

can decide what class of Indians can be allowed to settle down in order to promote the good of the country, and what class of Indians should be sent out because they cannot promote the good of the country. Had our late Prime Minister brought out some elucidation on this subject by the Government of Burma?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: No classes as such have been fixed, nor would it be desirable. As I mentioned, they want to build a socialist society. Those who believe in that can find a place in it, and they will be allowed to stay on.

#### RE STRIKE BY TEXTILE WORKERS IN BOMBAY

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): From yesterday the textile workers in Bombay are on a general strike, because their demand for bonus for the year 1964 has not yet been met.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): What about my question on Burma?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has already been disposed of.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a minute. You are employers' people; you are their spokesmen. It is all right. Now let me speak for the workers. Now I would like to know . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Is Burma our employer? What is he saying?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, I should like to know from the Government whether the Central Government has taken interest in the matter, because we find police force is being used, attempt is being made to break the strike and deny their legitimate demand for bonus for the year 1964. This is 1966. Therefore, Sir, I would request, through you, the Central Government to get in touch with the Bom-

bay Government and make a statement in the House about the result.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received your notice. I will pass it on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And also they should intervene in order to compel the employers to meet the demand of the workers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now continue the discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Mr. Mir had not finished his speech yesterday. He may do so now.

شری جی - ایم - مہر ( جموں اور  
کشمیر ) : میر مہن صاحب - کل  
جب مہن راشٹرپتی جی کے ایڈریس  
پر اچھے وچار کا اظہار کر رہا تھا تو مہن  
نے شاعری جی کی لائف کے متعلق  
عرض کیا تھا کہ کس مختصانہ طریقہ  
سے شاعری جی نے ہندوستان کی  
خدمت کی جنگ کے وقت اور پھر  
جب امن کا وقت آیا تو اپنی جان  
عزیز کو قربان کیا - مہن نے یہ عرض  
کیا تھا کہ ہندوستان کے نہتے بھی اگر  
شاعری جی کے نقش قدم پر چلیں  
تو نہا ہندوستان - جس کا خواب ہم  
نے آج سے کئی سال پہلے لیا تھا وہ  
یقیناً پورا ہو سکے گا - مہن نے یہ عرض  
کیا تھا کہ شاعری جی نے جب دنیا  
سے رحلت فرمائی تو ان کے پاس رہنے  
کے لئے ایک چوہنہری تک نہیں تھی -

[ شری جے - ایم - میر ]

بچوں کے لئے کوئی انتظام نہیں تھا - کوئی بلک ہولڈس نہیں تھا - یہ ایک شاندار روایت شاستری جی نے ہندوستان میں بسنے والے لوگوں کے لئے اور ہندوستان کے راہ نماؤں کے لئے قائم کی - میں یہ عرض کر رہا تھا کہ ہندوستان میں بسنے والے تمام پانچوں کے نہتاؤں کو شاستری جی کے نقش قدم پر چلنا ہوگا -

اس کے ساتھ ہی میں نے تاشقند افغان کا سواگت کرتے ہوئے یہ کہا تھا کہ پاکستان کی طرف سے سالوں تک جو مسلسل حملہ ہوتا رہا اور پھر ۱۹۶۵ء میں جس طریقہ سے پاکستان نے ہمارے ملک پر حملہ کیا اور جو مصائب اور مشکلات کا سامنا ہم کو کرنا پڑا - ہمارے مکانوں کو جلا دیا گیا - ہماری جائیدادوں کو لوٹ لیا گیا - اس کے باوجود کشمیریوں نے ایک ہوکڑ ۱۹۴۷ء میں جو روشنی کی کرن گاندھی جی کو کھمبہ میں نظر آئی تھی اس مشعل کو ہمیشہ کے لئے زندہ رکھنے کا عہد کیا - ہم نے وعدہ کیا کہ ہم اس مشعل کو بجھنے نہیں دیں گے جو روشنی کی کرن گاندھی جی کو کھمبہ میں نظر آئی تھی - اب تاشقند کا اعلان ہو گیا ہے - دونوں ممالک پاکستان اور ہندوستان میں ہمارے مشترکہ قسم کے مسائل ہیں - خوراک کے مسئلہ میں ہماری ایک جیسی

پوزیشن ہے - زبان کے مسئلہ میں بے روزگاری اور بیماری کے مسئلہ میں اور تعلیمی معیار کے مسئلہ میں دونوں ملکوں کی پوزیشن ایک جیسی ہے - اب جب کہ دونوں ممالک کے تعلقات تاشقند کے اعلان کے بعد بہتر ہوئے ہیں تو ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ ہم سیکورٹی کونسل سے کشمیر کے مسئلہ کو جو آج سے اتھارہ سال پہلے ہم نے کر وہاں گئے تھے وہ ہم واپس لے لیں کیونکہ مجھے خدشہ ہے کہ سیکورٹی کونسل میں ہلاک پاور پالیٹکس اور ہولڈس آف پاور کو قائم رکھنے کے لئے کچھ ممالک دونوں ملکوں کو اکٹھے نہیں رہنے دینا چاہتے - اب پاکستان نے بھی یہ محسوس کر لیا ہے کہ پاکستان کی بہتری اسی میں ہے کہ وہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ مل کر رہے - وہ تو وار پیمت جو جواہر لال جی نے آفر کیا تھا اور جسے شاستری جی نے دے دیا تھا آج مجھے خوشی ہے کہ پاکستان نے بڑی مدت کے بعد اس آفر کو قبول کیا - آج منسٹر پریل ہول پر کانفرنس ہو رہی ہے اور سردار سورن سنگھ جی وہاں تشریف لے گئے ہیں - میں دعا کروں گا کہ ان کی مملکت کامیاب ہو اور بہتو صاحب کوئی اور زبان وہاں نہ بولیں جس سے ہمارے خوش گوار تعلقات میں پھر کسی قسم کی خرابی پیدا ہو اور ہمیں نقصان ہو اور ماحول جس کے لئے شاستری جی نے ایلنی جان دی وہ پھر خراب ہو جائے - مجھے یقین ہے کہ یہ تمام

باتیں پاکستان کے ذہن میں ہیں -  
اسی لئے میں یہ عرض کر رہا ہوں کہ  
ہندوستان اور پاکستان میں امن اور شانتی  
کو جو ایک نئی دھار چل پڑی  
ہے اس کو قائم رکھنے کے لئے یہ  
ضروری ہے کہ ہم کشمیر کے مسئلہ کو  
سیکوریٹی کونسل سے واپس لیں اور  
پاکستان کے ساتھ ہونے پر یہ فیصلہ  
کریں کہ پاکستان کے قبضہ میں جو  
اتھارہ سال سے کشمیر کا علاقہ چلا آ  
رہا ہے اس کو کس طریقہ سے ہم  
پاکستان سے آزاد کرائیں اور کس  
طریقہ سے اس حصہ کو کشمیر کے  
سے ملان - یہ ایک فیصلہ ہمیں  
پاکستان کے ساتھ کرنا ہے اور اس لئے  
میں گزارش کروں گا کہ سیکوریٹی  
کونسل سے اس کھس کو واپس لیا  
جائے -

اس کے ساتھ ہی مجھے کشمیری  
ہونے کے ناتے پر فخر ہے کہ کشمیر نے  
ہندوستان کو ایک بار پھر ایسا پرانے  
مستور دیا ہے جو ماس لہدر ہے اور  
جس کے پچھے ہندوستان کا بچہ  
بچہ چلنے کے لئے تیار ہے - یہ  
کشمیریوں کے لئے اور تمام دیہی  
واسیوں کے لئے مبارکباد کا مقام ہے -

श्री अजुन अरोड़ा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
काश्मीर ने नहीं, यू० पी० ने दिया ।

شری جی - ایم - مہو : جی  
نہیں - کشمیر نے دیا ہے اور سب  
سے پہلے ہمارا حق ہے -

एक माननीय सदस्य : दिल्ली का हक  
है ।

شری جی - ایم - مہو : دلی کا  
نہیں کشمیر کا حق ہے - اس نے لئے  
ہمیں فخر ہے اور ہمارا سر بلند ہے -

جنگب والا پاکستان کے حملہ کی  
وجہ سے پنجاب کشمیر اور راجستھان  
کے بارے میں جن مصائب کا سامنا  
لوگوں کو کرنا پڑا اور لوگ تباہ و  
برباد ہوئے اور اپنے گھروں سے اجڑ گئے  
ان کی بھائی کا ایک زبردست کام  
ہے لیکن مجھے افسوس ہے کہ حکومت  
نے اس طرف کوئی خاص قدم نہیں  
اٹھایا ہے - انہوں نے جو قربانی کی -  
انہوں نے جن مصائب کا سامنا کیا  
اس کو مد نظر رکھتے ہوئے حکومت نے  
آج تک ان کو بسانے کے لئے کسی قسم کا  
قدم نہیں اٹھایا - جس طریقہ سے ان  
کا سیکورٹی ہونا چاہئے اور جس  
طریقہ سے ان کی مدد کرنی چاہئے  
وہ آج تک نہیں کی گئی - اس لئے  
میں حکومت پر زور دوں گا کہ جن  
بہادروں نے ان مشکلات کا سامنا کیا  
ان کو بسانے کے لئے قوری قدم اٹھایا  
جائے -

اس کے ساتھ ہی ہمارے جن  
بہادر جوانوں نے اپنی جان عزیز  
تھالی پر رکھ کر اپنے مائے وطن کی  
عزت بچائی ان کی مدد کرنا اس  
حکومت کا فرض ہے - ان کے بال  
بچوں کی پوری مدد اور دیکھ بھال  
کی جانی چاہئے یہ کہوں کہ ان  
کی قربانی ایک رنگ لائی ہے - ہماری  
بہادر فوجوں نے ایک دیکھتے قائم کیا  
اور ایک تاریخ پیدا کی - اور چائنا  
کی لوائی کے رات جو کچھ ہم نے

[شری جی - ایم - مہر]

کہوہا تھا وہ سیاسی طور پر اور ملٹری طور پر پھر ہم نے حاصل کیا - اور یہی وجہ ہے کہ آج ہندوستان کا ایک ایک انسان اپنا سر فخر سے بلند کر کے چل رہا ہے اور اس کے دل میں اپنی فوج کے لئے - اپنی فوج کے ان جوانوں کے لئے - ان سپوتوں کے لئے بڑی عزت ہے جنہوں نے خوشی خوشی اپنی جانیں قربان کر دیں - اس لئے آج حکومت کا یہ بہت بڑا فرض ہے کہ وہ ان کے بچوں کی تعلیم و تربیت کے لئے فوری قدم اٹھائے -

جلاب والا - میں نے یہ عرض کیا تھا کہ کشمیر کے لوگوں نے اپنی وفاداری کا پورا ثبوت دیا - اور ہندوستان کے ساتھ الحاق کا جب اعلان انہوں نے ۱۹۴۷ء میں کیا، تھا اس کے حق میں ایک بار پھر جب پاکستان کی فوجوں نے ان پر حملہ کیا تو انہوں نے ثبوت دیا اور بہت ہی بہادری کے ساتھ ثبوت دیا اور کئی کئی اپنے جوانوں اور کئی اپنے لوگوں کو قربان کیا - لیکن ہندوستان کی سرکار کی بھی کچھ ذمہ داریاں ہیں - کچھ آئندہ ذمہ داریاں ہیں اور ان ذمہ داریوں کے نبھانے کے متعلق ہی کل میں اس معزز ایوان میں ذکر کر رہا تھا کہ اٹھارہ سال ہوئے اور ان اٹھارہ سالوں میں صرف پانچ میل دیڑھے لائن پتھان

کوٹ سے کٹھوا تک پہنچ سکی - یہ بہت ہی افسوس کرنے کا مقام ہے کہ جس ریاست کی اتنی اہم پوزیشن ہے اس میں اتنے سالوں میں صرف پانچ میل دیڑھے لائن بلٹائی گئی - ضرورت یہ تھی کہ حکومت اس طرف زیادہ سے زیادہ توجہ دیتی - کھمبہ ایک ایسا علاقہ ہے جس پر دو طرف سے حملہ ہے - ایک طرف سے پاکستان کا دوسری طرف سے چین کا - ان حالات میں پچھلے اٹھارہ سالوں میں اگر کشمیر تک نہیں تو کم سے کم جموں تک دیڑھے لائن پہنچائی جانی چاہئے تھی لیکن مجھے افسوس ہے کہ اس طرف توجہ نہیں دی گئی -

اسی طرح کشمیر کی پراہم لا ایلنڈ آرڈر کی پراہم نہیں ہے - ہوسن پراہم ہے - کشمیر میں بیروزگاری ہے - کشمیر کے لوگ غریب ہیں اور کشمیر میں جو تجارت تھی وہ پاکستان کے حملہ سے بالکل ٹھپ ہو کر رہ گئی - وہاں جتنی بھی ترقی اور بزنس تھی وہ سب ختم ہو کر رہ گئی ہے لیکن حکومت نے ابھی تک اس طرف کوئی توجہ نہیں دی - کشمیر ہی ہندوستان میں ایک ایسی بدقسمت ریاست ہے جس میں کوئی سہولتی اسپونسرڈ اسکیم یا پراجیکٹ نہیں ہے جسے سہلتر فائلڈس کر رہا ہو - اسی

لئے میں یہ عرض کر رہا ہوں کہ کشمیر کی پراہلم دیومن پراہلم ہے اور آپ کو وہاں کے لوگوں کو غلہ مہیا کرنا ہے۔ وہاں کے لوگوں کے ان امپلائمنٹ کا انتظام کرنا ہے اور جو لاکھوں لوگ وہاں بے کار پڑے ہوئے ہیں ان کو کوئی کام دینا ہے۔ جیسا میں نے عرض کیا کہ وہاں تجارت ختم ہو چکی ہے انڈسٹری وہاں پر کوئی ہے نہیں اور ٹورزم کی جو ہماری سب سے بڑی انڈسٹری ہے اور جس سے لاکھوں انسانوں کو روزی مل سکتی ہے وہ بالکل ٹھپ پڑی ہوئی ہے اور اس طرف حکومت نے آج تک کوئی توجہ نہیں دی۔

جہاں تک ہائیڈرو الیکٹرک پاور کا تعلق ہے ہمارے پاس بے شمار ذرائع موجود ہیں لیکن ان کو ایکسپلائٹ کرنے کے لئے سینٹرل گورنمنٹ کی طرف سے کچھ نہیں کیا جا رہا ہے۔ وہاں سلال ہائیڈرو الیکٹرک پراجیکٹ سے ہم بے شمار بجلی مہیا کر سکتے ہیں اور ہائیڈرو الیکٹرک پاور مہیا کر کے جموں کشمیر ہی نہیں بلکہ ہم پنجاب اور دہلی کو بھی بجلی دے سکتے ہیں۔ اس کے لئے ہم نے سینٹرل گورنمنٹ سے ریکوسٹ کی لیکن آج تک سینٹر نے اس طرف بالکل توجہ نہیں دی اور ان کے کانوں

پر جو تک رہے لگیں - ۱۰  
82 R.S.—3.

یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اب ایسا وقت آ گیا ہے جب ہم تمام کلیموزن کو دور کر دینا چاہئے اور ہندوستان کی سرکار اگر یہ سمجھتی ہے کہ کشمیر کا ہندوستان کے نقشہ میں کہیں مقام ہے تو اس کا یہ فرض ہو جاتا ہے کہ وہ وہاں کی تکلیفوں، دقتوں اور مصائب کی طرف پوری توجہ دے۔ اور زیادہ سے زیادہ انٹرسٹ لے۔ انڈسٹری چاہے پبلک سینکٹر میں کھولیں یا پرائیویٹ سینکٹر میں کھولیں جس سے لوگوں کو روزگار ملے۔ جس سے وہاں کی بجلی بڑھے، وہاں کی انڈسٹری بڑھے اور جو لوگ وہاں ان کو کام ملے۔ کیوں کہ آپ کو معلوم ہے کہ خالی بیتھ کر شیشانی سوچتی ہے اس لئے جو سب سے بڑا مسئلہ ہے ان امپلائمنٹ کا ٹورزم کی انڈسٹری ہے، ہماری رولن کی انڈسٹری ہے، ان کو ڈولپ کرنے کے لئے سینٹر کی طرف سے کوئی انسینٹیو نہیں دیا گیا۔ اس لئے میں اس کے لئے حکومت سے گزارش کروں گا۔ ان چند گزارشات کے ساتھ میں اپنی تقریر ختم کرتے ہوئے اس ایوان میں جو تحریک پیش کی گئی ہے اس کی پرزور حمایت کرتا ہوں۔

†[श्री जी० एम० मोर : (जम्मू और काश्मीर): चेयरमैन साहब, कल जब मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के एड्रेस पर अपने विचार का

† [ ] Hindi Translation.

[श्री जी० एम० मीर]

इजहार कर रहा था तो मैंने शास्त्री जी की डेथ और शास्त्री जी की लाइफ के मुतल्लिक अर्ज किया था कि किस मुखलिसाना तरीके से शास्त्री जी ने हिन्दुस्तान की खिदमत की, जंग के वक्त और फिर जब अमन का वक्त आया तो अपनी जाने अजीज को कुर्बान किया । मैंने यह अर्ज किया था कि हिन्दुस्तान के नेता भी अगर शास्त्री जी के नक्शे कदम पर चले तो नया हिन्दुस्तान, जिस का ख्वाब हमने आज से कई साल पहले लिया था वह यकीनन पूरा हो सकेगा । मैंने यह अर्ज किया था कि शास्त्री जी ने जब दुनिया से रेहलत फरमाई तो उन के पास रहने के लिए एक झोंपड़ी तक नहीं थी । बच्चों के लिए कोई इन्तजाम नहीं था, कोई बैंक बेलेंस नहीं था । यह एक शानदार रवायत शास्त्री जी ने हिन्दुस्तान में बसने वाले लोगों के लिए और हिन्दुस्तान के रहनुमाओं के लिए कायम की । मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में बसने वाले तमाम पार्टियों के नेताओं को शास्त्री जी के नक्शे कदम पर चलना होगा ।

इसके साथ ही मैंने ताशकन्द ऐलान का स्वागत करते हुए यह कहा था कि पाकिस्तान की तरफ से सालों तक जो मुसलसल हमला होता रहा और फिर 1965 ई० में जिस तरीके से पाकिस्तान ने हमारे मुल्क पर हमला किया और मुसायब और मुश्किलात का सामना हमको करना पड़ा, हमारे मकानों को जला दिया गया, हमारी जायदादों को लूट लिया गया, इसके बावजूद काश्मीरियों ने एक होकर 1947 में जो रोशनी की किरण गांधी जी को काश्मीर में नजर आई थी उस मशाल को हमेशा के लिये जिन्दा रखने का अहद किया । हमने वायदा किया कि हम उस मशाल को बुझने नहीं देंगे जो रोशनी की किरण गांधीजी को काश्मीर में नजर आई थी । अब ताशकन्द का ऐलान हो गया है । दोनों मुमालक,

पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान, में हमारे मुश्तरका किस्म के मुसायल है । खुराक के मसले में हमारी एक जैसी पोजिशन है, जबान के मसले में, बेरोजगारी और बीमारी के मसले में और तामीली मयार के मसले में दोनों मुल्कों की पोजीशन एक जैसी है । अब जब कि दोनों मुमालक के ताल्लुकात ताशकन्द के ऐलान के बाद बेहतर हुए हैं तो जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम सिक्थोरिटी कौंसिल से काश्मीर के मसले को, जो आज से अठारह साल पहले हम लेकर वहां गये थे वह हम वापस ले लें क्योंकि मुझे खदशा है कि सिक्थोरिटी कौंसिल में ब्लाक पावर पोलिटिक्स और बेलेंस आफ पावर को कायम रखने के लिए कुछ मुमालक दोनों मुल्कों को इकट्ठे नहीं रहने देना चाहते । अब पाकिस्तान ने भी यह महसूस कर लिया है कि पाकिस्तान की बेहतरी इसी में है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मिल कर रहे वह नो वार पैकज जो जवाहर लाल जी ने आफर किया था और जिसे शास्त्री जी ने दुहराया था, आज मुझे खुशी है कि पाकिस्तान ने बड़ी मुद्दत के बाद इस आफर को कबल किया । आज मिनिस्ट्रियल लेवल पर काफ़ेस हो रही है और सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी वहां तशरीफ ले गये हैं । मैं दुआ करूंगा कि उनकी मीटिंग कामयाब हो और भुट्टो साहब कोई और जबान वहां न बोले जिस से हमारा खुशगवार ताल्लुकात में फिर किसी किस्म की खराबी पैदा हो और हमें नुकसान हो और वह माहौल जिस के लिए शास्त्री जी ने अपनी जान दी वह फिर खराब हो जाए । मुझे यकीन है कि यह तमाम बातें पाकिस्तान के जहन में हैं । इसलिए मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में अमन और शान्ति की जो एक नई धारा चल पड़ी है उसको कायम रखने के लिए यह जरूरी है कि हम काश्मीर के मसले को सिक्थोरिटी कौंसिल से वापस लें और पाकिस्तान के साथ बैठ कर यह फैसला करे कि पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में जो अठारह साल से काश्मीर का इलाका चला

आ रहा है उसको किस तरीके से हम पाकिस्तान से आज़ाद कराएं किस तरीके से इस हिस्से को काश्मीर के साथ मिलाएं। यह एक फैसला हमें पाकिस्तान के साथ करना है और इसलिए मैं गुज़ारिश करूंगा कि सिक्थोरटी कौंसिल से इस केस को वापस लिया जाए।

