

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Sir I protest against this abuse of the procedure of the House. The day before yesterday I faced this House for one hour. The Deputy Chairman allowed the discussion to go on for one hour. I had tried to answer every question that was put. Now, my friend, Mr. Rajnarain, is trying to protract the debate by asking further questions and carrying on the discussion. I do not know under what procedure this is being done. If there is a privilege motion, I am prepared to face it. If I have made any incorrect statement, I am prepared to explain it, but now to continue the debate which ended the day before yesterday really I do not know under what rule this is being done.

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। मुझे आपके जरिये एक ही अर्ज करनी है श्री चागला से कि उन्होंने इस सदन को गुमराह किया है, जो हमने फैक्ट्स दिये हैं, उनको छिपाने की कोशिश की है और जो बयान निकाला गया है वह गलत है। हम प्रिविलेज मोशन लिख कर देंगे।

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—contd.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to make the first point that winds of change are blowing in India and the Congress in its *post mortem* of the election has not yet come to realise what changes have already taken place or what changes may take place in the future. The entire Address of the President does not reflect the change in the correlations of the forces in India because the people of India have rejected this reactionary Congress caucus that has been ruling in India for the last 20 years, a reactionary caucus that did not and do not serve the interests of the people, that did not and do not intend to serve the interests of the people, a reactionary caucus that serves and wants to serve the interests of a narrow stratum only, a section of the bourgeois landlords

and the foreign imperialists. It has been in their service.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

The Address of the President does not reflect any change; it only signifies that they want to proceed along the old beaten path. It is true that the people of India are on the march; it is true that they have not yet found out the alternative path; it is also true that utilising the discontent of the people against the Congress, the Swatantra Party has been able to secure a good amount, a sizeable amount, of the electorate, on to their side, to swing a good portion of the electorate on to its side. That is a reactionary party. In rejecting the Congress, the people have not yet found the democratic forces and a democratic path; a portion of the electorate has gone over to the Swatantra Party or to the Jana Sangh. The Swatantra Party is for the untrammelled operation of the vested interests and they want to openly plump for the protection of the foreign imperialists like any other satellite country in Latin America. Theirs is an open declaration. They say, we must openly align and espouse the cause of the imperialists and be under their protection. The Congress only wants to do the same thing, is doing the same thing—it is hobnobbing with the imperialists, surrendering the national interests to the imperialists, aligning themselves with the imperialists, throwing overboard the policy of non-alignment which they are mouthing merely in words, of which perhaps nothing remains in fact. Only under a smoke-screen of non-alignment, they are precisely pursuing their policy in order to hoodwink the people. The Swatantra Party says, let us do it openly. The Congress says, no, let us do it under a screen, behind the screen, so that the people can be bluffed and hoodwinked. That is the difference between the two parties.

Now, I would like to make this point again that the President's Address is a petty, philistine rigmarole containing nothing new. It is said that

the President is bound by the advice of his Cabinet. I agree that this is the normal procedure. But should the President accept the unconstitutional advice of his Cabinet about that Proclamation? That is a moot point. A Cabinet that is prepared to subvert democracy, a Cabinet that wants to choke the channels of democracy and somehow or the other put its own party in power in Rajasthan, if that Cabinet gives a piece of advice which is patently unconstitutional and is beyond the limits of the Constitution, should the President do that unconstitutional act? I think, not. The President should be there to uphold the Constitution the normal democratic spirit of the Constitution, if there be any spirit; there are contradictory things in the Constitution. But he must be there to uphold the democratic procedure and he must not accept the unconstitutional advice of his Cabinet. Yet that has been done. I think the President should not hide behind that convention that he is bound down by the advice of his Cabinet and do illegal things, make illegal proclamations.

Then, that has happened here? The whole country is passing through a famine. It has become a critical and eternal famine. Now, the PL-480 was a method devised by this Government in order to meet the situation of famine created by the Government itself. But the PL-480 was the green signal, it is an open invitation to the Americans to make inroads into the country, to penetrate into the country, to indulge the subversive activities and subvert democracy in India and create an American economic empire inside India. That is how it has proceeded. You have not made any progressive land reforms. What the French Revolution could do under the banner of liberty, equality and fraternity three hundred years ago, this reactionary Government, mouthing the phrases of socialistic pattern with just not a shred of socialism in it, did not even do that—confiscate the land and give it to the peasantry which could

be done by the French capitalists three hundred years ago. You are more reactionary than the French capitalists themselves. So, you have created a famine. That is bound to go on in this way. You have not wiped out the debt of the peasantry; you have not written off or abolished the land revenue. The feudal rents, the feudal debts and the feudal procedures are there. So, through this device you have created a famine. Production can never increase unless the forces of production are unfettered and they have a free play. Having created this famine condition, through the PL-480 you have invited the American imperialists. It is not a food gift, or a food aid. I should like to put this question squarely before the Government. What is the US doing with some 200 or 300 crores of the counter-part funds that they have in India? Have they not bribed the officials? Have they not created an American Lobby in Parliament? Are you sure that they have not bribed the Generals themselves, or that they have not created an American Fifth Column in every agency and in every sector of the economy and the public life of India. With these huge funds at their disposal it is precisely what they have done and they have been allowed to do this, to subsidise the American Fifth Column in India. That is the net result of the PL-480 and that shows clearly that you have betrayed the nation to serve the Americans well.

Now, as regards the economy, it is in shambles. Let us say that India has become economically bankrupt, totally and fully, and this trend cannot be reversed by the way in which you are moving. You are moving in the old way. You have planned for this bankruptcy. The so-called Five Year Plans are plans for getting our independence more and more into dependence upon foreign aid, foreign imperialists, foreign control and foreign exploitation, so that now you have come to such a pass that whatever small industry would be set up, that

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

industry cannot be run unless we import the intermediate goods, spare parts and components to the tune of Rs. 800 crores annually and that too from the Western sources. You have not planned in such a way that our economy becomes a self-reliant one or a self-generating one, that it can regenerate or rejuvenate itself. You have thrown it into total dependence. And foreigners not you, are in control of the economy. With the so-called aid and loans and another form of exploitation by way of investments running into one thousand crores of rupees in the private sector, the Indian economy is now in the grip of the Americans and India has become just like any other Latin American country, an American economy empire.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. The VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I was on the point of our economy. Now it has been broached about by Prof. B. R. Chinoy, for example, that as a price for getting whatever we require from the Yankees we should go in for a second dose of devaluation. He says that because devaluation has not been done to a sufficient extent, in order to normalise the situation we should go in for a second dose of devaluation. Are you going in for such measure? You have already surrendered the economy of this country to the Americans. There is recession. There is over-production. There is under-utilisation of capacity. You have brought about this in order to serve the interest of that narrow stratum of vested interests

—Indian and foreign. Now if you go in for a second dose of devaluation, then, God himself would not be able to save India.

Sir, if the wage level is simultaneously raised throughout the country, the problem of there being no market for our consumer goods can be solved without there being any inflation. Economy theory teaches that if the wage level is raised simultaneously throughout the country in all the industries, there would not be inflation and there would be a sufficiently big consumer market in order to absorb the production.

Coming to Agriculture, unless agricultural reforms are carried out, unless peasants are given land gratis, unless their debts are cancelled, unless their rent is cancelled, production would not increase. The vast countryside can act as the greatest cushion. Our economy is stagnating and deteriorating and having its effect on the country. It is bringing about an economic crisis. So what is required is a moratorium on foreign debt, and loans.

We should not import goods that we do not require and whatever we import should be on the basis of barter, in exchange of our commodities. We must compel them to trade on that basis. That is a *sine qua non* of any planning. There can be no planning unless the foreign trade is nationalised and taken over by the State. Without that there would be only planning for a crisis, for foreign dependence and sacrifice of national interest and nothing else. Without that there can be no planning whatsoever.

Now I would like to touch on the question of West Bengal and Kerala, and also on the question of Bihar. In Bihar drought is there. Now who is going to feed the people of Kerala West Bengal and Bihar? We think it is the responsibility of the Centre.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): What about Madras?

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** If so, include it, I have no objection. So it is the responsibility of the Centre. Only the Centre can execute an all India food policy. What is happening? Kerala is not getting its food. You asked them to stop overdrafts and you have asked them to raise the price of the rationed quantity or quantum which naturally invites Centre-State conflict. So we squarely say that of the people of Kerala or West Bengal suffer the entire blame would be put on the Centre. Now if you say that there is drought or shortage of foodstuff, why do you not introduce State trading on a country-wide scale and mop up every single grain of marketable surplus? You are not doing that. You are allowing hoarders a free run.

You have the Food Corporation of India. What has it done in Bengal? During this season already 4 to 5 lakh tonnes of foodgrains have changed hands but only 50,000 tonnes have been procured by the Food Corporation of India. Now they say that the previous Government, the Profulla Sen Government, did not go in for procurement and now the entire rationing system in West Bengal is going to break down. The entire food front there is in shambles. That is the state they have left us in. Whose fault is this? Obviously the Centre's. As far as I understand, the last year's quantum of 14 lakh tonnes of wheat and 2 lakh tonnes of rice you are not prepared to give us. You plead, "Where is the surplus stock?". Well, it is the Centre's responsibility. Throughout India you should have introduced State trading and mopped up every single marketable grain, everything, so that it could be rationed out. You have not done that. You have landed us in this pass, and you are not giving us the assurance that you will get us 2 lakhs tonnes of rice and whether you will get us 14 lakh tonnes of wheat, i.e. the quantity you gave last year. We are not concerned with your PL-480. If all the marketable surplus had been in your hands and distributed equitably there would have been no quarrel. We would then be pre-

pared to eat less and go without the PL-480 grain. You have deliberately brought us to this situation.

Now for the non-gazetted employees of the Kerala Government we require Rs. 6 crores. You are not giving us that money. If you do not give that, you should give us our share of foreign exchange. In West Bengal on jute, tea and other things we earn at least more than Rs 300 crores of foreign exchange.

**SHRI A. D. MANI** (Madhya Pradesh): India earns.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** The State of West Bengal earns. Almost 50 per cent of the foreign exchange is earned by West Bengal. Why should we suffer when we earn so much of foreign exchange? Give us that portion of foreign exchange. With the money we can import from whatever countries we please and we can put our economy on a sound footing. We can nationalise foreign concerns and set up new industries. We can go in for industrialisation and also solve the unemployment question. So good Centre-State relationship is in the hands of the Centre. In these circumstances if you ask the States to find resources for themselves and not to ask for Central assistance is a deliberate, planned conspiracy against the non-Congress governments. You are deliberately inviting conflict between the Centre and the States and manoeuvring in such a way as to discredit the State Governments so that they cannot solve their problems when you have created all the problems. Last year within this month, at least three lakh tons were collected. The outgoing State Congress Government has not left any stock. Levy was not even operated and no grain was collected. No rice was collected. That is the position we are now in Bengal. So I say this is a serious problem. So we want to know how much food and rice you would give us. Then there should not be any rise in the price of the consumers' ration. If there be any difference between the price at which it has to be sold

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

to the consumers and the price at which it is collected, then this difference should be made up by the Central Government. There is no other way out. So you must be prepared to cover that balance so that there may not be any rise of even a paise in the ration quantum which is sold to the people. Rather there should be a decline in prices. There should be a cut-down in prices so that people can get food at cheap rates. What we say is that under no circumstances the consumer price of ration supply shall be raised. It must be maintained. We want to find out what quantity of foodgrains will be supplied, at what price and the amount of subsidy to maintain the present consumer price. We demand from the Centre that the difference between the procurement prices, whatever they are, and the present fixed consumer prices, should be borne by the Central Government fully. That is what I wanted to say as regards food.

Next, I want to say a few words on our foreign relations. Let us take the question of border. In April, 1952, our army advanced up to the McMahon Line. Ten years before we were not there. After 1952 when our army advanced, China did not protest. So we think NEFA belongs to India, it is part and parcel of India and China cannot make any claim whatsoever there. But there is dispute here in Ladakh. When that road was constructed, during three years the Indian Government did not make any protest. Mr. Nehru said on the floor of Parliament that the border alignment was not known. It was only in 1960 that they had revised that position and said that everything was known. It is clear that there is a dispute. But we find no mention of that even in the President's Address. We are always imposing conditions for any sort of negotiations. This position is misunderstood throughout the entire world. We do not know what China will do. But we want that our Government should go in for unconditional nego-

tiations in regard to this border dispute. Mr. Nehru said that the question of Ladakh does not involve the question of sovereignty, but the question of Kashmir does. If that is so, if that is the stand of the Government, no one can understand us. Anything can be said within the four corners of India, but this position is nowhere understood abroad, and we are isolated thereby. There is a crushing burden of Rs. 1,000 crores of Defence expenditure and Mr. Morarji Desai would come and say there is Rs. 300 crores of deficit or more than that. Our economy is really being put to unhearable strain, the last straw on proverbial camel's back. This is the position we are in. If we can solve this problem, we can ease the pressure put by the imperialist opponents. We can cut down the Defence Budget. We should stand on our own feet. But you are not deliberately doing that. So when there is a clear question of dispute, why should we not go in for negotiations? For that matter, I want to put it that I for one cannot understand why the Soviet Union should not call for unconditional negotiations. If they are for peaceful co-existence, if they are for peace and peace in this part of Asia, it is the bounden duty of the Soviet Union, I think, to openly call for unconditional negotiations between India and China. Whether China would be prepared to negotiate is another question. By doing this, the Soviet Union would be helping peace and peaceful co-existence. It is mysterious, it is incomprehensible to me as to why the Soviet Union is not doing so now.

Now, as regards the question of foreign policy, we are in enmity with our neighbours, but we are on friendly terms with our real enemy, that is America. Without waging any war, they have grabbed the entire country. We are becoming another Latin American satellite country. We are becoming a part and parcel of the American system. That is the position we have been landed in. The Hon'ble Mr. Chagla said that we are prepared

to discuss anything with Pakistan. Why not discuss the Kashmir issue? Apart from that, in order to settle the Kashmir issue, I raise the question why Sheikh Abdulla should not be released. The Kashmir election has been a fake election. There has been no democratic election in Kashmir. It is a fake election under military power. So we should release Sheikh Abdulla and his associates. We should try to come to some sort of a settlement on Kashmir with Sheikh Abdulla so that Kashmir remains with us, at least the portion, which is on this side of the cease-fire line, whatever it is. But it should be done with the consent of the Kashmiri people. Everybody knows that in the Kashmir valley, 95 per cent of the people are opposed to India because of India's policies . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, that is the real position. This so-called free and fair election, when you reject 19 nomination papers and have a walk-over, is not free election. That is no democratic way to solve this question. We should try to find some *via media* to institute negotiations on Kashmir with Sheikh Abdu'la, etc., and cut down our Defence Budget drastically.

