

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister has been pleased to furnish to the House whatever information he felt he could and I do not think any further supplementary is necessary. Therefore we shall go to the Motion of Thanks. Mr. Mani.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; I assure you, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would not ask any question on the investigation.

*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any^ thing else il unnecessary. I have already called Mr. Mani.

**.MOTION OF THANKS ON THE ADDRESS BY THE VICE-PRESIDENT DISCHARGING THE FUNC-TIONS OF THE PRESIDENT—*continued.***

SHRI A. D. MANI: (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, when the House adjourned the debate on the Vice-President's Address on Thursday last, I started making a reference to the Government's failure to carry out the terms of the firm resolve of Parliament of November 1962 regarding the vacation of Chinese aggression. Before going further into the matter, I should like to deal first with the extraordinary developments that have taken place as a result of the efforts of some members of the Security Council to reach a consensus on the question of Kashmir. Madam, I should like to say here that the debate in the Security Council has shown that in spite of the very diligent foreign policy which we have followed with sincerity we have not found many supporters for India in the world on important issues. This is a matter which should engage the serious consideration of the Government and they should find out what is wrong

with the essentials of our foreign policy.

Further, a reference was made—and I was surprised to see that reference made by the delegate of Czechoslovakia which has been a country very friendly to India—in the Security Council about the restoration of communal harmony in India and Pakistan. This more or less seems to have found support among other delegates of the Security Council. We expected that the delegate of Czechoslovakia, of all States, would have understood the position of India better and not made a statement which seems to suggest that minorities in India are not getting a square deal. I think, Madam, that in view of the fact that the communal situation in India has been referred to in the speeches of some members of the Security Council, the Government of India should suggest to those members, who raised this point, that they should send observers both to India and Pakistan and find out for themselves who deals with minorities better. We have got a very clean record here with all the statutory protection that we have given the minorities to give them equal opportunities for advancement in life. I am sure when such an offer is made, Pakistan will not accept it because it is Pakistan that has not treated its minorities squarely and in the manner we have done.

Madam, references have been made in this debate to the speech of Sir Patrick Dean. It is unfortunate that the Conservative Party of the U.K. has always taken a very unsympathetic view regarding India's stand on Kashmir but what is surprising is that in the House of Commons there has been no reference by the spokesmen of the British Labour Party to the speech of Sir Patrick Dean. It seems to me that even the British Labour Party is standing behind the Conservative party on the question of plebiscite. If this is to be the pattern of British views on the subject, I am

only strengthen the forces in India that want a severance of the Commonwealth connection.

Madam, now that Kashmir has figured so largely in the debates of the Security Council, I think it is the duty of the Government of India to assist those forces in Kashmir which want a broadbased Government and not a Government consisting of only one clique. It is unfortunate that the administration of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad has brought about a wave of controversy in Kashmir and somehow Kashmir seems to occupy a very special place not only in relation to its constitutional status but also in respect of corruption. Madam, many allegations have been made against Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, including those made by the hon. Member from Kashmir, Mr. Tariq. I do not want to deal with those allegations here but I must say here that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad has not said a word in reply to those allegations. At least in the case of Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon when allegations were made he came forward and said that he would have the matter enquired into by a Supreme Court Judge. In view of the fact that allegations have been made against his integrity and in view of the fact that allegations have been made that he has misused the administrative powers for proposal aggrandisement, it is the duty of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad to offer to the Prime Minister that he will subject himself to an enquiry by a Supreme Court Judge in the same way in which Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon has done in regard to the Opposition's allegations in the Punjab.

I would like to say further that in regard to Kashmir I am not in favour of the enforcement of the President's Rule as has been suggested by some persons. I think in view of the stand that we have taken on the Kashmir dispute in the Security Council, namely that there can be no question of a plebiscite, it is the duty of the legislature of Kashmir to pass a Reso-

lution accepting full integration with India. The responsibility is now with the leaders of the National Conference to come forward and say that Kashmir will be fully integrated with India and I do hope that such an action would be taken because there is no room now—now that Kashmir is a part of India—for any special status to be given to any part of the country.

Madam, I would like to go on and deal with the amendment which I have tabled about corruption and when the amendment comes up for discussion I shall state my views again. But I must say here that the Government of India cannot expect the Government servants to accept higher standards of moral rectitude when at the ministerial level the same standards of investigation are not applied. There has been a case in Kerala where a Minister was involved in a traffic accident and where he drove away the car without picking up the injured persons. Now, in the U.K. some months ago there was a Minister who gave his motor car to a youth who drove it without a licence and that youth was involved in an accident. The result was that the Minister tendered his resignation.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was in England.

SHRI A. D. MANI: In India it depends upon the individual power the Minister has with the Powers that be in Delhi that decide the course of investigation of the case. Madam, I would like to say that the time has come now—in view of the fact that public sector is expanding and that more and more controls are being imposed on the economy—for the Government to bring forward a Bill to set up tribunals consisting of two Judges of the Supreme Court to try cases of political corruption and to investigate into allegations against those in power.

Madam, I would like to go on to the question of China and that is a point

[Shri A. D. Mani.]  
 that I raised in a very brief way when the House adjourned on Thursday last. The Government of India have stated in reply to the disclosure made by Mr. Minoo Masani that there has been no such undertaking given to Mrs. Bandaranaike that the Indian troops will not march up to the MacMahon Line. Madam, unfortunately the impression is very widespread all over the world that such an undertaking has been given and I may quote here one of the messages that Premier Chou En-lai sent to Mrs. Bandaranaike, dated 19th January, 1963.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): What is the authority?

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is a published letter of Mr. Chou En-lai wherein a statement is made that it was China's understanding—please remember this, China's understanding—that in the eastern sector India will continue to refrain from sending her troops to reenter the areas south of the actual line of control as on November 7, 1959, vacated by the Chinese frontier guards and will send there only civilian personnel carrying arms for self-defence as India has done up till now. Copies of this have appeared in Delhi. This statement of Premier Chou En-lai has not been contradicted so far.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : The Prime Minister has said that there is no such understanding given and he has said that our military advisers have the fullest liberty to decide the issue on merits. He has said it in this very House.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Now, I do agree that somebody conveying some impression to Premier Chou En-lai does not bind the Government. It is hearsay evidence. But in view of the fact that statements have appeared

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: What the Prime Minister said in this House and

elsewhere should be acceptable to the learned Member.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : After the publication of the letter written by Mrs. Bandaranaike, a further clarification is needed.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am saying after the statement has been made. I would like to ask why the Government has not asked Mrs. Bandaranaike to come forward and dissociate herself from a wrong impression conveyed to the Chinese Government. We have got a right to ask a person, who comes and talks to us and conveys a different impression to somebody, to come forward and say: "That is not what I said." No such move has been made, by the Government of India to ask Mrs. Bandaranaike to come forward and publicly dissociate herself from the terms of her letter to Premier Chou En-lai. As long as that is not done, the suspicion will be widespread. We may believe the Prime Minister. We do. When he says that he has given no such assurance, we believe that. As long as that is not done, the suspicion will be widespread in the international field that such an assurance and undertaking has been given. Now, I would like the spokesman of the Government, when he replies to the debate, to say clearly and emphatically that this impression has not been given to Mrs. Bandaranaike, that Mrs. Bandaranaike made a false statement and that the Government of India would ask Mrs. Bandaranaike to come forward and dissociate herself from the views attributed to the Prime Minister of our Government. This is necessary for our national self-respect, because somehow the feeling has gone abroad that some secret deals have been entered into with the Chinese Government, through the intermediary of the Ceylon Prime Minister. They may be holding a false impression, but this impression has got to be dispelled.

Now, I understand that General Ne Win, when he came to India, made suggestions to our Government that the Colombo proposals should be reopened and that the Government of India should not take their stand only on the Colombo proposals but seek new avenues for a settlement of the dispute. I understand further—you may ask what is the source of information. I am a journalist and I know how things go on. I get information from various quarters. I understand that Sri Mountbatten also during his visit to India and later during his visit to Burma wanted this matter to be reopened. I should like to ask the Government whether it is their policy to allow the reopening of this issue. If it is going to be reopened as a result of the conversations with General Ne Win and Earl Mountbatten, it is only proper that the Government of India should come forward with a resolution asking for approval for resumption of talks with China. This cannot be done in a hole-and-corner fashion. We cannot yield to the importunities of friends who want us to reopen this issue with China. We must take our stand on the Resolution that has been adopted by this House as well as the other House that we will not rest content until we rid our territory of the aggressor.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I remind the hon. Member that immediately after the visit of General Ne Win, Mr. Dinesh Singh, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, restated the Government of India's stand that resumption of negotiations is possible only on the basis of acceptance of the Colombo proposals? The Colombo proposals are the basis.

SHRI A. D. MANI: No. I would like this statement to come—with great respect to Mr. Dinesh Singh—from somebody higher up in the Government. We would like the person who "or the Prime Minister to say it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: There are three.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I can show you many statements which are wrong, which have been made by Deputy Ministers, on the face of it. You yourself know that some of the answers to questions are not necessarily correct. I would like the Prime Minister . . .

Sma ARJUN ARORA: They are all very correct.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIK (Kerala); It is a reflection on the Deputy Minister.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like, the Prime Minister or any person who officiates for him in this House or otherwise to come forward and say that this matter will certainly be . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Reiteration of their stand.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . brought forward before Parliament and the consent of Parliament will be taken before negotiations. I feel so strongly about this matter that I felt that I should raise this point in this debate that the public at large seems to feel that somehow we have weakened our resolve to rid the Indian soil of this aggressor and that we want to enter into some deal which will be universally fashionable and which may be acceptable to some of the so-called intermediaries.

I do not want to say anything more except that these are issues on which we do expect a statement from the Government. Unfortunately, whenever the Government replies to debates of this character, some points are picked up and highlighted.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Only worthwhile points are picked up.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is not worth while for you to pick up a point which is very embarrassing to you. You

[Shri A. D. Mani.] know very well that these secret deals are being entered into and you do not want to deny them publicly. We do hope that the Government will come forward and make a clear statement that will rid the atmosphere of so much of suspicion that has been spread by reports that some such secret negotiations are going on.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I support the Motion of Thanks to the Vice-President. The Vice-President has spoken of our relations with Pakistan. This is a matter which vitally concerns us and is as important as the invasion of China. Since Pakistan invaded our territory in 1947, during the last sixteen years, there have been aggressive designs on the part of Pakistan. There has been a constant threat offered to us. Pakistan has joined China in her nefarious designs against our territory. Now, who is responsible for all these things. Everyone who reads the British statute the Government of India Act and the Instrument of Accession, knows, that the accession was in law final and irrevocable. It was as good and valid an accession as any accession of any other State in India. Anyone who reads the British statute and the Instrument of Accession will come to the conclusion that the legal result of this accession was that the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State became a territory of the Union of India and the union became indissoluble. Everyone now knows and there cannot be any dispute about the fact that Pakistan invaded the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State, indeed. Pakistan itself admitted later that her armies were on the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. Then while nations are talking of peace in the world—they speak repeatedly everyday of the United Nations Charter which bans the use of force and threat of the use of force,—how is it that we find this aggression, this use of force, these threats of the use of force tolerated and condoned? The only problem which emerges from this situation is that Pakistan should be prevented

from further aggression and should be compelled by public pressure to vacate the territory which it has illegally occupied.

Now, Madam, reference is made to the United Nations resolutions, forgetting that with the exception of the Cease-fire Agreement the rest was all conditional, forgetting that our Prime Minister while accepting the resolutions definitely stated that unless, or if—to be more correct—Pakistan does not implement these resolutions, they will not be binding upon the Government of India. And when these conditions which Pakistan had performed to fulfil were not fulfilled by Pakistan, how is it that anyone is entitled to say that the resolutions still subsist? Madam, Pakistan has violated these resolutions everyday. Everyday that it keeps its armies on the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State, in the so-called Azad Kashmir territory, is a violation of these resolutions. The preaching of hatred against India, the creation of an atmosphere which is unfavourable to any negotiations, all these are violations of the United Nations resolutions. It is said in the Security Council that there is the principle of self-determination. This is forgetting again that there cannot be any question of self-determination in a territory which is governed by the people residing in that territory through a democratic government. It is a misnomer to call this self-determination. It is forgotten that self-determination only comes in where there is a foreign rule over the territory belonging to other people. The whole American history is forgotten. Taxes, wanted to separate. It was held that there was an indissoluble union after a State came into the Federal Union, and no one can separate. How is it then that people talk of self-determination when they could not talk of self-determination in a territory which may be part of the United Kingdom, which may be part of the United States of America or which may be any other part of

India? The question, therefore, is, how is it that the United Kingdom is adopting a partisan attitude at this matter? I am not generalising. The United Kingdom has got noble acts in its history, but such a partisan attitude which abandons all regard for truth, which forsakes fairness, revives naturally old memories. Did not the United Kingdom rule us; on the principle of divide and rule? All those things are brought back to mind, and it is distressing that a friendly country should put us on a par with Pakistan in the matter of treatment of minorities. Do not the Britishers, who are quite a number in this country, see for themselves that minorities are protected in our Constitution? There is an independent judiciary protecting the minorities. There is the Parliament protecting the minorities, and is it fair, is it right to put us on a par with Pakistan in the treatment of minorities?

Now, it is again forgotten that the question of treatment of minorities is a human question. While again we talk of human rights, we celebrate every year the Human Rights Day, there is the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Man, yet it is forgotten how minorities are being treated in Pakistan as a result of continuous hatred-propaganda in the Press and as a result of intolerance and discrimination observed against the minorities. We all know that maltreatment of minorities or incitement to maltreatment of minorities is a grave breach of human rights. Yet this is being done and such a statement has been made by a representative of a friendly foreign country. I would repeat that I am not generalising. There are still people in England, that is my belief, who would look at things in a correct perspective, who would try to investigate the truth of the existing facts and who would take a detached view. Now, if this is the attitude, at what cost has the United Kingdom representative adopted this? Is it realised that the refugee\* problem comes in the

train of and is a natural consequence of maltreatment of minorities in Pakistan? Is it realised that if encouragement is given to Pakistan in this manner, the result might be major upsets and that might affect the peace in this part of the world? All these, I submit, Madam, are matters which should be realised by a member of the Commonwealth, which should be realised by a responsible delegate in the Security Council.

Madam, I will not detain the House longer upon this question. I will pass on to a different question altogether, and that is the question of our public sector. I feel—and I strongly feel—that we must consolidate and protect our public sector properly. It was distressing that one had to read in the papers that several lakhs worth of materials were burnt in Ranchi. The question arises whether those goods were insured, what were the arrangements made for the protection of such goods. And in the working of our public sector, there are certain things which require a close study and which also require protection.

Madam Deputy Chairman, we have to nationalise certain activities in the interests of the general welfare but we must learn first to protect and preserve what we have already done

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In view of the long list of speakers that I have with me, I think the lunch hour could be cut down and allowed from 1.30 to 2.30 P.M. We shall sit till 1.30 P.M. Shri Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, the Vice-President in his Address has given us an indication of the Government's policy—both regarding internal and external affairs. I shall deal very briefly with one or two things connected with internal affairs.

We know, as a matter of fact, that while there has been an increase in

[Shri P. N. Saprú.] our industrial output, our food production has gone down extremely. Food prices are very high. It is true that Government have opened fair price shops. But it is forgotten that the common man finds it very difficult to get things at these fair price shops in a reasonable time. I have heard complaints that people who go to these fair price shops have to wait for hours before they can get their orders executed. This is a matter to which due attention should be given.

Then, it is a matter of satisfaction also that our national Industries are doing fairly well but there is room for efficiency so far as the public sector is concerned. It is the public sector which must hold the field aloft hereafter.

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

I do not rule out the private sector altogether but I would like to emphasise that in a socialist country important sections of the industry should be in the public sector.

Let me now turn to the external matters. We have serious discussions at the Security Council and Mr. Chagla made what I would call an excellent speech on Kashmir. He has put our case with his ability which compels admiration. It is a matter of deep regret that the United Kingdom should have taken a partisan line in regard to this matter. The speech of the British representative was of an extremely biased character and it ignored certain realities. For nearly seventeen years Kashmir or a good part of Kashmir has been a part of this country. Conditions which are a prerequisite <sup>for</sup> the holding of a plebiscite have not been fulfilled by Pakistan. And as life is not static, conditions have changed, and those conditions should have been taken into account in considering this question. We cannot compromise on the question of Kashmir though we are ready and genuinely desirous of improving our

relations with Pakistan. But there is no genuine desire on the part of Pakistan to improve her relation\* with us.

Let me just refer to what is happening in East Bengal. In East Bengal, the minorities are being squeezed out. There were riots and disturbances at Khulna and other places. The life, property and honour of the minority community' were not safe in East Pakistan and so, they had to flee to Calcutta for their lives. Unfortunately, we had to face a difficult situation in Calcutta and in places near about Calcutta, and it is to the credit of our Government that firm steps were taken to put down the communal riots. In this, tribute is due to Shri Gulzarilal Nanda and Shri P. C. Sen for the boldness which they displayed in solving complicated problems. The problem of the refugees is a human problem and I think it should be our endeavour to make it easy for those who cannot live under the existing conditions in the theocratic State of Pakistan, to come over to India. We cannot be indifferent to the suffering of our countrymen across the borders of West Bengal.