इस के साथ ही मुझे काश्मीरी होने के नाते यह फ़ख़ है कि काश्मीर ने हिन्दुस्तान को एक बार फिर ऐसा प्राइम मिनिस्टर दिया है जो मास लीडर है और जिसके पीछे हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा चलने के लिए तैयार है। इन काश्मीरियों के लिए और तमाम देशवासियों के लिए मुबारकबाद का मुकाम है।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : काश्मीर ने नहीं, यू० पी० ने दिया।

श्री जी० एम० मीर : जी नहीं, काश्मीर ने दिया है और सब से पहले हमारा हक़ है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : दिल्ली का हक़ है।

श्री जी० एम० मीर : दिल्ली का नहीं, काश्मीर का हक़ है। इसलिए हमें फ़ख़ है, और हमारा सिर वुलन्द है। जनाब वाला, पाकिस्तान के हमले की वजह से पंजाब, काश्मीर और राजस्थान के बार्डर पर जिन जिन मुसायब का सामना लोगों को करना पड़ा है, और लोग तबाह व बरबाद हुए और अपने घरों से उजड़े गये उनकी बहाली का एक जबरदस्त काम है लेकिन मुझे अफ़सोस है कि हकूमत ने इस तरफ़ कोई खास कदम नहीं उठाया है। उन्होंने जो कुर्बानी की, उन्होंने जिन मुसायब का सामना किया उसको मद्दे-नज़र रखते हुए हकूमत ने आज तक उनको बसाने के लिए किसी किस्म का कदम नहीं उठाया। जिस तरीके से उनका सेटिलमेंट होना चाहिए और जिस तरीके से उनकी मदद

करनी चाहिए वह आज तक नहीं की गई। इसलिए मैं हकूमत पर जोर दूंगा कि जिन बहादुरों ने इन मुश्किलात का सामना किया उन के बसाने के लिए फौरी कदम उठाया जाय।

इसके साथ ही हमारे जिन बहादुर जवानों ने अपनी जाने अज़ीज़ हथेली पर रखकर अपने मादरे-वतन की इज्जत बचाई उनकी मदद करना इस हकूमत का फ़र्ज़ है। उनके बाल बच्चों की पूरी मदद और देख-भाल की जानी चाहिए, क्योंकि उनकी कुर्बानी एक रंग लाई है। हमारी बहादुर फौजों ने एक रिकार्ड कायम किया और एक तारीख़ पैदा की और चायना की लड़ाई के वक्त जो कुछ हमने खोया था वह सियासी तौर पर, मिलिट्री तौर पर फिर हमने हासिल किया। और यही वजह है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान का एक एक इंसान अपना सिर फ़ख़ से बुलन्द कर के चल रहा है और उसके दिल में अपनी फौज के लिए, अपनी फौज के उन जवानों के लिए, उन सपूतों के लिए, बड़ी इज्जत है जिन्होंने खुशी खुशी अपनी जानें कुर्बान कर दीं। इसलिए आज हकूमत का यह बड़ा फ़र्ज़ है कि वह उन के बच्चों की तालीम व तरबियत के लिए फौरी कदम उठाये।

जनाब वाला, मैंने यह अर्ज़ किया था कि काश्मीर के लोगों ने अपनी वफादारी का पूरा सबूत दिया और हिन्दुस्तान के साथ अलहाक़ का जो ऐलान उन्होंने 1947 ई० में किया था उस के हक़ में एक बार फिर जब पाकिस्तान की फौजों ने उन पर हमला किया तो उन्होंने सबूत दिया, और बहुत ही बहादुरी के साथ सबूत दिया और कई अपने जवानों और कई अपने लोगों को कुर्बान किया। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की भी कुछ जिम्मेदारियां हैं, कुछ आयनी जिम्मेदारियां हैं और उन जिम्मेदारियों के निभाने के मुतल्लिक ही कल मैं इस मुअज़िज एंवान

[श्री जी० एम० मीर]

में जिक्र कर रहा था कि अठारह साल हुए और इन अठारह सालों में सिर्फ पांच मील रेलवे लाइन पठानकोट से कठुवा तक पहुंच सकी। यह बहुत ही अफसोस करने का मकाम है कि जिस रियासत की इतनी अहम पोजिशन है उस में इतने सालों में सिर्फ पांच मील रेलवे लाइन बनाई गई। जरूरत यह थी कि हकूमत इस तरफ ज्यादा से ज्यादा तवज्जो देती। काश्मीर एक ऐसा इलाका है जिस पर दो तरफ से हमला है, एक तरफ से पाकिस्तान का दूसरी तरफ से चीन का। इन हालात में पिछले अठारह सालों में अगर काश्मीर तक नहीं तो कम से कम जम्मू तक रेलवे लाइन पहुंचाई जानी चाहिए थी लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि इस तरफ तवज्जो नहीं दी गई।

इसी तरह काश्मीर की प्रोब्लम ला एन्ड आर्डर की प्रोब्लम नहीं है। ह्यूमन प्रोब्लम है। काश्मीर में बेरोजगारी है, काश्मीर के लोग गरीब हैं और काश्मीर में जो तिजारत थी वह पाकिस्तान के हमले से बिल्कुल ठप्प हो कर रह गई, वहां जितनी भी ट्रेड और बिजनेस थी वह सब खत्म हो कर रह गई है लेकिन हकूमत ने अभी तक इस तरफ कोई तवज्जो नहीं दी। काश्मीर ही हिन्दुस्तान में एक ऐसी बदकिस्मत रियासत है जिस में कोई सेन्ट्रली स्पॉन्सर्ड स्कीम या प्राजेक्ट नहीं है जिसे सेन्टर फाइनांस कर रहा हो। इसीलिए मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा हूं कि काश्मीर की प्रोब्लम ह्यूमन प्रोब्लम है और आपको वहां के लोगों को गल्ला मुहय्या करना है, वहां के लोगों के अनइम्प्लाइमेंट का इन्तेजाम करना है और जो लाखों लोग वहां बेकार पड़े हुए हैं उनको कोई काम देना है। जैसा मैंने अर्ज किया कि वहां तिजारत खत्म हो चुकी है, इण्डस्ट्री वहां पर कोई है नहीं और टूरिज्म की जो हमारी सब से बड़ी इण्डस्ट्री है और

जिससे लाखों इंसानों को रोजी मिल सकती है वह बिल्कुल ठप्प पड़ी हुई है। और इस तरफ हकूमत ने आज तक कोई तवज्जो नहीं दी।

जहां तक हाइड्रो-इलेक्ट्रिक पावर का ताल्लुक है हमारे पास बेशुमार जराए मौजूद हैं लेकिन उनको एक्सप्लाइट करने के लिए सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कुछ नहीं किया जा रहा है। वहां सलाल-हाइड्रो-इलेक्ट्रिक प्राजेक्ट से हम बेशुमार बिजली मुहय्या कर सकते हैं और हाइड्रो-इलेक्ट्रिक पावर मुहय्या कर के जम्मू काश्मीर ही नहीं बल्कि हम पंजाब और दिल्ली को भी बिजली दे सकते हैं। इसके लिए हमने सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट से रिक्वेस्ट की लेकिन आज तक सेन्टर ने इस तरफ बिल्कुल तवज्जो नहीं दी और उनके कानों पर जू तक नहीं रेंगी। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अब ऐसा वक्त आ गया है जब हमें तमाम कंप्यूजन को दूर कर देना चाहिये और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अगर यह समझती है कि काश्मीर का हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे में कहीं मकाम है तो उसका यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि वह वहां की तकलीफों, दिक्कतों और मुसायब की तरफ पूरी तवज्जो दे और ज्यादा से ज्यादा इन्वेस्ट ले। इण्डस्ट्री चाहे पब्लिक सेक्टर में खोलें या प्राइवेट सेक्टर में खोलें जिस से लोगों को रोजगार मिले, जिस से वहां की बिजली बढ़े, वहां की इण्डस्ट्री बढ़े और जो लोग हैं उन को काम मिले, क्योंकि आपको मालूम है कि खाली बैठ कर शैतानी सूझती है इसलिए जो सब से बड़ा मसला है, अन-इम्प्लायमेंट का, टूरिज्म की इण्डस्ट्री है, हमारी वूलन की इण्डस्ट्री है, उनको डेवेलप करने के लिए सेन्टर की तरफ से कोई इन्सैटिव नहीं दिया गया है। इसलिए मैं इसके लिए हकूमत से गुजारिश करूंगा। इन चन्द गुजारशात के साथ मैं अपनी तकरीर खत्म करते हुए इस एवान में जो तहरीक पेश की गई है उसकी पुरजोर हिमायत करता हूं।]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I am glad that I am speaking immediately after the hon. Member from Jammu and Kashmir. I think now after the Tashkent Declaration, we do need to apply our mind to the question of Kashmir. We are happy and glad at the manner in which the Tashkent Agreement is being implemented and I assume that in the course of the next few weeks most of the terms of the Agreement will have been implemented. We do hope so and as far as the indications go we find that the Government of this country and also the Government of Pakistan, notwithstanding what Mr. Bhutto might or might not say, are trying to implement this Agreement. Now, the question will arise after that: Where do we go from there? Is the deadlock to come again? Or, are we to freeze the relations at that point or are we to do something more? I do maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the Tashkent Agreement is every day improving the climate and I am sure in that climate we shall have to do a little re-thinking in this matter in the sense that we should attempt to find a solution to our differences over the question of Kashmir. There is no escape from it. Kashmir is undoubtedly, as we have always said and I say it now, an integral part of India. That position we maintain but at the same time the fact has to be faced that a part of Jammu and Kashmir is not with us and has been in the possession of Pakistan for eighteen years now. If I remember right, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chavan told one of the meetings that a part of Kashmir went to the possession of Pakistan even before the accession was formalised. Now, the fact remains that a part of Jammu and Kashmir is under Pakistani occupation for a number of years, eighteen years, in fact, ever since this problem arose, that problem arose, that a part of the State went to Pakistan and is with Pakistan. What are we going to do? One thing is quite clear. Both the countries today are committed under an agreement, the Tashkent Agreement not to resort to force for the

solution of any of their problems or outstanding differences and that includes whatever problem or difference is there no matter who raises it. Under the Agreement every party is precluded from taking recourse to arms directly or indirectly for the solution of the difference or the problem. It is quite clear. As far as India is concerned, we have never sought the solution of any problem with Pakistan by arms and that goes to the credit of our country but unfortunately, this cannot be said of Pakistan but I believe that the Tashkent spirit is creating a change in political life as well there. We have to consider this because I do not think that in the larger interests of the two countries in this sub-continent and of world peace we can bring the Indo-Pak. relations to an even keel and settle finally and once for all the problem and enter the field of brotherly and friendly relations between these two countries without coming to grip with the question or problem, whatever you call it, of Kashmir.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of what the late Pandit Nehru said. In 1955, he made an offer to Mohamad Ali Bogra, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan. In that offer, he had suggested that the question could be settled on the basis of the 1949 cease-fire line. That is the proposal he made but this offer unfortunately was rejected by the Government at that time of Pakistan but that rejection was, of course, not right. This was their attitude at that time, their posture at that time because this was immediately after they had got military aid from America. The U.S.-Pak Pact was in 1954 and naturally having got arms and prodded by the Americans they did not accept this kind of an offer at all and they thought they could carry on like this and threaten us. I think that even some of them in Pakistan will have realised by now that that way nothing could be settled as far as the peace-loving people of India is concerned. Speaking at a public meeting in New

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Delhi on April 13, 1956, about a year later the late Prime Minister Nehru said—and I am quoting what he said:

"I am willing to accept that the question of part of Kashmir which is under you could be settled by demarcating the border on the basis of the present cease-fire line. We have no desire to take it by fighting."

This is what Pandit Nehru said at that time. Many people in the country and some not supported him. This was said not only to a private audience but was said in a public meeting also and was reported in the newspapers all over the world. This showed for one thing that India's attitude was highly constructive and that India was trying to meet the problem half way in order to settle once for all the tormenting and tortured relations between our two countries, India and Pakistan. Now, we have travelled far away from those days, nearly a decade has passed since the Prime Minister made that offer. Is it not possible for us to revive that offer and seek or explore the possibilities of coming to a settlement on the basis of that offer? On behalf of my Party, I am spelling it out very categorically. We have given a lot of thought to this matter ever since the matter has been with us. In very many ways we have discussed it and I wish to place before the House for your consideration this suggestion. In the present situation, I think it would be advisable for the Government of India to revive that offer again and, on the basis of the "No War Pact" and the 1949 cease-fire line seek a solution of the problem of Kashmir with Pakistan. I know the difficulties involved in it. I know questions will be raised also but I know that we have no other alternative if we have to travel along with the Tashkent spirit and if we want to improve our relations with Pakistan and bring that melancholy chapter of strained relation to an end. In such a situation, we have no other alternative except to seek solution on

the basis of this because we are committed under an Agreement not to take recourse to arms. What else is left to us unless it be, as some hon. Members said, that we try to persuade Pakistan to give up that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is under her control? I do not think anyone in this House or elsewhere in the country would suggest that we should wait because we think the Pakistani authorities could be persuaded to give up the portion of Jammu and Kashmir which is under their occupation. Since that is not a possibility, let us be realistic and let us also bear in mind the Agreement that we have signed and then take the diplomatic initiative in reviving this offer and making it known to the world that we seek a solution. Yes, this would mean some sacrifice on our part but greater is the need for friendship and amity between India and Pakistan, return to the earlier normal relations that should exist between these two countries. This sub-continent should be one in which the two neighbours tied by common history, common culture, common tradition, who are brothers and sisters divided on both sides of the frontier, can co-mingle in friendly and brotherly relations. What else can be a greater objective than this? Mr. Chairman, I say this thing because I have faith in my people. We have seen how secularism triumphs at the time of peril. I say this thing because I know that we are a nation who have been proud of our secularism of our fine tradition. I know that all of us feel extremely sympathetic towards the people of Pakistan and want this problem to be settled once and for all. Let us make this sub-continent a garden of friendship and good relations between those who lived side by side in the same country one day, who fought the British together, who today are brothers and who tomorrow will remain brothers. But something unfortunately has intervened. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think this suggestion is well worth considering. By a minor adjustment this can be met, given the Tashkent spirit and given

acceptance by Pakistan of these proposals. That is why I say that this constructive approach should be developed. I know I have spoken on a controversial subject. I am quite clear on this. I thought that somebody must spell out this thing and I thought our Party should spell it out. In fact, this is not an easy thing to say. Perhaps some people might even say that in the election year one should not say such things but it is precisely because of the election year that I am saying this. We want to come together. I am sure—I have no doubt in my mind—that our people are imbued with the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration. We have chosen the path of peace; even in war we have fought for peace. Today we find the Tashkent spirit spreading all over the country and changing the landscape of relations between our countries and giving rise to men of goodwill on both sides of the frontier asserting themselves more and more and creating an atmosphere of better understanding and goodwill in this part and also in the other part. Today is the proper time if ever there was a time to develop the initiative and go forward. I think it is worthy of our attempt, worthy of our country. Therefore, I submit in all humility and sincerity to this House and to the Government that they should take the initiative. And world opinion, I am sure, will be with us in this matter. In the background that is there already, if India takes this step, it will be appreciated. This is not 1955 when Mohammad Ali could spurn the offer in the way he did. Today there is a changed world. Today we have got friends and people all over the world admiring our approach in this matter. Therefore, I think the world public opinion will also be mobilised in our favour and the situation is all the more favourable. For one thing I know that the Western Powers will find it difficult to oppose such a thing. The Security Council is dead and gone. No solution was ever possible in the Security Council and no solution will be possible. Today Tashkent has opened new vistas for new efforts, new endeavours,

for a wise statemanship to be brought to bear upon the subject. And let us proceed along that line and see whether for once and for all we cannot put an end to that unfortunate development—in fact two unfortunate things—that strained the relations between our countries. Therefore, I say let us have the perspective clear and let us place this perspective before the whole world, place it before the people of Pakistan and I am sure men of goodwill will rise in support of it and what we desire shall come about. This is all that I have to say on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something about one or two other subjects. Another problem which is worrying us is the attitude of the Government with regard to Vietnam. In the President's Address you will find that they have shown only concern in barely three lines, quite long for the President but not of course long for me. It has taken up barely three lines but I think something more is needed. India is the Chairman of the International Control Commission and the International Control Commission has certain clear obligations given to it under the Geneva Agreement of 1954 itself. These obligations relate to the control, supervision, etc. and to the introduction of arms, armed personnel and so on. Today, we find that the International Control Commission has been made practically defunct and unfortunately it is not discharging its responsibilities. As Chairman of the International Control Commission the representative of India owes to our country and to the people of Asia and to the Agreement itself a much better role than he has been playing. Therefore I think, we should come out firmly against the introduction of arms and weapons there by the U.S.A. There are already over 200,000—and it may be now nearly 300,000—U.S. troops in that small country trying to suppress in a sea of blood the freedom urge of the people. Therefore, I think, when President Ho Chi Minh makes the appeal, it should be responded to not merely by expressing con-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

earn but by doing something more; above all, by discharging the responsibilities assigned to us under the Geneva Agreement as Chairman of the International Control Commission. Today, Mr. Chairman, I was reading in the foreign Press a news item that Mr. Humphrey sought at least to silence India. They know that India cannot just be pushed on to their side, to the side of America, as an active force. They know it very well. What they want to get done is to silence India, paralyse India's initiative and activities in terms of the Geneva Agreement and then gain out of it all the political and military advantages. Therefore, I think silence here is absolutely harmful; it is not in consonance with our own international commitments and certainly not in accord with the assignment that we ourselves assumed under the Geneva Agreement when we accepted the position of Chairman of the International Control Commission. Their troops must be withdrawn. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, is going to the United States of America and I think it should be made clear to them. Our position should be made clear. Maybe some will say that if we say such things we cannot play our part effectively in bringing about peace. I cannot accept that argument. Then the Soviet Union will not be playing any part at all. The Soviet Union is fully supporting the Vietnamese people's fight against American imperialism and at the same time they are working hard so that an honourable peace may come to Vietnam. For me it is possible to do so. In fact that is the only way you can play your part, by rallying behind you the world progressive forces and public opinion. I think that our attitude is one of great failure. Very many things are appearing in the U.S. Press about Mr. Humphrey's visit. It is quite clear that the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Humphrey, came here with a political purpose in pursuance of the decision taken at the Honolulu Conference where President Johnson, along with his South Viet-

namese puppet drew up a new plan for intensifying the war in Vietnam simultaneously under cover of peace and friendship. It is in pursuance of that decision that Mr. Humphrey was sent to India and having come here what he did we all known. After leaving the country he indulged in a language which makes it very clear—as to what he intended to achieve here. My fear is this that the Government, of course, without completely surrendering but in order that it can get economic aid—they have been in economic difficulties and they think in terms of aid—and also in order that they can get PL 480 food imports, wants in this matter to be on the right of the United States of America. Mr. Chairman, that is a position which is unacceptable to a country which is non-aligned and anti-colonial because our non-alignment is an active force; it is not passivity; it is not capitulation to imperialist aggression. Why do we not stand by the Bandung spirit of 1955 and say that Asia is for the Asians and Americans have no business to come there all the way from thousands of miles away in order to carry on their war, depredation and savagery in which they are indulging in Vietnam today? We should fully express our solidarity and support with the brave fighting people of Vietnam. In the past when bombings took place on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Government of India used to protest but today they do not do even that. What am I to infer? I am sure the Government does not like this bombing of Vietnam but why are they not protesting against it? The only explanation is that they are afraid of angering and annoying the United States so that our food supplies may not be stopped or our economic aid is not withheld. Even without our doing these things, the United States of America are not releasing the committed aid for the last year of the Third Plan.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa):  
Would you not be a little more charitable? They are doing it with a clear conscience.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** He is the conscience-keeper of the Americans.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** You seem to be the conscience-keeper of the Prime Minister.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** No, no. I am not the conscience-keeper of anybody. Now, all I say is if you want to pressurise the Government, do it. Ask them to do it. I do not want to say that the Government has become an American stooge or the Government has become the Government of Thailand. But what my fear is this and I am justified in saying this that because of the economic difficulties they have landed themselves in, because of the food crisis, which is largely the creation of man, well, the Government is afraid of annoying the Americans, lest there should be more difficulties. This is not right. We defame our country. Our stature is weakened. Our image is blackened and tarnished by such action and we know that if we take a firm stand the Americans will not be in a position to bludgeon our country in such a manner that we cannot go ahead with our plans.

In this connection, I should like also to express another important reason. Why should not the German Democratic Republic be recognised even now? We have seen how in the crucial days of the war between India and Pakistan, the German Federal Republic, otherwise known as West Germany, sided with Pakistan and then they allowed a hate campaign against our country. Their press was full of all kinds of allegations and accusations against our country. They supplied weapons indirectly and directly to Pakistan. They did many other things, but then the Government has recognised it. I am not saying, withdraw the recognition from that Government, but the discrimination against the German Democratic Republic should be put an end to. And if one could be recognised, why not the Government of the German Democratic Republic just as well? Even in the crisis of August/September, 1965 their Government

made open statements supporting India's position. It has very good economic relations with our country. It wants cultural relations with our country. Why that Government should not be recognised just because some people in the Ministry of External Affairs do not like it? I cannot understand. The Americans do not like it. I know. West Germany is lobbying Members of Parliament even to prevent recognition, but I do not think that we should any longer withhold recognition. The G.D.R. should be recognised in the interests of peace, in the interests of better relations with that country and in our national interest also, because relationship between these two countries is essential for our economic development. Also, they can help us and we can help them in our own humble way.