AN HON. MEMBER: By giving it?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, not by giving it. If we can settle with Sheikh Abdulla, it will remain with us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Niren Ghosh, you have taken 27 minutes.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: There was some interruption. I will finish within three minutes. As regards the Emergency, the Defence of India Act, etc., we have read in the papers that from the 1st July the Emergency will be lifted. Why not lift it throughout the length and breadth of the country? The Emergency should not be in any part of India. It should be lifted unconditionally everywhere without any

reservation. The Defence of India Act, the Emergency, the Rajasthan Proclamation, this sort of fake election in Kashmir—what do these mean? It means that it is the Congress which poses a threat to parliamentary democracy. This parliamentary democracy is under threat from the attacks of the Congress and the people of India should know and learn to defend parliamentary democracy from these forces. I do not know what the Swatantra party's attitude would be on this question. They should clarify their position. But nowadays I see there is little distinction between the Swatantra and the Congress. They want to sail in the same boat perhaps. I would advise them to think a hundred times before doing that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It only shows that the Congress has become wiser.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, the Swatantra has become smaller. As regards language, there is an assurance given, but I am not satisfied, we are not satisfied with that. If we are to cement the unity of India, all the fourteen languages should be given the same status and put on a footing of equality, so that no language group has any grievance on this score. Otherwise, if we try to thrust or impose Hindi, it will lead to the disintegration of India, not to national integration. So all the national languages should be put on an equal footing.

Then, in the name of federal structure, India has become a unitary State. I say the widest possible powers should be given to the States. The States must enjoy the widest possible power. But now, it has become not a federal State but a unitary State. Every power is vested in the Centre and the State Governments are glorified municipal corporations. It is almost like that. I would say that in order to preserve, cement and strengthen the unity of India, the question

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

of Centre-State relationship should be examined afresh and a new and the only basis should be that the State Governments must be given the widest possible autonomy and the institution of Governorship as at present constituted, appointed by the President, should go. The Governors are not functioning in an impartial manner. They are functioning in a partisan way, subserving particular parties and interests. At least they should be elected by the State Legislatures if it is necessary to retain that institution or this superfluous cumbrous institution, a relic of the British past, should be done away with at once and forthwith.

With these few words, I conclude.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI (Rajasthan): Sir, I rise here to support the Motion of Thanks for the Address by the President to the Joint Houses of Parliament. The President's Address has presented to Parliament a profile of the great Republic now in its seventeenth year, robust, healthy, constitutionally competent, politically mature and culturally vigorous, now entering into an era of commonwealth of youth, young men and women of this country. It spells out specifically and precisely the conceptual framework of our polity, built by all of us together, irrespective of party affiliations over the last 20 years and under the leadership and guidance of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru until 1964. Under his guidance we have been able to build up three main fundamentals of Indian political institutions. Firstly, that the Indian democracy has passed through the take-off stage, belying the fears and apprehensions of the observers within and outside this country. Secondly, that socialism will remain the common man's ideology for our onward march in this country, and thirdly, that non-alignment, as the policy in foreign affairs, would remain a compass, in chartering or negotiating the problems in the ocean of in-

ternational affairs. The President has remindingly referred to it. He has also reminded us very rightly that there were irreversible trends in world politics and therefore we had to remain dynamically close to the events in the world. This will need on our part to be very vigilant and we shall require to uphold our commitment to the triple principles of public life; first, it requires the strength of character and sacrifice. Secondly, it will require us to believe in socialist principles. Thirdly, it will require us to adhere to the democratic decency or all decencies that come in political life and behaviour. The visiting card that the electorate has left with us is obvious and clear. It demands of us, who are representing the electorate in this House and the other, that we nourish this democracy and this country and the public with our positive involvement in a positive goal. Some of the issues that the President has touched in his Address, I would like to refer to them very briefly, but before I do that, as a Member coming from Rajasthan, I feel very distressed as to what happened in Jaipur when the disturbance took place in Jaipur on 7th of this month. Our sympathies go to those who have been victims in this particular disturbance. However, since this issue is entrusted to judicial enquiry, we should leave it at that and wait for its findings as to who was responsible but as far as the President's Rule is concerned, I believe it is meant to preserve constitutional propriety and political neutrality. In the midst of political confusion, in the midst of social confusion there, it was difficult to find the political equation within the Legislature.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member but will he point out a single non-colonial Constitution of a quasi-federal or federal character which has an article like article 356?

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI: That we shall discuss when we come to the amendment if any. I only want to assure myself and the House...

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I understood the hon. Member to say.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI: None will be sorry about it more than the President himself as he has referred to in his Address that in Rajasthan responsible Government had to be delayed and President's Rule had to be brought about. However, I am sure this is a passing phase and this is, to my mind, the knife of the surgeon meant ephemerally to restore the health of an ailing patient. It will not and should not take a long time and we shall all be happy, irrespective of which party comes to power, to see that responsible Government is restored in my State of Rajasthan.

Referring to foreign policy, if only a conspectus of world situation is taken, I feel there is a qualitative transformation in the Afro-Asian affairs as in world affairs. I was rather surprised to read in the 1965 issue of 'The Newsweek' of 12th July entitled "Afro-Asian Unity—Myth and Sombre reality". It calls Afro-Asian Unity a misnomer, that Asian unity is a misnomer, that it has nothing to unite and only there is poverty in the Afro-Asian countries. I do not want to be disrespectful to the country wherefrom this "Newsweek" is published. Should I take it that the Anti-poverty Programme of the U.S.A. indicates lack of unity in the American society? Does poverty mean that the society is divided? The Afro-Asian society showed its vigour during the Indonesian crisis in 1948-49. It effectively proved its strength when the Suez Canal issue came up and we all know the Afro-Asian pressure diplomacy, genuine and deep as it was, brought about the result contrary to what was expected by the might of the West. We are accustomed no doubt to the ever-fluctuating undependable foe-friend equation of European diplomacy, but in our Asian society we have our historical cultural understanding and cultural unity to our own common issues in the background of our common struggle

against colonial and imperialist powers in the past for several decades and centuries. It is true that we have to deepen the sense of political regionalism on an enlightened base, but it is also true that regional polity cannot have an isolated repercussion, and in this China has been one of the supreme enemies, one which has distorted the otherwise restored Afro-Asian family. My friend, Mr. Ghosh, said that we should negotiate with China unconditionally. I presume that it would be too much for any patriot to talk that language. Although we should never fear to negotiate, but we should never negotiate out of fear, as late President Kennedy rightly said Our unalterable premise is nation's dignity and a nation's sovereignty of course, of all concerned. So if anyone thinks of negotiating, he should bear this in mind. It can never do away with this thing. I do not know what exactly my friend meant or what was in his mind when he referred to the French Revolution. I am afraid he has misread the happenings and the consequences of the French Revolution. I do not have the time to go into them in detail and I do not want to repeat the barbarous and monstrous things that happened in the course of the French Revolution and the result which it achieved in ultimately restoring the monarchy which we do not want. We want to adhere to certain principles enumerated in that Revolution, Equality Fraternity, Liberty and New Socialism. We would not follow the processes adopted by those revolutionaries. I suggest therefore to my Afro-Asian friends to evolve an Afro-Asian consensus to be built up on Afro-Asian fundamentals. Referring to Vietnam, our policy as a nation is obvious; we are all opposed to what is happening in Vietnam. We do not want that there should be any foreign power in Vietnam or in any other country. I believe we should take the initiative to convene a consultative committee meeting or a assembly of Afro-Asian parliamentarians first to discuss the matter threadbare and involve ourselves on a positive line of action. You can-



[Shri Shantilal Kothari.]  
 not bring about solutions by isolating one from another and embitter relations or complicate the issue further. In this India has a special responsibility. Mutually acceptable functional and cultural perspectives and ties have to be built up for the solutions sought for. The 'London Times' in its issue of the 13th of this month writes editorially that there is no national consciousness in our foreign affairs, in our foreign policy. I am surprised that an old democracy should say that there was no national consensus in our foreign affairs or in our foreign policy. We have national consensus. We have non-alignment, positive non-alignment. Non-alignment does not mean lack of commitment. Non-alignment does not mean that we are averse to take part in responsible decisions and their implementation. Non-alignment is not dead neutrality. Non-alignment is a positive concept, enabling us to look at issues as they come with a commitment to Afro-Asian progress and Afro-Asian freedom. May I ask our friend from the United Kingdom, who wrote this thing in the 'London Times', "Have they consensus, even low level on the issue of Rhodesia, on their entry into the European Common Market, on their relationship with NATO, on their relationship with Germany and on their relationship with Russia or with the U.S.A.?" I do not know what he means by this. He has obviously confused unity with uniformity. Democracy does not care for uniformity; it cares for unity and we have shown an example of it during these recent elections and during the last so many years in other fields. If now India or the Asian countries ignore or fight shy to go into the problems of Afro-Asian countries I am afraid the statesmanship of Afro-Asian countries will be put to a great danger, and we shall be doing so at our own peril and at the peril of the coming generation. It is high time that a vigorous Afro-Asian policy was expounded and implemented by us all in collaboration with other members of the Afro-Asian fraternity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Kothari, I may tell you that you have only one and a half minutes more.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI: May I be permitted to take just about five minutes from now? To conclude my reference to foreign affairs I shall say this. We must have within Africa and Asia the firmest, fairest and finest statesmanship forthcoming. The President's Address fortunately responds to these requirements and I hope the Government would implement them in a more vigorous manner.

Only one point about our foreign services. This morning I went through an item in the papers and it is that the Ambassador in Tokyo was going to be appointed to some gubernatorial post. I want to only bring to the notice of the House that last month, on the 4th of February, I had a meeting with the Foreign Minister and said that we were desirous of knowing as to what the present Ambassador in Tokyo had done in Indonesia when he was there and now when he is in Japan. I am afraid sometimes these things are worth knowing. While I say this I must also say that we have the finest people, the finest officials abroad, who are doing a very good job, no doubt, and we have got such fine people within our services here also. But this is one isolated example and I spent one hour with the Foreign Affairs Minister discussing this case. I can understand his predecessor who was perhaps alleged to be foreign to foreign affairs, but the present Foreign Affairs Minister, I hope, will look into these things thoroughly. I must have the answer after having talked to him for one hour over this case. I took it up with him after my recent tour of Japan. I want to remind him that skilful answers are no substitute for substantial, feasible results.

Referring to the problem of Centre-States, for the first time we see

federal polity in operation. We are happy that our Prime Minister took the first opportunity of sending the warmest and most cordial greetings to the non-Congress multi-party Governments that have come to power in various States, and this co-operation and collaboration indicates the faith of the leadership of the party in power in what we call open federal democratic polity. This shows also that there is a sense on all sides as to what political hygiene means in a federal polity.

There have been references made that a minority of votes has brought the Congress Party a majority of seats. I was looking into the figures for Kerala, and particularly the figures for Madras and West Bengal. I am sure that the leaders of the Opposition parties do not want to apply the same yardstick in respect of those States where they are in power. I say this because in Madras over 41 per cent of votes have been cast in favour of the Congress whereas the ruling party there, the D.M.K. got only 40 per cent of the votes. So also in Kerala and in West Bengal. If you examine the whole thing and see the figures, that is what you find. I do not want to go into those details just now. I am only interested in seeing that the healthy convention laid down during the last twenty years of the party getting the majority of seats being called upon to shoulder the responsibilities of Government is observed. The party that gets that majority in the Legislature or in Parliament must be given this responsibility.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA): Mr. Kothari, you are now encroaching upon other Members' time.

AN HON MEMBER: That is normal.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Sir, I do not want that statement of the hon Member to go uncontradicted. He gave some figures of percentage, but there seems to be some lapse in his arithmetic.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI: I did not mention Orissa.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA. Even in the case of Madras, the Congress contested all the seats in Madras Assembly and the D.M.K. there contested only some 170 or 175 seats. If you apply the test of percentage of votes, you should take only those seats which were contested by the D.M.K. and also all those seats that the Congress contested. The base must be the same for both if you want to make a comparison.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI: I did not mention the number of seats that were contested. I only mentioned the votes that were cast in favour of the parties. I do agree with all those who say that under our Constitution the party that gets the quantitative majority of seats must be entrusted with the responsibility of forming the Government.

And lastly I want to say only a few words on the subject of food and prices. This was mentioned by hon. friends earlier.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA): That is a very low priority for food.

SHRI SHANTILAL KOTHARI: My hon friend Shri Z. A. Ahmad and my hon friend, Shri Ghosh, referred to the Centre's responsibility to provide food to the States. Yes, the Centre is responsible to do everything for the country. But we must also be very careful not to contradict ourselves. We have got to remember that it is the responsibility of all to grow more food and in the case of failure of the monsoons we have got to import foodgrains. While I do understand that political factors of economic diplomacy must be borne in mind I can assure hon. Members that for the last twenty years we have been extra careful about this matter and that is precisely why we stand today as a growing nation. Thank you Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA): I have got a large number of Members who want to take part in this debate. I would, therefore, request hon Members to limit their remarks to fifteen minutes.