Madam, let me now turn to another question, that of Hazratbal. A statement was made by our respected Home Minister in regard to this Hazratbal affair. It appears that two or three persons who were supposed to be directly responsible have been arrested. Statements were made on the floor of this House in a remarkable speech by Shri Tariq the other day. I think Shri Tariq spoke from the heart, and what Shri Tariq wanted to impress upon the House was that the administration of Kashmir was not that sort of administration that we should be proud of. Therefore, we should give serious consideration to the question whether we should go on supporting men whom we know are unclean or whom the public has reason to believe to be unclean. I think the question raised by the Hazratbal

incidents which led to rioting in Pakistan, which led to rioting in India, is a very important one, and an effort should be made to have a full and careful enquiry by a high-powered committee consisting of a Supreme Court Judge or a senior High Court Judge, not connected with the Kashmir Administration.

**1 P.M.**

I have no personal knowledge of what is happening in Kashmir, but I have no reason to think that Mr. Tariq was not speaking from the heart, and I think it is incumbent on us to consider this question of Kashmir from the right angle.

May I also say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that as a person connected with the judiciary, it is a matter of surprise to me, it is a matter of pain to me, that the trial of Sheikh Abdullah should have dragged on for five years or more. Sheikh Abdullah was for five years under preventive detention and for nearly five years his trial has been dragging on. I have known of conspiracy cases and I know conspiracy cases take a long time, but I think it is the duty of counsel,— whether they represent the Government or whether they represent the accused—to see that the proceedings are not unduly prolonged. This question of Abdullah and the future of Abdullah deserves to be reconsidered from a fresh angle.

May I also say that as there is dissatisfaction not with India or with the Indian Government—I mean, the people of Kashmir are genuinely anxious to retain their connection with India—but as there is dissatisfaction with the present local administration, I think it is necessary for us to think in terms of an all-party Government so far as Kashmir is concerned. The other alternative—and it is a bolder alternative—is to have President's rule for a time and after some time to hold fresh elections and then put the party, which has a majority under the system of free elections, in power. But I prefer an all-party Government and I hope that this will be done.

1123 HSD—5.

The Hazratbal incident is not a minor incident. It is an incident which discredited the Government of Kashmir, which had repercussions all over the country and which might have flared up communal passions both in this country and in Pakistan.

You cannot blame the refugees from East Bengal for feeling bitter. After all we are human beings. If we had been treated as they had been treated in Khulna, I do *not* know what we would have done. Let us place ourselves in their position and view the problem in its proper perspective.

We have Pakistan as our neighbour and we have to make up our mind as to what our policy should be. Our policy should be one of friendship. But we cannot have friendship on the basis of appeasement. I make a distinction between friendship and appeasement. I hope a day will come when Pakistan and India will be what the U.S.A. and Canada are to each other today. Some sort of a loose confederation between India and Pakistan, that perhaps is the right and the ultimate solution of the Indo-Pakistan problem. This sub-continent is one integral whole. Nature has made this sub-continent one whole and we have got no desire to get back what Pakistan has got. We want her to enjoy her freedom, but we cannot forget that in Pakistan there is no democracy and we cannot hand over Kashmir to a totalitarian State which denies democratic rights to its own people.

Before I conclude, may I just say a word about our relationship with the Commonwealth? I have great regard for the Commonwealth. I think Sir Alec Home and the British representative at the United Nations do not speak for the entire body of British people, and therefore it is that I am not, while taking a firm line, for severance of the Commonwealth tie.

May I just say a word to those of my friends who are fond of telling us



[Shri P. N. Sapru.] that our policy of non-alignment has failed? I do not think that the policy of non-alignment has failed. I am not one of those who would like to appease China, but I am for peace on honourable terms with China. And may I just invite your attention to a remarkable article in the 'Manchester Guardian' of Thursday, November 14, 1963? It is this:

"For it has become clearer in the interval that if China in fact wanted to inflict further damage on India last November what restrained her was not the help of India's Western friends—however freely offered—but the policy of non-alignment so heavily criticised then. We now know that the Soviet Union was also strongly opposed to the Chinese advance, and in a better position than the West to make its opposition tell."

Well, I think we should remember that we cannot place ourselves entirely in the hands of any one bloc. This balance of power which we have today is in some ways vital for our purposes, and I think this policy of non-alignment is a realistic policy which shall pay dividends even so far as China is concerned, for while there can be no surrender on our part; we must be ready to talk to the Chinese people on the basis of the Colombo proposals. I am not going to discuss whether Mrs. Bandaranaike was right or whether she was wrong in saying what she did, but I want a reasonable solution of the Chinese problem. Probably it is easier for us to settle with China than with Pakistan.

Thank you very much.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not propose to touch on issue, of foreign policy or on Pakistan, because a number of Members of this House have already dealt with them. But I propose to deal in the short time at my disposal with some of the internal problems that have been touched upon by the Vice-President.

Sir, the Vice-President had told us that in spite of difficulties and disturbances we have continued to move forward towards our objective of a democratic and socialist order. Sir, a few months back we had before us the Mid-term Appraisal of the Third Plan by the Planning Commission and this is what the Planning Commission had to say;

"We are stuck and stuck badly. We are bogged down. We have fallen behind in the achievement of the moderate targets which we have set up for ourselves. In the thirty months of the Third Plan, we have not only failed to advance towards our socialist goals but on the contrary, we have put the clock back in several key sectors of national economy."

I emphasise that in the thirty months of the Third Plan we have not only failed to advance towards our socialist goals, but on the contrary, we have the clock back in several key sectors of our national economy. This was the assessment made by the economists of the Planning Commission and it is a serious assessment made by the Planning Commission, and it is here we are told by the Vice-President that we are continuing to advance towards our objective of a democratic and socialist order, and I do not know how these two statements could be reconciled with each other. Probably the connotation of what democracy and socialism are, or what democratic socialism is, differs with different people.

At any rate, at Bhubaneswar we had a great debate and the Congress Party, nine years after it had advanced the objective of democratic socialism, thought it fit once again to define what that socialism meant. Now I quote the relevant passage. We have been told:

"The Congress is working for a revolution in the economic and social relationships in Indian society. The revolution is to be brought about through radical changes in\*"

the attitudes and outlook of people as well as the institutions through which they have to function. The object is to achieve an economy of abundance in the try by the fullest and most effective use of the human material resources so that the well-being of every individual can be assured. Every one should have equal opportunity and a just share in the fruits of progress. Privilege, disparities and exploitation should be eliminated."

If the Vice-President had told us how in this period these things namely, the "privilege, disparities and exploitation" have been mitigated to some extent, then one could understand the statement that pite difficulties we have been progressing towards our objective of democratic • socialist order. But he does not even touch that question. The Prime Minister, for example, only last November, addressing the National Development Council, had stated categorically:

"If we put up a number of Plans and the people continue to starve and live without house, we have failed even though we have done something big in some of the Plans."

And then he put a pertinent question. "What about the common man? What have these long thirteen years of national planning done for him?" This is a pertinent and pointed question that the Prime Minister himself has put while addressing the National Development Council in November last. To that question of the Prime Minister of India we expected a reply in the Address. When the Vice-President was addressing the two Houses and telling us and the entire world through this House that we have been advancing towards our goal of democratic socialism, what he was expected to give was a straightforward and clear answer to the pertinent question that was put by the Prime Minister himself when he was addressing the National Development Council. What is the ans-

wer to that question? The question I is debatable for the very simple reason that the very answer to this question would expose the pretensions of democratic socialism that this Government is parading again and again.

I am reminded of the old saying. In our ancient Hindu society there used to be a saying. They also were socialists. And what is the definition of socialism? We desire the well-being of every human being. Our ancients also used to sing that slogan.

“सर्वे जनाः सुखिनो भवन्तु ।”

To that add something else. While generally they were for the well-being of the people, they also stated,

“गो ब्राह्मणैश्चैः सुखमस्तु नित्यम्” The Brahmin and the cow must have happiness every day. While these are the selected people, the Brahmins, a particular caste, must have "Sukham" every day. Similarly, today the Brahmin caste is removed and another class has come, the class of monopolists, the class of big businessmen. They must have happiness every day. This is your order of so-called socialism. I would just change that *sloka* a little: —

“सर्वे जनाः सुखिनो भवन्तु  
टाटा बिड़लायाः सुखमस्तु नित्यम् ।”

This is now the order of socialism. Instead of "Go, Brahmin" you just put Tata and Birlas. If you just substitute that, then the ancient definition of socialism that is prevalent in the Indian society remains the same That is what has been taken by the Congress Party .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar):  
Question.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: . . . Your practice has shown that. After all, what has happened to the common man? Have the fruits of labour, fruits of progress gone to mitigate the sufferings of the common people? Why is it that the Vice-President refused to answer that question? (Interruption by Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee.) I do not want any interrup-

[Shri P. Ramamurti.] tion, please. I will answer your interruptions later on. Why is it that you avoid to answer this straightforward and simple question? Yes, the question is very, very inconvenient. I will just quote some figures. These figures are not worked out by me. These are figures which our Prime Minister very eloquently stated on the floor of this House. "We have to find out where this increased income has gone." And then he said that he was going to appoint a committee which shall go into this question and give its report during the course of six months. At any rate, we do not know where that committee is. And probably the time has come when we have to appoint another committee to find out where that committee, which was appointed to find out where that increased income had gone, has gone. This is the position. Fortunately, we are now told that this Committee has submitted its report, an interim report, to the Government. It is yet to see the light of the day. Nonetheless, even without this Committee's report, what are the facts as have been revealed by some of these reports? I will just take some time.

Mr. Birla, who cannot be accused of any bias towards Communism, made a statement some time ago in the United States of America. In his statement he had pointed out that in 1950-51 the total investment capital of all the companies amounted to Rs. 900 crores of which about Rs. 300 crores were foreign investments, whereas in 1961-62, that is, at the end of the two Plans, the investments had gone up from Rs. 900 crores to about Rs. 2,500 crores out of which foreign investments accounted for about Rs. 830 crore-. Where has this increased investments come from? It is not as if some of these capitalists were having some trees in their backyard which were pouring money and they were able to invest that. After all, this huge amount of capital in the private sector of our industries came

from the sweat and toil of our people. It came from the wealth created by the common people. All this money came from their sufferings.

Now, the March, 1960 Bulletin of the Reserve Bank has to say something. When they enquired into the affairs of 70 companies, having about Rs. 212 crores of rupees of share capital, whose market value at that time was Rs. 417 crores, it showed that a small coterie, representing a fractional 0.5 per cent, of share holding, accounted for 56.5 per cent, of the total value of shares in these companies with a paid-up capital of Rs. 212 crores, the market value of which was Rs. 417 crores. This is how concentration has gone on in this period. Therefore, you have to answer that specific question put by the Prime Minister when he was addressing the National Development Council. These facts ought to be stated before the people. You should show how the people have fared, how certain other individuals in this country have fared. And the same enquiry also reveals—the study was conducted by the Company Law Administration of the Government of India—that out of the total directorships of 4,174, 44 persons were holding 2,000 directorships while 502 people held the rest of the 2,174. Again, it has also showed that 15 big business houses, with deposits of Rs. 25 crores and over, had altogether Rs. 478.91 crores of the total deposits in the 363 joint stock companies in our country in 1958-59. The concentration has increased since then. The same study, the Mahala-nobis Committee, revealed that two houses in this country, the houses of Tatas and Birlas alone were able to control about Rs. 600 crores of the total capital investment of the Indian companies in this country. This is how concentration of wealth has gone on in this country during the last 17 years that this Government has been in office. And this concentration has gone on even after they had proclaimed that their goal was the achievement of a democratic socialist

order. Still, in the face of these very facts our Vice-President comes and proclaims to the whole world that we have continued to advance towards our goal of democratic socialism, in the face, as I told you of the directly contradictory statement made in the assessment of the five-year Plan. This is where we stand.

Therefore, I would like to point out that it is better not to have this facade. After all, what is it that we have been doing? We have not been progressing towards socialism? We have been progressing towards capitalism of an intensive or monopolist character. If in an underdeveloped country like this, where capital formation has been extremely scarce, if this much of concentration of capital and wealth can take place during the last 50 years, one can understand what this development that is taking place in this country is. It is not even the ordinary capitalism that was developing in the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries when *laissez-faire* economy was there in Europe. It is not even that type of capitalism. It is capitalism that is developing in a distorted way, in a way that more and more of the wealth that is created by the sweat and toil of the people of this country is beginning to be concentrated more and more in the hands of a few houses hardly about half a dozen or dozen houses in the country who today are able to control the economic levers of production and also to control the economic levers of distribution. That is what is happening in the country. These are the telling facts that are placed before the country. Yet, we are told that we are advancing towards democratic socialism. Why is it so?

This is only the legal aspect of it. These are the legally published figures but we know that this is not the only aspect of it. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, the other day in Madras, as soon as he became the Finance Minister of this country, when he went to Madras, he was surrounded by pressmen and asked

what he was going to do about the prices, because we know that Mr. Krishnamachari, when he was the Finance Minister, during the period after he had resigned the Finance Ministership, in the subsequent period when he was an ordinary Member of Parliament, he used to talk very much about the rise in the prices in Madras. Therefore, when he went to Madras, many of the Madras correspondents surrounded him and asked what he was going to do, and do you know what he said? He said that the biggest villain of the piece was unaccounted money. They asked him how much unaccounted money was there and he said that Rs. 200 crores of taxation was being evaded year after year. This is not my statement. This is the statement made by Mr. Krishnamachari, who is in charge of our finances to-day. When Rs. 200 crores of taxation is evaded, obviously, it would mean that the entire amount is not real income. That alone is not the income that is not shown in the accounts. Obviously at least a sum of Rs. 400 crores per annum is not shown in the accounts for which the evasion of the order of Rs. 200 crores is taking place. Now annually about 400 crores of rupees of income, concealed from all the accounts of the Government, concealed from the banks, that also is continuously taking place for the last 17 years. Maybe it may not be of the same order of Rs. 400 crores seventeen years ago. It might be less but during all these years this has been taking place. Therefore, what is the amount of money that has accumulated in the hands of some of the people, which has not been accounted so far? Easily it would come to Rs. 3,000 crores. So, seventeen multiplied by four hundred will come to sixty-eight hundred, and it would come to Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 crores of money that is in circulation. This is accumulated in the hands of some people and in whose hands? It is not in the hands of the common people, not in the hands of the working classes and the peasants, not in the

[Shri P. Ramamurti.] hands of the middleclass employees. This is what we call democratic socialism. Quite apart from the accumulation of wealth that has taken place legally, which is shown in the books, quite apart from that, over Rs. 2,500 crores out of the toil and sweat of the common people of the country, that money also having been accumulated some sharks, by speculators, by income-tax dodgers, is part of the concentration that has gone on taking place in this country ever since our Government came into existence. This is our democratic-socialism.

Well, it is no wonder that—the Food Minister is sitting there—our Government refuses to take or raise a little finger on the question of prices. What is the answer that we get from the Vice-President's Address? He says:

"Shortfalls in the production of foodgrains have had a disturbing effect on price levels. Through larger releases of foodgrains from Government stocks, the setting up of additional fair-price shops where-ever feasible and appropriate regulation of movements and through credit policies, every effort has been made to prevent prices of foodgrains from shooting up . . . ."

What is the result of all this? It keeps silent on that. We have made efforts by releasing large stocks. What has been the effect? The effect is, rice has been selling at Rs. 45 in Bengal. This is the effect. Why not admit plainly that in spite of the efforts that we have made, we have not been able to hold the price line, that the price line has been going up. This simple answer, this straightforward answer, is not found because things, have got to be hidden. Then what is the answer? It says:

"In the long run, however, the stability of prices, whether of agricultural or industrial products, can only be achieved through higher production to match the rising level of consumption."

What has this to do with socialism? This is the story that has been said from Adam Smith. Under a capitalist economy, when profit is the main motive, that motivates production as well as distribution. Under capitalism, we have been told that more production there is, less will be the price. The same story is repeated. What has this to do with the socialist system? Has this anything to do with the socialist system? If more production was there the prices will automatically fall. Who wanted this refrain? The question is, when there is a shortfall—the reality is there—what is the thing that the Government is doing in order to prevent this rise in the prices? Absolutely nothing, except releasing some foodgrains here and there and running of fair price shops. How these are run everybody knows. They are making people wait in queues and after some time put up a board "There is no stock". This is what is happening in every fair price shop. Why? I make the charge. In spite of the fact that we have had three Plans and in spite of the fact that every Plan proclaimed that the success of the Plan, depends on the Government's ability to hold the price line, why is it that the price line has not been held either during the course of the first plan or the second Plan or the Third Plan? Is it that something is wrong with your planning or am I entitled or, justified in saying that there is a planned increase in the prices? I make the charge that the increase in the prices is deliberate plan. Why is it a deliberate and a planned one? It is deliberate and planned for the simple reason that our capitalists must get capital. They are today building up capital in this country, not like the British or the French people built their capitalist industries. The British were able to get primary accumulation by the loot that the East India Company carried on inside India. They were able to get primary accumulation of capital by selling the slaves of Africa in the slave

market. They were thus able to have that primary accumulation of capital and later on when they built up their industries, they were able to destroy the industries in the colonial countries. They destroyed industries in our country. They forced their goods at exorbitant prices on the people of our country and they also took from our agricultural products by forcing lower prices. Uneconomical terms of trade were forced on us. This is how British capital was built. This is how French capital was built. But unfortunately for our capitalists inside our country, they did not have an empire to loot. Today they cannot think in terms of an empire to loot. Therefore whom are they to loot in order to get this money? How could they get from Rs. 900 crores of capital in 1951 to Rs. 2500 crores now? Where from did they get this money? The only source for their loot is the 450 million people of this country and how can they loot them? The price increase is a specific instrument forced by the capital of this country in order to mulct the common people of their share of the wealth created out of their sweat and toil in order that these capitalists may get their big share out of this wealth. That is how capital is being formed. This is how it has been provided all these years and I say that the Government has totally turned a blind eye to, all that is happening for the simple reason that it is interested in building up this kind of capital. It wants capital formation and the only way in which capital can be formed is by looting the people, not by looting any other country. That is the simple fact that stares us in the face. That is why the entire policy that has been pursued all these years is based on the question of bolstering the private capital in our country, and not only private capital of an ordinary nature but private capital concentrated more and more in the hands of a few big capitalists and that is why we know how this capital was built up. The Government itself made loans available to these big

capitalists. Out of the Rs. 128 crores of money granted as loans, thirty-five per cent went to big giants. Let us not forget that thirty-five per cent went to these big giants.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Ramamurti, you can continue later on.