Here, now, let me come to one or two things about this emergency. Well, emergency everybody seems to dislike. Now, you must have read in the papers the statement, which 34 eminent citizens of India have made urging the Government to end the emergency and in that statement they say that the fair name of our democracy stands tarnished in the eyes of the world by adopting methods characteristic of a police State. These are expressions—by whom—not by communist agitators, not by Opposition Members, but by three leading retired Chief Justices of India. A number of Judges and Mr. Justice Radha Binod Pal—who was a Judge of the International Court which tried the war criminals—journalists, eminent people, Vice-Chancellors and many others have said this. Now, the Government has been so isolated over this matter, and the Government has to blame itself and nobody else. Now, can you cite a single example in recent history or other recorded history where three Chief Justices of a country—all three living Chief Justices of the country and they are leadingmen—have been constrained or compelled to make an appeal to the Head of the Government asking for the revocation of the emergency in the name of democracy, a situation in which

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

such people have been compelled to declare publicly that they feel that democracy is tarnished before the eyes of the world? Now, here it is a question of the restoration of Fundamental Rights. It is not a question merely of the release of detenus. Four hundred and fifty million Indians have been given Fundamental Rights under the Constitution, a written Constitution, which we have given into ourselves. The Fundamental Rights stand suspended. The question is, whether you are restoring it or not, you are keeping me under a constant risk, the risk of my right being violated, and my right of going to a court of law and challenging them, challenging the Government's order, is negated. Such is the position. Therefore, the main and fundamental issue is one of restoring the Fundamental Rights and this cannot be done without lifting the emergency and scrapping the D.I.R., etc. Here the President says: "Unfortunately our relations with the People's Republic of China still continue to be strained." Nowhere in the President's Address you will find the words grave emergency today. All that is said is that our relations with China are strained. Now, in the name of the same President a Proclamation is in force and a state of emergency is in force, which is permissible under article 352 of the Constitution only in case of grave emergency. Therefore, the President's Address itself is a refutation of all that has been said by some people in support of emergency in the Ministry and the Government perhaps. Therefore, I say that strained relations are there. You would like that it should be taken note of. Our country should be aware of the dangers. But our Constitution does not provide for the continuance of the emergency in order to meet a situation of strained relations with our neighbour. That is what I want to say. Therefore, here we are a little surprised today by seeing in the press that some Chief Ministers seem to be opposing the revocation of the emergency. What they are saying, I need not say. Here I find that the "Hindu"

has come out with a strong editorial against it, in which the "Hindu" has said very clearly that the Chief Ministers are doing it for their own partisan and special reasons. Emergency was invoked by the Central Government for the defence of the country, for the security of the country. Now, the Chief Ministers say: "Well, keep it. We need it for dealing with others." Well, I do not think this is a very right thing for the Chief Ministers to do and all I can say is that no attention should be paid to what the Chief Ministers, or some of them, are saying. Here I should like to point out one thing more. In 1943 Mr. Winston Churchill wrote a letter to the Home Secretary of England. In 1943, please remember that the War had not ended. The War continued for another two years. The letter was in regard to some detenus and of these Mr. Oswald Mosley was one. They were openly in support of Hitler. We were in England when the War broke out. They were openly supporting Hitler and after some time they were put in detention. What Mr Winston Churchill wrote is very interesting and I cannot avoid the temptation of reading out one or two lines. He wrote to the Home Secretary from Cairo and Teheran. He wrote:

"I expect you will be questioned about the release of the Mosleys. No doubt, the pith of your case is health and humanity. You might, however, consider whether you should not unfold as a back ground the great principle of *habeas corpus* and trial by jury, which are the supreme protection invented by the British people for ordinary individuals against the State. The power of the executive to cast a man into prison without formulating any charge known to the law, and particularly to deny him judgment by his peers for an indefinite period, is in the highest degree odious, and is the foundation of all totalitarian government... It is only when extreme danger to the State can be pleaded that this power may be temporarily assumed by the executive, and even so its working must

be interpreted with the utmost vigilance by a free Parliament. As the danger passes, persons so imprisoned against whom there is no charge which courts and juries would accept, should be released, as you have been steadily doing, until hardly any are left. Extraordinary powers assumed by the executive with the consent of Parliament in emergencies should be yielded up when and as the emergency declines. On no account should we lend any countenance to the totalitarian idea of the right of the executive to lock up its political opponents or unpopular people . . . Do not quit the heights."

I cannot ask Mr. Nanda and his Government to quit the heights but I can ask them not to live in the depths of political and moral depravity. I can ask them. I wish I can ask them because they are not in the heights, but certainly I ask them what I have asked: Do not wallow in political depravity by your conduct and behaviour. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to state here that I understand that the Home Secretary and the Defence Secretary are opposing the revocation of the emergency when many people in the Congress Party, the entire Opposition, nay, the whole country has demanded it. I should like to know whether this democracy is going to be placed at the mercies of the Intelligence Department and the Secretary of the Home Ministry and the Secretary of the Defence Ministry.

*(Interruption)*

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Sir, on a point of order. Is the hon. Member in order in referring to the advice of members of the Civil Service? They are not in Parliament. They cannot be questioned. There is a Minister who represents the Government and he should be called in question, not members of the Civil Service.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is an old story, I know.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): How does the hon. Member know that the Home Secretary and the Defence Secretary are opposed to it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is my information.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, either he should be asked to disclose . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, not at all.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Otherwise he should not drag them in. Officials should not be dragged in. They are not here to reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shri Vajpayee is saying that he is not here. Every day he is bringing charges against so many people.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Not Government officers. They are not here to reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shri Vajpayee should know that we discussed the L.I.C. and the Principal Secretary, and the Chagla Commission was appointed. ....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not insist on naming the people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can understand that. But how hon. Members sometimes rise on a point of order, I do not understand. We discussed the L.I.C., discussed the Secretary, and a Commission was appointed.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There were definite allegations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I make that allegation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not make that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can say that I should not make allegations. That is a different matter. But let them not rise on a point of order. That has been done.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Impropiety

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That you can say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken more time than I have allowed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry, Sir, that Shri Vajpayee, whom I never interrupt when he says similar things, interrupts me. I am very sorry to state it, but I still have got all the affection for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like you to finish soon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Five minutes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five minutes would mean five minutes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He has taken much more time than has been given to us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Are you quarrelling over it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not waste time. You finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These are small matters. The Swatantra Party should be given more time. Next time I will give some time from my time.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing I should like to add is this. I do not like the Governor's ordering the M.L.As. out of the Assembly. They are not presiding officers. Yet we find in Rajasthan that the Governor took the role of a presiding officer and chucked out the M.L.As. This is not good. All I can say is that this is happening all over the country.

Finally, I should like only to end by saying one thing. Yesterday I heard here the speech of our Planning Minister. I thought that I was attending a Cambridge seminar, University of Cambridge.

AN HON. MEMBER: The London School of Economics.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Do not defame Cambridge.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The same Cambridge if you like, whatever it is. Anyway a professorial thing he said. Mr. Asoka Mehta is a very good man, a very learned man. He said many things. We are some of us fifty years old, I can tell you. Therefore, it is very difficult for us when we get such things from him. He should have told us as the Planning Minister why in 30 industries out of 50, which were surveyed, there was a decline in production, why the rate of growth was going down, why there was idle capacity to the extent of 14 or 15 per cent in many industries, why the majority of the targets under the Third Plan had not been fulfilled, why the taxation target had been more than doubled. These are the things he should have said. It is no use telling us about the drinking water and all that, co-operation and all that. Co-operation will be there, but co-operation for what? Mr. Asoka Mehta did not even mention that there was a Monopolies Commission. It is a faulty report, but they had pointed out something. He did not mention that there was a commitment to reduce the income disparities, that there was a Mahalanobis Commission report, that there was a statement by him as Planning Minister and otherwise also which needed to be implemented. We should have liked to know what direction in the light of the experience of the Third Plan he would give to planning and how he would have overcome the lapses that have appeared, the drawbacks that are apparent, the structural difficulties that are there. It is not enough to tell us that there are

structural difficulties. Everybody knows that. But the structural difficulties have got to be overcome by the Planning Minister by vigorous economic, political and fiscal measures, monetary and other measures. Nothing of the kind. We were disappointed by the speech of the Planning Minister because he left us more confounded except for the nice way he speaks. All that I say in the end, Mr. Chairman, is that we have been landed in a mess, in a jam because of the policies of the Government, and it is very essential—and we shall discuss these policies during the Budget discussion—for the Planning Minister and the Government to take courage in both hands and come to grips with the problem of hunger, poverty and unemployment and bring about radical institutional and structural changes not only in the agrarian sector of the economy by radical land reforms but also in the industrial sector of the economy by breaking up and disbanding the concentration of wealth and economic power and monopolies, and so on.

These are some of the humble suggestions given by a man who is not an expert but who would like all the same to press these things before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will continue till 1-30. Mr. Debabrata Mookerjee.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has made certain suggestions which are of a constructive character. It may be that the question he raises as to whether there should be some settlement with Pakistan on the basis of the 1949 Cease-Fire Line is a very difficult question, a question upon which the entire country will be called upon to make up its mind. Nevertheless that is a question which should be considered, and it can safely be said without pronouncing upon its merits that it is a constructive sug-

gestion which follows as a corollary to the Tashkent Declaration and the spirit of the Tashkent announcement. I am not sure, Sir, whether Shri Bhupesh Gupta's fulminations, with regard to the present attitude of the Government of India as regards the continuance of the Defence of India Rules are justified. What I wish to ask is whether in view of the latest pronouncement made by the Home Minister who, in pith and substance, has promised reconsideration of the situation, was it not rash on the part of Shri Bhupesh Gupta to fly at the throat of the Home Minister and demand the immediate withdrawal of the Defence of India Rules? I think Shri Bhupesh Gupta will try to reply by saying that it is not his opinion to which he was giving expression, but the considered opinion of the highest judiciary in the land and it is upon that that he took his stand. I do not know, Sir, what the retired Chief Justices of India or other Judges of the High Courts have said . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You do not know?

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: I know only this that the present Chief Justice has been pleased to make certain observations in a case which had come up before him. The case was undoubtedly one of the worst of its kind. It was a very bad case. And it is well known that bad cases make bad law. If we take a little care in reading the judgment of the learned Chief Justice, we will at once discover that what the learned Chief Justice wanted to say was that in that case, the formalities of the law had not been observed, that the affidavit sworn by the Home Secretary was unworthy of him and that there were certain facts proved in the case, which made it necessary for the Supreme Court to observe that this was an ugly instance of the application of the

[Shri Debabrata Mookerjee:]  
 Defence of India Rules. The learned Chief Justice did not stop there. He proceeded to say that such cases were not matters of every-day occurrence. He never intended to say that this is the way in which the Government tries to carry on its day-to-day administration. I have before me a pamphlet which perhaps Shri Bhupesh Gupta . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Oh! you have got it!

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: I am not speaking without my brief. I am not in the habit of doing so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sure . . .

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: I have before me a pamphlet which sets out the observations of eminent jurists. I dare say, there is a case for careful consideration of the question at the hands of the Government. But I ask Shri Bhupesh Gupta once again through you, Sir: Is there any need for the fulminations, for the pugilistic attitude which he has taken, keeping in view the statement made by the Home Minister on the situation? Has not the Home Minister promised reconsideration of the whole matter? Has he not done it in the most unequivocal manner? The Chief Justice, as I was telling you, was pleased to observe—I am reading from the pamphlet which purports to have been issued by the party to which Shri Bhupesh Gupta belongs—

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have produced it for your convenience.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: The Chief Justice was pleased to say. "It is true that cases of this kind are rare..." I should imagine that he would have taken these . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That was not the latest one.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: I do not know of a later publication.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thirty-four eminent citizens . . .

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: Let us not have this cross-talk. I think Shri Bhupesh Gupta's party has not withdrawn this pamphlet.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is true. Have it. But I may also make available for your kind perusal the statement issued by 34 eminent citizens including three Chief Justices.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: For my purpose this is good enough. I say this. The learned Chief Justice has been pleased to observe that it is true that cases of this kind are rare. But he proceeds to state:

"...but even the presence of such rare cases constitutes a warning to which we think it is our duty to invite the attention of the appropriate authorities."

I dare say, Sir, that the Government of India has no intention whatsoever to disregard the opinion of the Chief Justice of India. They are considering the matter. And I have not the slightest doubt that after having taken a full view of the entire situation, they will not hesitate to do what appears to them to be just and proper. Surely, their decision, whatever it may be, will be subject, once again, to the criticism of my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta and the members of his party. But until such time comes, it would only be decent, if I may say so, for them to bide time and see how the Government of India acts. (*Interruptions*.) Please, I am not in the habit of being interrupted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that you are a judge.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: I once was, not now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that you have not been able to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Bhupesh Gupta, let him proceed, please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to ask your opinion. I want your opinion.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: Till such time comes, it would only be decent on the part of Shri Bhupesh Gupta and the members of his party or those who do not agree with me to wait and see how the Government of India reacts.

I wish to tell you, Sir, in this connection that the Defence of India Rules have to be read in the context of events and the enveloping menace to which we, consistently with our own safety, cannot shut our eyes. True, we have made peace with Pakistan. And it is the earnest hope of everyone of us that it will lead to a lasting solution of all the outstanding problems between India and Pakistan. Let us hope, as Shri Bhupesh Gupta has hoped, that the Tashkent spirit will pervade the country and will in future govern the relations between our two countries, India and Pakistan. At the same time, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there is another country with which we have to reckon and that is China. The subversive activities of China were stepped up in the African continent. You are well aware of what they had been doing there during the last few months. You know that the small African country, Burundi, took the lead in making an effective protest against Chinese aggressive intentions in that continent. You also know what other insidious methods are followed by that country in Africa. They believe in conflicts and in subversion. As many as 14 African Heads of State met to curb Chinese designs in Africa. You know that there had been a shipment of arms to Uganda and that was discovered by Kenya. You know that Malawi open-

ly protested against the Chinese attitude of subversion. You know that Dahomey, the Central African Republic, and Upper Volta joined the anti-Peking movement. You know that a Chief of Staff of one of the African countries found a cache of arms in the presidential palace and a secret fighting ground for the purpose of training guerrillas was also discovered. You know that even Ho Chi-minh is not always satisfied with China's professions. And surely, you know what the present attitude of Castro's Cuba is. I have detailed these facts—these are matters of common knowledge—only with a view to impressing upon you the extreme urgency for keeping in mind the serious character of the Chinese menace. It is true, the menace has been with us for about four years. It is perhaps also true that we have to learn to live with this menace as we are sometimes compelled to learn to live with a bad heart or a damaged liver. But the menace is there. In this enveloping menace, this country was compelled to have recourse to the Defence of India Rules. And to that was added the additional menace coming from our neighbour, Pakistan. In those circumstances the emergency was continued and the enjoyment of fundamental rights was suspended. It will not do merely to say that time has come when you can close the shop and wind up the business and go and feel happy. It is time to have a review of the entire situation and see what you can do about it. It is true it becomes the immediate duty of the Government of India, at least, to take note of the views of eminent men all over the country and if possible to act in consonance with what they think to be the duty of a responsible government. I do not say there is not a case for review. I say there is no occasion for showing angry eyes, no case for saying that Government have been running the administration in a most irresponsible manner and putting people into jails in a cavalier fashion. Sir, do we not know that in many cases you cannot support the

[Shri Debabrata Mookerjee.]  
control orders that have been promulgated to secure social objectives without the help of the Defence of India Rules?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: If Mr. Gupta says "No," I would contradict him and advise him to read the law . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can tell you, Mr. former Judge, that I have read the law and I need not be told to understand it. We have got other institutions . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gupta, he is not yielding.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: . . . I will not attempt the impossible and imitate Mr. Gupta's manners. I will only say this . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Nobody is competent to do that

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: Yes. I think the Essential Commodities Act, such as it is, is perhaps—I say "perhaps"—not sufficient to sustain and buttress the numerous regulatory orders that have been promulgated in the public interest

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Amend it

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: The orders which have been passed with a view to securing for the common man the daily necessities of life have got to be studied and considered in the context of the altered situation. You cannot fight everything on a political plane. You have to consider all facts relevant to a case before you take a decision

Sir, I am not suggesting that Mr. Gupta is playing to the gallery. I am saying this that he requires, with his friends, to sit round the table, put their hands on their breast and apply their minds to the realities of the

situation. It is not right that they take their stand upon the dreary desert of dead habit of opposing any and every move initiated by the ruling party. It is essential that we all bend our energies in trying to find out what is good for the nation as a whole. It is not right to say that the Defence of India Rules have been prostituted in order that political opponents might be inconvenienced. If the position is carefully analysed, it will be quite evident that we have to take into account the surrounding circumstances keeping the security of the country and the maintenance of services and supplies essential to the life of the community as our first consideration, and then try and see whether the Defence of India Rules can be done away with.

I think, Sir, it is a great tribute to India to have a Constitution functioning, in which we have a chapter on Fundamental Rights and at the same time to have been able to carry on developmental projects. I would ask Mr. Gupta, through you, Sir, to name another country where they have worked a Constitution like the one we have and carried on with numerous developmental works

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot name a country where out of 15 years of Constitution, 41 months have been under the Defence of India Rules and a state of emergency in times of peace barring the war days . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gupta, please

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: I admire Mr. Gupta's complacent self-sufficiency. I shall not call it arrogance; I shall call it ignorance. He says that he knows of no country where for 41 months emergency regulations have been in force. I will ask him to turn for one moment . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In peace time, no.

**SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE:**  
... I will ask him for one moment to turn to the history of England during the last War ...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Come on. I join issue.

**SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE:**  
... where you will find that the country had been for years under the Defence Regulations, of one kind or another.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** When? I ask the hon. Member, tell us, when?

**SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE:**  
I say, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I will not be cowed down by you.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** You ask me questions and you preface it by saying as if we know nothing. I ask you, when was it except during the War?

**SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE:**  
It was during the War.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Since the Magna Carta was signed ...

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

**SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE:**  
Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is blissfully ignorant of the fact that the world has travelled a long distance since 1940. There was no such thing before 1945-46 called the cold war. We are now living in an age of cold war, and China is a great menace to us, and we have provided against that.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** May I tell the hon'ble former Judge that our Constitution does not provide for the Defence of India Rules during cold war ...

**SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar):** China is occupying large territories of India. Is it not a state of war?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** No.

**SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE:**  
Sir, angry looks, vituperation, gestulations, either on my part or on the part of Mr. Gupta, will not help the situation. Let us sit down and try and take a quiet look honestly at the facts with which we have to deal. Let us try and find out whether we can scrap the Defence of India Rules just at this moment as Mr. Gupta would like us to do. We cannot do that. We have to take, as I say, once again a look round about and see whether this is possible to be done at once. Mr. Gupta complains that Fundamental Rights have been trodden upon by an irresponsible Government. I would say, Sir, that just as there is a chapter on Fundamental Rights, there should be written into the Constitution a chapter on fundamental duties and obligations. No doubt Government have their duties to discharge, and if they fail to do their duties, surely they come in for criticism, and they will forfeit the right to rule the country. But at the same time, Sir, we, the citizens, have our duties and responsibilities. It will not be merely to say that this must be done by the Government, and that provided for by the Government, and everything must be got done by the Government. I think we have good reasons to ask ourselves this question, what we are doing? What is the ordinary citizen doing to help the country, to help the Government, to help himself? Rights cannot be divorced from duties and obligations. The Government has the obligation to see that the common man gets his food; the Government has been trying to discharge the obligation with the help of the much-maligned Rules. Look at West Bengal for one moment. Well, you cannot get *chhenna* products now, you cannot get milk products; this is considerable deprivation. I dare say, Sir, Bengali culture is intimately linked up with *sandesh*, but then ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There I, fully agree with you.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: . . . but then the people of West Bengal have been made to forgo them. And why have they been made to, and for whom? I ask. It is for the people, so that nursing mothers, babies, infants, the weak and the invalid may get their share of milk. And all this has been done with the help of emergency measures. You lift the emergency and you get the *chhenna*; you resurrect the *sandesh* and the *sandesh* will travel lusciously into Mr. Gupta's mouth and make him happy, but his countrymen in West Bengal will starve and weep, weep and starve to death.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH (Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support wholeheartedly the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address to both the Houses of Parliament. Sir, in his Address the President referred to the food production problem. It has been mentioned in the Address that in 1965-66 we were likely to achieve a production of 76 to 77 million tonnes of foodgrains as against 88 million tonnes of foodgrains produced in the previous years.

[THE DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Madam Deputy Chairman, we all along have been thinking in terms of production of more fertilisers. Our foodgrains mainly depend upon the monsoons, and if the monsoons fail, the foodgrains also fail us. Madam, it is perfectly right that we should lay stress on more and more production of fertilisers, in millions of tonnes but, Madam, I must say that our foremost duty is that we pool all our resources for the adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes. May be that fertilisers are very good, and they are actually very very helpful for food production but, Madam, in the absence of water these fertilisers are not so much of use. As a matter of fact it is being mentioned today that in the absence of water

they can be harmful also. Therefore, Madam, I would like to see that our country lays more stress upon the supply of an adequate quantity of water—may be through large schemes or petty schemes or small works—so that more of water supply is made available.

Our Government is doing its bit, Madam, towards the family planning side to arrest the growth of population. Certainly our food problem, our family planning problem and all the other things are intimately connected, one with the other, and if we lay stress on family planning we will arrest the growth of population as well as produce a healthy nation. So as to achieve better results in this regard of the arrest of population growth, I see that abortion is also, being thought of for its legalisation. Only yesterday a lady Member did object to abortion because of the physiological evils accompanying abortions. But, Madam, this is a point which can be debated. I am not a doctor but am still trying to say these things. This unwieldy and uncontrolled growth of population certainly affects foodgrain production and distribution.

Madam, one point more—of course it is the talk in the Central Hall, or outside; it is the talk of the day also—it may not be very much concerned with the food production problem, or saving of food, or population growth—but this point is being debated, and I would like to offer this point for debate here also. It is this. Madam, there are some incurable unfortunate patients, who are looking for death, and are always looking to the Almighty so that the Almighty might take them away. In some cases the patients are afflicted with such diseases that they continue to remain in bed suffering for years together, not for so long as two years or three years, but even more, for five years and seven years and ten years. Such patients pray to God for their death, but they are unable

to die. I would not dare to suggest, Madam, anything that might bring untoward effects on me, but the talk of the day is that Government should come to the help of such patients and do something so as to relieve them of that pain and suffering.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : How?