प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धान्तालंकार (नाम-निर्देशित) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे अनुपस्थित सदस्य श्री राजनारायण जी राष्ट्रपति जी से बहुत नाराज हैं। उनका कहना है कि देश के अन्दर अन्न संकट पड़ा हुआ है, लेकिन राष्ट्रपति जी भी यही कहते हैं कि देश के अन्दर अन्न संकट पड़ा हुआ है। आपके कहने में और राष्ट्रपति जी के कहने में फर्क यह है कि आप तो शोर मचाते हैं कि अन्न संकट है, अन्न संकट है, यह है, वह है। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति जी जब अन्न संकट के बारे में कहते हैं तो उसके साथ ही यह भी कहते हैं कि 1971 तक हमें अन्न संकट को देश से दूर करना है और इस आदेश के साथ उन्होंने सम्बोधन किया है।

अन्न संकट का प्रश्न ऐसा है जिस को कांग्रेस स्वयं अनुभव करती है। महात्मा गांधी जी ने कहा था कि अगर भगवान इस देश के अन्दर जन्म लेंगे तो उन्हें रोटी के रूप में जन्म लेना होगा और तब यहाँ की जनता उस भगवान को पहचान सकेगी। इस अन्न संकट की समस्या को महात्मा गांधी भी अनुभव करते थे और वे इसके बारे में जनता को बतलाते रहते थे। अब प्रश्न यह है और समस्या यह है कि यह देश जो कि एक कृषि प्रधान देश है, जिस देश को दूसरे देशों को अन्न देना चाहिये था, उस देश को उद्योग प्रधान देश अन्न दे रहा है। अमरीका के अन्दर एक बड़ा प्रश्न उत्पन्न हो गया है कि अमरीका एक उद्योग प्रधान देश है, वहाँ की जनता कृषि प्रधान नहीं है। लेकिन उद्योग प्रधान देश अमरीका से कृषि प्रधान देश अन्न की भीख माग रहा है। इस समस्या के बारे में राष्ट्रपतिजीने कहा कि इसको हल

करना है। इस बारे में किसी को कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर हम इस समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं तो यह समस्या हल हो सकती है क्योंकि भारत में इस समय प्रति एकड़  $8\frac{1}{2}$  मन गेहूँ पैदा होता है। अमरीका के अन्दर जो कि एक उद्योग प्रधान देश है वहाँ पर प्रति एकड़ 29 मन गेहूँ पैदा होता है बेल्जियम में प्रति एकड़ 42 मन गेहूँ पैदा होता है और जापान में प्रति एकड़ 50 मन धान पैदा होता है। जब हमारे अन्न उत्पादन में इतना भेद है तो हम क्यों नहीं अन्न उत्पादन की मात्रा को बढ़ा सकते हैं? हम अपने देश में ऐसी स्थिति उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं जिससे अन्न की समस्या हमेशा के लिये हल हो सकती है।

हमें बढ़ते हुए दामों को कम करना है, यह दूसरी बात राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कही है। न्यूट्रिशन एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने कहा था कि अगर प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को अपना भोजन मिले जिससे उसका शरीर पुष्ट हो सके, तो उसका भोजन पर 35 रुपये माहवार व्यय होगा। अपने देश के अन्दर 30 प्रतिशत आमदनी ऐसे हैं जिनकी प्रतिमास आमदनी 15 रुपये है। 10 प्रतिशत व्यक्ति ऐसे हैं जिनकी प्रतिमास आमदनी 10 रुपये माहवार है। तो ऐसी हालत में 40 प्रतिशत व्यक्ति ऐसे हैं जिनकी आमदनी 35 रुपये प्रतिमास से कम है। उन को अपने भोजन के लिये इतना कमाने की ज़रूरत है जिससे वह अपने स्वास्थ्य को कायम रख सकें। इसी वजह से राष्ट्रपति जी ने देश का ध्यान इन बढ़ते हुए दामों की ओर खींचा है और कहा है कि इन दामों को हमें कम करना होगा। 1965 के दामों को अगर देखा जाय और उनकी तुलना 1967 के जनवरी और फरवरी से की जाये, तो हम यह पायेंगे कि दामों में काफी वृद्धि हो गई है और इन दो महीनों में 17 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हो चुकी है। अगर दो महीनों के अन्दर 17 प्रतिशत की बढ़ोतरी दामों में हो गई है,

तो हमें वास्तव में यह सोचना होगा कि एक गरीब आदमी अपना जीवन किस तरह से व्यतीत कर सकेगा। इसी वजह से राष्ट्रपति जी ने इस तरफ देश का ध्यान खींचा है कि हमें बढ़ते हुए दामों को कम करना है।

तीसरी बात जिस की तरफ राष्ट्रपति जी ने ध्यान दिलाया है वह देश की आर्थिक स्थिति के बारे में है कि वह किस तरह से आत्म निर्भर हो सकता है। उनका कहना है कि 1976 तक देश को आर्थिक दृष्टि से आत्म निर्भर हो जाना चाहिये। हमारे देश के ऊपर जो इस समय हजं है वह 10,471 करोड़ रुपया है। इसमें अपने देश के अन्दर 6,217 करोड़ रुपया है और विदेशों का 4,624 करोड़ रुपया हमने कर्ज लिया है। यही कारण है कि पिछले वर्ष 32 करोड़ का डैफिसिट बजट था और इस वर्ष 350 करोड़ का डैफिसिट है। यह डैफिसिट इस लिये है कि देश की बढ़ती हुई आवश्यकताओं को पूरा करने के लिये हमें कर्ज लेना पड़ता है। राष्ट्रपति ने इस ओर संकेत किया है कि हमें देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को 1976 तक ऐसा बनाना होगा जिससे हमें दूसरे देशों से कर्ज न लेना पड़े।

चौथी बात जिस तरफ राष्ट्रपति जी ने हमारा ध्यान आकर्षित किया है वह यह है कि अपने देश के अन्दर 40 प्रति हजार से संख्या बढ़ती ही चली जा रही है। इस बढ़ती हुई जन संख्या को 25 प्रति हजार लाने की आवश्यकता है। आप स्वयं सोचें कि एक तालाब के अन्दर पानी आता जाये और उसके अन्दर एक छेद हो तथा पानी निकलता चला जाये, तो तालाब कभी नहीं भर सकता है। जिस समय देश का विभाजन हुआ था, उस समय इस देश की जन संख्या करीब 33 करोड़ की थी। इस देश का कुछ हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को चला गया और इस तरह से कुछ करोड़ आबादी पाकिस्तान की तरफ चली गई और हमारे यहाँ करीब 25 : 30 करोड़ आबादी बच रही। लेकिन

अब हमारे देश की संख्या बढ़ते बढ़ते करीब 50 करोड़ तक पहुँच गई है। इतने लोगों को हमें खाना देना होगा और केवल शोष मचाने से हम अन्न की समस्या को हल नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस तरह के शोष मचाने से कभी भी हमारी कोई अन्न तथा दूसरी समस्याएँ हल नहीं हो सकती हैं। अगर आज वर्षा हो गई है, परसों वर्षा हो गई है, तो यह आप या कांग्रेस ने वर्षा नहीं की। कांग्रेस के या किसी और के हाथ में वर्षा का होना या न होना नहीं है। यह तो दैवी आपत्तियाँ हैं जिन्हें हमें सब मिलकर सामना करना होगा।

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया (मध्य प्रदेश) :** आपने यज्ञ करने का सुझाव दिया था, उसके द्वारा वर्षा हो सकती है। क्या आप ऐसा सुझाव करेंगे।

**प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धान्तलालका :** यह तो हम अच्छी तरह से कर सकते हैं। ये चार बातें राष्ट्रपति ने हमारे सामने रखी है और पाँचवीं बात यह है जो हमारी शिक्षा की समस्या है वह हमारी सबसे मुख्य समस्या है। इस समय देश की स्थिति यह है कि माध्यमिक और उच्च शिक्षा प्राप्त व्यक्ति केवल 2 प्रतिशत है। जो बच्चे इस समय स्कूलों में शिक्षा ले रहे हैं वे दो प्रतिशत हैं। जो उच्च शिक्षा प्राप्त व्यक्ति है, उनकी संख्या केवल 2 प्रतिशत है और इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि 98 प्रतिशत व्यक्ति इस देश के अन्दर ऐसे हैं जिनको उच्च शिक्षा, माध्यमिक शिक्षा और विश्वविद्यालय की शिक्षा प्राप्त नहीं है। तो ऐसा देश जिस के अन्दर 98 प्रतिशत व्यक्ति ऐसे हों जिन को उच्च शिक्षा न मिली हो, वे लोग चाहे कृषि का प्रश्न क्यों न हो, चाहे राजनैतिक प्रश्न क्यों न हो और कोई प्रश्न क्यों न हो उसमें किसी तरह से भी देश की उन्नति के लिए योगदान नहीं दे सकते। इस लिये सरकार को शिक्षा की तरफ विशेष ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

[प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धांतालंकार]

अब देखिये कि इस शिक्षा के न होने के कारण क्या हो रहे हैं। जितने हमारे एलेक्शन हो रहे हैं वे जाति बिरादरी के आधार पर हो रहे हैं। हम यह देखते हैं कि फलां जगह से कौन आसानी से चुना जा सकता है। अगर बनिये का क्षेत्र है तो बनिये को टिकट देते हैं, अगर ब्राह्मण का क्षेत्र है तो ब्राह्मण को टिकट देते हैं और अगर कहीं मुसलमान का क्षेत्र है तो मुसलमान को टिकट देते हैं इसलिये हमारी जो डेमोक्रेसी है, हमारा जो जनतंत्र है, उसके अन्दर जो यह एक भ्रजनतात्विक व्यवस्था उत्पन्न हो रही है, उस व्यवस्था को हमें दूर करना होगा।

चूँकि लोग शिक्षित नहीं हैं, यही कारण है कि आज हमारे देश में निर्दलीय सदस्यों की संख्या बढ़ती चली जा रही है। आप दूसरे देशों में देखिये। इंग्लैंड के अन्दर वहाँ का जो हाउस आफ कामन्स है, उसमें 263 सदस्य लेबर पार्टी के हैं, 253 कंज़र्वेटिव हैं, 12 लिबरल हैं और कुल 2 अन्य सदस्य हैं अमेरिका के अन्दर सेनेट में डेमोक्रेट 68 हैं, रिपब्लिकन 32 हैं और इंडिपेंडेंट एक भी नहीं है। लेकिन आप देखिये कि अपने देश में क्या स्थिति है। सब विधान सभाओं की अगर मख्या जोड़ी जाय तो विधान सभाओं के 3459 सदस्य हैं जिनमें 320 इंडिपेंडेंट हैं। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि 10 प्रतिशत निर्दलीय है। और इससे यह भी स्पष्ट होता है कि हमारी जनता इस बात को अनुभव नहीं करती है कि हमें किस प्रांग्राम पर चलना है। जितने दल हैं वे किसी नीति को लेकर सामने आते हैं। लेकिन यहाँ पर जो किसी नीति को लेकर नहीं आते, जो निर्दलीय है वे आज तक विशेष प्रकार की राजनैतिक समस्या उत्पन्न कर रहे हैं। भिन्न भिन्न राज्यों में जा करके क्या देखते हैं कि इंडिपेंडेंट्स का खींचने की कोशिश होती है और इनके मिलाप में जो आज सरकारें बन रही हैं उन सरकारों की क्या हालत है कि जनमंडल वाले, स्वतंत्र वाले, कम्युनिस्ट, ये लोग मिल रहे हैं।

उद्घाटन विवाह

गीत गायन्ति गर्धभा :

परस्परं प्रशंसन्ति

अहो रूप अहो ध्वनि:

यह व्यवस्था आज अपने देश में हो रही है कि जिन का आपस में कोई प्रोग्राम नहीं है, उनका एक दूसरे से विवाह हो रहा है। गंधा कह रहा है ऊँट से कि आपका कैसा सुन्दर रूप है और ऊँट कह रहा है गंधे से कि आपका कैसा मधुर स्वर है। इस तरह के जो आज हमारे राजनैतिक संगठन बन रहे हैं, वे देश की भलाई नहीं कर सकते। इसी लिये मैं आप से कह रहा हूँ कि आज शिक्षा की आवश्यकता है। हमारा देश अशिक्षित है। आप कहते हैं कि हमने शिक्षा के लिये बहुत काम किया। लेकिन मैं आपसे कह रहा हूँ कि हमारे देश में 98 प्रतिशत ऐसे लोग हैं जिनको उच्च शिक्षा प्राप्त नहीं है, जिनको माध्यमिक शिक्षा तक प्राप्त नहीं है।

श्री डाह्याभाई बी० पटेल (गुजरात) :

इसी वजह से कांग्रेस को वो मिलते हैं।

प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धांतालंकार : इसी

वजह से आपको भी वोट मिल जाते हैं।

श्री डाह्याभाई बी० पटेल : नहीं, नहीं,

हम को नहीं मिलते हैं।

प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धांतालंकार : जो जाता

है उसी को वोट मिल जाते हैं इस लिये शिक्षा का प्रचार करने की आवश्यकता है शिक्षा के अभाव के कारण आज हमारे देश के अन्दर जो इंटीग्रेशन होना चाहिये, वह इंटीग्रेशन नहीं हो रहा है।

शिक्षा आयोग ने, अपनी रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने पेश की है और राष्ट्रपति ने उसकी तरफ ध्यान आकर्षित किया है कि शिक्षा आयोग ने जो कुछ कहा है उसे हमें क्रिया में परिणत करना चाहिये। शिक्षा आयोग की रिपोर्ट को

हमने भी पढ़ा है। शिक्षा आयोग ने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही है जो पहले जो आयोग नियुक्त हुये उन्होंने न कही हो। पहले यूनिवर्सिटी कमीशन नियुक्त हुआ, मदालियर कमीशन नियुक्त हुआ और उन लोगों ने जितनी बातें कहीं, वही सब शिक्षा आयोग ने भी कही। शिक्षा आयोग ने एक जगह यह लिखा है :

"We realise that many of the things we say here have been said before notably by the University Education Commission in 1948-49. The real need is action."