The House stands adjourned till 2-30.

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. GOVINDA REDDY) in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Mr. Ramamurti will continue his speech.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Before, the House adjourned for lunch, I was dealing with the question of prices and I was pointing out that prices constitute a powerful instrument by means of which the earnings of the common people, are mulcted and they flow into the coffers of the big businessmen in this country for capital formation. We have also seen the total amount of capital that has actually gone into the hands of these people during the last few years. Naturally, therefore, I say the Government is reluctant to take any real step for holding the price line. If it were not so, the simple fact would not stare us in the face that Government spokesmen have been saying again and again that it is middlemen that are responsible for putting up the prices. We

[Shri P. Ramamurti.] know, Sir, that as far as the peasants are concerned, as far as the small peasants having two or three or five acres of land are concerned, they do not get the advantage of the high prices of foodgrains. We know that immediately the crop is harvested, these people are forced to sell their produce at distress prices for the simple reason that they are heavily indebted and the usurious moneylender comes and stands before their doorsteps. Therefore, it is not these people who actually put up the prices. The increased prices do not benefit the ordinary people, the common peasants, but only those people who have large areas of land concentrated in their hands, people who are in a position to hold back their stocks, who need not, sell them immediately and these people, as a consequence, these landlords, actually benefit by these increases in prices. Therefore, these increases in prices have been brought about not by the peasants, not by the poor peasants, but by the big landlords as well as by those speculators who are able to hold on to stocks. It is not the ordinary retail dealers who are responsible for the increase in price. It is essentially the wholesale dealer who is responsible for the increase in price. If you take the last twenty years or so, ever since the Second World War, you will find that it is the wholesale traders who are responsible for putting up prices, and the Government knows it. The Government knows that every time it is the wholesale dealers who are responsible for this rise in prices, all these years. It has been seen ever since the War that these people are no longer fit, that they are absolutely unfit to manage the most important function of our economic life, namely, the distribution of the commodities produced by our peasants, the most important things, things that are necessities of life.

Now, how to put an end to this state of affairs? Is it to be done by fixing the prices? We have seen the effect

of fixing the price of sugar. We fixed the price of sugar and unfortunately, sugar is not available at the present time in the market. Even sugar does not obey the law of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. That is unfortunately the position. Therefore, the only way in which it can be done is for the Government to abolish the wholesale trade in foodgrains in private hands altogether, since these people have proved themselves totally unfit. They are interested not in the welfare of the common people; but they are interested only in their pelf, they are interested only in making money out of the blood of the common people. Therefore, what is to be the punishment? We do not ask you to shoot them down. The only thing that can be done is to abolish private wholesale trade in foodgrains.

We know that the Congress Party passed a resolution in 1958, at the All India Congress Committee session at Nagpur, when Panditji said that the monopoly trade in foodgrains must vest in the Government. He did not talk of wholesale trade only. He wanted the monopoly of the entire foodgrains trade to be vested in the Government. This resolution was passed in 1958, and Panditji went to Chaupaty sands of Bombay two days after that resolution was passed and shouted that no intelligent person can oppose, in today's conditions, State monopoly of the foodgrains trade. Well, what does it mean? It means that any person who opposes it is not an intelligent person. Five long years have elapsed since then. Five or six years have elapsed since that resolution was passed and that resolution is a dead letter. We are today asking the Government not to take over the entire monopoly of the foodgrains trade. We ask the Government to take over only the wholesale trade in foodgrains. Am I to understand that Panditji has been running this Government with unintelligent people all these six years? Certainly not. They are intelligent people. They know

what it is and Panditji also "mows what it is. Despite all this talk of socialism Panditji unfortunately happens to be the leader of the capitalist class in this country. That is the real fact. Only from time to time, these slogans of socialism are being shouted. That is why in spite of these resolutions passed from time to time, in spite of Panditji shouting that no intelligent person can today oppose the State monopoly in foodgrains trade, nothing is being done actually. And at the Bhubaneswar session of the Congress somebody brought forward an amendment putting forward the demand that the Government should take over the wholesale trade in foodgrains; but then the leaders of the Congress opposed it. So what is the way out? Is there no way out? It seems there is no way out as far as the common people are concerned and the present position will continue and the prices will continue to rise. What is it that we are promised? We are promised that at the end of another 12 or 15 years, in 1975, everybody will have food to eat, everybody will have a house to live in and everybody will have cloth to wear. But what is to happen between then and now? Should the prices continue to increase? If we ask them this question, the Government says: Well, don't ask that question now. The prices will increase. But ask this question at the end of 15 years. Wait till that time. That is the wonderful socialism that they talk about in this country. Therefore, Sir, this, I submit, is the position with regard to the common people, their food and whatever else they want.

For example, take the question of land. We have been promised that by the end of another 2 years from now the land reforms will be carried out. But why have they not been carried out all those years? This is not a promise that is being made only now. Even in 1958, at Nagpur, it was said that land reforms would be carried out in two years. But now, after five or six years, they want another

two years' period. Why is that? The Home Minister, Shri Nandaji, at Jaipur said, "Well, unfortunately, though we want to carry out these land reforms, the majority of the members of the Legislatures as well as the Ministers in the States, are opposed to it, and that is why we are unable to carry out real land reforms." So the cat is out of the bag. Who are these members? These are the very people who have been put up by the Congress Party, people who promised that when they were elected they would carry out these land reforms. You put up the very people who are now opposed to the land reforms and they are the people who are interested in keeping the land monopoly in their own hands. But they promise to the entire people of this country that real land reforms are going to be carried out? Why this facade? Why this camouflage? Why not tell the people that you are not going to carry out land reforms, that this concentration of land will continue as before? Here is the answer at the Bhubaneswar session itself. They have said there that this great revolution of the Congress Party, of having democratic socialism is to be brought about by peaceful means and with the consent of the people, as if the peasants today are opposed to land reforms, as if the common people are opposed to getting things at the proper price, as if these common people themselves want to get things at higher prices. Why this talk of the common people? Who are those who are opposed to these land reforms? Only the few landlords. Who are opposed to proper prices being maintained? Only those in the wholesale trade and without their consent, nothing can be done. This is the wonderful kind of socialism that is being preached. Therefore, I say, let us call black, black. Let us not try to invent some new names.

As far as the fundamental question of property relations that are going to decide what sort of society we are going to have is concerned, no change is going to be made whatsoever. The capitalists will continue to have their



[Shri P. Ramamurti]

profits; the monopolists will continue to have their factories; the landlords will continue to have their lands; the big hoarders will continue to have every facility to continue to hoard; and similarly the speculators will continue to have facilities to speculate. The bank monopoly will continue in -this country and not being satisfied with all this, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, our Finance Minister, is today saying from Bombay that there is an open door for foreign capital also to come into this country. This is our -wonderful socialism; there is the Tndian capital, the British capital, the American capital, the West German eapital, the Italian capital. Together with our capitalists they will all have full play in this country. The land monopoly will continue; the bank monopoly will continue. And it is with all these that we are going to have socialism. That is the wonderful socialism that is being promised to our people. Therefore I say we do not want socialism from this Government. As far as I am concerned, as far as the Communist Party is concerned, we never expected this Government to have anything to do with socialism. Therefore let Us not deceive ourselves. We only ask this Government to carry out certain ordinary immediate democratic reforms that were carried out by the bourgeo-ise revolutions. In the industrial revo ution that took place in Europe natuially they had to put an end to the fedual relations in land. Do that first. First of all, abolish landlordism in this country; break this monopoly of land in the hands of a few people. Do that first; similarly break also the stronghold of foreign capital that is today eating into the vitals of our country. Year after year money is being pumped out of the country, money that can be invested in our country. Do those elementary simple things first. Do not talk big; these tall talks are not necessary. After all, the proof of the pudding is in the easting of it, not in what you talk. It is not democratic socialism; it is mono-

poly capitalism that is developing in this country with the help of foreign monopolists. They are entering into collaboration agreement with foreign monopolists. It is not the ordinary middle class entrepreneur who can enter into collaboration agreement with the big giant monopolies of Britain and America. My friend, Mr. Jaipuria, for example, may be able to enter into such collaboration agreements

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar - Pradesh): Please spare Jaipuria. You have got other political parties to take care of.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: After all, collaboration agreement is a very good thing from your point of view.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) : Also with communist countries.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Collaboration agreements of these people are not entered into with communist countries. They are entered into mainly with giant companies of Britain and America. It is those people who come into such collaboration agreements. You invite all this capital and it is on this basis that we are going to have this wonderful socialism. Then I say, better save the people from this kind of camouflage. Tell them plainly. If it is something else, then you have to answer this question. You have to answer the straight question that was put by Panditji himself in the National Development Council —how have the people fared all these years. An answer to that question is being burked. Why an answer is being burked? Because it is very, very inconvenient for them to give. Therefore the question is being burked. .I would have liked the President's Address to tell how the common people in this country have fared during the past year, how the workers have fared in this country, how the peasants have fared in this country, how other people have - fared in this country.

These things are not there; yet we are told that this is the Address of a democratic socialist order.

Therefore I would only finally say that despite all that the Government might do, people will have to fight against these things. My friend, Dr. Gopal Singh, the other day, was talking of the struggles that were taking place. Well, these struggles will continue to take place despite all the laws that are made; so long as these policies are being pursued in this country, so long as the common people of the country are not being looked after properly, the common people will certainly take the destiny in their own hands and they will begin to fight against these policies and no power on earth may be able to stand up against a united people who fight against these policies. I would only like to say that we are not very anxious to continue this kind of struggle. We are certainly anxious to settle things in a different way, if ways could be found. Therefore we would urge upon the Government "to take up and tackle some of these problems, the vital problems that are facing the country today. On the economic situation that is today developing in the country and on other questions take a different attitude, not the attitude of pampering the monopolists, not the attitude of bolstering up the speculators in the country, not the attitude of helping the tax-dodgers who are cheating the Government to the tune of 3s. 200 crores. Because of your failure to tackle the tax-dodgers, you make the common people pay more and more taxes. It is your failure. Because you have been unable to collect your dues from the tax-dodgers you are taxing the people more and more. So, in the next Budget let us hope that the Government, apart from refraining from imposing more taxes, will completely do away with all the fresh taxes that were imposed on the common people in last year's budget.

You have got to collect more and more money from those people who have been dodging you all these years.

Lastly, I would like to make a reference to the question of Kashmir which has been agitating the country. We have heard many speeches on the situation in Kashmir and I hope the Government will take note of all these things and see to it that a situation arises in Kashmir where a Government which is acceptable to the people of Kashmir, a broadbased Government which is acceptable to the people of Kashmir, is given to them so that we will see the day when Pakistan will not be able to take advantage of the situation that exists in Kashmir. Sir, it is high time that the Government bestows serious attention to this question; I know serious attention is being given but somehow things are not coming off all right. Therefore, I would like the Government to take this question more seriously so that we are spared the humiliating position that is before us today and before the eyes of the entire world.

Since my time is up, I would only make a final appeal to the Government to think betimes on the economic policies that they are pursuing. Let them not think in terms of somehow or other deceiving the people. After all, it is nothing more than deception to talk of democratic socialism with what the Government is doing today. Let them not think of continuing these things. On the other hand let them seriously think of doing something immediately to mitigate the sufferings of the people. The definition of socialism and all that can wait; we can discuss about that sometime later. But immediately let them think in terms of something which will immediately mitigate the sufferings of the people, bring down the prices to an appreciable level and see that the peasants of this country actually get the land.

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

Now, the Kerala land legislation is the biggest scandal. The President had given assent to the earlier legislation that was passed by the Communist Government that was then there and we know that that Government was made to quit office merely because the landlord elements there immediately began a big fight and the Congress Party also joined that big fight and later on what do we find now? Today the new Congress Government comes and passes a legislation which takes away some of the very basic reforms that we had given to the peasants and while the same Congress Party, the same Central Government took months and months to give the President's assent to the legislation that was passed by the former Kerala Government, here within a few days the assent is given by the President. Why? When it comes to a question of taking from the hands of the peasants the land that they already have the Government have no compunction whatsoever; on the other hand when it comes to the question of giving the land to the tiller, when it is a real tenancy legislation transferring the land from the hands of the landlords then the Government will have to satisfy the intransigence of big landlords. Only if they consent, the peasants can get the land. I say, give up this policy. Think of the ordinary and immediate democratic reforms that are necessary for the advancement of the common man.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL (Rajasthan): Vice-Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the Vice-President for his able Address. It gives a clear picture, although briefly, of the external and internal conditions prevalent in the country.

Sir, before I deal with certain matters I would like to refer to a most shameful episode that took place on the 26th January at the Republic Day parade. The Chinese diplomats most unceremoniously left the Parade when awards were going to be given to our heroes who had fought the Chinese so valiantly on our frontiers.

It was a piece of utter discourtesy, most uncouth, undiplomatic and mean. I have never known of a country's diplomats behaving in such an uncultured fashion as the Chinese diplomats behaved that day when they left the Parade. They knew very well that the awards were going to be given. Why did they come at all? What was their intention? Did they come there to show that they were going to walk out? What did they mean? It was much better that they should have kept away. So far as our diplomats are concerned many Members have put questions in this House. Courtesy is shown either to the head of the State or it is courtesy shown on the independence day of a country that all the diplomats assemble. But here the Chinese diplomats in a most discourteous manner walked out of the Parade. It is for them to give an answer as to why they did so. I strongly condemn this action of theirs and I want the Government to make a note of what they have done. Nothing has been said from the side of the Government about this and I do wish . . . .'

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : They must have sent a note of protest.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: I do not know. You know better than I do: I want the Government's spokesman to give an answer to the dirty behaviour of the Chinese diplomats stationed in this country. It is possible that any Government other than ours—because we try to keep our relations—probably would have asked these Chinese diplomats to leave the country immediately. I do not know what action the Government is taking in this matter but I do suggest that all these diplomats who walked out of the parade that day should be asked to leave the country and go back to their own.

Having said this, I refer to paragraph 14 of the distinguished Address in which the hon. Vice-President has

referred to the continued Chinese threat to our frontiers and their military build-up. Now, the Colombo proposals have been very much paraded in this House. It is the Opposition now which says that the Colombo proposals have not been accepted. We know that they have not been accepted. It was the Opposition who had earlier said that the Colombo proposals should not be accepted, but now it is they who are the protagonists of the Colombo proposals. In this connection, may I be permitted to draw the attention of non. House to a letter of the distinguished Prime Minister of Ceylon

dated March 7, 1963, to which reference was made by one hon. Member, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, in his speech that day? I threw him a challenge—Now, the letter is being quoted out of context. Words are being put in the mouth of the Prime Minister saying that it was not his intention to advance his forces up to the MacMahon Line. I could give you this assurance. Now, first of all, this was a completely informal meeting. Remember this. It was in that informal meeting where only four persons were sitting that he said it. I take it for granted that he said this. But what has been the attitude of the Government of India all along? This letter itself contains that and I will quote it. Now, the letter says at the end:

"They maintain, the Government of India maintain, that the Colombo Conference proposals gave both India and China the right on the eastern sector to move right up to the MacMahon Line on the south and north respectively, and that it would be contrary to the Colombo Conference proposals if India were required to keep her forces farther south. This has been the stand of the Government of India so far as the MacMahon Line is concerned. Now, they are quoting the Prime Minister as saying that the Indian forces will not be

moved up to the MacMahon Line. May I remind my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, and I believe it was in response to his question at a meeting of

the Informal Consultative Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs that the Prime Minister said:

"Logistics do not give us the authority to move up to the MacMahon Line." Now, if the logistics do not confer upon us the military capacity to move up to the MacMahon Line, shall we say: "No, no, we are already moving up or we have already moved up."?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: That is quite a different matter. It is for the Prime Minister to say that he will send his forces up to the MacMahon Line. He may decide or may not decide to send his forces. But how can the Prime Minister go out of his way to give an assurance?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): He is not yielding, Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: I have not said at all that the Prime Minister has given this assurance. It is Mrs. Bandaranaike who has given the assurance.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Let the Prime Minister contradict it.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: There is already a communique issued by the Government of India wherein they have said that they have given no such assurance and that they intend to move their forces to the MacMahon Line. I am only trying to point out that Mr. Vajpayee has not contradicted me about the meeting of the Informal Consultative Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: That only confirms that the Prime Minister has been speaking with two voices.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: No, Mr. Vajpayee. That is not correct. If, as I said, the logistics do not confer upon us the military capacity to move

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal.] up.' that does not mean that we should move up immediately. We will certainly move up. It is the intention of the Government and of the Defence Forces to move up. It is our right. Our line is up to the Mac-Mahon Line. Remember, this letter is almost a year old. We are quoting this letter a year later. As to what has happened during this period from the 7th March to date, let Mr. Vajpayee or Mr. Dahyabhai Patel put a question, as to whether our Defence Forces have moved up to the Mac-Mahon Line or not. So, it is very wrong to quote this letter in this way.

