indian citizens of non-Assamese origin and their property that took place in broad daylight in Gouhati and other places in Assam on Republic Day, the 26th January, 1968, resulting in a large number of them becoming homeless and in the destruction of property worth crores of rupees as a result of the denial of even elementary protection to those who were left at the mercy of the mob.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while referring to the prevalent unemployment, there is no mention in the Address of concrete steps to provide employment opportunities by encouraging productive investments.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

6. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while referring to the conflict in Vietnam, the Address (a) repeats the sterile appeal for an unconditional stoppage of the bombing of North Vietnam at a time when North Vietnam and the Viet Cong have intensified their attack on capital of South Vietnam and other places resulting in large losses of civilian life and (b) in this manner shown an utter lack of appreciation of the real nature of North Vietnamese aggression on South Vietnam and the desirability that it should be repelled in the interests of peace and security of the countries of South and South-East Asia including our own.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that while referring to the movements for liberation of people from colonial rule in the southern part of Africa, the Address fails to refer to the brave struggle of the people of Tibet for the liberation of their country from Chinese Communist domination.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that while contenting itself with a platonic hope that the ties between India and the countries of South and South-East Asia will be further strengthened, the Address makes no concrete proposals in regard to filling the vacuum caused by the withdrawal of British power from the region and the developing of a system of regional collective security among the countries of South and South-East Asia against the common menace of Chinese Communist expansionism.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain concrete proposals to solve the problems created by the divisive forces in the name of region, language or community, which are destroying the unity of the country.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain in particular, any proposals capable of implementation which seek to reconcile the serious differences of opinion between the Centre and the States on the Official Languages Act recently enacted by Parliament.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not reveal an adequate awareness of the serious danger to the stability of Parliamentary institutions by recent developments in West Bengal, Bihar and Punjab.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain schemes to remedy the staggering problems of unemployment which threaten to undermine the very fabric of the community.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain suggestions for the solution of the West Asian crisis based on the just claims of Israel for the recognition of its territorial existence.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the grave threat to the nation's unity and the growing sense of insecurity felt by the large sections of citizens and measures to combat these tendencies.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the grave threat to the Constitution as evidenced by flagrant abuse of the powers of the Governors in the matter of appointment or removal of the Chief Ministers.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the grave malaise in the nation's economy as evidenced by recession, rising prices, unemployment, growing disparity in the income, and measures to combat or all alleviate the sufferings of our people.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

28. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of any measures to redeem the pledges taken by Parliament to liberate the territories occupied by China and Pakistan.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

29. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the deterioration in the socio-economic conditions of Scheduled Castes,

Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes of our people and measures to bring them up at par with others in the society.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

30. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to finalise the Fourth Plan.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

31. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to nationalise General Insurance.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

32. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to settle the dispute about the future of Chandigarh.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

33. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to implement in full the recommendations of the Khosla Commission Report for Delhi Policemen.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

34. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to give assistance to State Governments to enable them to pay dearness allowance to their employees at par with the Central Government employees.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

35. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to ban automation in L.I.C., oil companies and various public and private sector undertakings.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

36. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to fix a national minimum wage based on the recommendations made by the 15th session of the Indian Labour Conference.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

37. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to include Cochin Shipyard in the Fourth Five Year Plan.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

38. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to continue rice subsidy to Kerala State.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

39. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to allot sufficient funds for the development of Kerala.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

40. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to declare a moratorium on foreign debt repayment.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

41. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to stop importing PL 480 cotton despite foreign exchange difficulties.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

42. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure

of the Government to stop police verification in public sector undertakings.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

43. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to compel the newspaper managements to implement the wage board report for working journalists and non-working journalists.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

44. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to find out an amicable settlement of the language question in India.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

45. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to condemn U.S. aggression in Vietnam.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

46. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to prevent the South African representatives from participating in the UNCTAD-II conference.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

47. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the vindictive attitude of the Government towards West Bengal.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

48. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to distribute waste land to the agricultural workers and poor peasants.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

49. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to put an end to differential treatment given to jawans and officials in the Army.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

50. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to establish Ambassadorial relations with the People's Republic of China.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

51. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure

[The Deputy Chairman:]

of the Government to ban the activities of fascist organisation like Shiv Sena in Bombay.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

52. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to recognise the German Democratic Republic.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

53. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to condemn the establishment of U.S. Military base in the Indian Ocean.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

54. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to fulfil their assurance to the staff of the Telephone Revenue Accounts office that they will be absorbed in the other P and T units of the Telephone Districts in New Delhi and Hyderabad.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

55. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to stay the orders of the Postmaster General, Madras Circle, Madras, who has resorted to reduction in the strength of the peons in his office.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

56. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to meet the representatives of the All India (Posts and Telegraphs) Administrative Offices Employees Association, to negotiate on their demands submitted on the 23rd October, 1967.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

57. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to put an end to the country's dependence on foreign food.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

58. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to

protect the existing conditions of service of the staff of the Telephone Revenue Accounts Offices resulting in pecuniary loss to them due to the non-protection of the present emoluments drawn by them and their pay scales.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

59. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to grant independent status to the Postal Stock Depots in each Circle which is causing hardship to the staff.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

60. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to stop the Heads of the Telephone Districts in New Delhi and Hyderabad from resorting to reductions in the staff strength of their respective offices.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

61. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to give the promised monthly quota of 75,000 tons of rice to Kerala.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

62. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to adopt a national food policy.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

63. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to grant adequate funds for development of fisheries in Kerala.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

64. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to release all political prisoners in Bengal.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The question is:

65. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the following facts namely:—

(i) that after the adoption of the no-confidence motion against the Sanyukta Vidhayak Dal Government in Bihar, the Governor, by violating the provisions of the Constitution, administered the oath of office of

[The Deputy Chairman.]

the Chief Minister to Shri Satish Prasad Sinha for merely two days, nominated Shri Bindhyeshwari Prasad Mandal to Legislative Council on the advice of the interim Chief Minister, Shri Satish Prasad Sinha in violation of article 171, and then administered the oath of office of Chief Minister to Shri Bindhyeshwari Prasad Mandal,

(ii) that the Governor of West Bengal installed Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh as Chief Minister by dismissing the U.L.F. Government without ascertaining its majority in the Legislative Assembly, leading to a constitutional crisis in Bengal

(iii) that the Governor of Punjab administered the oath of office of Chief Minister to Shri Lachman Singh Gill despite the fact that Shri Gurnam Singh claimed a majority in his favour;

(iv) that Presidents' rule was enforced in Haryana despite the fact that the majority was in favour of Rao Birendra Singh's Ministry;

(v) that the State Governments have not been able to grant dearness allowance to their non-gazetted employees admissible in terms of the recommendations of the Gajendra-gadkar Commission for want of sufficient financial assistance from Central Government, as a result of which agitation by employees in every State is becoming more and more violent, and particularly in Haryana where they resorted to strike;

(vi) that no laws regulating the appointment and service conditions of Government employees in pursuance of article 309 of the Constitution have so far been enacted even

after eighteen years of the coming into force of the Constitution;

(vii) that Government employees have been deprived of their trade union rights.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is.

66. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the activities of anti-national elements in Assam, disrespect to the National Flag, the acts of arson in Gauhati on the 26th January, the threat posed by the infiltration of Pakistanis into Assam and the steps for dealing with them.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

67. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the present serious situation in East Asia and its repercussions on India and concrete suggestions to face it.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:—

68. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not say anything about the formation of a single food zone for the country as a whole by abolishing the existing food zones.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

69. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the situation arising out of the threat to the security of the country on account of the aggressive designs of China and Pakistan nor does it indicate the steps to be taken to face this challenge.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The question is:

70. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the loss of crores of rupees suffered by industries in the public sector an account of the wide gap between estimates and actual performances and the steps for avoiding such losses.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

71. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the the repeated violations by Pakistan of the Tashkant Declaration and the concrete steps which the Government of India should take in regard to such violations.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

72. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the wide disparity between the dearness

allowance of employees of the Central Government and of the various State Governments or the action proposed for removing or minimising that disparity.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

73. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that no reference has been made in the Address about steps to remove gradually the impact of western cultures prevalent among the high officials of the Army and to propagate Indian culture among them.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

74. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not indicate steps for expansion of the auxiliary force in the interest of the security of the country.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

75. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not indicate support for the struggle for Independence by the Pakhtoons and East Pakistan.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

76. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not contain proposals for

[The Deputy Chairman.]

bringing about uniformity in the matter of giving relief to the families of deceased soldiers in different States.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

77. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the scarcity of kerosene oil all over the country and the steps to be taken to meet the situation.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

78. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not make any reference about the fixation and grant of support price to the producers of foodgrains.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

79. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not indicate steps for abolishing the special status given to Kashmir under the Constitution and to bring it on a par with the other States.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

80. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not refer to the growing

indiscipline and disruptive tendencies among the students and the steps to be taken to remove them.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

81. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the increasing unemployment among engineers and others and the steps for solving this problem.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

82. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not make any mention of the desirability of establishing diplomatic relations with Israel with a view to adding to the number of countries friendly to India.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

83. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the need for the attainment of independence by Tibet.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

84. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address contains no mention of the failure

of Government to fulfil the assurances given in the Addresses of the previous Presidents and the steps to be taken to fulfil them in future.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

85. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not draw attention to the indifference and wrong planning by Government for saving the people from famine conditions in the country.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

86. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not condemn Government for not accepting the demand of the Samyukt Socialist Party for the recruitment of a 'Food Army' (*Annu Sena*) with a view to expanding agriculture by bringing under cultivation non-fertile, fallow, barren and water-logged areas, forest No. 4 and other waste land.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

87. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not contain any warning regarding Government's failure to free the farmers from old debts and make available to them cheap manure, water and electri-

city etc., and to the sufferings caused to them thereby.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

88. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not express concern about the continued fall in the per capita national income.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

89. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention Government's failure to check rise in prices of essential commodities of every day use.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

90. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not draw attention of Government to the need for establishing a rational balance between the prices of essential agricultural produce and industrial products.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

91. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not emphasise the need for irrigating the unirrigated land

[The Deputy Chairman.]

by making extensive use of minor irrigation projects.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

92. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not draw proper attention of Government to the need for increasing export of goods produced in the country.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

93. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not denounce Government for its failure to implement the Fourth Plan, thereby leading to recession, increased economic strain on the poorer sections of the people and loss to the nation.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

94. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not throw any light on the necessity for giving an appropriate dearness allowance and other facilities to the workers and employees of the public sector industries and the other services with a view to raise their standard of living.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

95. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not draw the attention to the corruption and blackmarketing prevalent in the Government among Ministers and the administration and does not contain any exhortation to the Ministers and responsible officers to lead an ideal life in order to save the society from moral degradation.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

96. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not emphasise the need to check the continuously increasing unemployment, poverty, dearness, dacoity, murders, epidemics, immorality, riots and robbery.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

97. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention Government's failure to improve the lot of the Harijans and other backward classes of people by implementing the report of the Backward Classes Commission and by accepting the Samyukt Socialist Party's proposal to reserve 60 per cent of seats in every walk of life for backward people (Harijans Shudras, women, Advasis and poor Muslims).'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

98. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not condemn the Government for the riots which occurred as a result of the wrong policies of the Central Government regarding language, caste and community.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

99. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not condemn undue interference by the Centre in the affairs of West Bengal, Bihar, Haryana and other non-Congress States and the unholy attempt to topple the non-Congress Governments and thereby throttling the Constitution.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

100. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the failure of Government to defend the national borders.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

101. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not draw attention to the

increasing foreign loans and the increasing foreign influence.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

102. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not hold Government guilty for non-acceptance of the demand of the Samyukt Socialist Party to create a third Power and a third Camp in the international field and to adopt a functional and constructive foreign policy, nor does it indicate how far Government's policy to advocate in turn the cause of American and Russian blocs has gone against the national interest.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

103. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not warn the Government about the harm suffered by the country by not following a well-planned and firm policy in relation to Pakistan and China in the interest of the Nation.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

104. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address has not warned the Government about those absurd and irrelevant declarations made by it from time to time regarding the solution of the Assam and Nagaland

[The Deputy Chairman.]

problems and thereby adding to the unrest and riots in that area.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

105. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not draw the attention of the Government towards the basic mistakes so far committed by it with regard to the practical domestic, foreign, educational, agricultural and industrial policies.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

106. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to emphasise that only by amending the Constitution and granting maximum possible powers to the States in order to enable the people of the States to fully develop themselves and fashion their own destiny without any dependence on and interference from the Centre, can the fissiparous tendencies be checked, unity of India cemented on a durable basis and democracy maintained and strengthened.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

107. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not mention the failure of the Government to solve the language problem on a democratic basis by trying to impose only one of the Indian languages as official

language on the people of India, thus relegating other Indian national languages to a secondary position while at the same time retaining a foreign language on an official basis—a policy, leading to the balkanization of India.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

108. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not sharply bring out the fact that only by amending the Constitution and giving all the Indian national languages the status of link language, can the vital national aspirations of the people of India be satisfied, a democratic solution found for the language problem and democratic unity of India strengthened.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:—

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 12th February, 1968.'"

The House divided:

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—90; Noes—4.

AYES—90

Anand Chand, Shri.

Anandan, Shri T. V.

Anis Kidwai, Shrimati

Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.

Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.

Arora, Shri Arjan.

Asthana, Shri L. D.

Bachchan, Dr. H. R.

Baharul Islam, Shri.

Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.

Bindumati Devi, Shrimati.

Chaman Lall, Diwan.

Chavda, Shri K. S.

Chetia, Shri P.

Dass, Shri Mahabir.

Devaki Gopidas, Shrimati.

Dharam Prakash, Dr.

Dharia, Shri M. M.

Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.

Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.

Gilbert, Shri A. C.

Gujral, Shri I. K.

Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.

Kathju, Shri P. N.

Kaul, Shri M. N.

Khaitan, Shri R. P.

Koya, Shri Palat Kunhi.

Kulkarni, Shri A. G.

Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.

Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.

Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.)

Mani, Shri A. D.

Maniben Vallabhbbhai Patel,
Kumari.

Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra.

Mehta, Shri Om.

Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.

Mishra, Shri L. N.

Misra, Shri Lokanath.

Mitra, Shri P. C.

Mohammad, Chaudhary A.

Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.

Mookerjee, Shri Debabrata.

Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.

Muniswamy, Shri N. R.

Neki Ram, Shri.

Panda, Shri Brahmananda.

Pande, Shri Tarkeshwar.

Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.

Patel, Shri T. K.

Patil, Shri G. R.

Patra, Shri N.

Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.

Purkayastha, Shri M.

Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta,
Shrimati.

Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.

Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.

Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.

Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.

Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.

Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.

Salig Ram, Dr.

Sangma, Shri E. M.

Sapru, Shri P. N.

Sen, Dr. Triguna.

Shah, Shri K. K.

Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.

Siddalingaya, Shri T.

Siddhantalankar, Prof. Satyavrata.

Singh, Shri Dalpat.

Singh, Dr. Gopal.

Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad.

Sinha, Shri B. K. P.

Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.

Sur, Shri M. M.

Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.

Tapase, Shri G. D.

Tara Ramchandra Sathe, Shrimati.

Tariq, Shri A. M.

Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.

Tripathi, Shri H. V.

Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.

Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.

Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.

Varma, Shri B. B.

Varma, Shri C. L.

Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.

Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.

Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.

Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES—4

Murahari, Shri G.

Rajnarain, Shri.

Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.

Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.

The motion was adopted

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 23rd February, 1968.