जो असली चीज है, जिसके करने की आवश्यकता है, वह क्रियात्मक कार्य करने की आवश्यकता है, जब तक हम क्रिया में उन बातों को परिणित नहीं करते जिन बातों के आधार पर एक राष्ट्र आगे प्रगति कर सकता है, तब तक कितनी भी रिपोर्टें आप उत्पन्न करते चले जायं, कितने ही लोगों को इकट्ठा करते जायं, लेकिन उसका नतीजा कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। शिक्षा ऐसी चीज है जिस के कारण देश उन्नति कर सकता है। आज भिन्न भिन्न तरह के लोगों पर लांछन लगाया जाता है। लेकिन आप देखिये कि राजस्थान के अन्दर क्या हुआ। एक व्यक्ति सारे राज्य के अन्दर इधर से उधर कर रहा है। एक श्री जगन्नाथ का नाम मैंने पढ़ा अखबारों के अन्दर। वह जगन्नाथ अगर इधर हो जाय तो इनकी मेजोरिटी हो जाती है और उधर हो जाय तो उनकी मेजोरिटी हो जाती है। जिम राज्य के अन्दर एक व्यक्ति की इच्छा पर इधर से उधर हो जाय, वहाँ क्या इस तरह की व्यवस्था वाछनीय होगी और क्या इस तरह से कोई शासन अपने आप को सबल बना सकता है। तो हमें अपने बच्चों को, अपने देश के होनहार नवयुवकों को शिक्षित करने की आवश्यकता है। अब अपने देश को आजाद हुये करीब 20 साल हो गये। शिक्षा में 14 वर्ष के अन्दर आप देश को कुछ से कुछ बना सकते हैं। आज मान वर्ष का जो बच्चा स्कूल जाता है और जिम्मे कुछ नहीं पढ़ा है, 14 वर्ष के अन्दर उस बच्चे को

आप बी० ए०, एम० ए० बना देते हैं। तो 14 वर्ष एक देश को कुछ से कुछ बनाने के लिये जरूरत से ज्यादा समय है। आपके सामने एक निश्चित योजना होनी चाहिये कि आप को देश को क्या बनाना है। आपके सामने एक नक्शा होना चाहिये, आप के सामने एक तस्वीर होनी चाहिये, एक चित्र होना चाहिये कि आप देश को क्या बनाना चाहते हैं। उस नक्शे को लेकर के हम शिक्षणालयों को आमूल-चूल बदल दें। आप देखिये कि हिटलर ने अपने देश को कितने वर्षों में क्या से क्या बना दिया, मसोलनी ने अपने देश को कितने वर्षों में क्या से क्या बना दिया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप चाहें तो आप भी अपने देश को क्या से क्या बना सकते हैं, लेकिन उसके लिये एक चित्र बनाने की आवश्यकता है। शिक्षा जो सब से जरूरी चीज है उसी को ही हम आज बिल्कुल नेगलेक्ट करते जा रहे हैं। उसकी तरफ आपका ध्यान नहीं है। और बातों की तरफ तो आपका ध्यान है। आप इधर शोर मचाते हैं, उधर शोर मचाते हैं और फिर उसका परिणाम वही होता है जो राजस्थान में हुआ। जब यहाँ राजस्थान का जिक्र हो रहा था तो हमारे राजनारायण साहब ने कहा कि मैं वहाँ गया और मैंने टेलीफोन किया राज्यपाल को और कहा कि मैं लाता हूँ 92 आदमियों को। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब आप यू० पी० के हैं तो आपको यू० पी० में जाकर कुछ करना चाहिये। आप को क्या जरूरत है कि आप राजस्थान में जा करके यह सब करें। इस प्रकार आज हर जगह उत्पात करने का सिलसिला बना हुआ है और समझा जाता है कि हम जनता को जिधर चाहे उधर मोड़ दें। इसका कारण यही है कि हम शिक्षा की तरफ विघ्न ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। हमारे नवयुवकों के अन्दर, बल्कि मुझे माफ कीजियेगा यह कहने के लिये कि विधायकों के अन्दर भी यह चरित्र नहीं है जिस चरित्र के होने की आवश्यकता है। नहीं तो वय कारण है कि आज आप देखते हैं कि हरियर के अन्दर आज एक सरकार

बनती है और कल दूसरी बन जाती है। मिनिस्टर बनाओं तो यह सरकार, न बनाओ तो दूसरी सरकार। यह एक ही दल की हालत नहीं है, सभी दलों की हालत है। आप कहते हैं कि हमारे आदमियों को लोग खरीद लेते हैं। जो खरीद लेता है, वह ठीक है, गुनाह करता है। लेकिन जो खरीदा जाता है, वह क्यों खरीदा जाता है वह तो कांग्रेस का नहीं होता है। जो अपने आप को बेचते हैं, जो अपने आप को बेचने के लिये तैयार हैं, वे किस पार्टी के हैं।

**श्री लोक नाथ मिश्र :** देश में कांग्रेस ने सब को यही तालीम दी है।

**प्रो० सत्यव्रत सिद्धांतार्जुनकार :** तालीम की दोनों को जरूरत है।

आज देश में गरीबी दूर करने के लिये इस बात की जरूरत है कि शिक्षा हो और वह शिक्षा भी ठीक तरह की हो। आज शिक्षा बढ़ती चली जाती है लेकिन शिक्षा के साथ साथ अनएम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ता चला जाता है। आज शिक्षा ऐसी दी जा रही है जिस से बेकारी बढ़ती चली जा रही है। इसलिये शिक्षा भी ऐसी होनी चाहिये जो देश के सामने अनेकों समस्याएँ हैं उनको पूरा कर सके। उदाहरणार्थ आज साइंस की ओर टेक्नीक की, जरूरत है। जैसी शिक्षा आज तक चली आ रही है, वैसी शिक्षा की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

तो मैं इतना ही कह कर समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति ने जो चतुर्सूत्री कार्यक्रम रखा है उसके साथ पांचवाँ सूत्र मिला कर इसको पंचसूत्री बना दिया जाये कि शिक्षा की जो आवश्यकता है उसको पूरा किया जाये। जैसे उन्होंने कहा कि '71 तक अन्न संकट दूर होना चाहिये '76 तक आर्थिक विषमता दूर हो जानी चाहिये उसी तरह से कोई सन लगा दीजिए कि '75 तक शिक्षा का जो प्रश्न है वह हल हो जाना चाहिये।

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the President's Address. This is the election year and the manner in which we have conducted our elections or rather the Election Commission has conducted the elections reflects credit on us. Our thanks are due to the Election Commission or the efficient manner in which it has conducted the elections in this country. May, I, however say that I do not feel happy at what happened in Kashmir? I do not look up on Kashmir elections as free elections. It is rather a startling statement to make. It is a statement which many of my friends will not like. Sheikh Abdullah was in detention and it is strange that 23 members should have been declared unopposed by the returning officer. I am glad that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, who had to fight against heavy odds, has been returned to the Lok Sabha and speaking for myself I welcome him to this Parliament of ours. I should like also our relations with Kashmir to be based upon a deeper understanding of the aspirations of the people of Kashmir. We gave certain undertakings. We cannot go back to the year of 1947 or 1948. That is not my proposition, but we should respect the special status which was guaranteed to the people of Kashmir in 1947 in our Constitution and we should make no encroachment on it.

Then, I should like to say a word about or relationship with the new States. I think it should be a relationship based upon a deep understanding of what they stand for. We are a quasi-federation. The other day I was talking to a distinguished lawyer and he said we are a unitary State. But I have always looked upon our republic as a quasi-federation. Now, I have looked up some of the books on constitutional theory. It has been a hobby with me all my life to read political science, political theory and comparative politics and I have not come across any Constitution anywhere of a federal or quasi-federal

character where you have the counter-part of article 356. You have not got it in the Canadian Constitution. You have not got it in the Australian Constitution. You have not got it in the United States Constitution. You have not got it in the Swiss Constitution and you have not got it in the federal State of Germany. This is a relic of imperialis days. This was a provision which the British had imposed upon us in the interests of preserving their suzerainty over India in the Act of 1935 and I think if we are to successfully work our Constitution we should revise our outlook with regard to article 356. I am not going into its merits. I am raising it it on the ground that Dr. Sampurnanand, the great astrologer, has found it necessary to use this article in Rajasthan.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE** (Bihar): He has done it on the basis of the Constitution, not based on astrology.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** He lost his Chief Ministership in U.P. on the basis of astrology, but that is a different matter.

I may also say that I would like the North to develop a new attitude toward the South. We must take a lesson from what has happened in Madras. The Congress lost to DMK because there was resentment in the minds of the people of the South against the manner in which the North has been treating the South. (Interruption) You know that every time there has been a conflict between the South and the North, the unity of the country has disappeared. Therefore, it has become imperative by necessary for us to understand the culture of the South, to understand the spirit which animates the people of the South and to work in co-operation. Speaking for myself I would like to go and live in Kerala and I would feel happier with the people of Kerala than with the people of U.P., Bihar, Madhy Pradesh or Rajasthan, people who represent the backward areas of India.

Now, I should also like to say a word about our foreign policy. I am sorry that there are only casual references to our foreign policy. I think the question of Vietnam raises many moral issues and I think President Jhonson has not been acting in a manner so as to enhance his prestige. May I also say that we are trying to adopt an attitude of arrogance towards other countries? We assume that all the right is with us and all the wrong is with China. Now, I am not prepared to make any such assumption and I want you to get out of this rut. The other day I was reading a book, which is a very anti-Indian book in some ways. It is however, a thought-provoking book and I would like to quote from "The Crisis of India". The author compares the progress that we have made with the progress that China has made and he says that the progress that China has made has been greater than the progress we have made. This was no doubt before the cultural revolution, but it is sometimes interesting to see how others see us. I cannot get exactly that passage. This is a brilliant passage in which he is making a comparison between China and India to the detriment of India. I do not share that view. I think we have done very well, but I do not want India to be complacent. We are passing through a revolutionary period in our history, we are passing through a revolutionary phase in our history. I do not think that India will have a revolution, but if we do not take notice of the currents of thoughts that are moving millions of people, we shall be submerged in the vast revolution which may take place.

Our people are today suffering from famine. They are suffering from disease. They are suffering from high prices and water scarcity. The other day I noticed a very touching scene. A servant of mine came and told me: "Sir, you are a kind-hearted man. I have got six children. How can I live on this small ration? Why do



[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

you not have the mercy to shoot me and my children? Why must I live in this horrible condition all my life? I wonder whether there is not truth in what he said. He went on: "Sir, you take five meals a day. You have your morning tea; you have your breakfast; you have your lunch; you have your evening tea; then you have your dinner. I cannot have even two meals a day. I sometimes have only a cup of tea, occasionally. Why do you penalise me like this? It is not possible for me to get food in the ration shops. I have to wait hours before I can get food and you expect me to work. I think it will serve no useful purpose, please finish us". I said to myself, "here is a man who is speaking from his heart; I wonder whether we Indians who talk so glibly about our spirituality, who are never tired of repeating . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: A free enterpriser.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am not a free enterpriser. Please do not associate me with the free enterprisers. I have often felt that we cannot look at questions from a human angle. I was told by a very revered friend of mine that what the Hindus have worshipped throughout the ages is 'tyag', renunciation. I told him that he was talking like a humbug. I said I would give a concrete instance. Here is Harold Wilson. He formed a Government. He offered a big post to Frank Cousins who was one of the leaders of the Left. Frank Cousins resigned because he is not in agreement with the basic policies of Harold Wilson, and then not only does he resign that but he resigns his membership of Parliament so that he may be able to fight the issue out with Harold Wilson. I call that "tyag". I do not call this hunting for office 'tyag'. In this I include every one, the whole House—I mean no disrespect to anyone. Mr. Vice-Chairman, if we are to progress, we must draw lessons from the defeat which we had sustained. I know that

figures can be interpreted in different ways. Personally I am always in favour of what I call the preferential vote . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We can discuss that when the Representation of the People Bill comes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I must say that if the Constitution must work properly, it is necessary for us to revise it and see that article 356 disappears. Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the President's Address, I am sorry to say, is a disappointing document. We all know that the President's Address is not drafted only by himself but is a statement of policy of this Government, and as a statement of policy of the Government it is a badly written essay on current affairs in any university examination. Many ideas which figure in the Address are disjointed and I expected that when the President addressed both the Houses of Parliament, he would make a pointed reference to the benefits, if any, which the country had derived from devaluation. There has been no mention whatever about devaluation in the Address, a fact to which my hon. friend, Mr. Jagat Narain, has drawn attention in one of his amendments. It is now known that during the last six months the country has lost as much as 100 million dollars on account of devaluation. Our exports are not picking up and our textiles are meeting with very sharp resistance in many countries of the world. Our textile market abroad was one of our price markets and we have lost our textile market to other competitors. There is also resistance in regard to jute. Our jute earnings also have not come up to the expectations entertained by the Ministry of Commerce.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Therefore, we have lost our Commerce Minister.

SHRI A. D. MANI: We have also lost our Commerce Minister who was not in favour of the policy of devaluation. Our economy is in shambles. The political fabric has been maintained somehow in the various parts of the country through the law and order situation in some part of the country has posed a serious challenge to democracy in India. Even though our political fabric is in existence today and has been unshaken by recent events, the economic chaos reminds me as a student of history of the days of 1770 when Lord Clive made a second visit when the country was in the stage of a crisis. At that time Lord Clive tried to reorganise the economy of those territories which were under the East India Company. If we are not in a position to survive the economic crisis, our democracy will cease to exist, and it is a significant factor that we have not been able to avoid deficit financing though this has been a cardinal feature of the stated policy after devaluation. We all have read the statement of Kerala Government that they would like their over draft to be written off. There are many States which have heavily overdrawn from the Reserve Bank. And deficit financing is going on apace in every State in the country including the Centre. Now we are faced with a staggering deficit in the Vote on Account Budget which has been presented. I am afraid, if we are not in a position to retrieve the economic situation, we would not be able to maintain the parliamentary institutions in the country and we expected that the President would make a reference to the economic affairs in detail in his speech.

In spite of the fact that the Congress controlled the governments in all the State before the General Elections, it was not able to arrest the prices and the prices continue to rise, in spite of occasional resistance as in the State of West Bengal after the new Ministry came to power there.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Madam, I have given notice of a number of amendments on which I would like to speak in the course of my comments on the President's Address. The President has referred to the conduct of the General Elections and tributes have been paid to the efficiency and care with which the Election Commissioner has conducted the elections. It is not proper to mention officials by name but I think, Madam, that it is my duty to mention the name of the Deputy Election Commissioner, Mr. P. S. Subramaniam, also who toured along with the Chief Election Commissioner from one part of the country to another to conduct the General Elections. The General Elections have proved to be a triumph of Indian democracy and has given the lie to the stories spread abroad that Indian democracy was in danger and that the 1967 elections would see the death of Indian democracy. Democracy has been maintained and free and fair elections have also been held in all parts of the country.

But, Madam, it might have been noticed that a certain new pattern of electioneering has come into evidence in the recent General Elections. In the 1962 General Elections, meetings used to be addressed by leaders. But now on account of the disturbances, house-to-house canvassing has become the pattern of canvassing in the recent elections. And if the meetings continue to be disturbed, I am afraid that in 1972 the candidates may have to go in tanks and armoured cars to meet their voters because there will be so much of violence in 1972 that they may not be able to indulge in open canvassing.

I feel that the time has come for the Election Commission to consider how the law and order can be maintained before the conduct of the General Elections.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** If Ministers resign before the elections there will be no trouble.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** Yes, if the Ministers resign before the General Elections, there will not be such a trouble as there had been in the recent General Elections. Further, it has become necessary for the Penal Code to be amended to enhance the penalties in regard to the offences committed at the time of the elections. Disturbance at meetings too should be made penal offence because everyone should have the opportunity of stating his case before the public. Recently, candidates have also been the subject of wild attacks. Mr. Madhu Limaye of the other House was subjected to severe assault in Monghyr. These are all very bad portends and I do hope that the Election Commission would give serious attention to this aspect of the matter and suggest an amendment to the criminal law in order to maintain law and order during the General Elections.