Now, having said this, I shall refer further to the Colombo proposals. I am happy to say that the Government has continued to remain firm on the question of acceptance of the Colombo proposals by the Chinese before any talks for negotiations reopen between India and China. And may I recall that there are certain papers today which have now been carrying on a propaganda, writing editorials and leaderettes in which they have said that the climate has changed, that there is no force left in the Colombo proposals and that the Colombo proposals should be given up? May I remind Mr. Vajpayee that he should read some of the editorials which have appeared in the "Times of India" and the "Hindustan Times" and what they say about it? It is extraordinary that they are carrying on in two voices. On the one side, they say, "No, no. The Colombo proposals must be accepted in toto. We have accepted it as far as we are concerned. The Chinese must accept them in toto." At the same time, they say: "No no. Now, the atmosphere has changed. It is not necessary to stick to the Colombo proposals." I believe that the Colombo proposal may not for the present be accepted by the Chinese. It is in this context probably that Mr. Chou-En-lai went abroad on his tour, trying to placate some of the African countries for holding an Afro-Asian conference. |

But his mission, as everybody knows, has failed. The failure of his mission means that preparations are not taking place for a non-aligned conference, and I do hope that that conference will take place very soon.

3 P.M.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, having said this, I will now go to deal with the question of Pakistan's intransigence and aggressive attitudes towards India. Pakistan has never behaved well towards us. It has become a well-known fact. We have been trying our best to be friendly with them. We have extended our hand of amity and friendship. But Pakistan has rejected it. We asked for a no-war-declaration not today or yesterday but ten years back; we said: let there be a no-war declaration between the two countries; we can sit down round the table and discuss and settle our differences. That has not happened. But now again they have gone to the Security Council, with what result? No result will come out of it. But one simple and confirmed fact remains that Kashmir is an inseparable part of India, that an attack on Kashmir is an attack on India and that nobody is going to tolerate any more anything that a foreign country would like to do with Kashmir.

Mr. Vice-Chairman. I congratulate the leader of our delegation, Mr. Chagla, on the able speech which he made in the Security Council. But what has been the attitude of the British Government? We see once more the perfidious Albion in the picture. We have forgotten that perfidy has been transferred from Great Britain to China. We are used to talking about China's perfidy. It seems like a badminton match where perfidy is being thrown from one side to the other, and now it has come back to the old Albion and once more perfidious Albion is in the picture. I accuse the United Kingdom of duplicity. I accuse the United Kingdom of tormenting communal disharmony in this sub-continent. Peepie accuse.-

Sir Patrick Dean of making this speech or that. Sir Patrick Dean is only the handmaid of the British Government. I know Sir Patrick Dean very well. He is a very fine person, but he is only the handmaid of the British Government. If the British Government had given other instructions, probably he would have spoken otherwise.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Rather the Conservative Party.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: I am talking of the British Government, that is the Conservative Party. When the Labour Party comes into power, I do not know what is going to happen.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is just amazing that in the Security Council every question that comes up remains hanging for ever. You will be surprised that even the Hyderabad question is there on the agenda of the Security Council. It is ridiculous. Anybody can jump up there, and say: "I will raise the Hyderabad question". Besides, the Kashmir question is being agitated in the Security Council. These are some of the rules, delicate rules of the Security Council.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Your time is up.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: I will only refer to one point and that is the question which the distinguished Vice-President has referred to in his Address, that is, the cessation of nuclear tests and the desire put forward by the two great nuclear powers not to contaminate outer space by nuclear explosions. But Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is not enough. There is ample nuclear capacity in the world even today. In spite of the fact that there is a halting of new nuclear weapons, atomic weapons, there is enough capacity to destroy the world a hundred times over. What is going to happen to that? There must be some kind of agreement with regard

to the destruction of the atom bombs. Not only that, Mr. Vice-Chairman, but there is something more that has to be done. The causes of war have to be abolished. I maintain that there is no sign of liquidation of the Second World War even today. The Second World War has created problems of frontiers. Those problems are still with us. Let those problems be frozen. Let those frontiers be frozen. Let us start afresh. Let things remain as they are. Let there be an agreement on the final and complete abolition of war. Let there be general and complete disarmament.

شری پیارے لال کرپل مدطالبہ:  
(اثر پودھی): جذبات والا - میں آپ  
کا زیادہ وقت نہیں لوں گا - طبیعت  
نا ساز ہے اور حرارت بھی ہے -

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : फिर प्राप क्यों  
तकलीफ कर रहे हैं ?

شری پیارے لال کرپل مدطالبہ:  
اس لئے تقریر کر رہا ہوں کہ سوال  
اتنا اہم ہے کہ میں چاہتا ہوں کہ اس  
پر بحث ہو - کہا جاتا ہے کہ ہماری  
حکومت کی بنیاد سیکولرزم پر ہے -  
مختص آئینی طور پر یہ کہہ دینا کہ  
اس ملک کے اندر اس دیش کے اندر  
- سیکولرزم ہوگا یہ کافی نہیں ہے - آپ  
کو اس دیش کے اندر اس ملک کے اندر  
سیکو سوشل آرڈر کو لانا ہوگا - سیکولر  
سماجی نظام کو قائم کرنا ہوگا - اسی  
وقت ہم اس دیش کے اندر سیکولر  
حکومت بنا سکتے ہیں اور ہماری  
جمہوریت اور ہمارے پلان کی کامیابی  
لئے ساتھ ساتھ سیکولرزم کی کامیابی کا

[شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالبہ:]  
 زیادہ تر دار و مدار اس بات پر ہے کہ  
 ہم یہاں کی اقلیتوں کے ساتھ یہاں کی  
 مائٹارٹیٹھز کے ساتھ کیسا سلوک کرتے  
 ہیں۔ ہندوستان میں مائٹارٹیٹھز کا  
 سوال بہت اہمیت رکھتا ہے۔ اقلیتوں  
 کا سوال بہت اہمیت رکھتا ہے اور  
 چٹنی ہمیں اس سوال کی طرف توجہ  
 دینی چاہئے انہی توجہ ہم نہیں  
 دیتے۔ ہندوستان کے اندر سب سے  
 بڑی اقلیت مسلمانوں کی ہے۔ پھر  
 عیسائیوں کی ہے اینکلو انڈین کی ہے  
 اور سکھوں کی ہے۔ اور اس کے علاوہ ہم  
 شیڈولڈ کاسٹ کو بھی مائٹارٹیٹھز میں  
 سمجھ سکتے ہیں۔ حقیقت تو یہ  
 ہے کہ مسلمانوں کو اور  
 دوسری اقلیتوں کو ہندو اکثریت سے انہی  
 شکایت نہیں ہوگی چٹنی کہ یہاں  
 ان کے ہم مذہب اچھوتوں کو ہے۔  
 یہ ایک حقیقت ہے جو آپ کو ماننی  
 پڑے گی۔ متحض باتوں سے مسئلہ حل  
 نہیں ہوگا۔

श्री श्रीलभद्र याजी : विलक्षण गलत  
 बात है। हरिजन अल्पसंख्यक नहीं है वरन्  
 हिन्दू समाज के एक अंग है।

श्री پیارے لال کرپل دہطالبہ:  
 بالکل صحیح بات ہے۔ میں اس  
 مائٹارٹیٹھز سے نفاق رکھتا ہوں اور یہ  
 کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ یہ بات بالکل  
 صحیح ہے مگر آپ ان ہم مذہب

اچھوتوں کے ساتھ اچھا سلوک نہیں  
 کرتے ہیں۔ وہ آج ہزاروں آس ایبلٹیٹھز  
 سے سفر کر رہے ہیں۔ تب آپ کیسے  
 دعویٰ کر سکتے ہیں کہ آپ دوسری  
 اقلیتوں کے ساتھ برادرانہ اور منصفانہ  
 سلوک کر سکتے ہیں۔

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.  
 GOVINDA REDDY): You said you are  
 not well. Please do not strain your-  
 self by being loud.

شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالبہ:  
 مسلمان اور دوسری اقلیتیں مذہبی  
 طور پر تمدنی طور پر آپ سے الگ  
 اور دور ہیں۔ آپ ان مائٹارٹیٹھز کے  
 ساتھ کیسے انصاف کر سکتے ہیں  
 جبکہ آپ اپنے ہم مذہب بھائیوں کے  
 ساتھ اچھا سلوک نہیں کر سکتے ہیں۔

میں درخواست کرتا ہوں کہ میں  
 جو تقریر کرتا ہوں اس میں رکاوٹ  
 نہ ڈالی جائے۔ میں ایک حقیقت  
 کی طرف دھیان دلانا ہوں۔ ہم نے  
 کہا ہے کہ ہمارے یہاں سیکرلزم کی  
 حکومت ہوگی۔ پاکستان کو جانے  
 دیجئے۔ پاکستان نے اعلانہ طور پر  
 کہا کہ پاکستان کی حکومت کی  
 بنیاد اسلام پر ہوگی۔ لیکن پاکستان  
 جو کچھ کہتا ہے اس کو دیکھ کر ہمیں  
 بھی ویسا ہی نہیں کرتا ہے کیونکہ  
 ہم نے اعلانہ طور پر کہا ہے کہ ہماری  
 حکومت کی بنیاد سیکرلزم پر ہے  
 ہمیں اس دیش کے اندر سیکولر  
 سوشل آرڈر کو لانا ہوگا۔ اس لئے آپ

کو اس سوال کی طرف فوراً کرنا  
ہوگا۔

ہی اے۔ ایم۔ طارق (جسوں اور  
کشمور): پاکستان جو بھی کرتا ہے وہ  
اسلام کے خلاف کرتا ہے۔ وہ فوراً اسلامی  
حکومت ہے۔

شری پھارے لال کوہیل دہلوانہ:۔  
ہمیں اس سے کوئی مطلب نہیں ہے۔  
مگر انہوں نے اعلان کیا ہے کہ ان کی  
حکومت اسلامی بلحاظوں پر قائم ہے۔  
وہ خلاف کرتے ہیں اسلام کے یہ دوسری  
چیز ہے۔

ایسٹ بلکال کی اقلیتوں کے  
متعلق بہت کچھ یہاں پر کہا گیا ہے۔  
میں اس سارے کی تہذیبی سی توجہ  
ویسٹ بلکال کی مسلمان اقلیتوں کے  
بارے میں بھی دلائل گا۔ یہ صحیح  
ہے کہ ہم نہیں چاہتے کہ کسی  
اقلیت کے ساتھ کوئی غیر منصفانہ یا  
استہازی سلوک ہو۔ مگر جو یہاں کی  
مانڈاریتھز کو خصوصاً مسلمان مانڈاریتھی  
کو شکایات ہیں اور جہاں تک ان  
شکایات کا تعلق ہے وہ زیادہ تر مذہبی  
استہاز سے تعلق رکھتی ہیں۔ میرا  
یہ کہنا ہے کہ اس حقیقت کی طرف  
فوراً کریں۔ اگر آپ نہیں کرتے ہیں تو  
یہ مسئلہ کبھی حل نہیں ہوگا۔

کلکتہ میں فسادات ہوئے اور یہ  
مانڈا پوینا کہ وہاں یہ مسلمانوں کی  
جان و مال کو نقصان پہنچا اور ہم اس  
1123 RSD.—6.

چھڑے انکار نہیں کر سکتے ہوں۔  
کچھ لوگوں نے جن میں پارلیمنٹ کے  
ممبر مولانا مظفر حسین جو آل انڈیا  
متحدہ محاذ کے جنرل سیکریٹری  
ہیں۔ مولانا اسرار الحق جو اس  
جماعت کے صدر ہیں اور جماعت  
اسلامی کے دو لیڈر جو صدر رہ چکے  
ہیں پچھسی بلکال کے وزیر اعظم سے  
اجازت لیکر رائٹ انفیکٹڈ اہریا کا دورہ  
کیا تھا۔ ان لوگوں کو رائٹ انفیکٹڈ  
اہریا کو دیکھنے کی اجازت دیدی گئی  
تھی اور ان کے ساتھ آدمی بھیج دئے  
گئے تھے تاکہ ان پر کسی طرح کا حملہ  
نہ ہو۔ ان لوگوں نے فساد زدہ علاقوں  
کا دورہ کیا اور دورہ کرنے کے بعد انہوں نے  
ایک مہمورنڈم تیار کیا اور اس کو ہوم  
منسٹر شری نندا جی کے سامنے پیش  
کیا۔ شری نندا جی نے کہا کہ تم اس  
مہمورنڈم کو ویسٹ بلکال کے چیف  
منسٹر صاحب کے سامنے پیش کرو۔  
ان لوگوں نے ویسٹ بلکال کے چیف  
منسٹر کو یہ مہمورنڈم دیا۔ ہو سکتا ہے  
کہ مہمورنڈم میں کچھ ایسی باتوں  
ہوں جو انہیں بری لگی ہوں لیکن یہ  
دوسری چیز ہے۔ انہوں نے مہمورنڈم  
دیا اور چیف منسٹر صاحب اس کو  
دیکھتے ہی آگ بگولا ہو گئے۔ انہوں نے  
کہا کہ ہم نے تو تم کو فساد زدہ علاقہ  
میں جانے کا موقع دیا مگر تم نے اس  
کا نا جائز فائدہ اٹھایا۔ اور میں آپ کو  
حکم دیتا ہوں کہ آپ اسی رات کو کلکتہ  
سے باہر چلے جائیے۔ بعد میں رات کے



[شری پھارے لال کریل دہطالبہ] وقت انہیں گھر سے پولیس کے ذریعہ نکال کر کلکتہ سے باہر کر دیا - وزیر موصوف کو کم سے کم یہ تو معلوم کر لینا چاہئے تھا کہ انہوں نے مہمورنڈم میں جو ہانہیں اٹھانے کے بارے میں لکھی تھیں وہ صحیح ہیں یا نہیں - ایسی تہوڑی دیر ہرنی کہ سورے پاس تار آیا ہے کہ مولانا مظفر حسین کو گرفتار کر لیا گیا ہے - کس دن انہیں گرفتار کیا گیا - عہد کے دن انہیں گرفتار کیا گیا اور انہیں عہد نہیں ملانے دیا گیا - ہم لوگ برابر کہتے آ رہے ہیں کہ جب پارلیمنٹ کا سیشن ہوتا ہے تو کسی سپر کو گرفتار نہیں کرنا چاہئے - اس سدن میں جو سدن آئے ہیں وہ چلتا سے چن کر آئے ہیں اور انہیں چلنا کی بات کو اس سدن میں رکھنے کا ادھکار ہے - اگر انہیں گرفتار کرنا ہوتا تو بعد میں کہا جا سکتا تھا اور کم سے کم عہد کے دن تو انہیں گرفتار نہیں کہا جانا چاہئے تھا تاکہ وہ عہد تو ملتا لیتے - لیکن ایسا نہیں کہا گیا - سورے پاس تا ہے اور میں اس سدن میں اس کے متعلق سوال رکھوں گا - مسلمان ہمارے بھائی ہیں اور یہاں کی پھداوار ہیں - اس میں زبانہ تو ہندو سے کدورت ہو کر مسلمان بلے ہیں - آپ کا اور ہمارا فرض ہے اور حکومت کا فرض ہے کہ ہم ان کے بلہادی حقوق کا تحفظ کریں اور جہاں تک ہو سکے ہے

دیکھیں کہ ان کے جانا و مال کو کسی طرح کا کوئی نقصان نہ پہنچے - یہ ایک سوال ہے جس کی طرف میں آپ کا دھیان دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جن لیڈروں کو گرفتار کیا گیا ہے - سرکار ان کے متعلق سوچے کہ آیا یہ صحیح طور پر گرفتار کئے گئے ہیں یا نہیں -

اس کے بعد میں اچھرتوں کے بارے میں کچھ کہا چاہتا ہوں - ہندوستان کے اندر سوشلزم اور سیکولرزم کہاں سے آئے گا - جب تک ہم چھوٹا چھوٹا کو مانتے رہیں گے - ہم روزانہ کی زندگی میں چھوٹا چھوٹا کی چیزوں کو برتتے ہیں اور دن آدھم کو مانتے ہیں جو کہ ہندوؤں کے مذہب کا ایک حصہ ہے - ہم ملو سمرتی کی کتاب کو پوتر مانتے ہیں - اسکولوں، کالجوں اور یونیورسٹی میں ایم - اے - سوشلوجی کے کورس میں اس کو پڑھایا جاتا ہے - وہ ایم - اے - کے کورس کا ایک حصہ ہے جس میں یہ لکھا ہوا ہے کہ اگر اچھوت وید پڑھتا ہے تو اس کی زبان کاٹ دی جاتی چاہئے - اگر وہ اس کی کوئی بات سنتا ہے تو اس کے کانوں میں سیسہ بھر دینا چاہئے - اس میں اس طرح کے قرائدیں موجود ہیں اور اسکولوں کے کورس میں یہ کتاب پڑھائی جاتی ہے - اگر آپ اس طرح کی کتابوں کو پڑھا کر دیکھیں میں سبیلزم لانا چاہتے ہیں، دیکھیں کے اندر