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH : It is very difficult to suggest; I leave it for a debate; it is a point to be debated.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Do you want them to be a party to murdering such patients?

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH : I have not said anything, but I leave this point to be debated. But something should be done. This is the talk outside, everywhere.

श्रम, सेवानिवृत्ति और पुनर्वासि मंत्री  
(श्री जगजिवन राम : अपने दिमाग में बात  
कह दें जिये ।

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH : This is a point for discussion in future; next time.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): Next time he will give his mind.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH : The President has also referred to the industries in the private sector and the public sector. Madam, in the public sector the industries are coming up very nicely. Industries like machine-building, oil refineries, petro-chemicals, fertilisers and steel etc. are coming in huge numbers. They are going to be the bases, they are going to be the basic industries and the mother industries for other industries to be helped in the private sector, and the dependent industries in the public sector too. Madam, I must say regarding the private sector industries that, particularly in the year 1965-66, the private industry had to face a good deal of trouble for want of raw materials. Many a plant is threatened with closure, specially those which are dependent upon imported raw

materials. To quote the President, he has in his Address mentioned that "Industries in the private sector have also to expand their output and capacity" and added that "conditions have to be created in which private initiative and private savings can be harnessed to make the maximum possible contribution to growth and development within the framework of the Fourth Five-Year Plan." Madam, the Budget has already been laid. I wish it were possible to create the proper conditions and the proper climate for the growth of industry. But, Madam, I must say that the unnatural heavy tax burden has further been increased by 10 percent. in the Budget placed yesterday evening and it has been increased on the corporate as well as the non-corporate sectors. In order to give them the proper climate it was necessary that the industries after making profits, should be allowed to plough back their profits into the concerns. Madam, the necessary climate is not there. I wanted and I wished that something better would be done. But yesterday, Madam, last evening, things have gone even further and it will not now be possible for the industries to grow rapidly as the President in his Address has desired them to grow. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Lokanath Misra will speak after the lunch hour. The House now 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 LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, we are discussing the President's Address and the achievements of the Government when the country is suffering from half starvation.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): Question.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** To the very first sentence that I spoke, Sir, there is an objection raised by a doctor friend belonging to the ruling party. He seems to have doubts about the authority of, what I said. He lives in the city of Lucknow where he must be in possession of his ration card, more so because he belongs to the ruling party. Therefore, he would not have been deprived of his daily ration. He does not have information as to how the poor people in the rural areas suffer. The people in many of the areas that I have visited...

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh):** Mr. Lokanath Misra looks better fed.

**DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU :** He does not look starved.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** I may be appearing better fed, but you are the people who are really better fed. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have had the privilege of going round the rural areas during the inter-session period. At least eight districts in Orissa had very bad crops and there is almost semi-starvation condition among the people there. Because of the drought the people had only got from their own land about fifteen days' foodgrains. Thereafter, they did not know what to do. Those of them who approached me were advised to go for any relief work that might be there, made available for the people. But no relief works were made available to them. I do not know what has happened. Even though the Government may have to its credit fair price shops, the people must have the money to purchase the foodgrains from those shops. In the rural areas unless work is available to these people they do not earn anything and because of the drought conditions no work was available. Therefore, the people do not have the money even to purchase their daily necessities, their rations from these fair price shops. But when the people are starving in the rural areas we talk about the mighty plan. We have had plenty of experience of these

mighty plans for the last 18 years. It seems that Mr. Asoka Mehta who has become the spokesman of the ruling party so far as the Plan is concerned, as well as all the Members of the Government, have a world of their own, a world of their own imagination, where they live. They are soaring in the air. They do not know that the people who live on the ground have a standard of life different from the one that they themselves have. So they must be brought down to the land, to the earth so that they may see what is happening in the country. Many years ago, Sir, I had read a story, the story of the invisible robe, where a cunning tailor suggested to the then king to have a robe which would be beautiful and light. The king was carrying a heavy weight because he was wearing a heavy robe. Ultimately the day came when the tailor started putting on the king the invisible robe and in that robe the king appeared before his court. There his flatterers and all those people who depended upon the king, started applauding that invisible robe. Some said that the robe was marvellous. Some said it was excellent. even though the king had no clothes on. Now the Plan here in our country is in the form of that invisible robe and the Government is getting all the applause from Congress Members of Parliament who are of their own party and also from their party followers in the country. They say that this is the only panacea which can give us milk and honey and what not. Eighteen years after I have heard here Members from the Congress, the ruling party, for the first time denouncing the Plan.

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR :** Who is denouncing it?

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** Yes, Shri Asoka Mehta's followers will never denounce it.

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR :** Only Mr. Birla's followers are denouncing it

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** They are all in the Congress Party. They form sixty per cent. of the party. The eldest brother among the Birlas is himself a Congressman. (*Interruption*). The eldest Birla is a Congressman. Does anybody deny that?

**THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR):** From where does he get all these counts.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** I would like the Information and Broadcasting Minister who is in charge of the information of the whole country to say that Shri G. D. Birla is not a Congressman.

**SHRI RAJ BAHADUR :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not know from where my hon. friend gets all this count. He seems to be very much in league with the Birlas.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** I claim to know much more about Congressmen than many in the Congress Party themselves know. I claim that, Sir, now some in the ruling party, the party that has had tremendous power all these years, have been disillusioned. I was happy to find that they were frank enough and that they had the boldness to say the things which they wanted to say. There was a friend from Gujarat who said that there was no drinking water in the country for men.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):** Is there drinking water for women?

**AN HON. MEMBER :** He did not say that

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** I thought my hon. friend would have interrupted me by saying that there was no drinking water for cattle, because that is the election symbol of the Congress and they care more for cattle than for human beings. Now it is really ridiculous for the same administration, for the same ruling party to have continued in power for the last 18 years.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU :** What can be done?

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** And yet their big structures and all their schemes in their Plan have not been able to give even drinking water to the people from whom they collect taxes mercilessly in the name of the Plan. If they have not been able to dig wells in order to supply drinking water to the people, what else can they do? How can they give water to the plants when they have not been able to give water to human beings. You cannot expect that from this Government.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN :** This was explained at some length by Shri Asoka Mehta yesterday.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** Yes, I will come to Mr. Asoka Mehta also. (*Interruption*). The Deputy Minister should be audible if he wants to interrupt. Parliamentary courtesy requires that you should not interrupt if you are not bold enough to speak out.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA):** I say, why bring in Asoka Mehta's name here?

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** He is your new leader. He was your spokesman yesterday. Don't you keep that much information? He was your spokesman here yesterday.

Now, Sir, the figures of our imports of foodgrains are increasing year by year. Probably, they are keeping pace with the period of our Plans. During the First Plan, the imports were for much less than those in the 18th year. This year we are almost dependent upon the imports alone. We depend on rain for irrigation, we depend on imports for the basic necessities of human life. What have you done in the meantime? You can show us pictures of gigantic plans somewhere, another plan of the size of the Himalayas but what is the net yield to the

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]  
country that has been given by all these plans? The basic necessities have not been met and this is because of a great confusion existing in the Government.

Reference was made recently here to the presence of the Governor of Kerala who came here shirking his duty when the State of Kerala was having its worst so far as the food crisis went. What was he here for? He came here to canvass support for a particular candidate of the ruling Party. I interrupted the other day to ask whether he was here canvassing for Lever Brothers in the use of Sunlight Soap. What is worse, Sir, is that he was here as the Governor of Kerala, enjoying all the facilities that could be made available to a Governor and using the Kerala Government's car for going round Delhi.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Is it a fact?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is a fact. How else could he have gone round Delhi? Did he have a car of his own here? It was the Kerala Government car that he used

PROF. M. B. LAL: I presume he must have used his friend's car if he did not have a car here.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: No, he was staying in "Kerala House". You can also ascertain from the "Kerala House" records. He was using definitely Kerala Government money to canvass in favour of a particular candidate belonging to the ruling Party who was contesting the leadership election. What worse could be done by a responsible man who is called a Governor?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Nothing worse could be done but he was canvassing not for somebody. He himself was . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: But Sir, . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: He was canvassing not for another candidate.

PROF. M. B. LAL: It is a very important question, Sir, While he was here, he was not discharging the duties of the governorship but he was canvassing for someone with a view to canvassing for himself.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: There is another point that I would like to bring to the notice of the Chair and to the notice of the House. I want to know whether it is really permissible for a Governor to continue his membership of the ruling Party if we are really working in a democratic State. This particular Governor attended the A.I.C.C. session in Jaipur as one of its members. Immediately after his resignation there was no election held, that is, since his resignation and the holding of the A.I.C.C. session, there was no election held to this body. Therefore, it is definitely a fact that he continued to be a member of the A.I.C.C. even when he held the governorship. How many other Governors are there who are surreptitiously continuing to be members of the ruling Party? This must be gone into. What is Mr. Nanda doing? He is continuing the emergency to send his political opponents to jail but these are persons . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: . . . are persons here who are doing these things surreptitiously. These are the men who should be booked, who should be sacked immediately, dismissed and brought to the notice of the public.

There is another confusion here. I here have a news item which comes under the Ministry that my friend, Mr. Raj Bahadur, presides over. This caters to the election of the Deputy Chief Whip in both the Houses: Is Government money meant here to cater to the needs of a particular party? The Press Information Bureau, never

In its life, has done this service to any other Member, any Leader of the Opposition, not to speak of an ordinary Member. Even the Leaders of the Opposition in both the Houses have not got this type of publicity all through the existence of the Press Information Bureau.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like to offer a personal explanation. I do not propose to intervene in this Debate. This matter was brought to my notice just now and I do maintain, Sir, that there is hardly anything wrong in this. Even the internal elections of party Whips or Deputy Chief Whip or Chief Whip are matters of interest for the public. The people should know. Not only the Congress Party elections but also elections of the other Parties should be made known. People should know who is the Chief Whip, who is the Deputy Chief Whip, who are the other Whips and so on. There is nothing wrong about it. The Member can ask as to why his Party elections have not been mentioned, why they have not been publicised. He might perhaps say why the election of this gentleman as the President or that gentleman as the Secretary has not been mentioned in the Radio. Their proceedings are also reported. I think this is a matter where democracy should be allowed to function and the Press Information Bureau, the information agency and the information media of the Government should be allowed to cater to the people and give the necessary information about the functioning of the Party.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: If the hon. Member were that impartial, I would have no objection at all.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: It is rather a very unkind cut, Sir. I have been here only for a month. He has not seen much of me and he is casting aspersions.

PROF. M. B. LAL: He has seen a lot of you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We know you.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I make it very clear...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): But there is no time. When can you make it clear?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I make it very clear that I have nothing personally against Mr. Raj Bahadur.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Thank you very much.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is against the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The Minister gave the explanation that the people should know who the Deputy Chief Whip was, who the Chief Whip was. Does he mean to say.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Is there anything wrong about it?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Does he want the people to be ignorant about the name of the Deputy Chief Whip or the Chief Whip of the other parties?

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: If we had not given any information, we would have been accused and said that the Press Information Bureau was not functioning at all.

(Interruptions by Shrimati Devaki Gopidas).

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Please fix up the time with the Chair. If you want an explanation, I am prepared to give it, I am prepared to talk for the whole day but please fix up the time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is time to wind up.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, ... I am sorry, Sir. It is because she interrupted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is not strictly safe to speak any further.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: There is another point. I had once said that the only sacrifice to the credit of the Congress is the sacrifice of the sense of shame. Here is proof of that. Here is an invitation and another confusion prevailing there which I want to point out. Here is an invitation from Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, Minister of Irrigation and Power:

"Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad, Minister of Irrigation and Power, requests the pleasure of. . . . at Tea in Room No 315, in Sharam Bhavan. . ."

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: It is "Shram" not "Sharam"

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: My friend, Mr. L. N. Mishra, Deputy Minister of what Department, I do not know, I cannot say because there are ever so many departments and ever so many Deputy Ministers and there have been so many changes recently, has probably no idea of the vowels in the English language; he...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have already taken twenty minutes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The point is that they wanted to concentrate "sharam" in that Bhavan alone which my hon. friend, Shri Jagjivan Ram, represents. The Bhavan probably symbolises the way in which he was taken into the Cabinet.

Let us now see what happens under our very nose.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): But you have already taken twenty minutes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In Delhi, there is a population of twenty lakhs of people and the quantity of atta given is twenty thousand quintals daily. This quantity of twenty thousand quintals of atta is given to four of the biggest mills. They get wheat at 53 paise per kilo and atta is released at 59 paise per kilo for public con-

sumption. That is because the bigger mills charge two paise more per kg. There are about a thousand smaller mills that had quoted two paise less. And the total amount of loss on this account amounts to Rs. 20,000 per day which amount is going to these four bigger mills. Now this is a pre-election year and naturally the Congress would be trying to get the maximum out of the businessmen for the elections but that way they should not allow these four mills to fleece the people of Delhi to the tune of Rs. 20,000 per day, particularly the poorer sections, for the benefit of Congress funds.

Now, about education, I will speak only a word.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You are curtailing the chances of others.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Just give me two minutes. I will say a few words about education. We are now following a system of education which was first started by Mr. Macaulay. There has been little change after that. Since we are now in the eighteenth year of our Republic, I would particularly request the hon. Minister of Education, who is very reasonable, to find out some means whereby our students could be educated in a better way and be used subsequently after their educational career for some purpose. Now, under the present system of education what happens is, they only raise the figure of the educated unemployed. A boy or a girl is sent to the school because he or she has nothing better to do at home. Therefore, in the mofussil areas, if the boy can look after the cow he is not sent to the school because he is not assured even of his wages as a cowherd after his education. So I would request the Education Minister to kindly reorient the entire system of education so that it would suit our country.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That is why he has established a Commission whose report you will soon have

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): He knows that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: We have had several Commissions. The Commission does not count. What counts is their mental attitude. If the Education Minister is bent upon changing this particular system of education he would change it.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): I know my hon. friend is stressing that our education should be production-oriented. I fully realise the point that the hon. Member is making that the farmer's son who gets himself educated won't work on the farm. He would go to the city to get a white collared job. And the farmer says, 'why should my son be educated if he is not going to be of help in the farm'. I am conscious of the problem and we are trying to tackle it. But my hon. friend would realise that there are two difficulties. One is that it is a State subject and secondly the figures are astronomical. There are 60 million students in the primary schools and I am sure my hon. friend realises the difficulty. We are fully conscious of it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Thank you.

पंडित भवानी प्रसाद तिवारी (मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर जो कृतज्ञता प्रकाश का प्रस्ताव है उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मेरी पहली प्रतिक्रिया यह है कि अभिभाषण में वास्तविकताओं के आधार पर भविष्य निर्माण के ऐसे संकेत हैं कि यदि वे कार्यान्वित किये गये तो भारत जिस गंतव्य पर पहुँचना चाहता है उसके समीप पहुँच सकेगा। मेरी यह भी प्रतिक्रिया है कि जिन कमजोरियों और दुर्बलताओं को जीत कर आगे बढ़ना है वे स्थितियाँ भी स्पष्ट रूप से इस अभिभाषण में आई हैं।

प्रारम्भ में ही इस भाषण में उस चमत्कार का उल्लेख किया गया है जिस का नाम लाल बहादुर शास्त्री हुआ। आज के जमाने में वैज्ञानिक चमत्कार ऊपर उछल रहे हैं, आसमान में। खबर है कि रूस ने लूना को उछाला और एक चमत्कार घटित हुआ? अभी अमेरिका ने अपोलो नक्षत्र आसमान में भेजा है। ये चमत्कार तो है ही। परन्तु जो मानव नक्षत्र, लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, हमारे समक्ष आया उसकी विशेषता यह थी कि उसमें एक ओर सूरज का तेज था तो दूसरी ओर चाँद का शीतल प्रकाश भी। इन दोनों का उपयोग उन्होंने विग्रह और संधि चलाने में और उसके आधार पर परराष्ट्र नीति की योजना करने में किया। जहाँ विग्रह की स्थिति आई वहाँ उनका ऐसा स्वर बुलन्द हुआ, ऐसी प्रेरणायुक्त वाणी निकली कि सारा राष्ट्र उनके पीछे हुआ और एक विजय की स्थिति में राष्ट्र को उन्होंने पहुँचाया। और जब इस बात की आवश्यकता हुई कि हम संधि का खेल खेलें, शांति की स्थितियाँ उत्पन्न करें तो उन्होंने ताशकन्द में यह घटित किया कि कोटि कोटि मानवों का कल्याण जिस ओर है उधर कदम उठाया जाना चाहिए और उन्होंने साहसपूर्वक ऐसा कदम उठाया। इन दो गुणों के कारण, एक साथ ये दो गुण उनमें होने के कारण, एक ओर तो उन्होंने उस सारी ग्लानि को जो चीन के युद्ध के बाद भारतवर्ष में छाई हुई थी, शकझोर कर सारे राष्ट्र को खड़ा कर दिया और दूसरी ओर ताशकन्द के समझौते से सारे विश्व को एक मार्गदर्शन दिया कि इस ओर जाया जा सकता है यदि राष्ट्र चाहें तो। असल में यह बात बड़ी कठिन होती है कि एक ओर जब ईर्ष्या, द्वेष या संकीर्ण सांप्रदायिकता का सर्प जाग उठे तो उसका मुकाबिला भी किया जाय और बाद में ऐसी बीन भी बजाई जाय कि वह मंत्रमुग्ध हो कर उस पर नर्तन करने लगे। श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ऐसे ही बीनकार हुए कि जब उन्होंने एक ओर संवादी स्वरों को एकत्रित किया तो साथ ही

[पंडित भगानी प्रसाद तिवारी]

विसंवादी स्वर भी उनके सहायक हुए। जो संगीत समझते हैं वे जानते हैं कि संवादी स्वरों के साथ विसंवादी स्वरों का मिल जाना रागिनी को कितना ऊंचा ले जाता है। असल में राजनैतिक दृष्टि से सोचा जाय तो यह एक पूरा सिलसिला है। स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जिस अनाक्रमण संधि को प्रस्तावित किया, उसको शास्त्री जी ने प्रतिफलित किया और इन्दिरा जी के ऊपर अब यह उत्तरदायित्व है कि उसे वे कार्यान्वित करें। मुझे विश्वास है कि उनके नेतृत्व में भारत को सफलता प्राप्त होगी।

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]  
3 P.M.

राष्ट्रपति के भाषण । राष्ट्र नीति के जो संकेत हैं, उनमें एक तो उन्होंने अपनी यात्रा का वर्णन किया है—विदेशों की यात्रा का वर्णन किया है—और यह बताया है कि विग्रह और संधि दोनों की स्थितियों में किस प्रकार भारत मित्र-लाभ घटित करने में सकल हो सका। एक ओर तो हमारे पड़ोसी देशों से जिनसे हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं थे इन दिनों उनसे अच्छे सम्बन्ध बने। आज की स्थिति में बर्मा से, सीलोन से, नेपाल से तो हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हुए और अब इस ताशकन्द के समझौते के बाद, घोषणा के बाद पाकिस्तान की भी गिनती मित्र राष्ट्रों में होगी। दूसरी ओर सारे विश्व के जो अन्य राष्ट्र हैं उनका ध्यान युद्ध के समय भी और ताशकन्द की घोषणा के बाद भी आकर्षित हुआ और नए-नए सम्बन्ध कायम हुए। आज वस्तुस्थिति ऐसी है कि चीन अकेला पड़ गया है। चीन जिसकी गिनती हम मित्रों में आज भी नहीं कर पाते, वह अकेला पड़ गया है। अभी अभी जब विरोधी दल के नेता श्री भूपेश जी भाषण कर रहे थे तो उन्होंने चीन के सम्बन्ध में एक बात कही। वह यह कही कि क्यों न चीन से समझौते की तरफ भारत पहले करे, क्यों न इस ओर कदम उठाया जाय। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जैसी कि चीन का आज

स्थिति है उसमें सारी दुनिया जानती है कि उसका भरोसा जो मशीनगन पर है, बन्दूक पर है, गोली पर है, वह अभी हटा नहीं है। वह शक्ति और आतंक से ही प्रभावित करके दूसरे की धरती पर कब्जा करना चाहता है, आज किए भी हुए हैं। जहाँ तक भारत का सम्बन्ध है, उसने पहले ही कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करके अपना खेल बता दिया था कि यदि शांति के क्षेत्र में उतरना चाहते हो तो हम इस माध्यम से उतरने के लिए तैयार हैं, किन्तु चीन नहीं उतरा। चीन यदि चाहता है कि वह शांति के क्षेत्र में उतरे तो या तो पुराने माध्यम को माने या किसी नये माध्यम की खोज करे। वास्तविक स्थिति तो यह है कि आज रूस भी—जो सिद्धान्ततः चीन के करीब है और जिसने भारत और पाकिस्तान दोनों को निमंत्रण दिया संधि के लिए—इस बात की संभावना नहीं देखता कि वह चीन को निमंत्रित करे और उसकी बात मानी जाय। ऐसी स्थिति में, मैं अपने मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त से यही निवेदन करूँगा कि यदि उनका प्रभाव चीन की तरफ पड़ना हो तो उससे निवेदन करें कि वह अपना खेल खेलना प्रारम्भ करे।

जहाँ तक तटस्थता की नीति के संकेत हैं, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कहा गया है कि जो अभी तक उपनिवेश बने हुए हैं उनके आजाद होने का हम समर्थन करते हैं। स्पष्ट रूप से इसमें रंगभेद का विरोध किया गया है और रोडेशिया का उल्लेख करके अप्रजा-तांत्रिक अल्पमतीय शासन को अमान्यता दी गई है। हमारा यह ख्याल है कि ये तीन दिशाएँ ही हैं जो हमारी तटस्थता की नीति को गतिशील करती हैं और इस ओर हम चल भी रहे हैं।

एक बात कही जाती है जब परराष्ट्र नीति की चर्चा होती है, दबाव की। मुझे अचरज होता है इस बात का कि प्रत्येक विवाद में या तो यह कहा जाता है कि अमेरिकन दबाव पड़ रहा है उससे सावधान होने की

आवश्यकता है या यह भी कहा गया कि रूस का दबाव पड़ता है—जहां तक ताशकन्द घोषणा का सम्बन्ध है, कुछ लोगों ने उसकी आलोचना करते हुए यह भी कहा । ये दो शक्तियां तो हैं विश्व में, परन्तु जहां तक भारत पर दबाव पड़ने का सम्बन्ध है, जब इन विरोधी शक्तियों का उल्लेख किया जाता है तो वैसे ही एक बात दूसरे को काट देती है । सच तो यह है कि ...