Madam, I would also like to go on to make a few observations on the imposition of President's rule in Rajasthan. This matter has been discussed on a number of occasions in this House through calling attention notices and interventions on other subjects. I would like to say this that it is not proper, after non-Congress Governments have come into existence in certain States, for Congressmen who are Governors to continue in office. If I may say so, it is the duty of Dr. Sampurnanand to resign his office as Governor of Rajasthan because he happened to be a very active Congressman before he assumed his present office, and I am not sure whether he still is not a Congressman. . .

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** Mr. Mani, for your information, no Congressman voluntarily resigns office unless he is pushed out.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** Yes but then

we do not want to push Governors out because it is not proper under the Constitution. It is open to us to say that no Congressman should continue in office in those States where non-Congress Governments have come into existence. Further, the Government also should evolve a new policy regarding the appointment to Governors. Now, whenever a person becomes inconvenient or is thrown out in the elections or is not in a position to get a seat from the Congress High Command, he is recommended for Governorship. Governorship has been the out-door relief of the Congress Party. Whenever any persons has been in need of a job, he approaches the Congress High Command and says, "You will kindly provide me with a seat somewhere. Otherwise, at least make me a Governor."

**SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa):** How many Congressmen have been made Governors?

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** I am saying that in Rajasthan, Dr. Sampurnanand, the Governor, is a Congressman. I think that for the post of Governors a suggestion has been made that the Governor should be elected by the State Legislatures. I am not in favour of the election for the post of Governor. It is possible for the Government to have a panel of retired jurists, men who can apply their impartial minds to the problems of the States, and appoint them as Governors. Or they can think of men who have distinguished themselves in public service. But they should not be confined to members of one party.

Madam, about the imposition of the President's rule in Rajasthan, I feel that it was thoroughly uncalled for because it was possible for the opposition to form a Government. It has never been in this history of India when Members of the opposition parties presented themselves at the Rashtrapati Bhavan in order to be physically counted as has been in the recent case. Even though physical verification was provided by

the strength of the opposition, yet, President's rule has been imposed in Rajasthan and I hope that....

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you deny that he was a Congressman?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Physical verification took place here. Mr. Chavan was there, he counted all the men. (*Interruptions*) Further, in Rajasthan many complaints have been made that officials have indulged in canvassing for the Congress Party.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): In Madhya Pradesh too.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, in Madhya Pradesh too. This is a very serious matter because at the time of the formation of the ministry, it is not the duty of the official, it is not within the purview of his duty, to go and indulge in canvassing for any party, whatever may be the party in power before the elections or after. If they want to restore people's faith in the *bona fides* of exchange earnings of Kerala to be Rajasthan must be abrogated and a free play of parliamentary forces must be brought into existence and the opposition be given the opportunity to form the Government.

Madam, I would like to go on to speak about the Centre-State relations about which I have tabled an amendment, and this also figures in the Presidential Address. Madam, after the non-Congress Governments have come into existence in six States with the possibility of their coming into existence in some more States, we cannot rely on the Centre alone for regulating the federal and state relationships. Mr. Annadurai has made a pointed reference to the need for more freedom for the States from the Centre. And Kerala has already asked for the foreign exchange earnings of Kerala to be used for the purpose of purchasing rice for Kerala. These demands are bound to increase in number. It is not possible for the Central Government, whatever may be its position, to give directions to the States where non-

Congress Governments have come into existence. I do not think the Central Government now has the title, in view of the results of the recent General Elections, to be regarded as the sole spokesman of Governments in

4 P.M. India. The President is there under the Constitution. But the President, as has been pointed out by Dr. Ambedkar, is guided by the advice tendered by his Ministers. But I feel that in order to regulate the Federation-State relationship in the new set-up that we find today, the Government should consider the proposal made by Sri B. N. Rau many years ago for the creation of a Privy Council, a Privy Council which will advise the President on matters which may be referred to him. The kind of matters which I have in mind are matter like the imposition of Presidential Rule in Rajasthan. When a situation like that arises, the President may consult not only the Prime Minister but also the Privy Council.

And who would be the members of the Privy Council? The Privy Council should, again, consist of men distinguished in public life, of men who have been ex-Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of India, ex-Chief Justices of High Courts, distinguished educationists. This panel may be chosen by the President on the advice of the State Governments concerned. They would be able to send some representative of the Privy Council. In a matter like the imposition of Presidential Rule in a State, it is obvious that under the scheme of things that I envisage the President would call a meeting of the Privy Council and take its advice also, and not only the advice of the Prime Minister. I feel that such a Privy Council should be brought into existence though this may mean an amendment of the Constitution. It is not possible for us to amend the Constitution in the present structure of Parliament because there may not be a valid majority for the amendment of the Constitution. But I feel the matter is so important that the Government should give its attention for evolving new procedures to determine the future

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

Federation-State relations. (Time bell rings) Madam, can I have one minute?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can have one minute.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): You suggest a Privy Council. It is a very happy thing. But would you not think that the Supreme Court can serve that purpose?

SHRI A. D. MANI: No. We do not want the Judiciary to be involved. Let the ex-Judges of the Supreme Court be on the Privy Council.

Madam, I would like to say one word in regard to our foreign policy on which I have tabled an amendment. There is no point in repeating that non-alignment continues to be the basis of our foreign policy. Non-alignment has become outdated and our foreign policy also in many matters has become outdated. We have very few friends in the world at the present time. This has been the legacy of the foreign policy followed during the last 15 years. Even a small country like Ceylon has got more friends than we have got. When I say "small" it is not a terminal derogation at all.

Madam, I feel that we have got to consider our continuance of the Commonwealth.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time-limit is over.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Only this point. If our export trade is to improve, we have got to improve our trade contacts with the European Economic Community and not with Britain alone. We have got to cultivate General De Gaulle. We have got common, close bonds of friendship with France. We may have to have a rethinking on our Commonwealth connections. In regard to Zambia I would like to make an observation. Zambia is in a very bad state on accounts of its strained relationship with Rhodesia. We should help Zambia in every way. This will restore our image in Africa where

many States feel that we are very soft towards Britain and are not in a position to take any strong measures against Mr. Ian Smith's regime.

Madam, these are the few remarks which I have got to make on the President's Address.

डा० धर्म प्रकाश (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में देश की एकता को सुदृढ़ बनाने, लोकतंत्रीय संस्थाओं को कायम रखने, आर्थिक विकास को आगे बढ़ाने और जन कल्याण हमारा परम उद्देश्य है जैसा घोषित किया गया है। उद्देश्य तो बहुत पवित्र है बहुत ऊंचा है, परन्तु विचारणीय विषय यह है कि अब तक राष्ट्रपति ने क्या गवर्नमेंट के कारनामों पर दृष्टिपात किया है? अब तक जो कुछ हुआ है वह क्या जन कल्याण में हुआ? एकता के सूत्र में जनता को बांधने के प्रयत्न किये गये या नहीं, सुरक्षा के लिए क्या प्रयत्न किये गये, इन सब बातों पर यदि हम अपनी पिछली सरकार के कारनामों पर थोड़ा सा ध्यान दें तो आगे के लिए आशाएं आधारित हो सकती हैं?

मुझे जब जन कल्याण की बात याद आती है, तो बड़ा दुख होता है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में 70 प्रतिशत उस जनसंख्या की जिसकी हमेशा से उपेक्षा की गई, जिसको हमेशा से अधिकारों से वंचित रखा गया है, कोई भी जिक्र नहीं किया। मुझे इस बात का भी दुःख है कि जो मेरे हाथ में प्रस्ताव के ऊपर माननीय सदस्यों के 89 संशोधन हैं, उनमें भी इस समस्या के बारे में कोई जिक्र नहीं है। मैंने बड़े गौर से इन संशोधनों को देखा और पाया कि किसी भी महानुभाव ने इन करोड़ों प्राणियों की दशा के बारे में कोई भी संशोधन नहीं दिया है और न सरकार से इस बारे में कोई बात पूछी कि उसके सामने इनके लिए कोई योजना है या नहीं। यह एक निहायत शर्मनाक बात है कि जिस देश के करोड़ों प्राणियों को अधि-

कारों से वंचित रखा गया है, जिन्हें सताया गया है, जिन्हें हमेशा अंधेरे में रखा गया है, जिनसे स्वार्थ साधन किया गया है, उस का अभिभाषण में जिक्र भी नहीं किया गया है, यह हमारी गवर्नमेंट के लिए शोभा नहीं देता है। इस राष्ट्र के अध्यक्ष के लिए भी जिसने सर्वोच्च सत्ता अपने हाथ में ले रखी है, शोभा नहीं देता है। हमने इस समस्या के बारे में सरकार का ध्यान एक बार नहीं अनेक बार खींचा है और जब भी मुझे अवसर मिलता है, मैं हमेशा उसका ध्यान इस समस्या की ओर दिलाता रहता हूँ कि इस बारे में कोई ठोस कदम उठाये जायें तथा इस समस्या का समाधान ढूँढा जाये। लेकिन मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि एक बार नहीं, अनेकों बार, इस समस्या के बारे में जानकारी होने के बावजूद भी, इस बारे में सरकार की ओर से कोई कदम नहीं उठाये जाते। मैं सदन से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यही रफतार रही, तो कुछ हमने चौथे आम चुनाव में देख लिया है कि किस तरह से जातीयता का नंगा नाच खेला गया, साम्प्रदायिकता की भावनाएं भड़काई गईं, क्षेत्रीय भावनाओं को भड़काया गया और रूपों के जोर से वोटों को खरीदा गया। अगर यही हालत रही तो जो अनपढ़ हैं, जो पिछड़े हैं, जो अधिकारों से वंचित हैं, उनका क्या हाल होगा आगामी आम चुनावों में इसका आप अन्दाजा अच्छी तरह से लगा सकते हैं तथा अपने सामने कोई प्रोग्राम रख सकते हैं ?

मैं कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ फिर भी आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक बार स्वर्गीय पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू को मैंने एक पत्र लिखा था। उस पत्र का उत्तर जो उन्होंने मुझे दिया, उसके शब्द मैं यहां पर दोहराना चाहता हूँ। स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री पं० नेहरू ने सन् 1938 में एक संदेश में मुझे लिखा था कि “अरली स्वराज्य तब ही होगा, जब सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को

बराबर के अधिकार हों और ऊंच और नीच जातियां होने की भावना मिट जाये।”

उन्होंने एक दूसरा पत्र 29 दिसम्बर, 1958 को मुझे लिखा था कि “बाज सवाल आपने ऐसे लिखे हैं, जिनमें कोई बहस की गुंजाइश नहीं है और वह सारे हमारे देश की स्थिति से बंधे हुए हैं। मैं इस कार्य में आपका सहयोग चाहता हूँ।”

इसके बाद एक स्थिति आती है। जब स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने मेरे पत्रोत्तर में 30 अगस्त, सन् 1964 ई० को लिखा था कि “आपने चर्चा अपने पत्र में ठीक ही की है। इन प्रश्नों की ओर प्रयत्न तो सरकार का रहा है, परन्तु यह कहना कि सब काम संतोषजनक हुआ है, ठीक नहीं होगा। जितना भी इस ओर अधिक से अधिक हो सके वह करना हमारा कर्तव्य है। आप स्वयं कार्य करते रहे हैं और आपकी सेवाओं का उपयोग हो सके तो उचित ही होगा।” यह दूसरे प्रधान मंत्री का पत्र और उनके उद्गार हैं। उसके बाद जब श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी प्रधान मंत्री बनीं तो उनसे भी पत्र-व्यवहार हुआ। उनके उद्गार भी जरा सुनिये। उन्होंने यह लिखा था 12 मार्च, 1966 को मेरे एक पत्र के उत्तर में :

“हरिजनों के विकास के बारे में आपकी चिंता को मैं महसूस करती हूँ और मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि आप इस क्षेत्र में जोरों से काम कर रहे हैं। मैं आपसे सहमत हूँ कि हमारी जनता के कमजोर वर्गों के उत्थान के लिये विशेष कदम उठाने चाहिये।”

दूसरे पत्र में उन्होंने यह लिखा : —

“मैं आपसे सहमत हूँ कि इतना व्यय करने के बाद भी पिछड़े

## [ डा० धर्म प्रकाश ]

लोगों के लिये सन्तोषजनक कार्य नहीं हुआ है ।”

ये उनके हृदय के उद्गार हैं, मगर इन उद्गारों को सामने रखते हुए मैं उनकी अदूरदर्शिता की एक बात भी आपके सामने रख दूँ। पिछली बार जब वे प्रधान मंत्री बनी थी, तो मैंने इन करोड़ों प्राणियों की अवस्था की ओर उनका ध्यान आकर्षित किया था। उन्होंने मुझ से कहा था कि आप श्री अशोक मेहता से मिल लीजिये; क्योंकि समाज कल्याण विभाग उनके सुपुर्द हमने किया है। मैं श्री अशोक मेहता से मिला और मैंने उनसे कहा कि इनकी दयनीय दशा पर आपने कौन सी योजना बनाई है और किस योजना के अनुसार आप कार्य करना चाहते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे पास कोई योजना नहीं है और मुझे तो इतना समय भी नहीं मिल पाता कि मैं योजना का काम देखने के अलावा इस समाज कल्याण के काम को देखूँ और आप प्रधान मंत्री से कह दीजिये कि मेरे पास इसके लिये समय नहीं है। चुनावों में मैंने प्रधान मंत्री को यह बात कह दी। लेकिन उस वक्त से लेकर आज तक इस पर कोई ठोस कार्य नहीं हुआ अलावा इसके कि अब जो मन्त्रिमंडल बना है, तो उसमें आपने देखा होगा कि वही मन्त्री जो कहते थे कि समाज कल्याण विभाग के लिये मेरे पास समय नहीं है, उन्हीं को वह विभाग सुपुर्द किया गया है और उसके लिये एक स्टेट मिनिस्टर बनाये गये हैं, उनकी कार्य कुशलता के सम्बन्ध में अभी मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता। हमारे इसी सदन के वे सदस्य भी हैं। मगर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिसको इस काम के करने का ज्ञान नहीं, जिनके हृदय में कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं, उनसे यह आशा करना कि इन करोड़ों प्राणियों का कल्याण होगा, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता, तो जहाँ आपने अभिभाषण

में इस समस्या की उपेक्षा देखी है, वहाँ इस प्रस्ताव पर जो 89 सशोधन आये हैं, उनमें भी इसका जिक्र नहीं है। तो मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप सदन के माननीय सदस्य इस बात को महसूस करें कि जो सरकार थोड़े आश्वासन देती चली आई है, उससे इन करोड़ों प्राणियों का भला कैसे होगा।

एक तो ये है। दूसरे है खेतिहार् मजदूर जो करोड़ों की संख्या में इस समय बेकार है। मुझे कभी कभी तो हसी आती है कि अभिभाषण में खाद्य समस्या हल करने के लिये बहुत बड़ा उद्देश्य हमारे सामने पेश किया गया है। खाद्य समस्या के सम्बन्ध में मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक जो हम असफल रहे हैं, उसमें किसका दोष है। या कभी हमने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर यह सोचा कि जो करोड़ों प्राणी बेकार हैं, उनकी सहायता हमने कहा तक की है। जमींदारी का विनाश करने के बाद हमने किसानों को खेती का मालिक बनाया है। क्या आपने कभी इस पर विचार किया कि पहले जो खेतिहार मजदूर थे, वे बड़े किसानों से या जमींदारों से जमीन ले कर जोतते बोते रहते थे, बटाई का काम करते थे और उससे उनको कुछ खाने को मिल जाता था? मगर जमींदारी प्रथा खत्म होने के बाद उनको एक बीघा जमीन नसीब नहीं हुई। आज तक उनके लिये गवर्नमेंट ने क्या किया?