برابری لانا چاہتے ہیں، سماج واد لانا چاہتے ہیں اور اقلیتوں کے ساتھ انصاف کرنا چاہتے ہیں تو یہ نہیں ہو سکتا جب تک آپ اس طرح کے حصوں کو حوزہ نہیں کریں گے تب تک آپ اہلے مقصد میں کامیاب نہیں ہو سکتے۔ ہم زیادہ دیر تک اس معاملہ میں سیلفٹی میٹل نہیں ہلے رہ سکتے ہیں۔ کیونکہ اچھوتوں کا جو مسئلہ ہے وہ دیہی میں ایک اہم مسئلہ ہے۔ اگر ہم اس کی طرف دھیان نہیں دیں گے تو دیہی کے اندر کبھی بھی انقلاب آسکتا ہے۔ آپ کو سوچنا چاہئے کہ اچھوت جو ہیں وہ ہمارے بھائی ہیں۔ دشمن نہیں ہیں۔ یہ لوگ ہندو مذہب کو جتنا ماننے میں اتنا اونچے ہندو تک نہیں مانتے ہیں۔ آپ کو ان کے ہر ایک گھر میں دامن ملے گی اور پوری طرح سے وہ دھرم کا پالن کرتے ہیں۔ لیکن ان کے جو بنیادی حقوق ہیں ان سے ان کو آپ محروم نہیں کر سکتے ہیں۔ اس لئے میں سرکار سے عرض کرونگا کہ جو ان کے بنیادی حقوق ہیں وہ انہیں جلد سے جلد ماننے چاہئے۔

دوسری بات میں جس کے متعلق کہنا چاہتا ہوں وہ کشمیر کے الحاق کے بارے میں ہے۔ کشمیر کا پوری طرح سے ہندوستان کے ساتھ الحاق ہونا چاہئے۔ اس کام میں کچھ

دیری ہو گئی ہے اور اب میں امید کرتا ہوں کہ اس کام میں بالکل دیری نہیں کی جانی چاہئے۔ آج وہاں کوئی آدمی نہ جا سکتا ہے اور نہ کوئی زمین ہی خرید سکتا ہے۔ کشمیر کے ساتھ جو اس طرح کا استہاز کیا گیا ہے اس کو ختم کیا جانا چاہئے۔ شہخ عبداللہ کو جیلوں میں رکھنے کی حکمت سے مدت سے جیل میں رکھا گیا ہے رہا کیا جانا چاہئے اور کسی کو بھی اتنی دیر تک جیل میں نہیں رکھا جانا چاہئے۔ یہ چیز ہمارے دیہی کو بدنام کرنے والی ہے جس کو ختم کیا جانا چاہئے۔ پارلیمنٹ نے پچاس ممبروں نے گورنمنٹ اور وزیراعظم صاحب کے پاس ایک ریمونڈم بھیجا ہے جس میں شہخ عبداللہ کو رہا کرنے کے لئے لکھا ہے مگر ابھی تک اس پر کوئی کارروائی نہیں ہوئی ہے۔ پارلیمنٹ نے پچاس ممبروں نے اپیل کی ہے کہ موجودہ حالات میں کشمیر کے لوگوں میں بے چینی ہے اور وہاں امن و امان میں خلل پیدا ہونے کا اندیشہ ہے اس لئے شہخ عبداللہ کو رہا کرنے میں دیری نہیں کرنی چاہئے۔ اگر آپ شہخ عبداللہ کو رہا کریں گے تو آپ کشمیر کے اوپر ہی نہیں بلکہ سارے ہندوستان کے اوپر لہسان کریں گے۔ آج کل کی موجودہ

[شری پیارے لال کرپل دہنالیہہ]  
 حالت میں انہیں جمل کے باہر  
 اپنانا چاہئے تھا۔ اور آئندہ انہیں بھی  
 حکومت ہند کے ساتھ پوری طرح  
 سے تعاون کرنا چاہئے۔ وہ کشمیر کا  
 ہندوستان کے ساتھ پوری طرح اہمیتی  
 کرنے کے معاملہ میں حکومت ہند کے  
 ساتھ پوری طرح سے تعاون کرینگے اور  
 ہر معاملہ میں حکومت ہند کا  
 ساتھ دیں گے۔

اب میں ہندوستان میں سوشلزم  
 لانے کے بارے میں دو ایک بات کہنا  
 چاہتا ہوں۔ یہاں پر لاکھوں کی  
 تعداد میں کھیتی والے مزدور ہیں  
 جن کے پاس زمینیں نہیں ہیں اور  
 ہمارے دیس میں بہت سی زمینیں  
 بھنگ پڑی ہوئی ہے جو کھیتی والے  
 مزدور کو دی جانی چاہئے۔ اس  
 زمین کو ان کھیتی والے مزدوروں میں  
 بانٹ دیا جانا چاہئے تاکہ دیس میں  
 پروڈکشن بڑھے۔ مگر کھیتی والے  
 مزدوروں کی مالی حالت ایسی ہے  
 کہ وہ پیسے دیکر زمین نہیں خرید  
 سکتے ہیں۔ دیس میں یہ لوگ  
 ہی ایسے آدمی ہیں جن کے پاس نہ  
 دھلے کو مکان ہے اور نہ کھیتی کرنے کے  
 لئے زمین ہی ہے۔ شہروں میں سرکار کے  
 پاس جو زمین ہوتی ہے وہ نفع کے  
 ذریعہ دی جاتی ہے اور بڑے بڑے  
 سرمایہ دار اس زمین کو خرید لیتے  
 ہیں۔ اور وہی اٹا کو مکان بناتے

ہیں اور پھر ان کو کرایہ میں لگا دیتے  
 ہیں۔ یہ چھڑ کہاں تک جائز ہے  
 اور کیا ہم اس طرح سے دیس میں سماج  
 واد لا سکتے ہیں۔

اب آپ کے سامنے میں اس صورت اور  
 ایکسپورت کے بارے میں عرض کرنا  
 چاہتا ہوں۔ آج دیکھنے میں یہ آتا  
 ہے کہ اس وقت اور ایکسپورت کا لائسنس  
 انہیں ہی دیا جاتا ہے جن کے پاس  
 کروڑوں روپے ہیں۔ جو لاکھوں روپے  
 کے مالک ہیں اور انہیں ہی اور روپے  
 کمانے کے لئے اس طرح کے لائسنس دئے  
 جاتے ہیں۔ جو بڑے بڑے ٹھیکے ہوتے  
 ہیں وہ ان لوگوں کو دئے جاتے ہیں  
 جن کے بیلنک بیلنس زیادہ ہوتے  
 ہیں۔ مہری سرکار سے یہ عرض ہے  
 کہ فریب آدمیوں کو بھی لائسنس  
 تقسیم کئے جانے چاہئیں تاکہ ان کی  
 مالی حالت بھی بہتر ہو سکے اور وہ  
 بھی اپنے پاؤں پر کھڑے ہونے کے لائق  
 بن پا سکیں۔ لیکن دیکھنے میں  
 یہ آتا ہے کہ اس وقت زیادہ اس وقت ہوتے  
 جا رہے ہیں اور فریب زیادہ فریب  
 تر ہوتے جا رہے ہیں۔ اس لئے مہری  
 سرکار سے درخواست ہے کہ فریب  
 لوگوں کو بھی لائسنس اس وقت اور  
 ایکسپورت کے لئے جانے چاہئیں۔

اس کے علاوہ ہمارے جو کلرک کام  
 کرتے ہیں ان کی مالی حالت  
 بھی ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔ اگر آج ان کی  
 حالت دیکھی جائے تو ہم پائیلنگ کے

وہ ایلے ہوں بچوں کو اچھی طرح سے پال نہیں سکتے ہوں نہ ان کو وہ اچھی طرح سے کہرا ہی پہنا سکتے ہوں اور نہ روتی کا ہی اچھی طرح سے بلڈریسٹ کر سکتے ہوں۔ جب دو تین ہزار والے ایلے کہہ گا بلڈریسٹ توہک طرح سے نہیں چلا سکتے ہوں تو یہ چھوٹے چھوٹے کلرک کس طرح چلا سکتے ہوں۔ آپ ان کی نظرہا بڑھاتیہ اور ان کے فیکریس الونس کو بڑھاتیہ تب ہی آپ اس دیہی میں سوشلزم قائم کر سکتے ہوں۔ اس وقت بڑے انیسروں اور چھوٹے کلرکوں کے بیچ میں جو تفریق ہے وہ بہت زیادہ ہے اور ایسے آپ کو جلد سے جلد ختم کرنا ہوگا۔ جب تک آپ اس چیز کو نہیں کرتے اس آمدنی کے فرق کو دور نہیں کرتے تب تک آپ اس دیہی میں سوشلزم نہیں لا سکتے ہوں۔

اس کے بعد میں تجارت کے بارے میں کچھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ جہاں تک تجارت کا سوال ہے آپ بڑے بڑے یونٹس دیکھیں گو ہی انڈیا دھندے فیکٹریاں اور مل کھولنے کے لئے پوسہ دے رہے ہوں۔ میں آپ سے درخواست کروں گا کہ جو اسی ایلے ہاتھ سے کام کرتے ہوں جو چھوٹے چھوٹے دھندے کرتے ہوں وہ ہاتھوں میں بہت چھوٹے چھوٹے کام کرتے ہوں یا شہروں میں کرتے ہوں ان کو اس طرح کے کام کرنے کے لئے لیں دیا جانا

چاہئے تاکہ وہ ایذا دھندا آسانی کے ساتھ کر سکیں۔ آپ کو ان کے اوپر کسی طرح کی پابندی لوں دینے میں نہیں لگانی چاہئے اور نہ کسی طرح کی سکوریٹی ہی لہنی چاہئے۔ آج اس دیہی میں اس طرح کے لوگوں کو چھوٹے چھوٹے لوں دینے کی ضرورت ہے۔ آپ کو ایلے انحصاری پالیسی میں بلہادی طور پر تبدیلی کرنی ہوگی تاکہ اس دیہی میں انیسروں اور فریہی کا فرق مت جائے۔ آج یہ لوگ بلہادی سوال ہے جس کو سرکار کو سب سے پہلے کرنا ہے۔ اگر وہ اس دیہی میں سلیجوان لانا چاہتی ہے اور اس کی طرف لے جانا چاہتی ہے تو سرکار کو اٹھتوں کے جو بلہادی حقوق ہے اور جو دوسرے ایسے اہم مسئلے ہوں ان کو پہلے حل کرنا چاہئے۔ میں اب زیادہ نہیں کہونتا کہونکہ مہری طبیعت توہک نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے یہ جلد باتیں کہہ کر آپ کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔

دھندے ہاں۔

† [ श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जनानेवाला में भाषका ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा; तबीयत नासाब है और हारत भी है ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: फिर आप क्या तकलीफ कर रहे हैं ?

† [ ] Hindi transliteration.

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब']  
इसलिए तकरीर कर रहा हूँ कि सवाल इतना महत्वपूर्ण है कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर बहस हो। कहा जाता है कि हमारी हुकूमत की बुनियाद सैक्यूलरिज्म पर है। महज भाईनी तौर पर यह कह देना कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर, इस देश के अन्दर, सैक्यूलरिज्म होगा यह काफी नहीं है। आप को इस देश के अन्दर, इस मुल्क के अन्दर, सैक्यूलर सोशल आर्डर को लाना होगा। सैक्यूलर समाजी निजाम को कायम करना होगा। इसी वक्त हम इस देश के अन्दर सैक्यूलर हुकूमत बना सकते हैं और हमारी जम्हूरियत और हमारे प्लान की कामयाबी के साथ साथ सैक्यूलरिज्म की कामयाबी का ज्यादातर दायरेदार इस बात पर है कि हम यहाँ की अकलीयतों के साथ, यहाँ की माइनोरीटीज के साथ कैसा सलूक करते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में माइनोरीटीज का सवाल बहुत महत्वपूर्ण रखता है। अकलीयतों का सवाल बहुत महत्वपूर्ण रखता है। जितनी इस सवाल की तरफ तवज्जो दी जानी चाहिए उतनी तवज्जो हम नहीं देते। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर सब से बड़ी अकलीयत मुसलमानों की है। फिर ईसाइयों की है, एंग्लो इंडियन की है और सिखों की है। और इसके अलावा हम शेड्यूलड कास्ट को भी माइनोरीटी में समझ सकते हैं। हकीकत तो यह है कि मुसलमानों को और दूसरी अकलीयतों को हिन्दू अकलीयत से इतनी शिकायत नहीं होगी जितनी कि यहाँ उनके हम-मजहब भाइयों को है। एक हकीकत है जो आप को माननी पड़ेगी। महज बातों से मसला हल नहीं होगा।

श्री शीलमङ्ग याजी: बिल्कुल गलत बात है। हरिजन अल्पसंख्यक नहीं हैं, वरन् हिन्दू समाज के एक अंग हैं।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब': बिल्कुल सही बात है। मैं इस माइनोरीटी से साल्लुक रखता हूँ और यह कह सकता हूँ कि यह बात बिल्कुल सही है। मगर आप इन हम-मजहब भाइयों के साथ अच्छा सलूक नहीं

करते हैं। वह आज हजारों डिसएंबिलिटीज से सफर कर रहे हैं। तब आप कैसे दावा कर सकते हैं कि आप दूसरी अकलीयतों के साथ बिरादराना और मुसिफाना सलूक कर सकते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You said you are not well. Please do not strain yourself by being loud.

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब': मुसलमान और दूसरी अकलीयतें मजहबी तौर पर, तमझनी तौर पर आप से अलग और दूर हैं। आप इन माइनोरीटीज के साथ कैसे इन्साफ कर सकते हैं जबकि आप अपने हम-मजहब भाइयों के साथ अच्छा सलूक नहीं कर सकते हैं।

मैं दरबवास्त करता हूँ कि मैं जो तकरीर करता हूँ उसमें क्वांट न डाली जाय। मैं एक हकीकत की तरफ ध्यान दिलाता हूँ। हमने कहा है कि हमारे यहाँ सैक्यूलरिज्म की हुकूमत होगी। पाकिस्तान को जाने दीजिये। पाकिस्तान ने ऐलानिया तौर पर कहा कि पाकिस्तान की हुकूमत की बुनियाद इस्लाम पर होगी। लेकिन पाकिस्तान जो कुछ करता है उसको देखकर हमें भी वैसा ही नहीं करना है क्योंकि हम ने ऐलानिया तौर पर कहा है कि हमारी हुकूमत की बुनियाद सैक्यूलरिज्म पर है। हमें इस देश के अन्दर सैक्यूलर सोशल आर्डर को लाना होगा। इसलिए आप को इस सवाल की तरफ ध्यान करना होगा।

श्री ए० एम० तारिक (जम्मू और काश्मीर): पाकिस्तान जो भी करता है वह इस्लाम के खिलाफ करता है। वह गैर-इस्लामी हुकूमत है।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब': हमें इससे कोई मतलब नहीं है। मगर उन्होंने ऐलान किया है कि उनकी हुकूमत इस्लामी बुनियादों पर कायम है। वह खिलाफ करते हैं इस्लाम के, यह दूसरी चीज है।

ईस्ट बंगाल की अकलीयतों के मुतल्लिक बहुत कुछ यहां पर कहा गया है। मैं इस हाउस की थोड़ी सी तबज्जो वैंस्ट बंगाल की मुसलमान अकलीयतों के बारे में भी दिलाऊंगा। यह सही है कि हम नहीं चाहते कि किसी अकलीयत के साथ कोई गैर-मुसिफाना या इम्तियाजी मुलूक हो। मगर जो यहां की माइनोरीटीज को, खुसूसन मुसलमान माइनो-रिटी को, शिकायत है और जहां तक इन शिकायत का ताल्लुक है वह ज्यादातर मजहबी इम्तियाज से ताल्लुक रखती है। मेरा यह कहना है कि इस हकीकत की तरफ गौर करें। अगर आप नहीं करते हैं तो यह मसला कभी हल नहीं होगा।

कलकत्ते में फसादात हुए और यह मानना पड़ेगा कि वहां पर मुसलमानों की जानो-माल को नुकसान पहुंचा और हम इस चीज से इन्कार नहीं कर सकते हैं। कुछ लोगों ने, जिनमें पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर मौलाना मुजफ्फर हुसैन, जो आल इंडिया मुन्हिदा मुहाज के जनरल सेक्रेटरी हैं, मौलाना इस्सराख हक, जो इस जमायत के सदर हैं और जमायत-ए-इस्लामी के दो लीडर जो सदर रह चुके हैं पश्चिमी बंगाल के वज्जारे आजम से इजाजत लेकर रायट एफेक्टेड एरिया का दौरा किया था। उन लोगों को रायट एफेक्टेड एरिया देखने की इजाजत दे दी गयी थी और उनके साथ आदमी भेज दिये गये थे ताकि उन पर किसी तरह का हमला न हो। उन लोगों ने फसाद-ज्जदा इलाकों का दौरा किया और दौरा करने के बाद उन्होंने एक मेमोरेंडम तैयार किया और उसको होम मिनिस्टर श्री नन्दा जी के सामने पेश किया। श्री नन्दा जी ने कहा कि तुम इस मेमोरेंडम को वैंस्ट बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने पेश करो। उन लोगों ने वैंस्ट बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर को यह मेमोरेंडम दिया। हो सकता है कि मेमोरेंडम में कुछ ऐसी बातें हों जो उन्हें बुरी लगी हों। लेकिन यह दूसरी चीज है। उन्होंने मेमोरेंडम दिया

और चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब उसको देखते ही आग-बबूला हो गये। उन्होंने कहा कि हम ने तो तुम को फसादज्जदा इलाके में जाने का मौका दिया मगर तुम ने उसका नाजायब फायदा उठाया और मैं आप को हुकन देता हूं कि आप इसी रात को कलकत्ता से बाहर चले जाइये। बाद में रात के वक्त उन्हें घर से पुलिस के जरिये निकाल कर कलकत्ता से बाहर कर दिया। वज्जारे मौसूफ को कम से कम यह तो मालूम कर लेना चाहिए था कि उन्होंने मेमोरेंडम में जो बातें अकलीयत के बारे में लिखी थीं वह सही हैं या नहीं। अभी थोड़ी देर हुई कि मेरे पास तार आया है कि मौलाना मुजफ्फर हुसैन को गिरफ्तार कर लिया गया है। किस दिन उन्हें गिरफ्तार किया गया? ईद के दिन उन्हें गिरफ्तार किया गया और उन्हें ईद नहीं मनाने दिया गया। हम लोग बराबर कहते आ रहे हैं कि जब पार्लियामेंट का सेशन होता है तो किसी मेम्बर को गिरफ्तार नहीं करना चाहिए। इस सदन में जो सदस्य आते हैं वह जनता से चुनकर आते हैं और उन्हें जनता का बात को इस सदन में रखने का अधिकार है। अगर उन्हें गिरफ्तार करना या तो बाद में किया जा सकता था और कम से कम ईद के दिन तो उन्हें गिरफ्तार नहीं किया जाना चाहिए था ताकि वह ईद तो मना लेते। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं किया गया। मेरे पास तार है और मैं इस सदन में इसके मुतल्लिक सवाल रखूंगा। मुसलमान हमारे भाई हैं और यहां की पंदावार हैं। इस में ज्यादातर हिन्दू से कनवर्ट होकर मुसलमान बने हैं। आपका और हमारा फर्ज है, हुकूमत का फर्ज है कि हम उनके बुनियादी हुकूकों का तहफूज करें और जहां तक हो सके यह देखें कि उनके जानो-माल को किसी तरह का कोई नुकसान न पहुंचे। यह एक सवाल है जिसकी तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं कि जिन लीडरों को गिरफ्तार किया गया है सरकार उनके मुतल्लिक सोचे कि आया वह सही तौर पर गिरफ्तार किये गये हैं या नहीं।

[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब"]

इसके बाद मैं अछूतों के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर सोशलिज्म और सैक्यूलरिज्म कहां से आयेगा जब तक हम छुआछूत को मानते रहेंगे। हम रोजाना की जिन्दगी में छुआछूत की चीजों को बरतते हैं और वर्णाश्रम को मानते हैं जो कि हिन्दुओं के मद्द्ब का एक हिस्सा है। हम मनुस्मृति की किताब को पवित्र मानते हैं। स्कूलों, कालेजों और यूनिवर्सिटी में एम० ए० सोशियोलॉजी के कोर्स में इसको पढ़ाया जाता है। वह एम० ए० के कोर्स का एक हिस्सा है जिसमें यह लिखा हुआ है कि अगर अछूत बंद पढ़ाता है तो उसकी ज़बान काट दी जानी चाहिए। अगर वह इसकी कोई बात सुनता है तो उसके कानों में सीसा भर देना चाहिए। उसमें इस तरह के बवानीन मौजूद हैं और स्कूलों के कोर्स में वह किताब पढ़ाई जाती है। अगर आप इस तरह की किताबों को पढ़ाकर देश में सोशलिज्म लाना चाहते हैं, देश के अन्दर बराबरी लाना चाहते हैं, समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं और अकलीयतों के साथ इन्साफ करना चाहते हैं तो यह नहीं हो सकता कि जब तक आप इस तरह के हिस्सों को हजफ नहीं करेंगे तब तक आप अपने मकसद में कामयाब नहीं हो सकते। हम ज्यादा देर तक इस मामले में सेंटिमेंटल नहीं बने रह सकते हैं क्योंकि अछूतों का जो मसला है वह देश में एक अहम मसला है। अगर हम इसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं देंगे तो देश के अन्दर कभी भी इन्क्लाब आ सकता है। आपको सोचना चाहिए कि अछूत जो हैं वह हमारे भाई हैं, दुश्मन नहीं हैं। यह लोग हिन्दू मजहब को जितना मानते हैं उतना ऊँचे हिन्दू तक नहीं मानते हैं। आपको उनके हर एक घर में रामायण मिलेगी और पूरी तरह से वह धर्म का पालन करते हैं। लेकिन उनके जो बुनियादी हकूक हैं उनसे उनको आप महरूम नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं सरकार से अज कलंगा

कि जो उनके बुनियादी हकूक हैं वह उन्हें जल्द से जल्द मिलने चाहिये।

दूसरी बात मैं जिसके मतल्लिक कहना चाहता हूँ वह कश्मीर के इलहाक के बारे में है। कश्मीर का पूरी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के साथ इलहाक होना चाहिए। इस काम में कुछ देरी हो गयी है और अब मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि इस काम में बिल्कुल देरी नहीं की जानी चाहिए। आज वहां कोई आदमी नहीं जा सकता है और न कोई जमीन ही खरीद सकता है। कश्मीर के साथ जो इस तरह का इम्तयाज किया गया है इसको खत्म किया जाना चाहिए। शेख अब्दुल्ला को, जिन्हें कैदी की हैसियत से मुद्दत से जेल में रखा गया है, रिहा किया जाना चाहिए और किसी को भी इतनी देर तक जेल में नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये। यह चीज हमारे देश को बदनाम करने वाली है जिस को खत्म किया जाना चाहिए। पार्लियामेंट के पचास मँम्बरों ने, गवर्नमेंट और वजीर-आजम के पास एक मँमोरेंडम भेजा है जिसमें शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा करने के लिए लिखा है। मगर अभी तक उस पर कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई है। पार्लियामेंट के पचास मँम्बरों ने अपील की है। मौजूदा हालात में कश्मीर के लोगों में बेचैनी है और वहां अमनो-अमान में खलल पैदा होने का अन्देश है। इसलिए शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा करने में देरी नहीं करनी चाहिए। अगर आप शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा करेंगे तो आप कश्मीर के ऊपर ही नहीं बल्कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर ऐहसान करेंगे। आजकल की मौजूदा हालत में उन्हें जेल के बाहर आ जाना चाहिए था। और आइन्दा उन्हें भी हकूमते हिन्द के साथ पूरी तरह से तआवुन करना चाहिए। वह कश्मीर का हिन्दुस्तान के साथ पूरी तरह इलहाक करने के मामले में हकूमते हिन्द के साथ पूरी तरह से तआवुन करेंगे और हर मामले में हकूमते हिन्द का साथ देंगे।

अब मैं हिन्दुस्तान में सोशलिज्म लाने के बारे में दो-एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। यह

पर लाखों की तादाद में खेती वाले मजदूर हैं जिनके पास जमीन नहीं है और हमारे देश में बहुत सी जमीन बेकार पड़ी हुई है जिसे खेती वाले मजदूर को दी जानी चाहिए। इस जमीन को उन खेती वाले मजदूरों में बांट दी जानी चाहिए ताकि देश में प्रोडक्शन बढ़े। मगर खेती वाले मजदूरों की माली हालत ऐसी है कि वे पैसा देकर जमीन नहीं खरीद सकते हैं। देश में यह लोग ही ऐसे आदमी हैं जिनके पास न रहने को मकान है और न खेती करने के लिए जमीन ही है। शहरों में सरकार के पास जो जमीन होती है वह नीलाम के जरिए दी जाती है और बड़े बड़े सरमायेदार इस जमीन को खरीद लेते हैं और रुपया लगा कर मकान बनाते हैं और फिर उनको किराए में लगा देते हैं। यह चीज कहां तक जायज है और क्या हम इस तरह से देश में समाजवाद ला सकते हैं ?

अब आपके सामने मैं इम्पोर्ट और एक्सपोर्ट के बारे में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। आज देखने में यह आता है कि इम्पोर्ट और एक्सपोर्ट का लाइसेंस उन्हें ही दिया जाता है जिनके पास करोड़ों रुपया है जो लाखों रुपए के मालिक हैं और उन्हें ही और रुपया कमाने के लिए इस तरह के लाइसेंस दिए जाते हैं। जो बड़े बड़े ठेके होते हैं वह उन लोगों को दिए जाते हैं जिनके बैंक बैलेंस ज्यादा होते हैं। मेरी सरकार से यह अर्ज है कि गरीब आर्दाभियों को भी लाइसेंस तकसीम किए जाने चाहिए ताकि उनकी माली हालत भी बेहतर हो सके और वह भी अपने पांव पर खड़े होने के लायक बन जा सकें। लेकिन देखने में यह आता है कि अमीर ज्यादा अमीरतर होते जा रहे हैं और गरीब ज्यादा गरीबतर होते जा रहे हैं। इसलिए मेरी सरकार से दरखास्त है कि गरीब लोगों को भी लाइसेंस इम्पोर्ट और एक्सपोर्ट के दिए जाने चाहिए।

इसके अलावा हमारे जो वर्क काम करते हैं उनकी माली हालत भी ठीक नहीं है। अगर

आज उनकी हालत देखी जाय तो हम पाएंगे कि वह अपने बीबी-बच्चों को अच्छी तरह से पाल नहीं सकते हैं, न इन को वह अच्छी तरह से कपड़ा ही पहना सकते हैं और न रोटी का ही अच्छी तरह से बन्दोबस्त कर सकते हैं। जब दो तीन हजार वाले अपने घर का बन्दोबस्त ठीक तरह से नहीं चला सकते हैं तो ये छोटे छोटे वर्क किस तरह चला सकते हैं। आप उनकी तनख्वाह बढ़ाएँ और उनकी डीयरनेस एलाउन्स को बढ़ाएँ तब ही आप इस देश में सोशलिज्म कायम कर सकते हैं। इस वक्त बड़े अफसरों और छोटे वर्कों के बीच में जो तफरीक है वह बहुत ज्यादा है और उसे आपको जल्द से जल्द खत्म करना होगा। अब तक आप इस चीज को नहीं करते इस आमदनी के फर्क को दूर नहीं करते तब तक आप इस देश में सोशलिज्म नहीं ला सकते हैं।

इसके बाद मैं तिजारत के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। जहां तक तिजारत का सवाल है आप बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों को ही उद्योग धन्धे फैक्ट्रियां और मिल खोलने के लिए पैसा दे रहे हैं। मैं आप से यह दरखास्त करूंगा कि जो आदमी अपने हाथ से काम करते हैं जो छोटे छोटे धन्धे करते हैं, देहातों में बहुत छोटे छोटे काम करते हैं या शहरों में करते हैं उनको इस तरह से काम करने के लिये लोन दिया जाना चाहिए ताकि वह अपना धन्धा आसानी के साथ कर सकें। आपको उनके ऊपर किसी तरह की पाबन्दी लोन देने में नहीं लगानी चाहिए और न किसी तरह की सिवयूरिटी ही लेनी चाहिए। आज इस देश में इस तरह के लोगों को छोटे छोटे लोन देने की जरूरत है। आप को अपने इक्विसादी पॉलिसी में बुनियादी तौर पर तब्दीली करनी होगी ताकि इस देश में अमीरी और गरीबी का फर्क मिट जाये। आज यह एक बुनियादी सवाल है जिसको सरकार को सब से पहले करना है अगर वह इस देश में समाजवाद लाना चाहती है और



[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील 'तालिब']

इसकी तरफ ले जाना चाहती है तो सरकार को अकलीयतों के जो बुनियादी हकूक हैं और जो दूसरे ऐसे अहम मसले हैं उनको पहले हल करना चाहिये। मैं अब ज्यादा नहीं कहूंगा क्योंकि मेरी तबीयत ठीक नहीं है। इसलिये ये चन्द बातें ही कह कर आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

[घन्यवाद।]

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, कार्यवाहक राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर घन्यवाद ज्ञापन का जो प्रस्ताव देवकीनंदन जी ने पेश किया है, मैं उसका सहर्ष समर्थन करता हूँ।

कार्यवाहक राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में जो लोकतंत्र और समाजवाद की गति के बारे में चित्र किया है, उसकी हमारे कतिपय सदस्य जो मुखालिफ पार्टी के लोग हैं, खास करके जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग हैं, उन्होंने बड़ी खिल्ली उड़ाई। प्रोमोविपट और प्रोचाइना जो दोनों लाबी के सदस्य हैं, उन दोनों ने इस तरह से हमारे समाजवाद की खिल्ली उड़ाई और पता यह चलता था कि यही समाजवाद के ठेकेदार हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में समाजवाद की मानोपली इन्हीं की है और दूसरे जिस समाजवाद की बात करते हैं वह समाजवाद निकम्मा है या वह पूरा नहीं है। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि आफिशियल कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी जब अपनी मीटिंग में बैठती है तो उसकी आवाज दूसरी होती है अभी भुवनेश्वर कांग्रेस में जो लोकतंत्र तथा समाजवाद पर एक प्रस्ताव पास किया गया, उसके लिये उनकी दाद या उनके सर्टिफिकेट से हमको फायदा नहीं होगा। भारतीय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी यदि समाजवाद के लिये कांग्रेस को दाद देगी या सर्टिफिकेट देगी तभी समाजवाद की गाड़ी आगे चलेगी, ऐसा नहीं है और इसकी जरूरत भी नहीं है। लेकिन खान न मान, मैं तेरा महमान की जो कहावत

है, उसी के अनुसार कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने कहा कि भुवनेश्वर में कांग्रेस आगे बढ़ गई और समाजवाद की गाड़ी आगे बढ़ रही है। जब दोनों विचार के उनके प्रतिनिधि आते हैं तो उनमें एक कम्पटीशन होने लगता है। शुरू से ले कर आखिर तक उन्होंने अपनी स्वीच में यह कहा कि यह समाजवाद बनावटी, नकली और झूठा है। इसी तरह के जितने शब्द कहे जा सकते हैं उनसे उन्होंने इसको विभूषित किया। मैं उन दोनों कामरेडों से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी कोई गिनती नहीं है। जो समाजवाद का ठेकेदार कामरेड झुशुचेव है, वह यदि हमारे समाजवाद को दाद देता है, हमारी योजना के काम को दाद देता है, तो आपको कौन पूछता है। समाजवाद के बाजार में कामरेड भूपेश जी और यह जो राममूर्ति जी हैं, इनकी कोई गिनती नहीं है, इनको कोई मानता नहीं है। इनको न चीन मानता है और न रूस मानता है। इसलिये यह कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा। उन्होंने शुरू से लेकर आखिर तक यह बतलाने की कोशिश की कि १७ वर्ष के अन्दर समाजवाद का कोई भी काम नहीं हुआ और उसके लिए उन्होंने तरह-तरह की दलीलें पेश कीं। मैं बराबर कहता आ रहा हूँ कि जब से यह हमारी शासन पार्टी गद्दी पर बैठी है तब से ये जितने छः सौ राजे महाराजे थे, उनको खत्म कर दिया गया है, तो क्या यह समाजवाद का रास्ता नहीं है? उनके राज्य छीन करके हमने उनके महल भी छीन लिये हैं और आज वे लखनऊ और दूसरी जगहों में होटल चला रहे हैं। एक राजा जी हमारे सामने बैठे हैं। इनका हमने राज्य लिया और इनका हमने महल भी पानी में डूबो दिया। तो ये जो छः सौ राजतंत्र चले गये, क्या यह समाजवाद का रास्ता नहीं है? हमारे सूबे में आठ लाख जमींदार थे और हमने जमींदारी प्रथा को खत्म कर दिया। उसी तरह से और सूबों में भी जितने जमींदारी, जागीरदारी या भालगुजारी तथा र्योत सिस्टम थे, उन सब को खत्म कर दिया गया है। क्या यह समाजवाद नहीं है? इसके बाद

जो तीस हजार एकड़ जमीन के मालिक थे उनको हमने ३० एकड़ जमीन का मालिक बना दिया। क्या यह लैंड रिफार्म नहीं है? कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की डेफिनीशन में, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि लैंड रिफार्म क्या है? हर एक राज्य में लैंड रिफार्म हुए हैं। कहीं कहीं नहीं हुए तो उसके लिये प्लानिंग कमीशन कह रहा है कि जल्दी करो।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