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** काटती नहीं, पुष्ट करती है ।

**पंडित भवानो प्रसाद तिवारी :** काटती है । काटती इस तरह है कि एक के प्रभाव या दूसरे के प्रभाव के बारे में विरोधी शक्तियों की बात कही जाती है । कुछ कहते हैं कि अमरीका का प्रभाव, दूसरे यह कहते हैं कि रूस का प्रभाव । मैं यह कहता हूं कि किसी का दबाव सही, भारत क्यों विचलित होने वाला है । जहां तक प्रभाव की बात है, आप इस बात को देखिये कि आज की स्थिति में भारत ने विश्व को जितना प्रभावित किया है, कदाचित् ही अन्य स्थितियों में उतना किया होगा । प्रत्येक राष्ट्र से यह आवाज उठती है कि भारत का इस वक्त का खेल बहुत श्रेष्ठ रहा और शांति की दिशा में उसने ताकतवर कदम उठाया ।

जहां तक घरेलू नीति का सम्बन्ध है, उसमें कुछ लोगों ने आलोचना करते हुए कहा कि इस अभिभाषण में उन्हें खेद है कि 'समाजवाद' शब्द नहीं आया, कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि उन्हें प्रसन्नता है कि इस अभिभाषण में 'समाजवाद' शब्द नहीं आया । असल में शब्दों का आना-जाना अपने-आप में कोई महत्व नहीं रखता है । यदि शब्द आ भी जाय तो यह कहा जा सकता है कि इपे कृति पर तौलिए, शब्दों में क्या धरा है । यदि शब्द नहीं भी हैं तो जो इसमें अन्य संकेत हैं उनसे यह अनुमान लगाया ही जा सकता है कि किस ओर दिशा दर्शन है । दिशा-

दर्शन स्पष्ट है कि अस्वास्थ्य से संघर्ष, अज्ञात से संघर्ष और दरिद्रता से संघर्ष । यह दिशा है जिस ओर चलना है ।

हां, इन संघर्षों के चलते हुए कुछ सावधानियां आवश्यक हैं । और मैं यह भी मानता हूं कि छोटी-मोटी गलतियां इधर-उधर होती हैं और इसीलिए यह स्थितियां हैं कि प्रजातांत्रिक ढंग से हम विवाद करके उनको सुधारे और आगे चलें । जैसा कहा गया कि जो दरिद्रता से संघर्ष है वह अवास्तविक तरीके से चलाया जा रहा है । मैं उसे स्वीकार करता हूं कि जहां दरिद्रता से संघर्ष एक ओर चलाया जाना चाहिए, वहां इसी के साथ-साथ यह भी जरूरी है कि व्यक्तिगत पूंजी की स्थितियों से संघर्ष भी चलना चाहिए । और यहीं से सरकार क्षेत्र और निजी क्षेत्र ये दो पैदा होते हैं 'अर्थ-व्यवस्था' में और यह तो स्वीकार्य बात है—और यह ठीक भी है—कि सरकारी क्षेत्रों को अधिक प्रोत्साहन दिया जाना चाहिए । इस बात पर अचरज प्रगट किया गया कि कई चीजें निजी क्षेत्र में जा रही हैं, वह ठीक व्यवस्था नहीं है । हां, जो सरकारी क्षेत्रों में व्यवस्था की गड़बड़ियां हों, उन्हें सुधारा जाना चाहिए । ( Time bell rings ) मैं एक मिनट में समाप्त करता हूं । असल में मुझे एक बात शिक्षा सम्बन्धी यह कहनी है कि यहां अभिभाषण में कहा गया है कि बड़ा विस्तार शिक्षा का हुआ । इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि हुआ परन्तु आज की स्थिति में आवश्यक यह है कि जितना विस्तार हो चुका है उसे और मजबूत करें । अधिक विस्तार से भी खराबियां पैदा होती हैं । जैसे कि अभी तक हम इस निश्चय पर नहीं पहुंच पाये कि हमारा क्या संस्कृति मान होना चाहिए जिन्हें हमें अप्रसर करना है । अभी प्रश्नोत्तर काल में शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने संस्कृति की एक परिभाषा दी थी कि वह कुछ ऐसी चीज है जिसका हमें गर्व है, यदि हम यहां तक पहुंचे हैं तो शायद इस पर विचार कर के आगे बढ़ने की आवश्यकता है ।

[पंडित भवानी प्रसाद तिल्लारी]

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस भाषण में खाद्य स्थिति के संकट की आत्मस्वीकृति बड़ी स्पष्ट है। इस स्थिति में जो आलोचना की जाती है कि बाहर से आयात न हो वह आलोचना इसलिये ठीक नहीं है कि उसके बिना शायद यह संकट मिट नहीं सकता, परन्तु यह बात ठीक है कि हम आत्मसम्मानपूर्वक ही यह चीजें करें, जहां ऐसी सम्भावना हो कि देश का आत्म-सम्मान नहीं रहता है तो उसे स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहिए चाहे उसके बदले जितना भी कष्ट हो। मैं एक ही बात कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ कि इस स्थिति में जिन देशों से सहायता प्राप्त होती है उनसे हमारा सम्बन्ध, भारत का सम्बन्ध, कुछ ऐसा है जैसा कि किसी कवि ने मेघ और चातक का सम्बन्ध निर्धारित किया है — “नहि जाचक नहि संग्रही,” और “शीश नाय नहि लेय” न तो हमें मांगना चाहिये, न तो हमें संग्रह करने के लिए मांगना चाहिए, इकट्ठा करने के लिए मांगना चाहिए, बल्कि वितरण सब को हो सके यह व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए और शीश झुका कर यानी स्वाभिमान खो कर नहीं लेना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो आज का नेतृत्व है उसने इस पर ध्यान दिया है और इस नीति को सफल बनाने में अग्रसर हो रहा है।

मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nausher Ali. If you like, you may sit and speak.

SYED NAUSHER ALI (West Bengal): Thank you, Madam. I had sent in two amendments. They could not be moved owing to my illness. They related to two matters: emergency and food. As regards food I reserve my comments to a future date. But as far as the emergency is concerned, I would just make a few brief remarks

Madam, at this fag end of the discussion it is hardly possible to make any new points on the continuance of the emergency. In my opinion there is no emergency. It had ceased long ago. I repeat there is no national emergency. The volume of opinion against the continuance of it in the Houses and outside them negatives the existence of an emergency. In a national emergency it is the nation that considers itself endangered. But here we find so much divergence of opinion, so much opposition both inside and outside the Houses, that it can never be called a national emergency. It is at best an emergency of the Congress Government. It is not even an emergency of the Congress party because I know there are many Congress M.Ps. who are dead against it.

Madam. I asked for leave to speak in the morning. In the evening it is very difficult for me to speak. However, I will finish my speech by making a few remarks.

Now I should not and I would not like to repeat what has already been said, but I cannot help referring, or inviting the attention of the Government, to the statement issued by 34 eminent men of India headed by Mr. Setalvad. These eminent persons cannot by any stretch of imagination be said to be partisans. They consisted of the former Attorney General, three Chief Justices of the Supreme Court, six Judges of the Supreme Court and High Court, I think eight newspaper editors and some other eminent men, I think four Vice-Chancellors including Dr. Deshmukh, Dr. Mudaliar, etc. Now I cannot conceive of a stronger condemnation of the continuation of this emergency declaration. What do they say? First of all they say that they have been induced to make this statement to see that the fair name of India is not tarnished abroad. Then they say that the continuation of this emergency is worthy only of a police State, of a dictatorship, not of a democracy. Finally, in answer to a question Mr. Setalvad stated that he

is not unconscious of the threat from China. But the Chinese attitude is unpredictable. And the nation cannot be deprived of the fundamental rights on this uncertain, imaginary apprehension of a danger. Article 352(1) and (2) give power to the Government to declare an emergency. What are the provisions? The provisions say that there must be a grave emergency either by war or by foreign aggression or by internal disturbance. There is no war, no foreign aggression, no no internal disturbance. This is the provision of article 352(1). Now, let us turn to article 352(3). It says that a Proclamation be made even when there is no actual war or aggression or internal disturbance but when it is imminent—I draw the attention of the Leader of the House to the word 'imminent'. Is there any imminent danger to India from any quarter whatsoever? Therefore, there is no background whatsoever, no reason whatsoever, for the continuation of this emergency—neither actual nor imminent. I submit that this continuation of the emergency is a gross violation and abuse of the Constitutional provisions of the country. It is mala fide, it is ultra vires, of the Constitution. You may dispose of any statement by the Opposition having a packed house. But how can you dispose of the opinion of these eminent personages whose opinion, I submit, is entitled to the greatest respect? And I hope that the Government will move in the matter immediately and show the respect that is due to them by declaring the emergency withdrawn.

I should like to draw the attention of the Leader of the House to the President's Address itself. Does that justify the continuance of this emergency? I submit not. Just look at this. What does the President say? The President simply says:

"Unfortunately, our relations with the People's Republic of China still continue to be strained. The country has to be vigilant and strong."

Who denies that the country should be vigilant? Who denies that the country should be strong? To be vigilant and strong is one thing and emergency is quite a different thing. Now, the President in the previous sentence has stated definitely that:

"We are fortunate in having very friendly relations with almost all countries in the world. We are particularly happy that the friendships and understanding with our neighbours have been further strengthened."

Where is the emergency then? Even taking this President's Address as it is, there is absolutely no justification whatsoever for the continuance of the emergency. As I have already stated, it is an emergency not of the nation, it is an emergency not of the Congress Party, it is an emergency of the Congress Government. I hope that the Government will realise the position and will withdraw the emergency forthwith without wasting time. I know that our Government has never done anything unless compelled to do so. We, the Opposition, are not in a position to compel them but I am sure if they continue in this way, the whole country will rise against them and throw them out.

Thank you, Madam, I cannot speak any more.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Madam, the hon. Member said that the fence of India Rules were ultra vires of the Constitution. This point was taken to the Supreme Court but the Supreme Court has not upheld that point. May I know what are reasons why the hon. Member said so?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot go on expressing an opinion. The Minister will reply to that. We are very short of time now. Shri Vajpayee.

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** महोदया, आज प्रातःकाल कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने, जो मेरे दुर्भाग्य से इस समय सदन में मौजूद नहीं हैं, यह सुझाव रखा था कि हमें युद्ध विराम रेखा के आधार पर काश्मीर का बटवारा मान लेना चाहिये। मैं इस सुझाव का विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मेरी दृष्टि में यह एक बड़ा घातक सुझाव है जो आक्रमण को बल प्रदान करेगा, हमारी प्रभुसत्ता को सौदे का विषय बना देगा और शेष काश्मीर पर भारत के अधिकार को कमजोर करेगा। श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने यह तो कहा कि सन् 1956 में स्वर्गीय नेहरू जी ने इसी आशय का प्रस्ताव पाकिस्तान के सामने रखा था लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं बताया कि उस प्रस्ताव के बारे में पाकिस्तान की प्रतिक्रिया क्या थी। पाकिस्तान ने उस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं किया था और उसके बाद नेहरू जी ने उस प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लिया था और संसद में कहा था कि अब वह प्रस्ताव भारत की ओर से खुला हुआ नहीं है।

मुझे आश्चर्य है कि ताशकंद घोषणा पर दस्तखत होने के बाद ही इस तरह की बातें कहीं जा रही हैं। ताशकंद घोषणा हमें इस बात से नहीं रोकती कि हम पाकिस्तान से कहें कि जम्मू और काश्मीर के जिस हिस्से पर वह कब्जा जमाये बैठा है उसे खाली कर दे, और सचमुच में हमें इस बात पर बल देना चाहिये था। अगर हम इस बात पर बल देते रहते तो शेष काश्मीर पर दावा करने की पाकिस्तान को हिम्मत नहीं होती। मगर हम राजनीति के ऐसे खिलाड़ी हैं कि अपने सभी पत्ते पट्टे मेज पर रख देते हैं और हमारा प्रतिपक्षी, हमारा विरोधी, उन पत्तों का लाभ उठाता है और आगे के लिये अपनी मांग जारी रखता है। आखिर जिस जम्मू और काश्मीर के भाग पर पाकिस्तान का कब्जा है उस पर पाकिस्तान का अधिकार क्या है सिवाय इसके कि उसने बलप्रयोग के द्वारा उस भाग पर कब्जा कर रखा है। आज शांति के लिये हम उस भाग को छोड़ दें तो भी

शांति होने वाली नहीं है। पाकिस्तान के दांत समूचे जम्मू और काश्मीर पर और खास कर काश्मीर की घाटी पर लगे हैं। इस तरह के सुझाव हमारी स्थिति को कमजोर करेंगे और पाकिस्तान को हमारे खिलाफ एक प्रचार का साधन दे देंगे।

श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने कहा ताशकंद घोषणा की एक ही नेचुरल कारोली है कि हम एक तिहाई काश्मीर पाकिस्तान को दे दें और पाकिस्तान को एक तिहाई काश्मीर देने की नेचुरल कारोली यह है कि हम अक्सार्डिचिन चीन को दे दें। यह बात उन्होंने कह नहीं मगर यह बात जरूर उनके मन में होगी, और मैं मार्क्सवादी कम्यूनिस्टों की ईमानदारी की तारीफ करूंगा कि वे खुले आम कहने लगे हैं कि हमें अक्सार्डिचिन चीन को देकर समझौता कर लेना चाहिए।

आक्रमण के सामने समर्पण करना आक्रमण को मिटाने का तरीका नहीं है। जो भूमि हमारी है, कानून से, विधान से, उस पर हम इसलिए अधिकार छोड़ दें कि दूसरे ने बल प्रयोग से उस पर कब्जा कर लिया है, तो हम भारत की अखंडता की, सार्वभौम सत्ता की, रक्षा नहीं कर सकेंगे।

महोदया, मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि ताशकंद में हमारे नेताओं ने यह सुझाव क्यों नहीं रखा कि हम हाजी पीर, कारगिल और तिथवाल से वापस जाते हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान की सेना इन क्षेत्रों में नहीं आयेगी और इस क्षेत्र को 'डिमिलिटराइज्ड जोन' बना दिया जाय। लेकिन ऐसा लगता है कि हमने ताशकंद में राष्ट्र के हित की रक्षा की चिन्ता नहीं की। और आज वह घोषणा ऐसे लोगों को बल प्रदान कर रही है जो किसी भी कीमत पर चीन और पाकिस्तान से समझौता चाहते हैं। हमें ऐसे प्रस्तावों के प्रति सावधान रहना होगा। भारतीय जनसंघ की स्थिति इस बारे में स्पष्ट है। हम जम्मू काश्मीर के एक तिहाई भाग पाकिस्तान को देने का विरोध करते रहे हैं, आज भी विरोध करते हैं और आगे भी विरोध करते रहेंगे। हम अपनी सार्वभौम सत्ता को

किसी तरह से छोड़ना के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। अगर वह ऐसा करेंगे तो हम डटकर उसका मुकाबला करेंगे।

महोदया कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता ने विएटनाम के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट किये। मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से, लेकिन दृढ़ता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार विएटनाम की स्थिति के बारे में एक भी शब्द ऐसा न बोले, एक भी कदम ऐसा न उठाये जिससे कम्युनिस्ट चीन को ताकत मिले। वहाँ जो कुछ हो रहा है, वह हमें पसन्द नहीं हो सकता है। लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में कभी कभी चुप भी रहना पड़ता है। हमें चुप रहने की कला का अभ्यास करना चाहिये। जिन प्रश्नों का हमारे हितों के साथ सीधा सम्बन्ध है, दूरगामी दृष्टि से जो स्थिति हमारे विरुद्ध जा सकती है, उस पर अपना मत व्यक्त करते समय हमें बड़ी सावधानी की जरूरत है। हाँ, सरकार की रोडेशिया के सम्बन्ध में जो नीति है, उस से मैं सन्तुष्ट नहीं हूँ और हमें ब्रिटेन पर दबाव डालना चाहिये कि वह रोडेशिया में बल प्रयोग करे। अफ्रीकी देश हमसे पहल की आशा करते हैं, हम राष्ट्र मंडल के सदस्य हैं और हम राष्ट्र-मंडल के अंगुवा बनने का भी दावा करते रहे हैं। रोडेशिया का मसला ऐसा है जिस पर हम चुप बैठने की गलती न करें वहाँ पर हमें बोलना चाहिये। ब्रिटेन को बल प्रयोग करने के लिए विवश करना हमारे हित में जायेगा। इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार को विचार करना चाहिये।

महोदया, जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी के विरुद्ध गम्भीर आरोप लगाये जा रहे हैं। कम्पनी के पुराने मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर ने 24 पृष्ठों का एक मेमोरेण्डम स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को पेश किया था। इस मेमोरेण्डम में मांग की गई थी कि जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी के सारे मामले को सी० बी० आई० को जांच के लिये सौंप दिया जाये, लेकिन अभी तक सरकार ने कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की है। कम्पनी की स्थिति यह है कि 2 करोड़ की उसकी पेड अप कैपिटल

है और 2½ करोड़ का उस पर कर्ज हो गया है। जिन परिस्थितियों में जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी को कर्जा दिया गया, मैं उसका उल्लेख नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। सरकार ने रास्ते से अलग जाकर जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी को कर्जा दिया, लेकिन कम्पनी ने उस कर्ज का ठीक तरीके से लाभ नहीं उठाया। भारत को जहाज देने के बारे में भी कम्पनी आनाकानी करती रही। विदेशी मुद्रा कमाने के लिये कम्पनी अपने जहाजों को विदेशी माल ढोने के लिये देती रही है। यह जरूरी है कि जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी के मामले के बारे में उच्चस्तरीय जांच की जाये। आज के दैनिक पत्र में भी निकला है कि कम्पनी के और भी डायरेक्टर इस्तीफा दे रहे हैं। इतनी बड़ी कम्पनी के प्रति सरकार उपेक्षा की नीति नहीं अपना सकती। एक रचनात्मक सुझाव यह हो सकता है कि शिपिंग कारपोरेशन जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी को अपने अधिकार में ले ले और उसके जहाजों को देश के हित में चलाये।

महोदया, शिक्षा मंत्री जी चले गये, मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि काशी हिन्दू विश्व-विद्यालय कब तक आर्डिनेंस के जरिये चलता रहेगा? विश्वविद्यालय की स्वायत्तता बहाल होनी चाहिये और विश्वविद्यालय के लिये कानून बनना चाहिये। यदि नाम में से 'हिन्दू' शब्द हटाने के बारे में देश में मतभेद है, तो सरकार को बहुमत के स्वागत करना चाहिये और हिन्दू शब्द को निकालने का विचार छोड़ देना चाहिये। किन्तु इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि वहाँ चिरकाल तक आर्डिनेंस चलता रहे। जहाँ तक हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय का बजट है वह नेपाल के बजट से ज्यादा है। इस विश्वविद्यालय के संचालकों के हाथ में काफी अधिकार और शक्ति है जिसका ठीक तरह से उपयोग नहीं हो रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को एक विधेयक लाना चाहिये जिससे आर्डिनेंस की जगह कानून की दी जा सके।

एक बात मैं सूचना मंत्री जी से भी कहना चाहता हूँ। वे भी चले गये हैं। आल इंडिया

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

रेडियो किस तरह से काम करता है, उसका मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। अभी वे अपने विभाग के बारे में बड़ी बात कह रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि पी० आई० बी० सभी दलों के साथ न्याय करता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आकाशवाणी भी उन्हीं के अन्तर्गत आती है। अभी जब परसों श्री सावरकर जी का देहान्त हुआ था तो आल इंडिया रेडियो ने उनके देहान्त की खबर पहली खबर के रूप में नहीं दी। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कही भाषण दिया—प्रतिदिन वह भाषण देती हैं—और वह प्रतिदिन रेडियो द्वारा दोहराया जाता है। उस दिन भी प्रधान मंत्री जी के भाषण की खबर पहले दी गई और श्री सावरकर जी की मृत्यु की खबर बाद में दी गई। आल इंडिया रेडियो ने यह भी नहीं कहा कि हमें यह घोषणा करते हुए दुःख होता है कि श्री सावरकर जी हमारे बीच से उठ गये हैं। क्या रेडियो में इतना भी सौजन्य नहीं है, और इतना भी शिष्टाचार नहीं है? श्री सावरकर जी के विचारों से मतभेद हो सकता है, मगर देश के लिये उन्होंने जो त्याग और बलिदान किया है, वह अनुपम है, अद्वितीय है। आल इंडिया रेडियो इस तरह की गलती भविष्य में न करे, इस दृष्टि से सरकार को सजग होना चाहिये।

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: Madam, our objectives are not known to a few people; our goal is not clear to them, and it will be worth while to recollect whether if the terms "socialism" and "social justice" do not find any place in the present Address, does it mean any deviation from the policy of the Government or from the declared objectives? Mr. Annadurai, in his own intelligent way, questioned the very objectives. He forgot that it is not necessary that each and every time that the President addresses both the Houses, he should reiterate the objectives which have been made clear to the country and have been placed before Parliament. In the Address of 1964, the President was pleased to state:

"It will continue to be the endeavour of our Government, in all possible ways, to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people, to promote our unity and well-being and to build a democratic and socialistic society in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent."