एक माननीय सदस्य : कमीशन बिठाया।

डा० धर्म प्रकाश : कमीशनो से काम नहीं चलता। मुझे याद है कि नागपुर में कांग्रेस ने को-ऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग के सम्बन्ध में एक रजोलेशन पास किया था और उसके बाद बड़ा हाहाकार मचा था। लेकिन मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि नागपुर अधिवेशन से लेकर आज तक ऐसे लोगों की कितनी सहायकी समितियाँ कायम हुईं जिनके पास एक बीघा जमीन नहीं है। माफ कीजिएगा, मैंने खुद जा

कर कई स्थानों पर देखा है। स्वर्गीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी से मैंने खुद कहा और लिख कर के दिया। कम से कम छः प्रांतों के बारे में मैंने कठिनाइयाँ बताईं कि उनमें बहुत सी जमीनें बेकार पड़ी हैं, जिनमें अनाज पैदा हो सकता है। मैंने बताया कि वे जमीनें इसलिये पड़ी हैं कि जितने बड़े-बड़े जमींदार हैं, बड़े-बड़े काश्तकार हैं वे उतनी ही जमीन जोतते-बोते हैं, जिससे उनका पालन-पोषण हो सके और उनकी बाकी जमीन बेकार पड़ी रहती है और उसको इसलिये किसी को जोतने-बोने को नहीं देते हैं, क्योंकि हमने यह कानून बना दिया है कि जो जोतेंगे, जमीन उसकी हो जायेगी और इसलिये उन बेचारे खेतिहर मजदूरों को वह बाकी जमीन नहीं मिलती है।

बहुत सी जमीन पचायत राज के कब्जे में भी आई है। मुझे माफ कीजिये, एक प्रसंग आ गया इसलिये कहता हूँ कि कम से कम 90 फीसदी जितना गुंडा एलीमेंट था हमारी देहात का, वह सब पचायतो में इकट्ठा हो गया है और ऐसे पचायत राज से हम आशा करते हैं कि वह गरीबों का भला करेगा, किसानों और मजदूरों का भला करेगा। यह बिल्कुल नामुमकिन है। वहाँ तो ऐसे डाकू बैठे हुए हैं कि उनको जो पैसा दे दे, उसको जो जमीन उनके कब्जे में है दे देगे अन्यथा वह जमीन किसी और को मिल नहीं सकती। मैंने कई पचायतों के सम्बन्ध में श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्रीजी को बताया और उनसे कहा कि आप वहाँ की प्रांतीय गवर्नमेंट को लिखिये कि उन्हें मजबूर करके ये जमीनें को-ऑपरेटिव सोसायटी बना कर खेतिहर मजदूरों को दे दी जायें, बल्कि उन्हें बीज दिया जाय, खाद दी जाय, हल बैल दिये जायें, पानी की सुविधाएँ दी जायें और कम से कम कुछ अर्से तक उनसे लगान की आशा न की जाय और फिर आप देखिये कि उत्पादन कितना बढ़ता है। खाली रेडियो पर बड़े-बड़े भाषण दे देने में अनाज पैदा नहीं होता, सब्जी पैदा नहीं होगी, इससे

कुछ पैदा होने वाला नहीं है। केवल बड़ी बड़ी स्पीचेज दे देने से या अधिभाषण में कह देने से ही हम आत्मनिर्भरता प्राप्त नहीं कर सकेंगे, इससे हमारी खाद्य समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है। इसके लिए बड़ी तेजी से काम करना पड़ेगा और यह देखना पड़ेगा कि इसमें कमी कहाँ है, कौन कमी कर रहा है और जो कमी कर रहा है उसको बड़ बना होगा, चाहे वह सरकारी एफसर हो, चाहे कोई मंत्रिमंडल का सदस्य हो और चाहे जनता का प्राइमरी हो। इसके साथ-साथ जो अच्छा काम कर रहा हो, उसे इनाम मिलना चाहिए।

अब तो भूतपूर्व मंत्री, डा० सुशीला नायर मंत्री नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि परिवार नियोजन की जितनी छीछाने-बूँद हुई है और जितना रुपया इस पर बर्बाद हुआ है, उसको अगर हम अपनी दृष्टि में रख कर आगे के लिए प्रोग्राम बनायें तो शायद कुछ लाभ हो सकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे अच्छी तरह याद है कि एक बार डा० सुशीला नायर से मैंने कहा था कि आप खाली विदेश का चक्का लगा कर के हमारे यहाँ परिवार नियोजन की आशा करती हैं। जरा यह भी देखना चाहिए कि हमारे देश के लोगो की मनोवृत्ति क्या है? अभी बहुतों से लोग हैं जो यह समझते हैं कि यह बच्चे परमात्मा की बेन हैं, आप उनको जाकर समझाइये कि आप क्यों इस दुख और परेशानी में पड़े हैं। अब शायद वे यह समझें कि हमें कम सताना पड़ा करनी है, वरना वे इसको भगवान की देन समझते हैं और जो इसमें रुकावट डाले उसको वे अपना दुश्मन समझते हैं। मैंने यह भी कहा कि अगर आप किसी सहर में खाली मीटिंग कर लेते हैं या कुछ डाक्टरों को प्रेरणा दे देते हैं, तो इससे परिवार नियोजन होने वाला नहीं है। मुझे यह कहने के लिए आप माफ करेगे कि सबसे ज्यादा बच्चे गरीबों में पैदा होते हैं और उन गरीबों में जो मजदूर हैं।



[डा० धर्म प्रकाश]

इन लोगों को जब तक घाप समझायें नहीं तब तक यह आशा करना कि परिवारनिर्भोजन हो जायेगा और यह जो जनसंख्या बहुत बुरी तरह से बढ़ रही है और जिसकी वजह से खाद्य समस्या भी कठिन और जटिल होती जा रही है, उसका समाधान हो जायगा तो निराशा हो हाथ लगेंगे। इसके लिए कुछ ठोस कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे। इसमें चूक जिक्र नहीं है इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिए। चाहे कोई अपोजीशन का हो, चाहे कांग्रेस का हो, सबको बैठ कर विचार करना चाहिए। यह देश की समस्या है, यह सिर्फ खिला उड़ाने से हल नहीं होगी, कीचड़ उछालने से हल नहीं होगी, हड़ताल या बन्द से हल नहीं होगी, यह तो सहयोग से हल होगी। सहयोग गवर्नमेंट को भी लेना पड़ेगा और गवर्नमेंट को देना भी पड़ेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के प्रति कृतज्ञता प्रकट करता हूँ। केवल यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जिन बातों को जिक्र नहीं किया वे भी इसमें शामिल हों।

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Madam, may I add my voice as that of a non-partyman in thanking our great President for the Address he delivered to the Joint Session of the Houses of Parliament. We shall long treasure in our memory the picture of the venerable old President in enfeebled health marching up to the platform and delivering his Address in a clear and resonant voice. He looked feeble in health but mentally he appeared absolutely clear and unhesitant. I hope everyone in this House will join with me in wishing our President longer life and better health.

In his Address he particularly stressed the point that democracy has grown mature in this country. I think this is a sentiment which all of us in every section of this House, will echo. What has happened is nothing disastrous,

of no harm to the nation. What has happened is the resurgence of the democratic will of the people in a free and fearless way. It was good that the Prime Minister of India immediately after the elections said the same thing. The Congress President also has welcomed this resurgence of the democratic will of the people. But having said that, we must look at some of the lessons which we must learn from what has happened. If what has happened is a well-deserved punishment to the ruling party, it is at the same time a serious warning to every party in India. The people of India are no longer going to be supine, listen passively to every demagogue and be swept away by mere emotion. The people of India now know what is good for them and how to get it. They realise what they must do in order that what is good for them will be done by those in charge of the Government. I think this is the greatest lesson from what I call, this ballot-box revolution of India. I come from the Madras State, and it is now known what has happened there. It was absolutely astonishing. The Congress President himself lost his seat in his own constituency with a majority of his own Castemen. A young student of another community just swept him out. Mr. C. Subramaniam, our able Minister of Agriculture and Food in the previous Government, a man who did signal service to the country, was also swept away from a constituency in which his caste-men overwhelmingly predominated. This has happened in other constituencies also. Caste no longer played a part as it did in the previous elections in the Madras State. Money played a funny part. People took money from both sides but voted for the party they wanted to vote for. People have now learnt what to do with the money-givers. Whoever gives money, they say: "Come and give it to us as much as you can." But in their minds they knew to whom they were going to vote. In this sense, money also did not play the kind of part it had played in the previous elections. The D.M.K. has been swept into power,

absolutely brooming away the ruling party.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:  
Other parties also.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Why are you bothered about the other parties? You bother about your own party. I want to say to this House and to you, Madam, and perhaps if I may, to the whole country that this triumph of the Opposition parties in the Madras State and elsewhere is largely due to the genius of one of our greatest men, Rajaji. I am no Swatantra party man I am not proposing to join the Swatantra party either. But his was the genius which put all the other conflicting parties together and made them into an irresistible unit against the Congress. I want this also to be realised by this House and by all those concerned that whatever may be our political differences with Shri Rajgopalachari, he has saved South India from a communal conflict of the most dangerous kind that might have occurred in that part of India. The D.M.K. as it started its original career, inherited from the past non-Brahminism, as it is called in South India. It could have developed into a very ugly communal party but the genius of Rajaji converted it into a non-communal party, a party which gave up the claim for an independence sovereign Tamil State. It is now testified to by everybody that the leader of this party has won the hearts of even opponents. So this ballot-box revolution in South India is no calamity at all.

I attended the other day the meeting in New Delhi of the Jan Sangh at which Rajaji was speaking, and as I listened to him I had a notion in my head that Rajaji can perhaps play the same part with the Jan Sangh also, making them less angular at many points and if the Swatantra party and the Jan Sangh party can join up together into a great and truly progressive and nationalist party, no calamity would befall this country.

I now come to one or two other matters about the maturity of democracy in this country. We have a new Government in Kerala now which is very different from the Government of the ruling party. So also in West Bengal I have no doubt in my mind that the Kerala Government, that the Madras Government, that the West Bengal Government are all going to be as good Governments as any other Government we have seen in this country, perhaps they might do better because of the experiences from which we learn our lessons. But having said all this about the maturing of our democracy, I must add that this process seems to be taking deeper roots in the minds of the people than in the minds of the ruling party. Being a non-party Member I get the confidence of friends of different parties and I know that no party in this country including the Congress is happy at what has happened in Rajasthan. What has happened there is, in my opinion, politically completely wrong and inexcusable. As soon as Shri Sukhadia said, "I cannot form the Government", after that, within a reasonable time, it was the duty of the Governor to have called the leader of the opposition parties form the Government. But something interposes. He says, "There is trouble in the streets." And because there is trouble in the streets and because he thinks that the Opposition party leaders are behind that trouble, he says, "I won't call them." This is astonishing. The trouble in the streets is because he has not called them and given them the chance to form a Government. He says however, "Because of that trouble I will not call them". I have no doubt in my mind—and many Congressmen will say this in their own hearts—that the Governor of Rajasthan became more a Congressman than the constitutional head of the States. It is a great pity that this has happened, and the consequences may be far-reaching affecting the very institution of Governorship. So, whereas on the one hand democracy has taken deeper roots in the mind of the people, we do not see evidence of that in the mind of

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]  
the Congress party. I am no enemy of the Congress. For thirty years I was in the Congress. I wish them well. But some of the things that they do reflect no credit at all to the great party, which it is.

Then, Madam, the President in his Address has made a reference to the Report of the Education Commission and expressed his hope that the recommendations of the Commission would be fully implemented without delay. The President knows and many of us know that the Education Ministry is often the grave-yard of some of the finest reports produced in this country. I can glad Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is sitting here though he is reading some papers and not listening to what I am saying. I wish he had been in the Education Ministry; then what I say might have gone straight into his mind. I said that the Education Ministry has been the grave-yard of some of the finest reports on education that any country could have produced. There was the Radhakrishnan Commission report asking for rural universities. There never has yet been a rural university in India. There was that Secondary Education Commission asking for a country-wide programme of multi-purpose high schools. It came into the picture and then suddenly disappeared. I had the honour of being the Chairman of a Committee called the Basic Education Assessment Committee. I think we gave a good report. But that report is today as dead as dodo. Basic Education itself is no longer in the picture. As an immediate alternative to Basic Education we were asked to frame another mid-way programme and I took on myself the responsibility of producing an Orientation Programme. It was started with a great deal of drum-beating. But that also is completely dead and there is no Orientation Programme anywhere now. We started rural higher education and a few Institutes for the same. But the rural higher education programme is not advancing one step further, and even up to the

point it has come, it is being confronted with serious difficulties. I am running a Rural Institute of Higher Education myself and I know exactly what is happening. So I am not at all optimistic that the Education Ministry will take up the recommendations of the Education Commission and put them through as quickly and effectively as necessary. Mr. Chagla was there at the time the Commission was appointed. But Mr. Chagla is now in Foreign Affairs. The man who sponsored the thing is no longer there. Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed also came and disappeared as if by magic after a few days, and he is now in charge of Industries. We have now a new Education Minister and a number of things he has said in the press are very heartening. But somebody tell the new Education Minister, "Please do not make promises." I have never yet known an Education Minister who has kept his promises. So it would be good if somebody would advise Dr. Triguna Sen not to make promises. He has also threatened that if within six months, he is unable to do what he wants he will resign. This kind of threat of *hara kiri* is very distressing. Do not make too many promises and then threaten to commit suicide! We wish the Education Minister, a new man, well. He is calling a conference of Education Ministers. We have had conferences galore of Education Ministers. Again and again they have met. I do not think any Ministry has called so many conferences, seminars, working groups etc. as the Education Ministry. Curiously a very distinguished man who, I thought, would be the Education Minister this time but is not so said to me something very interesting. I asked him, "Why is it that you do not hold the Education portfolio?" He, said, "I did not want it because I knew what would happen. There is no money. Education is a State subject. We can do very little from the Centre." I do not think that is the truth of the matter. A strong, good, clear-headed Education Minister, in close touch with the Education Ministries in the

States, can do a great deal of good work. And the test just now is about the implementation of the recommendations of the Report. Will the Education Ministry implement the recommendations of the Education Commission? It is a magnificent report. I do have some quarrels with that report. I have gone to the Education Commission and told them what my quarrels with the report are. All the same, I must say that if the recommendation of this report are implemented, we shall see a new picture of education in this country. But I have very strong forebodings that this will not happen and the President's hope may not be fulfilled. You are the only Cabinet Minister sitting here now—Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. Will you kindly take this message to the Cabinet and to the Minister of Education that today the future of education in this country depends—it may depend on a hundred other things tomorrow—today on the implementation of the recommendations of this Education Commission.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Your time is running out.

**SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN:** I will take only one or two minutes more, Madam.

We have a new Cabinet. Shrimati Indira Gandhi is back again in the Prime Minister's seat, and I am one of those who rejoice that she is back there in the Prime Minister's seat. She has now a very large Cabinet.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** The ratio is 1 : 7.

**SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN:** I do not know what will happen if there is a Swatantra Party Prime Minister. You may have more Ministers. I do not know; I cannot compare. What I am saying is this. There is a large Cabinet but I am sorry there are not enough women in the Cabinet of India. Madam I do not want to make you blush, but you should have been in the Cabinet of India, and you would have made a wonderful Minister. There are other able women who could have been included in the

Cabinet. Probably because the Prime Minister herself is a woman she did not think in terms of more women being necessary in the Cabinet.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** Women are very jealous.

**SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN:** Then secondly, I am sorry that the representation for Harijans—the Scheduled Castes—is very inadequate in the Cabinet. There are just one or two people; there is of course the old war-horse, Shri Jagjivan Ram, who has been in the Cabinet of India from the day there came into being a Cabinet and up to now. May God bless him; But where are others? I remember Mahatma Gandhi saying that when India became a Republic he would like to see a Harijan woman as the first, President of the Republic. He is gone; his voice is gone, and the Harijans are restless, unhappy and frustrated. I say this from personal experience. This is not a good thing for India.

Subject to these observations I wish the new Government well. I want them to be strong, united and radically progressive. The Finance Minister has already announced a deficit of Rs. 350 crores in the interim Budget. What would be the deficit one wonders, in the full-blooded Budget of the new years? He has a very hard task to perform. So our good wishes to him and the Government. May they resurrect the country's economy. May Congressmen pull their organisation up from the low position to which it has fallen. If they do not raise themselves up and make the country look up, the future is dark so far as they are concerned. But I have not the slightest doubt that the future is not dark for India. There are first-class parties which are coming to the force, which are as patriotic and as good as the Congress Party. The future of India is safe in the hands of the people. But if the future of the Congress Party is to be safe, they will have to take great care of themselves and the country in the years ahead.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: May their souls rest in peace.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the House will have to sit longer to-day, say up to 6 P.M. because I have a number of names before me and it will be difficult to give them all a chance.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Let us sit up to 5.30 P.M. only, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right Let us sit up to 5.30 P.M. Prof. Gadgil.

PROF. D. R. GADGIL (Nominated): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful and am greatly obliged to you for giving me this opportunity of joining in the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address. I shall confine myself to only a limited number of aspects and chiefly to what I may call the constitutional aspects of the question.

Before touching on the constitutional aspects I shall take the liberty of making a couple of suggestions to the ruling party. I make these particular suggestions now because I feel that the ruling party may find itself in a receptive mood to receive those suggestions at this juncture. I would renew the old suggestion which has had universal support from all sides including very many eminent Congressmen, namely, that legislation should be undertaken to prevent joint stock companies, public limited companies and private limited companies, from contributing to party funds. I think Madam, that the ruling party may be more receptive than at earlier moments to this particular suggestion. Recently during the contest or the supposed contest for the Prime Ministership both the Prime Minister and the new Deputy Prime Minister hotly resented a suggestion that businessmen should be interested in a matter like this. May I suggest that when you solicit funds on a large scale from business men for electioneering it appears to an outsider somewhat

hypocritical then to resent the interest that businessman naturally take in the formation of Governments. If you depend to such a large extent on business funds for electioneering then the influence not only on the formation of governments but the corrupting influence in the formulation of later policies is unavoidable. This is clear as daylight to everyone and as I said a large number of Congress statesmen, especially those who have retired, have fully accepted the truth of this. In the existing circumstances naturally the number of party claimants for support from businessmen will be larger and there is likely to be a much greater division than before. I hope the ruling party will receive this suggestion in good part and act promptly on it.

Another suggestion that I would make is to look at the electoral arrangements. It is being commented upon a number of times since the results have been declared, that there should be correspondence between the proportion of votes cast and the weightage of representation obtained in the Legislatures. A number of times it has been said that for a given proportion of votes you get a much higher weightage. This is not surprising because the electoral arrangements have been deliberately providing for it. I suggest that these electoral arrangements which deliberately provide for over-representation of a party which gets a slightly larger number of votes are electoral arrangements or voting arrangements adapted from countries where the two-party system has been established. It becomes necessary in a country where the two-party system is firmly established to tilt the balance rather violently in favour of one party so as to make the party position particularly stable. I suggest that a two-party stable system is a system that is not likely to emerge in India, that in fact a two-party system is entirely an exceptional arrangement which countries like the United Kingdom and the

United States of America because of a number of historical reasons have been able to achieve. If you look at the large number of democracies especially the continental ones, you will find that there is a spectrum of parties and not a two-party system and coalition governments instead of being looked upon as something evil are more in evidence and constantly we have a type of government that comes as a result of combinations. Madam, I urge that if you look at what has happened in India today you will see that we are getting a picture of party dispositions that appear very natural. In terms of European usage one might say that there is a conservative party allied to capitalist interests, a conservative party allied to socio-religious orthodoxy, a middle or rather central party which stems from an old liberal tradition with non-Marxist socialist trends, a socialist Marxist party and the communist party. There may be a large number of divisions, but this five-fold division seems to me to be the sort of arrangement that is emerging in India on a somewhat permanent basis and governments of the future are going to be coalition governments including the one at the Centre. I suggest that a single-party government even at the Centre we may not have and this one we now have is likely to be the last one. From future elections even at the Centre you will get some kind of a coalition. If this is the sort of political picture that we are to have in the future then I think the present electoral arrangements are all wrong. Even if we cannot go in for definite proportional representation, some modification like multi-member constituencies may be necessary in order to bring about a closer correspondence between the votes cast and the rate of representation obtained. That is extremely important.

That brings me to the last point which is that of constitutional arrangements especially in the context of the relationship of the Centre and the States in a variety of ways. There I think the appropriate point is to

begin with Rajasthan. I believe it is unnecessary to use any strong language. All the strong language, I believe, has been used up in this House. I am not used to using strong language. But I think one might say this that even on the facts stated by the Home Minister, another construction than the one put by him is possible. If another construction was possible it was highly desirable that that construction should have been accepted. It is quite clear that the President in this matter acted on the advice of his Ministers strictly. The President was the constitutional head; so that the kind of speculation that some people indulged in immediately after the elections that the President together with the body of Governors will emerge as a sort of independent third force is not likely to materialise. It is, I think, not likely to happen and I think it is undesirable that it should happen. I think it is unlikely that it should happen because that would mean a very strong personality as the President who exerts himself in the appointment of Governors and that the Governors and the President act together in unison in some matters. As I said, all these things are unlikely. Therefore the only other situation that we must look to is a situation in which the President is the constitutional head of the Union Government and the Governors are equally constitutional heads of State Governments. Madam, with your permission, I will read out a few sentences from a publication of the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics published in 1948. It says:

"The suggested procedure . . .

That is, the procedure in the draft Constitution published in 1948.

" . . . introduces into State politics the President of the Union. This might lead to a grave infringement of the autonomy of the State; it might also result in the lowering of the dignity of the office of President by mixing him up with what might be issues of party politics in

[Dr. D. R. Gadgil.]

the government of a State. In considering the provision relating the Presidents and Governors it must be constantly borne in mind that the incumbent of these offices will, in the large majority of cases, be elderly party politicians with a definite political past . . . The provision of appointing a Governor by a President will necessarily work on party lines and will lead to a very difficult position, especially when the party allegiance of the President of the Union and the majority of a legislature in a State are different."

I read this because I do not want to be merely wise after the event. This is something which was said 20 years before on a mere look at the constitutional provisions. I may also point out what we then went on to suggest. I suggested this:

"In recent years . . .

"That is, roundabout 1945 or so.

" . . . even the appointment of Governor-Generals and Governors in the Dominions has been made by the Crown more and more on the recommendation of the governments in power."

And what was recent 20 years ago has now become a thoroughly established practice in the Commonwealth so that without going so far as to suggest a change in the Constitution I feel that it is extremely necessary that in future a convention be established by which the President will appoint a Governor not on the advice of the Union Government or the Union Minister but on the advice of the Government of the State for which the Governor is to be appointed. This is the least step that we can take in the direction of solving the problems that are coming up.

The other sets of problems—and I think they are very serious problems—are going to be financial prob-

lems as well as problems in relation to such matters as food. And here I am very glad indeed that the President is seriously thinking of reorganising the Planning Commission. Now we have to think in terms of the Planning Commission of the Union Government. The Planning Commission is a body appointed by the Union Government and because the ruling party in all the States was the same the Planning Commission was able to play a large influential, unofficial, unconstitutional and in my opinion undesirable part in making allocations to the States and in determining financial relations between the States and the Union Government. As long ago as 1962 to the previous Finance Commission I had submitted a note pointing out that the practice by which the Planning Commission disposed of large grants to State Governments as *ad hoc* grants, almost discretionary grants, went against the spirit of the Constitution which required the Centre and States financial relations to be quinquennially reviewed and laid down properly by a proper financial Commission. You will now find it difficult to get out of that. The reorganisation of the Planning Commission at this juncture is very welcome and I hope it will be in the direction of taking away from the Planning Commission all kinds of execution or implementation duties and making it a real expert body which can with its expertise be able to talk to expert bodies in the State Planning Boards. That kind of discourse will be possible if the Planning Commission commands respect as an expert body and does not interfere in execution. What I visualise, Madam is really a further increase in the importance and in the functioning of organisations like the National Development Council. The National Development Council is at present supposed to look into the Plans or agree to the structure of the Plans but in fact everybody knows that it does not function in any real sense of the word. With the Chief Ministers having now ideas of their own the National Development Coun-

cil will begin to function on its own in a real sense. The suggestion made by the Venkatappayya Committee for the setting up of a National Food Council will take us also in the same direction. More and more in matters where the interests of the States and the Union Government are both involved and where there is likely to be conflict it appears to me that formal or informal organisations like the bodies of Chief Ministers are really going to function as the important forum where decisions will be taken. And you will in time have to see that these organisations are serviced by an independent expert secretariat. If you do that and in a series of conventions you build organisations like these, if you resort to the appointment of the Governors in the manner I have suggested then there is no reason indeed why any serious conflicts should arise in the States-Union relations. But this means a realisation on the part of the ruling party, especially the ruling party in the Centre, which has such a large lease of continuous power that it may have got into habits of thought, ways of action and patterns of behaviour which it will have to unlearn if it is to live with and in a real manner function successfully together with these variegated Ministries in the States

Thank you

5 P.M.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, amendment No. 3 stands in my name and in the short time at my disposal. I shall indicate what I have to say by referring to the Address of the President delivered on March 18, 1967. The first line of paragraph 6 says:—

“Our Government have just taken office.”

This is a constitutional fiction in the sense that it has just taken office after the fourth election but the same Government is running the show for the last twenty years. So, this Govern-

ment is not a new Government in the real sense of the term. So, this Government cannot plead innocence so far as their achievements or failures are concerned. Now, in this paragraph we find as one of the major objectives to end our dependence on food assistance from abroad by the end of 1971. The food problem is there and it has not been tackled in the course of the last twenty years. We try to solve it just by talking. No problem of this magnitude like feeding the fifty crores population of India can be solved in the manner which this Government has done.

Their number two objective is:—

“To do all that is possible to ensure that the rising trend in prices of the basic necessities of life is halted and conditions of stability achieved in the shortest possible time.”

This is just a pious wish. This Government is not sincere about holding the price-line. If it were really so, something could have been done. The index number is rising like spiral. What baffles me is the President in his Address in paragraph 9 says this:—

“The upsurge in prices particularly during the last two years, was primarily the result of the shortfall in agricultural production due to the failure of the monsoons.”

You are ascribing all the failures on the part of the Government to the failure of the monsoon. When there was a failure of the monsoon, what did the Government do? Since 1939 the price index has been constantly rising and rising unchecked. Then, it says:—

“Industrial production too was affected by the failure of the monsoons and the shortage of foreign exchange to import necessary raw materials.”

It is a very belated realisation that because of the shortage of foreign exchange, you cannot import necessary



[Shri D. L. Sen Gupta.]

raw materials. If this situation has arisen, what is the remedy? It calls for a reconsideration whether devaluation was a proper step. Having devalued the rupee, having put the country in the position as it stands today, you now give an explanation as to why there is a rise in prices. This Government is responsible for the whole situation. This morning by way of a supplementary I put a question to the Commerce Minister here in this House, as to whether he was aware of the fact that the Government, so far as the Railway Ministry was concerned, had already issued orders curtailing thirty per cent of its wagon production orders given to different engineering concerns, bringing in its train a series of complications. The reason given by the Railway Ministry is that our industry and commerce is in a standstill position. The manufacturers do not want wagons. Since there is no demand for wagons, the wagon order has got to be curtailed by the Railway Ministry and when this order is curtailed, it affects the industry as a whole, the working-class as a whole. In West Bengal alone we see the danger of about one lakh workers being unemployed. Now who is responsible for this situation? When the country demands a steady and studied solution of the unemployment problem, this Government is creating it. They do the mischief and then search for somebody to be blamed for it. When nobody is to be found, they blame the monsoon, which cannot defend itself and which is not represented anywhere, either in this House or outside. The country is not so foolish as to be belabored by the false promises or the false excuses of the ruling party or the Government, but why should the President, who is a much respected man in this country, make use of this plea? He should not have. He is a great man. He has great talent. He is a great philosopher. Why should he make these excuses for all the sufferings of the people of this country? That is my regret. As a matter of fact, this election has exposed the people's mind and I for one

do not believe that there has been a swing of the people either to the right or to the left. There is only one swing and that is against the Congress. It is not the ideology of the Congress. It is the Congress administration which was defeated. They voted for another Party very near the Congress so that that Party could defeat the Congress. That is why we find the DMK as the ruling Party in Madras. That is why we find the Swatantra in a strong position in Rajasthan. That is why we find the SSP in Bihar. That is why we find the United Front in Bengal. That is why we find the Swatantra and the dissident Congress in Orissa. So this is the position. People have decided not to give any further chance to the Congress Government, because they have bullied us all this time

Now, you will find in paragraph 17 this:—

"The foreign policy of India has stood the test of time."