जहाँ तक कैपिटलिस्टों का सम्बन्ध है, यह ठीक है कि यहाँ थोड़े से टाटा, बिड़ला जैसे लोग हैं। लेकिन थाप रेड चाइना में भी चले जायें, वहाँ भी कैपिटलिस्टों को खे रखे हुये हैं। वहाँ भी जो उनकी इकोनामिक पालिसी है, उसमें वे बड़े बड़े कैपिटलिस्टों को रखे हुये हैं। उसी तरह से हम भी अपने यहाँ कैपिटलिस्टों को रखे हुए हैं। लेकिन यह जो मिक्सड इकोनामी हमारी चल रही है, उसके लिये सरकार से हमारी यह बराबर सिकायत रहती है कि यह गंगा जमुना की नीति नहीं चल सकती है, इसको जल्दी बदलना चाहिये। फिर भी वह जो गंगा जमुना की नीति चल रही है, उसमें यह जो बड़े बड़े सरमायेदार हैं, पूँजी पति हैं, उनकी भ्रामदनी में से हम तो में से ७५ रुपये टैक्स के ले लेते हैं। क्या यह समाजवाद का रास्ता नहीं है? इसके बाद थाप देख लें कि जितनी हमारी बड़ी योजनाएं बनती हैं, परिकल्पना के मुताबिक जितनी हमारी स्कीमें होती हैं उनको हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर में टाटा, बिड़ला आदि को नहीं देते हैं बल्कि हम खुद स्टेट की ओर से उनका निर्माण करते हैं।

यह जाहिर है कि डेमोक्रेसी में, लोकतन्त्र में समाजवाद की गाड़ी तीव्र गति से नहीं चल पाती है। जहाँ डंडा चलता है, जहाँ डिक्टेटोरशिप है, वहाँ जल्दी, जल्दी काम होता है। लेकिन हमने यह निश्चय किया है कि हमें लोकतंत्र की पद्धति से समाजवाद की स्थापना करनी है, इसलिये उसमें देरी

होती है। फिर भी जो बाहर के समाजवादी देशों से लोग घाते हैं, वे हमारे कामों की प्रशंसा करते हैं। हजारों वर्षों तक हम गुलामी में रहे और हमारा शोषण ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद ने किया, जागीरदारों, जमींदारों और राजा महाराजाओं ने किया। इसलिये हमारा देश बहुत गरीब हो गया। रूस का गुणगान करने वाले इस समय यहाँ नहीं हैं, नहीं तो मैं उनसे सवाल पूछता कि जारशाही खत्म होने के बाद जो रूस में महान इत्कलाव हुआ, उसमें समाजवाद को लाने में कितना समय लगा? हम पांच वर्षीय योजना बनाते हैं, लेकिन वहाँ छः वर्षीय छः योजनाएं पूरी होने पर ३६ वर्ष में समाजवाद कायम हुआ। यह समाजवाद दाल भात का खाना नहीं है कि जल्दी जल्दी खा गये और समाजवाद स्थापित हो गया। जहाँ जात पात का सवाल है, बिरादरी का सवाल है और दूसरे बहुत से सवाल हैं, वहाँ समाजवाद की स्थापना करना और भी कठिन है।

अभी हमारे एक साथी ने तमाम उल्टा सीधा बोल दिया। जिसको रैमजें मैकडानलड नहीं कर सके, उसको कुरील साहब करना चाहते हैं। यहाँ कहने में कुछ होता नहीं है। यहाँ किसी की जवान पर कोई रोक नहीं है, न यहाँ और न बाहर। इसलिये जो लोग चाहते हैं, कह जाते हैं। उसी तरह से जिनको रैमजें मैकडानलड अल्पसंख्यक नहीं बना सके, उनको कुरील साहब अल्पसंख्यक बना रहे हैं। वे जात-पात के लिये रिजर्वेशन ले करके, जात-पात को बराबर कायम रखना चाहते हैं।

شری پیارے لال کوریل دوطالبہ :

ہم چل چل کر کہتے ہیں کہ آپ  
ایگزوریشن کو ختم کر دیجئے -

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' :

हम चिल्ला चिल्ला कर कहते हैं कि थाप रिजर्वेशन को खत्म कर दीजिये। ]

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : वे रिजर्वेशन मांगते हैं और उसके द्वारा जातपात बनाये रखना चाहते हैं ।

SHRI P. L. KUREEL URF TALIB: We don't want this paper representation. AU the Scheduled Castes who are elected on Congress ticket or on other parties' tickets are for all practical purposes caste Hindu representatives. They are elected on caste Hindu votes.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : जब भी वे बोलते हैं तो रिजर्वेशन की मांग करते हैं और जोर जोर से चिल्लाते हैं कि इनकलाब करेंगे । इनसे इनकलाब होगा ?

شہی رہا ہے گل کوہل مدطالب ہے  
ہم کہتے ہوں کہ آپ ریژریشن  
ختم کر دیجیے اور آج ہی ختم کر  
دیجئے۔

†[ श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब': हम कहते हैं कि आप रिजर्वेशन खत्म कर दीजिये और आज ही खत्म कर दीजिये ।]

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इनकलाब करने वाले तो हम हैं और हम धीरे धीरे समाजवाद को भी लायेंगे । वैसे अपनी सरकार से भी हम शिकायत करते हैं कि समाजवाद के लिये कुछ मुस्तैदी होनी चाहिये और जोर से काम होना चाहिये । लेकिन ये कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग जो अपने को समाजवाद का ठेकेदार समझते हैं और जो समाजवाद के मोनो-पलिस्ट बनना चाहते हैं, वे जो यह कहते थे कि इन १७ वर्षों में समाजवाद का कुछ काम ही नहीं हुआ है, यह मैं समझता हूँ कि वे सरासर गलत बात कह रहे थे । समाजवाद की गाड़ी चल रही है, लेकिन मेरी समझ से वह कठुए की गति से चल रही है, कच्छप गति से चल रही है ।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : कांग्रेस तो कम्युनिज्म की तरफ जा रही है ।

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हमारी पार्टी की दशा यह है कि एक तरफ राजे महाराजे और स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के नेता राजा जी यह कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस कम्युनिज्म की तरफ जा रही है और दूसरी तरफ कम्युनिस्ट यह कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस कैपिटलिस्टों की तरफ जा रही है । तो इन दो के बीच में हम जा रहे हैं । तो आज हमारे लिये मुसीबत यह है कि एक तो कहते हैं कि हम कम्युनिज्म की ओर जा रहे हैं और दूसरे कहते हैं कि हम कैपिटलिज्म की ओर जा रहे हैं लेकिन दोनों गलत हैं; हम कम्युनिज्म की तरफ भी नहीं जा रहे हैं और कैपिटलिज्म की तरफ भी नहीं जा रहे हैं । मैं तो डंके की चोट पर कहता हूँ कि रूस में भी कम्युनिज्म पांच सौ साल में भी नहीं आयेगा, कम्युनिज्म मामूली चीज नहीं है, "दि स्टेट शैल विदर अवे" यह मामूली बात नहीं है । इसलिये जो समाजवादी हैं उनसे मैं कहता हूँ— जो स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के लोग हैं वे तो रिपब्लिकनरी हैं, राजा-महाराजा हैं, ये तो कंजरवेटिव हैं लेकिन जो अपने को समाजवादी कहते हैं, तथाकथित समाजवादी नहीं बल्कि जो अपने को डेमोक्रेटिक सोशलिस्ट कहते हैं उनसे कहता हूँ—कि उनका यह फर्ज है कि अगर वह समाजवाद के हित में शासक पार्टी में मिलें नहीं तो कम से कम जो समाजवादी प्रोग्राम हों, कार्यक्रम हों उनमें सहयोग दें ।...

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : श्री रोजेल्फ्यूशंस को बिजू पटनायक जैसे कैपिटलिस्ट स्पासर करें ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हमारी इतनी महानता है कि हम ने अशोक मेहता को यह भी नहीं कहा कि पहले जाइन करो या पार्टी छोड़ो ...

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश): नहीं, पार्टी में इतनी दरिद्रता कि कोई उसमें है ही नहीं ।

dent

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मेरा कहना है कि समाजवाद कायम करने के लिये एक हो जाओ। कैसी कैसी समाजवादी पार्टी हिन्दुस्तान में है, यह समझ में नहीं आता है कि समाजवाद के रास्ते पर भी नहीं चलेगे और सहयोग भी नहीं करेंगे। मैं तो चेतावनी देता हूँ कि अगर देश में समाजवाद ठीक से नहीं चला तो फिर रिपब्लिकन होगा, प्रतिक्रियावाद होगा और समाजवाद को सब भूल जायेंगे। राजा महाराजा लोग इसके लिये भूमि तैयार कर रहे हैं...

شہد ہمارے لال کوہل مدطالبہ :  
شہداس چندر بوس کی روح کو تکلیف  
مت پہنچائے -

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब':  
शुभाष चन्द्र बस की रूह को तकलीफ मत  
पहुँचाए।]

श्री शीलभद्र याजी: आप बैठ जाइए,  
आप बहुत बोल चुके हैं।

इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारी शासक पार्टी जो समाजवाद का रास्ता अपना रही है वही रास्ता मुल्क के लिये और सब के लिये अच्छा है और उसी को मान कर के आप लोगों को चलना चाहिये और अपनी दुकानदारी को बन्द करना चाहिये, अलग अलग दुकान रखने से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। हमारे कामराज नाडर साहब ने आप लोगों से अपील की है और आप लोगों को उसे मानना चाहिये। कुरील साहब तो इनको, हरिजनों को, अक्लिमत बना लेते हैं, जो कि अंग्रेजों ने नहीं बनाया वह अब यह बना रहे हैं ताकि ये लोग जातपात के फेर में पड़ जायें, इसने काम चलने वाला नहीं है।

सब लोग जानते हैं कि समाजवाद में जो मजदूर हैं उनका ज्यादा हिस्सा होता

है और उनकी बेहवूदी करना सरकार का फर्ज है। बहुत कोशिश करने के बाद, बहुत दिनों के बाद अभी बोनस कमीशन ने कुछ सिफारिशों की हैं और जो मंत्री यहां बैठे हुए हैं उनसे मैं कहूंगा कि सरकार की ओर उनकी यह कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि बिना किसी संकोच के, बिना किसी हिचकिचाहट के वह बोनस कमीशन की सिफारिशों को मंजूर कर लें। उसमें कोई हिचकिचाहट नहीं होनी चाहिये और उसको मंजूर कर लेना चाहिये।

इसके साथ ही साथ जो हमारे विरोधी दल के लोग हैं खास कर के जो अभी नहीं हैं उनसे भी मेरी अपील है। परसों जब मैं बोल रहा था तो उनको दुःख मालूम पड़ रहा था लेकिन मुसीबत यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की परिस्थिति बहुत गम्भीर है और अगर उनमें सचमुच देशभक्ति आ गई है तो इसे उन्हें समझना चाहिये। वह आज तरह तरह के सवाल पेश कर रहे हैं लेकिन उन्हें देखना चाहिये कि आज देश की परिस्थिति गम्भीर है। हमारे बाजपेयी जी भी हमसे मतभेद रखते हैं लेकिन मैं धूमता रहता हूँ और देखता रहता हूँ। आज परिस्थिति यह है कि आज प्रो-चाइनीज लाबी और प्रो-पाकिस्तानी लाबी बढ़ गई है। मैंने उस दिन जरा जाश में कहा था ...

شہد ہمارے لال کوہل مدطالبہ :  
ایسی لہی ایکی زہلمت پیدا کرتی  
ہے -

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब':  
ऐसी लाबी आपकी जहानियत पैदा करती है।]

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : लेकिन यह आप सब को सांचना चाहिये कि इस तरह से दानों की गुट बन्दी होना देश के लिये बहुत खतरनाक चीज है और अभी एमरजेंसी की हालत बनी हुई है, अभी १८ हजार वर्ग मील जो लूटा

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

में है वह चीनियों के कब्जे में है और जम्मू काश्मीर का एकतिहाई हिस्सा पाकिस्तानियों के कब्जे में है। इसलिये सब पार्टियों का इस तरह का प्रयास होना चाहिये जैसी कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अपील की थी कि जो बहुत से छोटे छोटे मसले हैं उनको हम और आप हल कर सकते हैं, लेकिन अभी देश में एकता कर के इस परिस्थिति से निपटना चाहिये। इस समय जो परिस्थिति है उसमें देश में एकता होनी चाहिये और प्राइम मिनिस्टर की अपील पर हमें ध्यान दे कर कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

अब हमारी सेना के लोग हैं। उनके लिये कुछ जरूर किया गया है, उनकी पे वर्गरेड में कुछ वृद्धि की गई है लेकिन वह नाकाफी है। सेना के लोगों में और ऊंचे अफसरों में वही अन्तर है, जो कन्डीशन ब्रिटिश इम्पीरियलिज्म के वक़्त में थी वही अब है, वही राटन सिस्टम है। यदि हम समाजवाद की बात करते हैं तो समाजवाद को चलाने के लिये नौकरशाही में ही मौलिक परिवर्तन नहीं होना है बल्कि आर्मी के जो पुराने रूल्स रेगुलेशंस हैं उनमें भी काफी तब्दीली लाने की जरूरत है। जब तक ऐसा नहीं करेंगे और जब तक आर्मी में कामरेडशिप का बर्ताव नहीं होगा तब तक कुछ नहीं होगा और इसका बुरा असर होगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री देवकीनन्दन खत्री के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ। २०६ जो अमेंडमेंट्स आये हैं—उनमें कुछ हमारे पी०एस०पी० के भी अमेंडमेंट्स हैं और वे कुछ तो सुनने के लायक हैं—उन सब अमेंडमेंट्स

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I believe I owe an apology to you as well as to the House for not having

dent

moved my amendments to the Address of the Vice-President which he delivered in his capacity as officiating President the other day. The reason for it was that the leader of my group, Shri Dahyabhai Patel had already on the Agenda certain amendments which were very similar to mine and h'e hat moved them.

Madam, the scope of the President's\* Address, or of the Vice-President speaking for the President, is an all-embracing one. It gives us the policies pursued by the Government up to date and it gives us a picture of what the Government proposes to do in the near future. I believe, if I were to touch on the various aspects mentioned therein, I would not be having time and I would only be tiring the patience of this House. I wish, therefore, with your permission, Madam, touch only on three points which, to my mind, are of importance today in the international and national fields.

There is the question of the Chinese aggression. There is the all-embracing question with which we are confronted today, by Pakistan taking the issue of Kashmir once again to the Security Council. And here, inside the country, there is the problem of rising prices as well as the weakening of the administrative structure in the States as well as in the Central Government which is causing us a lot of anxiety and misgivings. I would like now to dilate on these points and put before the House what I feel to be a non-partisan view.

I came from the Swatantra Party. (Interruption). Yes, Swatantra Party as the hon. friend says. But I would not like today to mention things in a partisan attitude. Rather from a detached point of view, I would like the hon. House to Consider what I feel to be the situation.

Madam, when China invaded our soil in 1962, this House and the other

House passed unanimous resolutions, resolutions which came from our hearts as representatives of the people of this great and ancient land, resolutions which reiterated the faith of the representatives here in "the destiny of India, and their common resolve to drive out the aggressor from every inch of the Indian territory occupied by them. When we look at the picture, I am pained to say that a certain inertia, a certain lethargy has come into our way of thinking after the Chinese unilateral withdrawal from the Eastern sector of our country. Directly the Chinese withdrew and directly we found that they had gone back a little beyond the MacMahon Line, we retired into a kind of inertia, a kind of sleeping over the whole affair, and although the emergency as such continues to be there, there is very little sign of our trying to regain the territories which are still in the occupation of the aggressor.

In this connection I was rather disturbed to read—and with your permission I would like to read—the letter of the Chinese Prime Minister which he sent to our Prime Minister, I believe, on the 10th of April, 1962 in which, while not agreeing with the Colombo Proposals in toto, in the last paragraph he made a rather interesting observation. This is what he said, Madam Deputy Chairman.

It says:

"If the Indian Government owing to its internal and external political requirements is not prepared to hold negotiations for the time being, the Chinese Government is willing to wait with patience."

That paragraph to my mind is a sinister one. I do not think the Government of India has understood the whole implications of what Mr. Chou En-lai meant by writing those words. What he meant to my mind, was that China was in the superior position where not only had it voluntarily gone away from the area it had occupied right

up to the foothills of Assam but that it had the necessary man-power, the necessary forces, the necessary military strength to see that if there was any further engagement or even any further movement of our troops either on the side of the MacMahon Line or in the Western sector, that they would be able to put in their full force and not only drive us back but teach us another lesson, perhaps much more bitter, than the one that we learnt in the winter of 1962. We, on the other hand, are still harping on the Colombo proposals which according to our Prime Minister, we have agreed to in toto. The Colombo proposals are good in themselves because they agree in effect to what our Prime Minister has stated and what this House had accepted that the Chinese accept the position so far as the boundary line is concerned, the line of actual control on September 8, 1962, but the Chinese are not willing to accept that. They only wanted the Colombo proposal as a basis for coming to the Conference table for further discussions and we are still saying that unless they accept the proposals in toto, we are not prepared to go further. To whose disadvantage is that position? It is to the disadvantage of the Chinese? I ask this in all humility. I do not think so. The Chinese have done what they wanted to. The Chinese have shown their strength. They have gone back, on their own admission, by their own unilateral action. They are still in occupation in the Western sector. They are still sitting on what they call the traditional line in the Central sector and they say, 'We do not accept the Colombo proposals in toto, we only accept them as a basis for negotiations' and I have quoted Mr. Chou En-lai who said, 'We are prepared to wait.' In the meanwhile our position, if I might be allowed to say so, deteriorates economically because our country is undergoing a heavy burden in the shape of defence expenditure. We know of the shortage of foreign currency and resources which we suffer from on account of our falling exports and therefore the burden on

[Shri Anand Chand] the common man is rising every day. Now that, I fear, is something which is only advantageous to the Chinese and not to us. Therefore, I hope that the Government of India will come forward with something concrete instead of just waiting for the Chinese to accept the Colombo proposals. I believe something about China was discussed when General Ne Win of Burma was here, though current report says that it was the fear that Burma has of the Chinese expansion rather than the solution of the Indo-Chinese dispute that made him come here. Whatever that may be, I think it is high time that we galvanised ourselves into action and did something to break this impasse which, to my mind, is only economically a burden on us and is of advantage to the Chinese aggressor and not to India under the present circumstances.