In the year 1965, the President in his Address has said:

"The development of a prosperous socialist society and the expansion of friendly co-operation with other nations of the world remain the basis of our policies."

And this year the President has said

"Our objectives are known and our goals are clear."

So if the President has stated it in one line this year, that one line referred to the objectives of the Government and the goals which we have been trying to achieve. Therefore, if the words 'socialism' or 'social justice' do not find a place in this Address, it does not mean that the Government deviates from the earlier policies. Just that one sentence clinches the basis of the policies of the Government. Of course, it can be asked whether we have achieved our goals, whether we have fully tried to fulfil the objectives which we have placed before the country. In that connection Shri Annadurai quoted Shri Kamraj, and I think Shri Annadurai holds Shri Kamraj in very high esteem because he gave an instance to show that his party tries to co-operate with the Government of the day and in quoting the example he said "We have raised a statue in the name of Shri Kamraj." Shri Kamraj is known for his straightforwardness, for telling bluntly the truth, and if Shri Kamraj had endeared himself to the people of Tamilnad and especially to Shri Annadurai then, his holding a high position in the

Congress Party to which the Government belongs, could it have lowered those objectives? Could it have lowered his stature if he were to lead our Congress Party? And in quoting from Shri Kamaraj's address he forgot to quote in full the relevant passage. Now Shri Kamaraj has said:

"The Congress ideology may thus be summed up as democratic socialism based on democracy, dignity of the individual and social justice."

After that a sub-committee was appointed to prepare a draft on the progress of implementation of the Bhubaneswar Congress Resolution on Democracy and Socialism. Now, to quote from Congress President, Shri Kamaraj's Address:

"It is eleven years since we clearly and unequivocally accepted socialism as our goal. We have to accelerate our efforts at achieving our declared objectives."

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Is it the Rashtrapati's or the President's Address that we are discussing, or is it the Congress President's Address that we are discussing?

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: Extracts from Shri Kamaraj's Address were quoted by Shri Annadurai. He read a part of it and left it at that, and he forgot to quote the relevant part in full. To quote Shri Kamaraj:

"Our development during this period has no doubt been significant." Now Shri Annadurai left out this sentence, and he quoted the portion coming later, namely:

"But it has not succeeded in lessening, let alone removing, the disparity between the rich and the poor."

He quoted the further sentences coming after this. Therefore, to quote Shri Kamaraj in a way as to convey only the impression that he is not satisfied—as a matter of fact most of us are not satisfied—with the development is not fair when he has himself said that "our development during this period has no doubt been significant." Although we are not satisfied with the pace of development, we have to see whether or not our efforts have been in the right direction.

PROF. M. B. LAL: The committee to enquire into the pace of development is set up by the Congress.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: Professor Saheb, I agree. If we were ourselves satisfied, the question of an inquiry committee would not arise. Because we are not satisfied, there was the need for it. We want to correct ourselves. We have not said we are infallible. We are not dogmatic. We say we commit mistakes, that we are not able to fulfil those objectives in a shorter time, and we want to do so.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): You may perhaps be able to do it in a century.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: Time is essential; no doubt about it; who can deny? And we want to do it in the shortest time. And yesterday Shri Asoka Mehta was also asking each one of us to contribute to it, to create an atmosphere in which those objectives could be achieved. Of course, that co-operation which prevailed till recently in the face of a danger is lacking a bit these days. Vinobaji said once that either it is the danger from China or from Pakistan which unites the parties into one, that at that time there is a cry all round for unity, co-operation, etc. and after that, after the storm is over, we go on looking, as if reading a thermometer, for the danger, and when the danger becomes less, the cooperation is less. When the danger does not loom large, then dis-

[Dr. M. M S. Siddhu]

unity and non-cooperation come in. In his own way he said that we should have unity and co-operation at all times in our own country, so that there may never be a danger to our country. And, therefore, whenever people talk of co-operation, it is not that the co-operation is something which should be had only in times of emergency. It should not be that the foreign powers should threaten our frontiers and then only we should think in terms of unity and integrity of the country. We should be united in the mighty effort to remove poverty. Of course, there are different ways of achieving the goals, but there has been a certain unanimity in a certain way that has been chosen. The question is: Have we in a unified way tried to fulfil those obligations which were proposed and accepted by each one of us? Have we discharged them? I think Shri Annadurai was very sour when he said that they have raised monuments in memory of those persons who were our national leaders, or leaders of the Congress Party; when a particular bus station was named after him, he said, there was an injunction against it obtained from the court—if I remember correctly. So is it because of the attitude of someone going in for an injunction against it, going in for its removal by an injunction, that his vision is clouded to an extent that he does not see clearly either the objectives or the goals which have been set before us?

As far as the new strategy on the food front is concerned, I am one of those who differ with it, because the new strategy places greater reliance firstly on seed and secondly on fertilisers. As a matter of fact, we are importing wheat mostly, and the States which grow wheat are Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. So if we want to increase the wheat production in the country, it is in these States that we have to develop certain resources. And the resource which is most needed is water. Therefore, if water is not given the necessary priority in these

regions in the new strategy and only seeds and fertilisers are given to all the States, then it is possible that the seeds and fertilizers may improve the yield in those areas that are saturated with irrigation, but that will not be able to make much difference to the total production of food in the country as a whole. That is why what we had said at Bhubaneswar is important. That is to say, land reform should play its part. That is the first. Secondly, emphasis should be given to irrigation by means of medium or small or even big reservoirs, by whatever means are available. This is a great necessity. But the attention of the people now being diverted to fertilizers is something which I cannot understand, especially in the context of the deal and the letters which have been exchanged between the U.S. Aid Mission and the Secretaries of the Food and Finance Ministries. Foreign companies are going to have collaboration with Indian concerns to produce one million tonnes of fertilizers and they are to be given the freedom to fix the price and the freedom of the market, that is to say, the choice of the market. I feel that this is something by which we will be mortgaging the whole economy, the whole of our agricultural economy, into the hands of those persons who are going to run these factories. And who are they? They are the same persons—connected with the firms which have been mentioned in the Monopoly Commission's Report. In other words, this is the one sector where we want to decrease the difference between the rich and the poor and here we will be giving these people more power and by this we will be giving them more handle in a field where they should not have so much power.

Thirdly, I would like to say something about rural credit. I need not go into the report of the Evaluation Committee which has just been published. It tells us a sorry state of affairs. While 63 per cent. of the people own land less than 5 acres, only 15 per cent. of the credit goes to them.

If the rural credit that is given to 63 per cent. of our people is only 15 per cent. then how is it possible to bring about any change in the present condition by adopting scientific or mechanical methods for the production of food?

Next I would like to say a few words about doctors. (*Time bell rings*). Give me a couple of minutes more, Madam, and then I will be done. I would like to say something about doctors and the emergency. These emergency powers have sometimes been used in a very invisible and indirect way. I will give an instance. Doctors serving in the States have not been allowed to resign because they are covered under the Essential Services provision. Their pay and emoluments cannot be raised and they will not be raised and they are obliged to serve on paltry sums. There is a lecturer and he is not given the post of Reader. When he wants to resign and apply and get to another place he is told, "No. You cannot do so. If you do, you will be prosecuted under the D.I.R." I would like to say that this is the type of emergency through which we have passed. We have done it. The medical profession co-operated with the Government. The profession co-operated fully with the Government realising their obligation to society. But there should be an end to this one-sided observance of all the obligations. I would like to say something more. In this House it has been said that the emergency should be done away with. I am one with them. I would ask the Government one question. Why is it that there has not been any sign of creating an atmosphere wherein this cry for doing away with the emergency would not have arisen? Is it due to the fact that the Essential Commodities Act has not been operated in the right manner? Had we been able to force prices down, keep the level of prices down and make the necessities of life available to the common man, I am sure nobody, not even these jurists, and others, would have raised any voice against the emergency. People would

then have understood the position. They would have understood that the very purpose for which these emergency provisions were incorporated were being fulfilled and that they were having the desired object. Therefore, I would welcome the decision of the Government to review the position. When they review the position, I am sure they will come to only one conclusion, namely, that these emergency powers should be done away with.

One thing more I would like to say. It has been stated that there is an increase in the number of doctors in the medical profession in the country. It is a good thing. But I would like to add one thing. When we are producing more doctors, we should make sure that the standards do not go down and the body which is entrusted with the task of keeping up the standard of education and giving recognition is the Medical Council of India. Madam, I regret to say that the Medical Council of India did not meet last time. The minutes of the Executive Committee were circulated to the members and we were asked to send in our comments, our assent or dissent. What was the reason for the change? Again the word "emergency" was brought forth and it was said that owing to the emergency, funds were not available for the Medical Council of India. And recently another meeting was fixed, in April, 1966. Again we have received the intimation that owing to the same emergency the meeting will not be held. Now, if the statutory bodies which have been created by this Parliament are not allowed to function or are not able to function, or if the persons concerned think that money is not made available to them in order to enable the Council to function, then do not create more doctors or more institutions. Do not have more medical colleges. Do not expand the medical services and the medical colleges unless and until you can maintain their standards. The body which has to regulate standards must have funds and they must meet more often because they must judge each institution

[Dr. M. M. S. Siddhu]  
properly. This method of correspondence between the Executive Committee and the General Body should be done away with. I am sure the Government would look into the finances of the Medical Council of India and if they need more funds, I am sure this House will not grudge it if the Minister comes forward with the necessary proposal.

Thank you.

4 P.M.

DR. S. CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Madras) : Madam, may I be permitted to comment, while thanking the President for the Address, on some of the points that have been raised before the House? To begin with, may I welcome and congratulate the head of this Government, the Leader of this Government, a lady who brings to us an extraordinary and a rare combination of outstanding ability, integrity and charm not only as a daughter of the revolution but as a being who has been nurtured in the tradition of a decade and a half of intense and rapid development of the nation?

Speaking about our foreign policy, I think the Opposition Members, particularly Shri Annadurai, the hon. Member who is not in the House, seems to have forgotten that the basic postulates of our foreign policy have been based on our desire to promote universal peace, even if we define the term as cessation of wars and local conflicts, and secondly to promote larger areas of political freedom and allowing the developing and underdeveloped nations to progress through rapid economic development and social progress. In this sense, no doubt, we have been permitted to build, and to see that we have peaceful and friendly relations with every country in the world, including, if possible, the People's Republic of China. Therefore, it is not surprising that our Government should have been endeavouring to promote a policy of good-neighbourliness, a policy of amity, peace and friendship not only with the major countries of the world but also

with countries which happen to be close neighbours like Pakistan, China and others. Here I must say that when I went round the world a few weeks ago, I read the newspaper editorials and not a single instance could be found where the people have not paid a well-fitting tribute to the memory of our late revered Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri who sacrificed his very self at the altar of peace, of promoting what we hope will be a lasting and permanent accord and settlement with our neighbouring country, Pakistan. May we hope that while the two countries are implementing this Tashkent Agreement—just as it takes two sides to make a quarrel, it also takes two sides to implement peace—may I not use this platform to voice my concern and a plea that our gesture of goodwill as shown by our Government in the Tashkent Agreement will be fully, amply, completely and unhesitatingly reciprocated by the Government and people of Pakistan so that our foreign policy will ultimately result in an undefined common frontier between India and Pakistan just as the undefended common frontier between Canada and the United States of America. It is hoped that we shall have such an undefended frontier in which people in India and Pakistan could travel in and come out without any restriction whatever.

Madam, talking about China, I have heard hon. Members saying that something ought to be done more. I have been an objective student of the relationship with China right from the creation of the Republic in that country. We have been continuously supporting them, have championed their cause for giving them a seat in the United Nations and we have been, through diplomatic and other channels, championing the cause of China to find its legitimate place in the comity of nations. May I be permitted to say that despite this help and support consistently given by the Government in the past decade and half, we had been treated to nothing but a stab in the back. The matter rests there and the Chinese have done nothing to im-

prove matters? They are going on shouting that we are the aggressors. that we have occupied territory which legitimately belongs to them. I do not, therefore, think how any hon. Member of this House, particularly Communists, could think of attacking our Government of not doing anything or, shall we say, promoting peace and trying to settle our international disputes in any manner other than through peaceful negotiations.

Madam, I now come to the other questions that people have been talking about, questions of our internal economic development. In one word, this is not a problem which is new to this Government or to its predecessor or the governments before. If I understand our history correctly, from times immemorial, the problem of intense poverty and low levels of consumption and low standards of living have been there and every Government has attempted to solve this problem but it has been left to this Government of eighteen years' standing to do something worthwhile about this problem of poverty. The Government has been trying to do its very best to promote a welfare State according to the lights granted to it. I am glad Mr. Siddhu said that we are fallible but we are doing our best according to the resources available to us, in the context of the international position with the assistance of such help that we can possibly muster from other countries which are friendly to us and which want to help us in rapidly raising our economic development and promoting higher levels of consumption. Political freedom at best is not an end in itself but is only a means to promote a better deal and better levels of consumption to every man, woman and child in this country. And here it simply means that we are a nation of hungry millions and something must be done and something is being done. I think hunger is not something new in our country. If I understand our history, hunger has been more or less a constant companion of our millions and for the first time we have a national government dedicated to the

promotion of the welfare of our people. This Government has recognised this problem and is doing something about it, despite the limitations, despite the lack of good lands, despite the want of irrigation facilities, despite the want of fertilisers and, despite the apathy and ignorance of the countryside. We shall have to start a revolution in the countryside so that ultimately, in our life time we shall give every citizen of this country a better deal and three square meals. If we are not able to accomplish this immediately, it is not the fault of the Government certainly. Certainly anybody who goes round the country knows that there is hunger in this country. I need not insult the intelligence of hon. Members by giving statistics of *per capita* consumption in India and compare it with that of other Western countries. The problem for the people of America, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland and England is not to put more weight but to reduce so that they may not have heart attack but here it is not a question of reducing the weight but of getting enough to do an honest day's labour in the fields and factories, in the homes and offices. All that I am saying to the Opposition Members is that you cannot accuse the Government of being impervious to the demands of the people, to the legitimate aspirations of the people. The Government is fully aware of its responsibilities and, what is more, is making dedicated attempts, serious endeavours to see what can be done in the unfortunate circumstances in which we are placed. If people do not understand this, I am sorry they have not attempted to look at the problems correctly or in the proper perspective. When we talk of the need of economic development, people are said to be logical and rational; but here one hon. Member asks, why should we get foreign aid? It seems to be absolutely devoid of logic because in the same breath the hon. Member says, people are starving, there is hunger and he is against foreign aid. We are hungry because the circumstances are beyond our control. The Congress Party, the Government of India, is unable to

[Dr. S. Chandra Shekhar]

manipulate the weather, the climate and create artificial rainfall and Monsoon—which we hope we shall be able to do in the years to come—there is this drought, the crops have failed and there is famine and hunger stalking the streets of this country. Therefore, we are compelled to go with a beggar's bowl to the capitals of the world and are accepting aid which is offered by friendly nations because we want immediate succour, sustenance and help for our country. We do not want even a single individual to die. I cannot understand how the hon. Member can oppose foreign aid when we need help badly. Nobody is going to give aid free. We are paying for it, we are paying the interest for it and incidentally helping world economic revolution by taking economic aid like the PL-480 from America. Therefore, let no Member say that this Government is not concerned with saving the life of the people, that it is impervious to the needs of the people. It is only because we are concerned with this that we go round, that Mr. Subramaniam went to Washington and—call it what you like—begged, requested, pleaded for and got the food to feed our people.

Then, there is the question of economic development and I am glad that Mr. Asoka Mehta spoke about it a little yesterday. There what is the problem? The problem is basically simple and I do not see how anybody can possibly misunderstand. Madam, I will take only a few minutes and explain the whole problem before us. The problem is one of poverty, one of limited economic resources, one of stagnant agricultural production and one of lack of rapid large-scale heavy industrialisation. Millions of people, eighty per cent., who are in the villages, are trying to siphon off from this overcrowded land what they can get for their sustenance and in the urban factories we put men, material and machines together and produce commodities and services and thereby we start the process of a beneficent chain reaction of having an increase

in our per capita income. I am not trying to be an economist here or as a professor giving lectures but it is a simple mechanism of chain reaction. But what is the trouble here in our country? Our total resources have been pooled. We know what we have, under the ground and on the ground. We know what our targets are; we know what our objectives are and we know what we want for our people. We know we want more food, more clothing, more housing, more hospitals, more schools, more universities, more research institutes, more and more of everything so that people may live in some dignity and enjoy the fruits of the political freedom. But we are not able to transform these limited resources into these objectives because we have very poor and backward technology and technical know-how. We do not have the capital; we do not have the necessary fiscal and financial resources and the logical and inevitable conclusion is that we have to go to the other countries and ask for economic aid.

I have just published a book, Madam, if I may mention it here—it has not reached this country yet—titled 'American Aid and Economic Development' published in London a few weeks back. I have examined there the problem of foreign aid. No country in the world—which has reached the present advanced status including the United States of America, the Soviet Union, Japan, England, France, West Germany and even some of the Latin American Republics like Argentina, Mexico and Brazil—has become advanced without foreign aid. At that time the idea of foreign aid was not known but they went to the international money market and floated loans, and their Governments negotiated them and thus pulled themselves up with foreign assistance. And India is no exception. By accepting aid we should not think we have lost something. We are not having any strings attached. We are not losing our sovereignty; we are not losing our sacred soil; we are losing nothing. We accept foreign aid on our terms. Several times people have

approached us that they would like to help us but we have said no because the terms of the loans were not acceptable, because the political implications were not acceptable. We have examined this carefully and successive Finance Ministers at the Centre from Mr. Shanmugam Chetty to Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari have said that we will accept aid provided it is given under specific conditions which are favourable for our country and are in conformity with our political status, economic development and social progress. I do not know why anybody today in the Opposition or otherwise should exhibit—if you will forgive me the use of this word—ignorance in understanding the process of the simple mechanism of planned economic development. We have not been able to achieve the targets. I would like to see in every village a high school, an auditorium, a swimming pool, potable running water in every hut and I will go even to this extent, you may laugh at me, that someday we may have air-conditioned homes in every village—we have not been able to do that for the simple reason that we do not have the resources. If we put the opposition in power, tomorrow, they will face the same challenge. If you sit there, you will face the same thing. You are not going to create money by putting toilet paper in the printing press; you are not going to do any such nonsense. Therefore under the circumstances, any objective student of economic development, apart from political affiliations and party ideologies, must concede that the Government of India has done—I say this not merely as a Congress member—the best possible thing in the circumstances. As we review the evidence very carefully—I have done it from outside with a very detached mind as a scholar and as a scientist—I have been compelled to admire the architects of our country's freedom that they have done so much with such limited resources. It is extraordinary, other people might have thrown up the sponge and said, 'we cannot do any better'. So we have done the very best we can under the circumstances.

Now, what about the food problem? The food problem is very simple. Here is a vast country of 480 million people. There are only two ways, if you simplify it that way, of improving our agricultural economy. Madam, I will take only two minutes to summarise this. One is that you increase the production of food on the land cultivated already; that is, you increase the *per capita* and *per acre* yield of land already under cultivation. Secondly you cultivate the land which has not been cultivated so far. After 5,000 years of existence since Mohenjodaro times, in this country there is not much land left uncultivated though in the statistics you will find a category called cultivable but uncultivated. If you examine where it is, you will find it is in the Rajasthan desert. Madam, I have examined this question. Last year I went to the Sahara desert. I have been to the Gobi desert in Southern Mongolia and China. I have visited the Central Australian desert. I have also seen the Attacamen desert in Latin America and few weeks ago I studied the Southern Mexico Mehawi and Arizona deserts in the United States. Because the population is increasing, sooner or later, we will have to bring these deserts under occupation and cultivation, whether you like it or not. In the United States they are building air-conditioned homes, air-conditioned factories, air-conditioned schools and air-conditioned cars in the deserts. Because of the population increase they want more space. Factories are being built in the deserts and they are bringing water from far off distances to make the desert bloom. This summer, Madam, I was in Israel and they have made a notable achievement of transforming the whole Sinai desert into a flowering tropical paradise. It is a small country where every square foot counts.

And we must bring the Rajasthan desert under occupation and cultivation. We have an Arid Lands Research Institute at Jodhpur. They are doing something but not enough. We want to put more resources there.

[Dr .S. Chandra Shekhar.]

more technology there, more money there, more brains there so that ultimately the Rajasthan desert yields us dividends in terms of food for our people. As for the land which is already cultivated, the problem is simple. It is a question of bringing more fertiliser, more resources, opening windows into the heads of our peasants in the countryside. It is easy to say this in Parliament. We can easily put it in a book but it takes decades of silent social revolution to make this change to come through, and I believe that our Government is trying to do its best in the limited context of the very limited resources available to us. I do not imagine for a moment anybody in the Treasury Benches—I see only Shri Sanjivayya there representing the Government—would like to say, 'what is your ambition, to reach the sky or the stars'. Everybody would like to have an affluent nation, everybody would like to have an affluent society. We are not able to do it because we just do not have the things we need.