What is the test of time? Does it mean that India should be bled white and India should be humiliated? Our foreign policy has brought us to this very sad predicament. The test of our foreign policy is this. There are so-called friendly countries who through their television depict us as a nation of beggars. No friendly country would have shown in its television that Indians do not get food, that Indians are dying of starvation, that they are begging for food from foreign countries. No friendly country would have depicted us in that fashion. Side by side the American television and the television in the U.K. showed prosperity in Pakistan and poverty in India. Is that the real picture? Poverty is there both in Pakistan and India but the foreign countries, the so-called friendly countries, because of our very good foreign policy, successful foreign policy, have put us in two chambers. Respect is reserved for Pakistan and indignity is reserved for India.

Now, you will find again in paragraph 15 this:—

"A National Commission on Labour has been set up under the chairmanship of Sri Gajendragadkar. The Commission will review and make appropriate recommendations on the whole field of the working and living conditions of labour . . ."

I am sorry to observe, with all personal regard for Mr. Gajendragadkar—he was an eminent Judge; he was an eminent jurist—on the 16th of this month while delivering a lecture in the Tata Institute of Social Science—it was a news published in the *Statesman* on the 17th of this month—he has observed that the trade union movement in this country is in the hands of political parties, Congress, Communist, P.S.P., all that. I do not dispute that part of the statement. But the second part of his statement is damaging and does not speak well of the Chairman of the National Commission on Labour. He has said that most of the demands of the labour are political and not economic. He has no labour background except doing certain labour cases in the Supreme Court or High Court or as a Judge of the Bank Tribunal. He has made sweeping remarks. He ought to have had statistics with him. Without statistics a person holding the position of Chairman of the National Commission on Labour should not have made that observation.

Before I finish I should tell this House that our first task in international policy should be to develop normal relations with Pakistan. I know that the President is eager for that and our Government is eager for that. But still normal condition has not been restored. There has been no direct communication yet between India and Pakistan. Our planes cannot go over Pakistan. So this is a situation which has hit hard the economy of West Bengal in particular which is a neighbouring State to East Pakistan. So, something has got to be done here and now, and it will

be a bankruptcy of intelligence if we cannot evolve measures to clear out this position.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, on a point of order. Last time you had given a specific ruling that during the discussion on the President's Address a Cabinet Minister must be present here in the House because it was so important a debate. Madam, we have a Minister who is without portfolio. It is an invisible portfolio. Even if we consider the Cabinet rank, there is a Minister who does not carry any portfolio. His portfolio is as invisible as his fragrance around him. Even then we do not have even one single Cabinet rank Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am told that they had taken permission since the House was sitting till 5-30 and there was a Cabinet meeting at 5 o'clock.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Cabinet meeting could have been postponed. It is no excuse to say that as you had announced that the House would sit till 5-30. We had our business also. The Cabinet Ministers may have their Cabinet meetings we have our own meetings. I have cancelled my meeting. It is no excuse for a Cabinet Minister to report that he had a Cabinet meeting and therefore he could not be present in the House. This is ignoring this House; this is an insult to this House since you have already, given a ruling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A Cabinet-rank Minister should be present in the House, but I am told that the Secretary was informed.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): I would suggest for your consideration and for consideration of the House that the system of going beyond the fixed hour is inconvenient to everybody. If we sit for the fixed hours, the trouble will not arise. Extending time always leads to trouble.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: An announcement was made earlier. Someone could have been here. I wanted to sit till 6 o'clock. On your suggestion I have made it till 5.30.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I think it is important to have a Cabinet Minister, that is, a person who sits in the Cabinet. In England they have also Ministers of Cabinet rank but without seat in the Cabinet; then Ministers of State; then Under Secretaries and Parliamentary Secretaries.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have a Minister of State here. The point that he is raising that there should be a Cabinet-rank Minister.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: As Mr. Misra has said, there should have been at least a Minister of Cabinet rank.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया : मेरा निवेदन यही है कि यह बड़ी बुरी परम्परा चली आ रही है। कल बोपहर के बाद भी मिनिस्टर साहब गायब थे और हाउस एडजर्न करना पड़ा। अभी भी कोई जिम्मेदार मिनिस्टर, कैबिनेट मिनिस्टरों में से एक तो आ सकता था। उसकी मीटिंग चल रही है तो या तो हमें एडजर्न कर देना चाहिए या वैं अपनी मीटिंग एडजर्न कर देते। यह तो उचित बात नहीं है कि परम्परा ठीक तरह से निभाई न जाय।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that if we had given them enough notice, one of them should have been here. In any case whatever the House decides, its direction that a Cabinet-rank Minister should be here at least for the President's Address when it is debated should be observed. I do feel that very strongly, but I leave it to the House. We go on till 5:30 and adjourn, and this may be brought to the attention of the Cabinet Ministers also.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :  
आज के बाद हम नहीं बैठेंगे। आज तो अब ठीक है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This will be for the last time that we shall continue without a Cabinet Minister till 5:30. In future it will depend on the House and they must accommodate themselves.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: In our State of West Bengal we have now a non-Congress Government. Our Ministers have come here to decide what will be the position of the supply of rice and wheat from the Central stocks so far as West Bengal is concerned. We are afraid that if sufficient response from the Centre is not available, we have got to decide our own destiny in our own way. West Bengal cannot remain in starvation when the whole of India is fed. West Bengal is a proverbially deficit State. We contribute the maximum to the Indian exchequer by way of foreign exchange in jute and tea. We have not much land for cultivation of paddy or wheat. We give to India what we have and we are proud of that, but certainly we expect that this fact will be taken into consideration by the rest of India. We are grateful that the Orissa Government has promised us supply of rice. The Centre has taken charge of procurement of foodgrains. When they take the responsibility of procurement of foodgrains, it is their responsibility that they should supply West Bengal what it requires. Unless they do it, we shall have to think of constitutional steps also, of how we can hold back our foreign exchange to buy wheat or rice from outside India even. But that is a position which will lead to certain difficulties. The only way out is, let the Government of India rise to the occasion and meet our needs in the manner that we want.

Thank you.

**SHRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PIL-LAI** (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, mention has been made in the President's Address about the food situation in our country. I am glad that he has mentioned it. It is of topical interest. All of us are interested in the food situation. All those hon. Members who have preceded me both today and day before yesterday had urged this point. They have given various reasons for not having enough food in our country and also they have given us some methods by which we can augment the food position. My object in touching this problem is this. In Madras, consecutively for three weeks before the elections, no rice was given in any of the ration shops and it brought about the downfall of the Congress there. Then, subsequently, they gave us very bad rice. I want to know from the Minister the reasons for not giving rice in any shop in Madras for three weeks consecutively before the elections. It is for that purpose that I mention this point.

Hon. Members who have preceded me also have told us a number of ways by which we can augment our rice position. Somebody has said that rats also eat much of our rice. It is a fact. The rat is no respecter of personality or place. Perhaps you may not be aware of the fact that today in this very august House when the Chairman was occupying that place, one rat entered and bit the legs of Mr. Mallikarjunudu and went away. So even in this House we can find rats. They are no respectors of persons or places. That being the case, we are not surprised that they eat away much of our rice that is stored in our godowns. The remedy or panacea that I suggest is this. What we must do is that we must make the tiller of the soil the owner of the land. Only then will we have enough of rice; only then will he have an interest in the land and also in cultivation. That is the only way of augmenting the rice position in our country. But hon. Members may say that it smacks of communist idea. As early as 1953, the Congress passed a

Resolution in Madras, at Avadi, that the policy of the Government would be to form a socialistic form of society. But having said that, they have not done anything towards that end. Now is the time to begin it. That is, we must make the tiller of the soil the owner of the land.

The second point that I wish to make is about the language problem. It is this language problem that was responsible for the defeat of Mr. Kamaraj Nadar at Virudhunagar. I was going to Tiruchendur. A number of students entered into my compartment at Madurai. They came in and took their seats. I spoke to them. When we go in the train, we **speak** with one another usually; we do not require any formality of introduction with one another. They told me that they were going to Virudhunagar to work against Mr. Kamaraj Nadar. When I asked them the reason they told me that he was responsible for bringing Hindi into the State and that they wanted to defeat him. When the train reached Virudhunagar, I saw all the students getting down. A lady was standing at the station. One school student went and caught hold of her legs and said, "Do not vote for the Congress, do not vote for Mr. Kamaraj Nadar. He is responsible for bringing Hindi in our State. We do not want to be second-rate citizens in this country. We want to be free citizens here. If Hindi is introduced, we will become second-class citizens." They also said that Mr. Kamaraj Nadar knew neither English nor good Tamil nor Hindi, that he was only a show boy of the North Indians and he was put up as Congress President so that he could introduce Hindi in his State. He said to her, "We do not want Hindi here. You should **not** vote for him." She said, "All right, my son, I will do whatever you say." That was what happened. Why I am saying all this is, the fanatic, Hindi Members should be careful. They should not force anything on us. My suggestion is that you must bury Hindi 100 fathoms deep. You must leave it there

[Shri J. Sivashanmugam Pillai.]  
for 100 years and you should not talk about it. After 100 years, you can take up the Hindi business. By that time all the students, if we give them full freedom, will read themselves. We need not force them to study Hindi.

The third point that I wish to make here is about the Rajasthan business. The hon. Minister the other day was trying to draw a parallel between what had happened in Madras in 1952 and what happened in Rajasthan now. I do remember what happened in Madras then because at that time I was the Speaker of the Madras Assembly, and I know what happened then in Madras. At that time Rajaji was the leader of the Congress Party. After the 1952 elections, Rajaji was elected the leader. But at that time he was not a member either of the Assembly or of the Council. I want this House to understand this position. Rajaji was not a member either of the Assembly or of the Council. But Mr. Sri Prakasa, who was the Governor of Madras at that time, called him to form a Ministry. Rajaji formed the Ministry. He was nominated to the Council after three months. He was the Chief Minister for three months; and then he was nominated to the Council. At least Mr. Sukhadia is in a better position, because he is an elected member of the Assembly of Rajasthan but Rajaji was not a member of either of the Houses. He was later on nominated to the Upper House there, after he became the Chief Minister. In the Assembly, Rajaji told us that he would not care for a hotchpotch opposition. What he said was correct because we cannot believe this hotchpotch opposition. Look at this. You would have seen a report in today's papers—I have seen it—that one Congressman was abducted and was forcibly taken to Delhi by the opposition members to see the President. That being the case, how can you believe all these signatures which are there. We cannot believe all these things. Rajaji said—and I do remember but I am speaking from memory—that the opposition is just like a

nellikkal mootai. In Hindi we say 'amla' for nellikkai. As long as they are in a bag, they stand together; but as soon as the bag is emptied, they scatter in various directions. This is the position of the opposition parties. So he said, "Either I will form a Ministry or I will advise the Governor to dissolve the Assembly so that there might be another election." That was what he said. The Rajasthan Assembly is there intact and any day Mr. Sukhadia can advise the Governor to dissolve the Assembly if he wants to. But he has not done it. It is in his constitutional power. He has not gone out of the way. We must know that in Madras, Rajaji...

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): He is quoting Rajaji as if he is Veda to him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has to finish his speech. Please finish, Mr. Pillai. Please carry on.

SHRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI: I am comparing what had happened in Madras with what happened in Rajasthan. What I say is that at least Mr. Sukhadia is a member of one House. But Rajaji was not a member of either House, either of the Assembly or the Council. But he formed the Ministry there. Then he said that if it was not acceptable, he would advise the Governor, Mr. Sri Prakasa, to dissolve the Assembly. But here this gentleman has not done anything of that sort. And it is within the power of the Governor to do so. Why I say all these things is, these hon. Members who are criticising the Governor must be thankful to the Governor that he has not dissolved the Assembly.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: He recommended that the Assembly be dissolved.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pillai, please be brief. There is one more speaker.

SHRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI: But one thing I must tell you. When I was the Speaker at Madras, I

never followed the list. I used to have my choice in calling the speakers.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why it is my choice to have called you.

SHRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PIL-LAI: I am the last speaker. But you are following the list. It was not done by me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not following the list.

SHRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PIL-LAI: All right.

Thank you.

श्री लक्ष्मीनारायण दास (मध्य प्रदेश):  
आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पाम  
आदरणीय राष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण  
में कुछ ऐसी बातें रह गई हैं कि जिनका उसमें  
जिक्र होना आवश्यक था। चुनाव में कई  
प्रान्तों में इस प्रकार से सरकारी अधिकारियों  
द्वारा हस्तक्षेप किया गया, बल्कि यह कहना  
चाहिए कि पदाधिकारियों और ऐसा समझिये  
कि मंत्रिमंडल इत्यादि के द्वारा भी हुआ।  
मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि यहां के केन्द्र के उस

वक्त जो उपमन्त्री थे श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल—  
वह समझिये कि रायपुर के हैं और मैं भी  
समझिये कि वहीं रायपुर का रहने  
वाला हूँ—तो श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल  
और श्री धर्म मन्थरण शुक्ल इन दोनों के ऊपर  
श्री द्वारकाप्रसाद जी मिश्र, जो कि मध्य प्रदेश  
के मुख्य मंत्री हैं उन्होंने चुनाव की सारी  
जवाबदेही दी थी।

उपसभापति : मैं जनसूत्री हूँ कि आप  
सोमवार को अपना भाषण जारी रख सकते  
हैं।

श्री लक्ष्मीनारायण दास : जी हां,  
क्योंकि मामला बड़ा खम्बा है और समय  
लगेगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You  
can continue on Monday. The House  
stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Mon-  
day.

The House adjourned at  
half-past five of the clock  
till 11 a.m. on Monday, the  
27th March, 1967.