Lastly, one thing more, Madam, with your indulgence. I now come to the basic problem—I am sure you have almost guessed what I am going to say—of population. Today, India is the second largest country in the world with 480 million people. We are adding ten to twelve million people every year. With this nett annual addition to the existing population, I have done the projection that by 2,000 A.D.—this may be a shock to the Members of the House—we shall probably be a billion in this country. One billion is one followed by nine zeros whereas one million is one followed by six zeros. The total population of the world, according to the United Nations Demographic Handbook, is 3.3 billions. That means by 2,000 A.D. the world population will be 6.4 billions and India will have the doubtful distinction of contributing one-sixth of the total world population. Now, I know—I am sorry Dr. Sushila Nayar is not here—the Government has taken a

very progressive stand on this question of population control which elicits the admiration of every country in the world. Japan and India are two countries cited everywhere. They know that India has adopted a progressive, modern demographic policy of control but here again we have not been successful. We have not reduced our birth-rate. I might inform Prof. Ruthnaswamy that the Catholic Church is examining its attitude on contraceptives. I want to bring the hon Member, Prof. Ruthnaswamy up to date on this impending change in the Catholics' attitude because Catholic people in India do not know what is going on in Rome. In Rome what is happening is that they have sharply changed their whole attitude. They are trying to find a graceful exit. In some Catholic countries they are permitting the Catholics to use what we call scientific contraceptives. Today we know what the situation is and the answer. From the sheath, the pill, sterilisation, the diaphragm, Jelly, etc. we have everything but we must create the motivation in our country. You just cannot say, we are going to spend one million rupees every month and the problem will be solved. Things cannot be brought about that way. Therefore, the people's attitude has to be changed with due propaganda. We can solve this problem by making the people demand a better life, a richer life and a more prosperous life, and Government moves in. I trust and hope that this Government—the Government which will succeed this Government next year, I hope, will be a Congress Government and I am positive about it—will see to it that our people in this country are given a better deal, because political freedom is not, as I began, a mere end in itself, but a means to better the economic lot of the people.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I want to thank you for your indulgence in letting me speak at length, but it is a very important question. Instead of bickerings and divisions on a Party basis, I would request the Members of the Opposition to see that we need

a spirit of co-operation and joint endeavour because the common task of India's development is an adventure in which every son and daughter must participate, no matter what his economic and political ideology and philosophy may be.

I have great pleasure in welcoming, and thanking the President, for the Address.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Khandekar. May I suggest a little speech control?

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): Is it not too late?

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति जी, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के ऊपर जो चर्चा हर साल होती है उसमें हम लोगों को यह विचार करने का अवसर मिलता है कि गये साल हमने क्या किया और आगामी वर्ष में हम को क्या करना है। इस संदर्भ को देखते हुए राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण से काफी निराशा होती है।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने गत वर्ष के संबंध में जो कुछ कहा है वह दबे शब्दों में कहा और इससे भी कई गुना खराब स्थिति गये वर्ष में हमारे देश की थी। उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में भविष्य के बारे में भी कोई ऐसे उपाय नहीं सुझाये हैं जिससे हम यह आशा रखें कि हमारा भविष्य उज्ज्वल है। हमारा जो ध्येय है उसके बारे में हम वर्षों से चिल्ला चिल्लाकर कह रहे हैं कि हम इस देश में जनतंत्र के आधार पर समाजवादी समाज का निर्माण करेंगे, लेकिन यह उद्देश्य हमें कहीं भी नज़र नहीं आता है। यह बात बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहनी पड़ती है, यह स्वाभाविक भी है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में ताशकंद का जिक्र किया। इस घोषणा के संबंध में इस सदन में काफी चर्चा हुई है और इस समय भी इस बारे में काफी चर्चा और विवाद हुआ।

मुझे सिर्फ इतना ही कहना है कि यद्यपि मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विवाद होते हैं, उन्हें शांति के साथ हल किया जाय, लेकिन कोई भी हल जो देश के लिए, राष्ट्र के लिए सम्मान पूर्वक न हो, देश के सम्मान के विरुद्ध हो, उसको स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता है और न ही उसका स्वागत किया जा सकता है। ताशकंद घोषणा के बारे में भी यही बात हुई।

ताशकंद घोषणा के मुताबिक इस समय भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच किसी प्रकार की लड़ाई नहीं हो रही है, लेकिन इसकी कोई गारन्टी नहीं दी गई है कि जो वातावरण इस समय बना हुआ है वह हमेशा बना रहेगा। मैं इस संबंध में एक दो बात सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। हमारे परराष्ट्र मंत्री जी ने इस घोषणा के संबंध में जवाब देते हुए यह कहा था कि आर्मी ने भी इस घोषणा का स्वागत किया है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे भी आर्मी के लोगों के साथ मिलने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ है। यह बात हो सकती है कि जो आर्मी के बड़े बड़े अफसर हैं, उन्होंने सरकार के दबाव में आकर इस घोषणा का स्वागत किया हो, लेकिन जो आम अफसर हैं, आम जवान हैं, उन्हें इस घोषणा के बारे में कोई खुशी नहीं हुई है। वे सवाल पूछते हैं कि जब हमें पीछे हटना ही था तो इतना बवंडर क्यों किया गया और इतने नौ-जवानों को शहीद क्यों किया गया? जब हम से काश्मीर के इलाके में जाने के लिए कहा गया तो अब वापस आने की बात क्यों की जा रही है? इस तरह का जो मनोबल हमारी आर्मी में उस समय बना था वह खत्म होने जा रहा है और यह बात अच्छी नहीं है।

इसी तरह से माननीय मंत्री जी ने यह भी कहा कि जो लोग शरणार्थी हैं, वहां से ग्रहों आये हैं, उन्होंने भी इस घोषणा का स्वागत किया है, लेकिन महोदया, मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो शरणार्थी वहां से आये थे वे फिर वापस जाना नहीं

[श्री रमेशचन्द्र शकरराव खाडेकर]

चाहते हैं। वे लोग कहते हैं कि जब तक हमें इस बात का आश्वासन नहीं दिया जाता है कि हमारे ऊपर दुबारा आक्रमण नहीं होगा, तब तक हम बढ़ा जाने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। इस तरह से उनके मन में एक तरह का असंतोष भरा हुआ है। तो कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि ताशकद घोषणा के बारे में जो यह कहा जा रहा है कि वह बड़े महत्व का है, उससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। यह घोषणा राष्ट्र के सम्मान के विरुद्ध है और मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ।

दूसरा प्रश्न जो राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में उठाया है, वह खाद्यान्न के सबंध में है। खाद्यान्न के सबंध में सारा दोष वर्षा न होने पर दिया गया है, लेकिन मैं यह बात नहीं मानता हूँ कि वर्षा न होने की वजह से ही हमारे देश में अन्न की इतनी गम्भीर स्थिति पैदा हो गई है इसका सारा दोष उस पर मड़ा जा रहा है। हमारी सरकार की खाद्यान्न के सबंध में जो दुलमुल नीति अभी तक चली आ रही है उसी का परिणाम है कि आज भी तीसरी योजना के अंतिम वर्ष में हमारे देश में अन्न के बारे में इस तरह की विषम परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है, जो हमारे लिए एक लज्जा की बात है। हमने तीसरी योजना में अन्न उत्पादन का जो लक्ष्य रखा था उसको पूरा करने के बजाय हम उत्पादन कम करते जा रहे हैं। पहले दो सालों में तो हमने इस सबंध में कुछ प्रगति भी की थी लेकिन तीसरे साल में हम पीछे चले गये हैं। आज हमें हजारों टन अन्न बाहर से मगाना पड़ रहा है और हम इसके लिए बाध्य हैं। जो देश कृषि प्रधान देश कहलाता है उसको दूसरे देशों से अन्न की याचना करनी पड़ रही है, यह हम सब लोगों के लिए लज्जा की बात है। आज 18 वर्षों से चाहे वर्षा हुई हो या न हुई हो, फिर भी हम बराबर बाहर से अन्न मगाते रहे हैं। इसका कारण यह है कि जो मूलभूत समस्या है उसकी ओर हमने ध्यान नहीं दिया है ताकि हम अन्न के सबंध में स्वावलम्बी बन सकें। आज देश

की क्या स्थिति है? आज देश के कई हिस्सों में अकाल पड़ा हुआ है और लोग भूखे मर रहे हैं, लेकिन सरकार इस बात को स्वीकार नहीं करती है। पहले सरकार यह कहती रही कि हमारे यहाँ किसी तरह का दुष्काल नहीं है, खाद्यान्न का किसी तरह का अभाव नहीं है। लेकिन जब उसे वस्तुस्थिति का ज्ञान हुआ तो उसने स्वीकार किया कि हमारे देश में अन्न का अभाव है और हमारे यहाँ अन्न का दुष्काल पड़ा हुआ है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी कई प्रदेशों में अन्न के अभाव से मौते हो रही हैं और छोटे छोटे बच्चे भी अन्न न मिलने की वजह से मर रहे हैं। हमारे यहाँ पशुधन की जिस तरह की स्थिति है उसके बारे में भी कोई नहीं चिल्लाता है। मेरे प्रदेश में भी अन्न के अभाव की वजह से मौते हो गई हैं और इस सबंध में मेरे पास कई प्रकार की खबरे आ रही हैं। आज वहाँ पर अकाल पड़ा हुआ है और तीन सालों से बरमान नहीं हुई है और इसकी वजह से वहाँ पर हालत दिन प्रति दिन खराब होती जा रही है। आज मेरे प्रदेश में अनाज का इतना अभाव है कि लोगों के पास खाना नहीं है और इस सबंध में वहाँ की विधान सभा में कई सवाल उठाये गये और एडजर्नमेंट मोशन हुए। जब सरकार ने इस पर भी इस समस्या की ओर विशेष ध्यान नहीं दिया तो हमारे कुछ सदस्य सत्याग्रह करने को तैयार हुए ताकि सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ जाये। लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी आज तक सरकार ने ऐसा कोई कारगर कदम नहीं उठाया जिस से वहाँ अन्न के बारे में कोई फैसला हो सके या अन्न के बारे में वहाँ की परिस्थिति कुछ ठीक हो पाये। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि पहले तो यह सरकार सोती रहती है और इसके खिलाफ शांतिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन या हड़ताल का कोई हथियार कारगर नहीं होता है। जब तक जनता के लोग इस बात पर उतारू नहीं हो जाते कि वे वायलेंस करें और ऐसा आन्दोलन करें जिस से सरकारी प्रापर्टी को नुकसान हो और उसका सरकारी कार्यालयों के ऊपर काँट

असर हो तब तक यह लोग जागते नहीं हैं। फिर उसका द्रोप राजकीय लोगों के ऊपर, राजकीय पार्टी के ऊपर मड़ा जाता है। मैं ऐसे कामों से सहमत नहीं हूँ। लेकिन लोग भी क्या करे। जब लोगों के भूखों मरने की बात होती है तब लोगों के लिये शांत रहना असंभव हो जाता है। इसलिये मैं आप के द्वारा सरकार को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि अब परिस्थिति काफी बदल गई है और दिनों दिन बदलती जा रही है और इसलिये सरकार को शीघ्र ही इसके सम्बन्ध में कोई कदम उठाना चाहिये। अन्न के सम्बन्ध में शीघ्र ही इस सदन में वादविवाद होने वाला है, इसलिये मैं उसके ऊपर अभी और ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहता।

अब एक सवाल जो सब के मन में है वह इमरजेंसी और डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूलस को समाप्त करने के सम्बन्ध में है। जब इस देश के ऊपर चीन का आक्रमण हुआ था तब हम सब लोगों ने एक मत से इमरजेंसी और डी० आई० आर० को कायम करने का जो सरकारी प्रस्ताव था उसका समर्थन किया था। लेकिन उस वक्त भी हमने सरकार को चेतावनी दी थी कि अगर सरकार उसका दुरुपयोग करेगी और जो दूसरे देश का आक्रमण हुआ था उसके सम्बन्ध में उसका उपयोग नहीं करेगी और सामान्य लोगों के ऊपर उसका उपयोग करेगी तो उसको बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जायगा। लेकिन वैसा ही हुआ। चीन का आक्रमण होने के बाद चीनी तो वापस चले गये लेकिन सरकार अपनी नींद में सोती रही और जिन के हक में इमरजेंसी और डी० आई० आर० के पावर्स दिये गये थे उन्होंने उसका दुरुपयोग करना प्रारम्भ कर दिया। इमरजेंसी और डी० आई० आर० को कायम रखने में जो आज का शासक वर्ग है, सत्ताधारी पार्टी है उसका वैसेटुड इंटेस्ट हो गया है। जैसे कोई पंजीवादी अपनी पूजी खोना नहीं चाहता, उसी प्रकार आज का शासक वर्ग, आज का अधिकारी वर्ग जो उसको अधिकार मिले द्ये हैं उनको समाप्त करना नहीं चाहता है

क्योंकि उससे उसको अपनी सत्ता कायम रखने में काफी आसानी होती है। अभी एक माननीय सज्जन ने कहा कि आज भी इमरजेंसी कायम है और दूसरे सज्जन ने कहा कि बताइये, कहाँ इमरजेंसी है। यह सभी जानते हैं कि आज भी हमारा हजारों वर्ग मील इलाका चीनियों के अधिकार में है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार अगर इमरजेंसी रखे तो उसमें मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन सरकार को यह कहना पड़ेगा कि जबर्न चीन के अधिकार में जो हमारा इलाका है उस को हम वापस ले लेंगे, उसको वापस ले लेना चाहते हैं और उसके लिये हम इमरजेंसी कायम रखना चाहते हैं। यदि सरकार ऐसा कहे तो मुझे इमरजेंसी कायम रखने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी। लेकिन सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में न कोई कदम उठाती है और न कोई बात करती है। ताशकन्द घोषणा के बाद एक मत प्रवाह इस दिशा में भी हो रहा है कि जब हमारा झगड़ा पाकिस्तान के साथ इस तरह से सुलझाया जा सकता है तो क्यों नहीं चीन के साथ भी उसी प्रकार कुछ ले दे कर समझौता करे। ताशकन्द घोषणा से जो एक प्रकार का वातावरण पैदा हुआ है उसका गलत अर्थ लगाया जा रहा है। इसलिये ताशकन्द घोषणा का भी हम विरोध करते हैं। इमरजेंसी के बारे में सरकार यह बहाना करती है कि चूँकि हमारी भूमि पर चीन का अधिकार है इसलिये इमरजेंसी कायम रखना हमारे लिये आवश्यक है। लेकिन चीन ने जो हमारा हिस्सा दबा रखा है उसके बारे में न आप कुछ कहते हैं और न आप उसको लेने की कोई तैयारी करते हैं। फिर नतीजा यह होता है कि जो अधिकार लोगों को दिये गये हैं, जिस ब्यूरोक्रेसी को दिये गये हैं, वह उनका सही तौर से इस्तेमाल नहीं करती है बल्कि उनका दुरुपयोग करती है। इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूँ कि आज इसमें कोई जस्टीफिकेशन नहीं है, कोई कारण नहीं है कि डी० आई० आर० या इमरजेंसी यहाँ पर रहे। उसको तुरन्त समाप्त कर देना चाहिये।

[श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर]

अब दूसरा सवाल जिसके बारे में राष्ट्र-पतिजी के अभिभाषण में खामोशी अस्तित्व की गई है वह देश में बढ़ती हुई बेकारी का है। वैसे ही इस देश में काफी बेकारी थी। लेकिन कुछ समय से भिन्न भिन्न प्रदेशों में वर्षा न होने के कारण बड़े बड़े बाध भर नहीं पाये और उनकी जो लेविल थी, वह कम होती गई और फिर उससे परिणाम यह हुआ कि उन बाधों में बिजली कम उत्पन्न हुई। बिजली कम उत्पन्न होने के कारण, जो उससे कारखाने चलते हैं, वे दिनों दिन बन्द होते जा रहे हैं और उन कारखानों में जो काम करने वाले हैं वे बेकार होते जा रहे हैं। हमारे प्रदेश में 75 परसेंट बिजली की कटौती होने से कई कारखाने या तो बन्द पड़े हैं या आधे दिन तक या कुछ समय तक काम करते हैं। परिणामतः बहुत से लोग बेकार होते जा रहे हैं, लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार कोई कारगर कदम नहीं उठाती है। सरकार केवल इसमें लगी हुई है कि दोष किमका है, स्टेट गवर्नमेन्ट का है या केन्द्रीय गवर्नमेन्ट का है, किस ने किस को बिजली दी, किस ने बिजली नहीं दी और कौन इसका जिम्मेदार है। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार कोई भी कारगर कदम नहीं उठाती है।

एक बात मैं और इस सदन के सामने कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि आज ऐसी परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो रही है जिस में केन्द्रीय सरकार और राज्य सरकारों में आपस में कोई कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है, आपस का कोई समझौता नहीं है, आपस में मिल कर कोई काम करने की इच्छा नहीं है। आप अनाज का ही उदाहरण ले लीजिये। केन्द्रीय सरकार यह चाहती थी कि अनाज के सम्बन्ध में कोई एक नीति अपनाई जाय और राज्य सरकारें उसके ऊपर अमल करें। लेकिन राज्य सरकारें उसके विपरीत काम कर रही हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पहले तो यह कहा था कि तीन लाख की आबादी वाले जो टाउन्स हैं उनमें राशनिंग की जायगी, फिर दस लाख

से ऊपर की आबादी वाले टाउन्स के बारे में कहा गया और अब कुछ ही शहरों के बारे में कहा जा रहा है। लेकिन आज कोई भी राज्य सरकार इस काम को अपने हाथ में लेने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। आज मध्य प्रदेश या ऐसी ही जो दूसरी मरगलम स्टेट्स हैं, जहाँ अनाज काफी है, वह भी केन्द्रीय सरकार से यह माग करती है कि जब तक केन्द्रीय सरकार उनको अनाज नहीं देगी, तब तक वे अपने यहाँ राशनिंग नहीं लागू करेंगी। इसी प्रकार प्रोहिबिशन के बारे में राज्य सरकारें कहती हैं कि हम दारूबन्दी करेंगे, नशाबन्दी करेंगे लेकिन हम को केन्द्रीय सरकार कुछ पैसा दे। इसी प्रकार कई ऐसे मामले हैं जिन को केन्द्रीय सरकार नहीं चाहती है लेकिन राज्य सरकारें बगैर केन्द्रीय सरकार से पूछे उन कामों को करती रहती हैं। यह सब कहने का मेरा तात्पर्य यह है कि आज केन्द्रीय सरकार एक तरफ जा रही है और राज्य सरकारें दूसरी तरफ जा रही हैं और जनता जो है वह बेचारी बीच में उनके संघर्ष में पिसती जा रही है।

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat) Madam, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks and express my gratitude to our worthy President for his kindly Address. The Address begins with a sad note, and rightly too, on the sad demise of our revered Prime Minister. I share the grief with others. Shastriji fought as a brave man when aggression from Pakistan came. From our Rajya Sabha's galleries I have seen his heart of compassion, even tears coming down, when he was mentioning the suffering of the people. He pursued the cardinal principle to which we are wedded, namely, the quest of peace. He knew that our problems could not be solved by arms, but only at the table, and he pursued that objective. And it must be said—it was in fulfilment of his great passion for peace that as a man of peace, he signed the Tashkent Agreement. Destiny called him and he died a glorious death.

The President has rightly referred to the Tashkent Agreement. More than the letter, the spirit is significant. Since so much has been said about it, I need not say any further except that it opens out a new chapter of friendship with Pakistan. It also opens out a new avenue and even guides the other countries as to how to solve their problems and that is why the Tashkent Agreement is a great achievement.

The President has rightly referred to our better relations with all the nations of the world except China and that is true. In our crises, they were not idle. Even in our trouble about food shortage and in giving loans, America is our friend, Russia is our friend and all the other countries have been showing sympathy and understanding of our problems. The help these countries have given in our developmental programmes and in our Herculean efforts to tide over the difficulties to reach the particular goal is welcomed by one and all.

Coming to the problem of the Chinese threat, which is linked up with the question of the emergency and the DIR, we must not take a very theoretical view of the emergency or a theoretical view of the DIR, and this Government should not be accused of being trigger-happy. Recently, the Home Minister came out with a statement that the Government will use the DIR only in cases concerning security. What do we see nowadays? What do we see in the food crisis? What do we see in the hartals? What do we see in labour and other troubles? Buses are smashed; heads are broken. There is this emotional discharge of feelings which leads to violence. The Government may not be able to give a particular quantum of rice, but it does not mean that the position should be thus exploited. There are still such elements in the country. Only when they know that they will be dealt with firmly and firmly alone, will they behave perfectly well. Otherwise, this tender plant of democracy is not out

of danger yet. I am not for the indiscriminate use of the DIR. But everybody is accustomed to say that this should go and this offends against the fundamental rights. As the Home Minister rightly said, the security of the State and the maintenance of law and order in the context of all these happenings should be borne in mind.

Coming to the food problem, we have been discussing the abolition of the zonal system since long. Obviously so. It was said some time back that it would be considered after three months. Even the A.I.C.C. has passed a resolution. Now, a Committee is there.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMACHANDRA SATHE) in the Chair.]

Well, it may be that there are some arguments for the Food Minister on this. But the question is: Is there no necessity for evolving a national policy? It should be that India as such should be either surplus or deficit, it is not that 15 districts are surplus and thirteen districts are deficit. Either the whole country is surplus or deficit and not that one enjoys everything and another suffers starvation. This will create a sort of parochial spirit which should be done away with by evolving a national policy. In this connection, it is good that now a Committee is sitting over this matter.

Then, take for instance the Narmada Project which is the lifeline of Gujarat. Madhya Pradesh may be interested in it, may be concerned with it, may have some case about it. Maharashtra may also have the same case. Gujarat also has a case. There is the Khosla Commission appointed. Even the full report has not been gone through. The Minister of a neighbouring State will say that it is not acceptable and it will create great concern in Gujarat. When all these Chief Ministers belong to one party and are of one Government, there should be no difficulty in ironing out the differences. A chain of action and reaction and great concern have

[Shri G. H. Valimohmed Momin] already started in Gujarat that the Narmada Project is being delayed, this or that. It causes great concern. All this could be avoided if a uniform policy is adopted and if in such a matter, the Chief Ministers of the different States are called upon to iron out their differences.

Coming to the point of administrative reforms, much has been said that this machinery is not able to cope with the task which the present urge for further advancement needs. I am happy that after certain consultations, an Administrative Reforms Commission has been appointed under the able chairmanship of Shri Morarji Desai. It should expedite its work and it should see that wherever there are hurdles, wherever there are cobwebs, wherever there are bottlenecks, they are all removed. As we know, if justice is delayed, it is justice denied. Therefore, if every man's application or every policy which has to be formulated is implemented by proper efforts in time, then, according to me, it will give good results.

One word about socialism. People say that the Congress Government, though it claims to be wedded to socialism, to achieve socialism, is not doing anything. Criticism will come from three quarters. The independents or the protagonists of the vested interest or of the *laissez-faire* theory will come and say, "Oh! you are trying to be Communist. You say that you are socialist, but you are going towards Russia." The Communists will come and say, "Oh! you are pro-America." The S.P. and P.S.P. people and others will come and say, "This is not socialism. What is this?" This is a mixed economy, there is a public sector, there is a private sector. There is inducement given to everybody. There is concession given to the middle classes. There are rights guaranteed to the labourers. There are trade unions; there is labour membership. All these things lead to the satisfaction of the needs of all sections of the society, not alone of the

rich, not alone of the upper strata of the people, not alone of the middle classes, not alone of the poor people. We have been attending to the Adivasis, we have been attending to the Scheduled Castes, we have been attending to a number of things. Somebody—an independent Member or a Member from Gujarat—said that there is no drinking water in the whole country. That is not the point. In particular areas there are certain difficulties. How can you say that when thousands of machines have been put up and water is provided from wells? There is no use in saying that there is no machinery, there is no water, there is no irrigation, there is no Bhakra-Nangal. You close your eyes to all these things and go on criticising. I think this kind of criticism will fall more heavily on the critics themselves than on the Government.

There are one or two problems to which I want to refer. Sometimes we talk of family planning as if we are tired of overpopulation. We say that it is because of that that we are not able to meet the food problem. You cannot solve this problem riding roughly over the sentiments of the people. Children are not the bane of our social life, our family life. Family Planning must come on a voluntary basis, it cannot come on a compulsory basis. It cannot be done by contraceptives and other methods. They open temptations to the young, impressionable minds, which will lead them to immorality. Tomorrow, you may say, we are tired of overpopulation and are unable to solve the food problem and so people of the ages of 65 or 70 and above should also go away so that we can have food. This is not the way to meet the nation's problem. The problem is such that each man should understand that he is responsible to the generation or to the children he brings forth, and you must go on a moral basis. Unfortunately, this Government's spokesmen and the Leader of the House go further and say that they will even legalise what is known as abortion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ram, Ram.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: It is certainly Ram, Ram, Allah, Allah. The question is: You are saying this to which class of people. Will it not open the doors for immorality? We do not want to ape, in our customs, what other countries have been doing. Howsoever poor the country may be, howsoever the country may be suffering, one great thing is that still we have not given up the moral backbone of our social life, which is our homely life.

The other thing is: What have we been doing in the name of secularism? If we remove the Hindu name from the Banaras University, Muslim name from the Aligarh University, Khalsa college name from the Sikh colleges, St. Stephen's name from the Christian colleges, we think secularism will be established. But are we able to face our people when their sentiments are aroused saying what is there in name? Instead of that, let a Muslim remain a Muslim, let the Muslim name be associated with the Aligarh University, let the Hindu name be associated with the Banaras Hindu University. But see that these Universities do not become the cess pool where they create communalist mosquitos, but become an atmosphere where the people of all communities inter-mingle themselves, respect each other's identity, respect each other's individuality and let us not run away just to establish by law secularism saying this and that. (*Time bell rings.*) Madam, if my time is over, I would say only one word. I thank our President for his Address and I would say only a word about the young leadership. We are all happy that our Prime Minister is young, our Deputy Minister and others are young. Let this young generation look upon their elders for guidance also and let the elders give them blessings. It is not alone the young who will run the show, it is not alone the old who will run the show. Let the young have the blessings of the old; let them secure it, and let the elder give them their blessings and we

will succeed in reaching what our President rightly says, "to our goal which is very clear", that is, to bring prosperity and happiness not only to the Indian people but to establish peace in the world at large.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY. Madam Vice-Chairman, we are at the fag end of the discussion on the President's Address and I do not want to travel on the same ground which many other Members have already travelled. I rise to speak stressing one particular point.

Madam, many Members have spoken about the uselessness and danger of the continuance of the D.I.R. Strangely enough, a few Congress Members also have spoken on the need for the removal of the D.I.R. To stress that point home more firmly, I give an example that happened in my home State recently, Madam. In a place called Sirkali taluk in the Madras States, there took place recently a panchayat election in which two parties were contesting. The Congress was defeated in the contest. And what happened immediately after is an interesting point, Madam. One lawyer of a particular party—that happens to be my party—by name, Mr. Pitchai, who had put in a good record of service both in his profession and in politics, was waylaid and beaten by hired *goondas* of the Congress. This lawyer was carrying documents, promissory notes and valuable records worth about a lakh of rupees and they were snatched away from him by the *goondas*. This lawyer and his driver with wounds had made a report to the police with a doctor's certificate that both of them had received wounds by attack. The local police, under instructions of the D.S.P., and other top-ranking police officials had taken action and the culprits were about to be apprehended. Now, Madam, the story takes an interesting turn. The culprits approached the Minister and the prosecution was eventually dropped. The poor lawyer ran here and there seeking justice and until yesterday morning, Madam, nothing had happen-

[Shri G. H. Valimohmed Momin] ed. Even my leader, Rajaji, had written a letter to the Congress boss, Mr. Kamaraj, who is the *de facto* Super Minister of Madras. But nothing had happened in spite of that letter. I asked our followers in that area to hold public meetings and demonstrations exposing the official interference, not the official interference, but the ministerial interference. They told me that since the D.I.R. was in full force, they were afraid to do so. Is it not a fitting case to demand, Madam, that D.I.R. should be withdrawn immediately? If the Government is not willing to do so even when the elections are approaching, I wonder how the Opposition is going to face the elections. If they say they cannot. I give an alternative suggestion to them, that is, let them keep the D.I.R. intact and vacate their ministerial positions six months before the elections. We do not mind if the D.I.R. is left in the hands of the officials but not with these Ministers who, I am afraid, are acting like buccaneers of the Elizabethan time. If this is done, I assure this House that the next Ministry in Madras will certainly not be a Congress Ministry but a Ministry belonging to the Opposition. That is why, this D.I.R. is being hugged to the bosom of the Congress buccaneers, and they have the cheek to come here and talk about Fundamental Rights.

I read in the papers, Madam, that Shri Asoka Mehta yesterday had tried to reply to Mr. Annadurai over the language issue and economic malady of the country. Shri Asoka Mehta had said that the example of Canada in regard to language question is incomparable to India. I do agree with him. No country is akin to India. No country has so many religions and languages and multiplicity of cultures. India is the only unique country which has some unity in diversity. That is why, Madam, it is all the more reason why we should not have one language as our national language. If we ought to have one language, it should not be a language of any particular region, but it should be a common language

equally foreign to everybody. That is why we demand English to remain as the common official language.

As regards economic malady, I have no faith in the prescription given by Mr. Asoka Mehta. I know Mr. Mehta for a very long time. If I am correct, I met him in 1946 or so and I had the honour of having translated a book written by him. And when I recollect those days, really I am sorry for Mr. Asoka Mehta. In those days he looked hale and healthy. When I looked at him for the first time after his becoming a Minister, I was really shocked. He looked so sick and so run down. How could I expect such a sickly man to administer medicine or prescription to a nation which is afflicted by this economic malady? So, Madam, I would rather advise him as an old friend, let him seek first medical aid for himself before he suggests any aid for the country's economic malady.

Another important matter, Madam, that I would like to bring to the notice of this Government is this. A few days before we gave a State reception to Dr. Nkrumah, President of Ghana. Before the flags that were put up in his honour were removed, the news came that he had been removed from the *gaddi*. I want to know whether our people in Ghana, our Ambassador was aware that a strong storm was gathering against Dr. Nkrumah there and he was about to be removed.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This happens with all our Ambassadors, always.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Did they inform our Government so that we might have been cautious in giving receptions and felicitations and making tall promises to Dr. Nkrumah? This is not an isolated incident, Madam. When late Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister, he went to Turkey to pay a State visit before the downfall of the then Turkish Government just a few days after. When Panditji returned to India, much before his arrival here, there the news was that the Govern-

ment which gave him a State reception had fallen. It was a surprise and shock to Panditji. I wonder what our Ambassadors stationed in foreign countries are doing. Is it not their duty to inform the home Government about the political trends in those countries?

Before I wind up my speech, Madam, I repeat that I appeal for the repeal of the D.I.R. immediately. Also drop this talk of Hindi as the sole official language. Also I earnestly appeal to the ruling party that they should amend the Constitution in such a manner as to infuse confidence in the minds of the people of the South.

Finally, Madam, I have a few words to say on corruption. There is a document here on Mr. Sukhadia, the Rajasthan Chief Minister. It is a document of 42 pages. When it came into my hands and I read it, I found it to read like a James Bond Novel; it is so thrilling. Authors will take many examples out of this memorandum. It contains 30 pages.

**SHRI RAM SINGH (Uttar Pradesh):** Why do you not keep it on the Table of the House?

**SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY:** I have no objection to place it on the Table of the House if the hon'ble Member wants. It contains 30 pages, closely printed. The size is foolscap.

I wonder whether my time 5 P.M. would permit me to read some of these allegations found therein. In these 30 printed pages there are 42 charges against the Chief Minister and if you permit me, Madam, to read the mere headings of this document, you will be surprised.

*(Interruptions)*

Do you want me to read them?

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** Why not keep it on the Table of the House?

82 RS—6.

**SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY:** I have no objection to place it on the Table of the House if I am permitted to do so.

**HON. MEMBERS:** No, no.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** I would only point out to you, Madam, that the fact is that both Congress Members as well as Members of the Opposition are appealing to you for placing it on the Table of the House.

**HON. MEMBERS:** No, no.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE):** No, it does not depend upon the wish of any Member. You go on, Mr. Mariswamy. You cannot place it on the Table of the House.

**SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY:** I shall place it on the Table of the House if you permit me.

*(Interruptions)*

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE):** Order, order. You proceed, Mr. Mariswamy, you have only a few minutes more at your disposal.

**SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY:** Very well, Madam. I will read the headings only of the charges. Charge No. 1 is about Mr. Sukhadia's dealings with some of the commercial firms. Charge No. 2 is again about a commercial firm. Charge No. 4 deals with the Rice and Macca Deals. Here it is very interesting reading. I wish I had the time to read the details mentioned here. *(Interruptions)* Charge No. 5 deals with Panarwa Jungle Affairs. Charge No. 6 relates to his dealings with Jaipur Udyog Limited.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** What is this affair about?

**SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY:** It is all about the deals entered into by this great Mr. Sukhadia whom they wanted as the General Secretary of the Congress. Thank God that he was not taken on as the General Secretary.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is because of all these charges that he wanted to escape from the Chief Ministership of Rajasthan.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Now this is a document signed by 17 people, most of them are M.L.As., and some are people very eminent in public life, and they are not corrupt as many of our Congress Ministers. Then charge No. 13 is about a Trip to New York. Charge No. 18 is about Mica Mines. Charge No. 19 is related to Ajanta Hotel, Udaipur. Charge No. 20 is about Swadeshi Cotton Mills, Udaipur. Charge No. 21 relates to Vinayak Chemical Ltd., Kota. Charge No. 22 is related to Deena Bhai, brother-in-law of somebody. Charge No. 23 relates to Neem Ka Thana and other Monopolies. Charge No. 24 relates to Misuse of Nehru Award. Madam, we have heard before about misuse of National Defence Fund collections and other things but this is the first time I am hearing about Misuse of Nehru Award. Charge No. 25 relates to Nationalisation of Bus Routes. Now this is a scandal everywhere. Even in my own State, Madam, I have got so many scandals about these bus routes, and rich people are given bus routes in return for a few lakhs of rupees for the Congress election fund. If they give a few lakhs of rupees, they are given bus routes, and the funds obtained from them are utilised to defeat the opponents against the Congress in elections. Charge No. 26 relates to Party Funds from Government Undertakings.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): May I interrupt my hon. friend and ask him to produce the evidence that he has in regard to this particular charge? Has he got any evidence?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: I do not yield. Please sit down.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I am asking a question of my hon. friend to produce the evidence in regard to this particular charge.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: On a point of explanation. Since he has raised a question, on a point of explanation I, have to rise. The fact is .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): But you need not give the explanation. Mr. Mariswamy is on his legs and he can.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Madam, this Memorandum has been submitted to the Prime Minister. Now, when the M.Ps. and the M.L.As., met the Home Minister in continuation of this Memorandum, which had been submitted to the late Prime Minister, Mr. Nanda said that the enquiry against Mr. Sukhadia was progressing and that he would take action in consultation with the Prime Minister. But as the climate changed from Delhi to Jaipur, Mr. Nanda is reported to have said that the charges were baseless. But it passes one's imagination to comprehend as to how Mr. Nanda could be right in arriving at such a conclusion diametrically opposite to his earlier one. Is it not a political decision?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: We are prepared to substantiate it.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: All these signatories are prepared to substantiate every charge they have levelled against the concerned people in power.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Unless you can substantiate them you cannot make such a statement here.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In many cases we have substantiated.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: On a point of order, Madam. Nobody can make a defamatory statement of this nature on the floor of this House. Nobody can.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: On the same point of order I have got a right to reply. Since a point of order has been raised I can also . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Your time is now over, Mr. Mariswamy.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I think that portion should be expunged.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Order, order. Mr. Sitaram Jaipuria.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, Vice-Chairman, it is rather a matter of fate that I have been asked to speak after such a heated speech, a heat generated more by the interruptions caused to the speech, a heat which we have been witnessing for some time, and I do hope that the Members will show indulgence to me to place my observations before the House. I join others in expressing our thanks to our revered President for addressing the Members of both Houses of Parliament. Indeed he had been very realistic and, I would also say, not too optimistic in his Address.

Now the period that has gone by has been one of great problems. The country has faced and is facing one of the worst food problems that we ever had to face. The Pakistani aggression added a lot of worries to it. Not only that; the resultant cut in foreign aid had aggravated the situation. On the top of all that, the most talked about Tashkent agreement, whose results are yet to be seen—it has to be seen as to what amount of lasting peace, if any, it brings—has certainly made us lose one of our greatest leaders and a son of the soil, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. Truly he was a Lal Bahadur Shastri of this country, Lal because he was the son of a great land and a commoner at that, Bahadur because he fought bravely, and Shastri because he acted according to his belief in Shastras—what he thought was right—and

because he gave a sermon to the world, the sermon of peace, how to live in peace and how to fight a battle. And we all pay our homage to that great soul.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh): Let us rise for two minutes.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA: I will request the hon. Member that in a matter of such a nature a little more sobriety is probably called for—in all humility I say this.

The other point that I would like to make, Madam, is that there have been certain glaring omissions in the Address of the President. No serious mention has been made about China except this one line indication that “our relations with \* \* \* China still continue to be strained,” and that we have “to be vigilant and strong.” In other words, I humbly submit, we are going back on past undertakings, going back on the solemn resolve of this Parliament in that regard. Do we or do we not accept that a country like China, of which the entire peace-loving world is scared that their manners, their ways of dealing, are a matter of worry and agony to all concerned? Are they going to give back our land? Does it mean that only because we are vigilant and strong we will get back our lost land? I had hoped and I wished that the President had stressed a little more on that and instilled a new hope in the minds of the people that the land that has been lost by us will be regained, that the glory of our motherland will be regained and that we shall again be in possession of it and be possessed of power and strength and dignity.

Not only that, the President's Address has not made even a mention of Kerala, where President's rule has been extended. It is not that alone that the extension of the President's rule in Kerala has not been made mention of. I had hoped that the Government of India, I mean the persons who had drafted that speech and given

[Shri Sitaram Jaipuria.]

the proposals, would have taken into consideration the fact that President's rule was applied to Kerala, and mentioned it. But no mention of President's rule in Kerala has at all been mentioned in the President's speech. And when the President's rule in that State has been extended, a State where democratic principles have been practically negatived, and when the President is the custodian of democratic principles there, I had expected that President's rule and its further extension in Kerala would find a place in the President's Address, and also a clear mention as to why it was necessary, and what he proposed to do should have also been mentioned. Not only that, I would not like to say much about the D.I.R. because quite a few of our friends have already mentioned it. I would only say this much. In our country we are not wanting in laws. In fact the laws that we are making are too many in number. We have not hesitated to amend even the Constitution a number of times. There is necessity for continuing the D.I.R. and every time using it. Many in the land including many in this House, except some Chief Ministers who may like to have it as a convenient sword are for ending the D.I.R. I do submit that in the present context, with all the laws that we have been making, the extension and the use of the D.I.R. seem to be unnecessary.

The Naga problem which has been threatening our sovereignty to some extent in the sense that they want a completely separate sovereign body which our Constitution does not permit, does not find mention in the President's Address. The Prime Minister spent some precious time in discussions with the Naga leaders. Perhaps these talks have produced nothing so far. Let us hope that their outcome will be better in the future. Even a mention of it is not found in the President's Address. I do think that when the President's Address is presented before Parliament it should contain generally such points of inter-

est which affect the entire country so that Members of Parliament can also devote a little time and attention to those burning topics on which depend the fate and the future of our country.

We have been, if I may say so, losing a little grip in our diplomacy. While the President has been pleased to say that we are fortunate in having friendly relations with almost all countries in the world, I would only remind this House that when the Pakistani aggression was there, what was the friendly support that we got from these friendly countries of the world? Which country came forward and said that Pakistan had committed aggression? In the present atmosphere of things I would certainly not like to be very vociferous and mention about Pakistani atrocities when that aggression took place. But I would most humbly submit that if you see which countries came forward to say that Pakistan had committed aggression, you find there was hardly any. They were looking on and observing. Under such conditions if you feel that our relations have been friendly, then I think you are a little mistaken and it is time that we reorient our diplomatic policy so that we have some friends, some friendly neighbours. A friend in need is a friend indeed, as the saying goes. I do hope that the countries whom we feel are our friends, will come to our help in times of trial and they will be our friends on whom we can depend and to whom also we can be of service if they are in need of our help.

Madam, about the economic progress of the country I would not like to say much at this stage because we are going to discuss the Budget. The Economic Review that the Finance Minister submitted to the House was realistic in its approach, but no solution is found in it. In the Budget a number of things were expected. Many thought that the Budget was going to revive the capital market and boost up the economy of the country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you discussing the Budget now?

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA: The preamble that the Finance Minister gave us indicated that the Finance Minister had gone deep into the matter of finding out the reasons for the present sluggishness in the economic condition of the country. But I am constrained to say that the solutions that have been suggested are not going to help us to achieve the results that we all wish to attain. After all, history repeats itself. If we want to learn from history, we should take the history of other countries like Japan and Germany where a liberal taxation policy had been the basis of their economy. I do hope that by learning the lessons set by such developed countries we shall be able to bring in policies which will improve our economic condition and we shall be better off all over. (*Time bell rings*) I shall finish in a couple of minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): One more minute.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA: On the question of food, the less said the better. If I say that the food policy has been bungled, I hope I would not be far from the truth. The whole question is that when we knew that there was shortage of food, when we knew that many States like Kerala were having acute shortage, there is no doubt that it was the duty of the Government to realise that and to see that food was rushed to those places where the shortage was felt most. If after the starting of the agitation the requirements are met, then it does not give a very rosy picture. As a friend said a little while ago, it appears that an impression is gaining ground all over the country that the Government's ear can be reached, that the Government's attention can be invited only by creating agitations. Kerala has been mentioned as an example. The

Punjabi Suba question or demand is also there and the Prime Minister has to make an appeal every day for one reason or the other because certain agitation is feared. In the Banaras University the name was changed quite unnecessarily and when an agitation was started, we kept quiet and the whole thing is almost given up for the present, it seems. That clearly indicates that agitations are required to attract the attention of the Government. I do hope that in a democratic set-up of things, the Government will create conditions where the public at large will feel that it is not agitation that will bring results but the reasonableness of their demands alone will improve matters.

There are a number of controversies that are going on. I will just refer to only one. The small car project has been talked about for the last so many years. Sometimes it is said that it is under consideration. Another Minister says that the matter has to be given the lowest priority. When the Japanese study team comes they say that the climate for investment is not good. A Minister from the United Kingdom says the same thing. When the Belgian entrepreneurs come they say that the aid has not been fully utilised. All these factors indicate that there is a certain amount of lack of coordination and a lack of realism and this is being appreciated in the different quarters. I do understand that in a vast country like ours, when we have such great problems and so many of them, there are bound to be certain lapses at times. But surely certain basic factors are very essential for the successful running of the Government which deserve prior attention. I do hope that if nothing else, at least clarity of thought and clearness of policy will be there. Due consideration, active consideration, in due course and such other hackneyed terms have already caught the imagination of the people and now they feel that these practically mean nothing. Something has got to be actually done which

[Shri Sitaram Jaipuria.]  
 alone will improve conditions in our country. We have a new Prime Minister, a leader of the youth, a lady who had been associated with politics right from her birth and I hope our new Prime Minister will give new life to the political life of the country and will create a place for India in the world, a place of honour and pride. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMAT TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): The Prime Minister will reply tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 1 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned eighteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 1966.