Then I wanted to say a few words about Pakistan and Kashmir. These questions are very much before the public today. They have agitated the minds of a good number of people in the country as well as in the Houses of Parliament. My friend was referring here only just now to the question of the release of Mr. Abdullah and a change in the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, but I would like to just give a little background to this whole question and then come to conclusions. The question of Jammu and Kashmir is a very complicated one. If we look to the history of the accession of the State to the then Dominion of India and the subsequent events, one thing stands out and stands out clearly, and that is that under the Instrument of Accession which the Maharaja executed in October 1947 when the Pakistani forces as well as the invaders from West Pakistan were in actual possession of most of the territories of the then Jammu and Kashmir State, that accession under law was an instrument which is irrevocable, which tied the Jammu and Kashmir State, as it tied any other of the Indian States that executed an Instrument of Accession to the Domi-

nion of India and there is no provision in our Constitution as such for the de-accession of any State. Under those circumstances, to my mind, there can be no question today of even thinking that the State of Jammu and Kashmir can cease to be a part, an integral part of the Union of India. When we entered into negotiations with Pakistan at the time when the Chinese aggressor was pushing us backwards and when the British and the Americans came to our aid—I think the Prime Minister made a statement and I would not dilate on that. We tried to come to some understanding with Pakistan but again and again as the statement shows the question of Kashmir cropped up. It seems that unless the people of India were willing to part with Kashmir, Pakistan would not be satisfied.

Now the question is, can we afford to do that? On what basis is this stand of plebiscite or referendum or call it whatever you like, by the people of Kashmir put forth? It is based on the two-nation theory. It is based on the theory of self-determination because the majority of the people in Jammu and Kashmir happen to be Muslims but my submission is that if we extend this theory to India as a whole and examine the figure, what do we see? According to the census of 1961 India had within its borders a population of 439 millions out of whom over 47 millions were Muslims and at the same time if my census figures, which I have taken from a Year Book, are correct, so far as Pakistan is concerned the total Muslim population in the whole of Pakistan—East and West—was 65 millions. We have therefore in this country 47 million Muslims, which is about two-thirds even a little more than that—of the total population of Muslims in Pakistan. Taking that fact into consideration, can the two-nation theory hold good to-day with such large minority of Muslim in the country? We have declared ourselves to be a secular State. Pakistan, on the other hand, has its Constitution on the basis of an Islamic State of Pakistan. I was reading their

old Constitution in which they said it would be an Islamic State. They have now revised their Constitution and I do not think it lies in my mouth to say anything in this behalf to the hon. Members of this House. But still I would like to quote a few words from the Preamble to Pakistan's latest Constitution which General Ayub Khan has promulgated, wherein he says:

"Whereas sovereignty over the entire Universe belongs to Almighty alone . . . ."

Of course with that we could have no quarrel, but in the end he says:

"Now, therefore, I, Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, Hi al-i-Pakistan, Hilal-i-Jura'at, President of Pakistan, in exercise of the Mandate given to me ... do hereby enact this Constitution."

Madam, what a contrast to the Preamble to our Constitution where, we say:

"We, the people of India have solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic".

Here it is the President of Pakistan, who, with the Blessings of Almighty God, is giving the people of Pakistan the Constitution. I don't think there would be any two opinions in any international forum, however high it ' be if it is not biased, when; the difference between the Constitutions, where the difference between the two concepts and of thinking, could not be clearly brought out. If there are doubts in the minds of people—and I am sorry there are—in this connection, with your permission, I would like to quote a very small instance, which I came across when I was travelling back to India in December last. I met a gentleman in the plane belonging to Kuwait. He was a Muslim and when the plane approached Kuwait, we got talking. And in that talk he said "Well, everything is 1123 HSD.—7.

all right. We like India" and „o on. "But why is it that Pakistan is not given Kashmir, because the Muslim population is the majority there. Why is not a referendum held in the territory of Jammu and Kashmir?" I explained to him, "It is not a question purely of there being Muslims. If it is a question of a plebiscite, what about those 47 millions of Muslims who are in the rest of the country?" He said, "Well, your position as such has never been explained to us. It has only been explained to us that because Jammu and Kashmir has got a majority of Muslims in its territory, therefore, a, of right a plebiscite should be held and this State should go to Pakistan." Therefore, my submission is that if the stand or position that we have taken is not understood in the councils of the world, it is due to the weakness in our publicity. It is due to our weakness that the whole picture is not given. I do not know why. If it is given, I am sure that in the councils of the world there will be a better appreciation of India's stand and all these questions of giving' over large parts of Jammu and Kashmir to Pakistan because of the Muslim majority there, would be blown up by the facts and figures that I have placed before the House.

Now, the question is, what is to be done with Jammu and Kashmir? My submission, Madam Deputy Chairman, is, first of all, we must say that we are not agreeable to any referendum or plebiscite or any such thing so far as the State of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, because it is an integral part of India under article 1. of our Constitution. It is one of the constituent States of India and, therefore, no question of any plebiscite or of breaking away from it, can arise, in the same way as we have denied by law as passed by Parliament a^y expression of opinion by any party in South India, for getting out of the ' Indian Union The parallel is there.

The other thing that should be done is that the, administrative tone



[Shri Anand Chand] there must be improved. In this connection I may say—I do not know if I am right in saying it—but I think that the Kamaraj Plan—I am going to speak about it a little later—as I have seen it and as I have studied it, might have been a good thing, might have inculcated amongst the Congress members a certain kind of what I might call, strengthening of their backbone, at a time when the fortunes of that party in the political fields were falling low. But I believe that in the administrative field, if you have looked at it honestly and dispassionately, it has deprived the country of experienced administrators and one of the practical results of that has been the toppling of the Kashmir administration. In this connection, when I am speaking, I hold brief for nobody, Madam Deputy Chairman. I am not speaking for the ex-Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir who was one of the persons who went out of the administration under the Kamaraj Plan. I am not speaking about the inefficiency of the present Premier which has come about because of the breakdown of law and order and the theft of the sacred relic and so on; and whatever incidents there were that we have seen in Kashmir. I am speaking only broadly, and saying that by removing people who are experienced in administration, you have not strengthened the administration of the country, and the mandate that the Congress got has not been carried out. Of course, we say—and it is true—that the mandate which the Congress received is a minority mandate, *It is not a majority vote, it is a 45 per cent, vote, by which they have received the mandate, but still the mandate is there, and as long as that mandate is there, it is the duty of the party in power to administer the country and to see that the administration of the country is carried out properly and is placed in able hands.* Taking away experienced administrators for working in the field might have been a good thing when the

British were here. That might have worked when we were labouring under an alien administration. But when you take away good experienced people out of the administration at a time when the country is beset with so many difficulties, external and internal, I do not think it helps Us to attain the objective of having an efficient government. Neither does it help the Congress party which is the ruling party, to fulfil the mandate which the people have given it to rule this country, till the next general elections. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, my submission is that something should be done urgently to remedy the state of affairs and let us start with Jammu and Kashmir. If the administration there is not correct, let it be made broadbased.

I heard a demand from the hon. Member here about the release of Sheikh Abdullah. I welcome it. As a matter of fact, the leader of my party here has tabled this amendment in which he says that we stand for the immediate release of all the detenus in Kashmir, including Sheikh Abdullah. Also I want to make it clear that when we demand that release, let us not forget the past. After all, it is on the past that the present and the future is based; otherwise history would have no use. I was going through this book here and trying to find out things and it says;

"Sheikh Abdullah considers Kashmir's accession to India as temporary and provisional and before his re-arrest in 1958, he thought that it might be a good thing to call a round table conference of the representatives of India, Pakistan and Kashmir, to seek an honourable settlement of the dispute, if plebiscite had become impracticable as has often been contended by India."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the book you are reading from?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: This, Madam Deputy Chairman, is called "Essential Documents in the Kashmir Dispute" by one Mr. Lakhnupal. I do not know the author, but it contains all the papers and I have got it from the Parliament library. It contains the relevant papers, the resolutions of the U.N. and so on. Now I want, to draw the attention of this hon. House to these words and say this. Let him be released; but let him at the same time say that he does not stand for what he has stated there.

SHRI A. D. MANI: He can make that statement from jail, that he does not stand for this.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I am not saying that he should not be released.

SHRI A. D. MANI: But why should he be released?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I am saying that he should be released for creating better atmosphere in the administration of the State, because I believe my hon. friend agrees, and most of the speeches heard here were in general agreement, that the present Government there needs strengthening, that the present Government of the State wanted fresh blood. My submission is that if fresh blood is wanted. I do not know why there should be this detention or political confinement in the State, especially when fingers can be pointed at us. Here my hon. friend has said this thing.

I would like to say another thing. Let us go back to the accession of that State. At the time the Maharaja of Kashmir acceded to India, one of the reasons that we put forward before world opinion was not only that the Maharaja as the sovereign ruler of that State was acceding to India under the Instrument of Accession, but that Sheikh Abdullah, the leader or the largest political party, was also in agreement.

SHRI A. D. MANI: That is an additional argument.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: But we had to say it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It was only an additional argument.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Whatever it was, we had to say it. We could not do otherwise. The Government of India abdicated power, Madam Deputy Chairman, to the Congress as well as to the Muslim League, when they left this country, although it was divided. Why was that? Because they represented large masses of the people in the country. So in the same way, in a contested, what I may call, accession, where there was the Maharaja with a large number of Muslim subjects, I think it was very-wise to say that somebody who spoke for the people was also in some way or other connected with that accession, the irrevocable tie with India. Therefore, my only submission is this. I am not going into the details. It will take away much of my time and not much is now left. My only submission is that there should be a categorical denial. Let there be a reassessment of the situation by him and also by his followers, and let there be no more talk of any plebiscite front in Kashmir, because this plebiscite front in Kashmir somehow or other keeps alive the issue that we are committed to such things. That Kashmir is not an integral part of India, and therefore, we cannot proceed. Otherwise I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister when he said that there was going to be a gradual erosion of article 370. Already, I think, it has outlived its purpose: but it cannot be completely eroded until and unless the Constitution drafted for the State of Jammu and Kashmir also is radically changed.

4 P.M.

I have read in the papers recently that there is a proposal to change the nomenclature of the Sadr-i-Riyasat to that of Governor and of the Prime Minister to that of Chief Minister.

[Shri Anand Chand.] That in itself to my mind will not be enough. I feel that the Constitution under which Kashmir today is being governed keeps it in a category which is separate and distinct from the other States of the Indian Union. If we want to hasten the process of the integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union and make it a State on par with the other States of the country, something would have to be done to see that the Constitution given by the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir to that State is also changed in the same process. That is my submission. It does not mean that I am taking sides with anybody. As I said in the very beginning, I am only speaking from a distance and I am only trying to place before hon. Members and before you, Madam Deputy Chairman, the facts as I see them.

I have already said that in the Security Council, I believe, our representative has made out a very good case. I find there is a move for some kind of a consensus but I am also sorry to find that Britain was rather so outspoken in its criticism of India not playing its part. That does not behove Britain. I think most of the hon. Members here and in the other House have already condemned this attitude and I believe the British Government also has come to know of the high feelings which it has raised in this country by taking a partisan view on this problem. At the same time as long as the situation is what it is like, some steps have to be taken by the Government. It has to see that this problem does not crop up again and again. Even if there is a consensus, I am sure it will crop up again. In the next agenda it will be put up again and they will say, 'what have you done about it?' And what is more, it places Pakistan and India on an equal footing, as bad boys before the world. The Security Council says, 'You are both bad boys; why don't you behave properly? We want you to behave.' But that is not the position: we are behaving extremely

well. We have not misbehaved. I think it should be clarified in the quarters concerned that we shall stand no more nonsense so far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, that the accession is irrevocable, that it is not a thing which can be set aside and there can be no question of going back on all the integration that has already taken place between India and Kashmir.

Lastly I come to the question, as I put it, of the internal situation in the country and the lack of leadership which I find at the present moment— I do not know whether the Congress friends realise it— both in the States and at the Centre.

”

SHRI A. D. MANI: They feel it all right but they cannot express it..

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I am glad of that but I may be allowed to express it, not for them but for myself. Madam Deputy Chairman, the Indian Republic is hardly sixteen years old. That our people are wedded to democracy is a heartening thing; that we are a secular State is beyond doubt. And here let me mention, with your permission, how moved I was on the day when the Vice-President delivered his Address acting in the capacity of the President, to see, if I may say so, a Muslim as the acting Head flanked on the right by a Sikh and on the left by you, Madam Deputy Chairman a Christian. There could not be, what I might call, a greater visible show of our democratic set-up; there could not be a more visible representation of what we stand for. But the point is that that secular democracy is only 16 years old. It has to be nurtured. The plant is there, but it has to grow; it has to take roots and for taking roots it has to have a good and clean Administration not only in the Centre but in all the States too. As I have<sup>1</sup> said before, we criticise; it is our duty to criticise. There would be no democracy if there were no criticism. I am sorry to say that in many instances here in India a critic

of the Government is looked upon not with friendship but with distrust and, if I might say s'o, with a certain amount of hostility. It should not be there. I have found that once a person is in the Opposition benches we develop a feeling, a very narrow-mind-feeling, as if there is a personal animosity existing between him and the ruling party. That should not be so. I would plead with the ruling party to drop that attitude. We have seen that in so many cases. I hope are quite conversant with it. Some of them do move in the constiti; for elections, and they can see it is there. If this thesis develops that anybody wh'o is opposed to the Congress is opposed to everything that India stands for—progress, socialism, democracy and the like—that should not be so. I would say that by now, after sixteen years of democratic traditions in this country, ample opportunity should have been given to the people to evolve a way of thought whereby they could express their opposition to the Government W fear, without being under any shadow and without the fear of detention and things like that. It should not be there. There should be no fettering because if you fetter public opinion, if you fetter the growing tendency of the people fo criticise, you drift towards^ totalitarianism and if we drift towards totalitarianism, democracy, I may submit, will be the first casualty.

So, speaking not 'as an Opposition member alone, but as one of the people, I think it is wrong fo lave starved the Centre and the States of efficient and tried administrators. I am' not speaking here for anybody, neither for the right nor for the left in the Congress because sometimes they say that the Cabinet is tilted to the left and sometimes they sa,, tilted fo the right. I am not speaking for anyone. I am only saying tl was wrong to deprive the country of leadership, of people who have been in the Administration for a long time. Alternate leadership, even if it is there,, must be effective. Madam Deputy Chairman, I was quite heartened to

see— Me is n'ot here now—that my hon. friend, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has been taken back into the Union Cabinet. I do not know how that came about. I was reading—and it is rather pertinent; if I might be allowed only two minutes, I won't take more time of the House—in the paper a report about the Jaipur session where the Kamraj plan was adopted.

SHRI A. D. MAKI: Which paper i\* that?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: That is the 'Hindustan Times.' Now, Mr. Shastri is quoted as saying that cne thing was quite certain and that quite certain thing was that he at least was not go-Jng to enter the Government in the near future. Of course, these are not his exact words; it will take me some time if I were to read them out bui\* that is what is said here. The point here is not one of sacrifice; the point is not one of detaching 'oneself from the Administration but the point is, whosoever is best suited to the job must be put on it. If the Prime Minister finds that he is the person who is suited for the job, #ien let him do it. Why all this confusion that first we read that he is being drafted back into Government to take up certain important functions which the Prime Minister has to perform and then suddenly he is degraded to the fourth position and now he is Minister without Portfolio but still looking after the external affairs and on the top of it the Prime Minister has come back to work though he is not quite fit Bnd still wants rest for some more time. What is all this? I feel it only produces confusion and by confusion maladministration grows. Let us have a clear understanding as to how the Government is going to function. If it is difficult for the Prime Minister to entrust all the work that he was doing to 'one, let there be some other arrangement. And here I would like, with your permission, to pay a tribute to him for his intelligence, his courage, his integrity; he is not only the leader of Parliament here or Of the

[Shri Anand Chand.] Congress Party but he is a world leader. I am not saying that simply for eulogising him. In my travels to several places I have heard people speaking of that. So there is no question about it. If today unfortunately he is incapacitated from attending to his work, it does not behove him to sit tight on it. It behoves him to see at once that if he cannot give it to one man, let there be three, let there be four. For God's sake let there be somebody who carries on the functions of the Government. Let there be no stalemate. Let there be no question of juniority and seniority and so on standing in the way of efficient administration. That is my appeal. That is my submission for this House, because thereby we are weakening the administrative structure. And if the Centre itself is weak, we know what the conditions in the States are today. I need not elaborate on that. Right from Kerala to "U.P. and everywhere—I do not want to criticise because it is not for me to criticise—facts are too well known. We appoint Vigilance Commissions. We see there is corruption, etc. We see all these things happening, firstly, because we are not sure of what we are doing and secondly, because we have not the necessary machinery to translate into action the policies of the Government of the day. If the machinery is bad, change it. If the Ministers are not up to the mark, change them. If the burden is too heavy, share it. But as long as the responsibility for running the administration of the country lies squarely on the shoulders of a particular party, it is their duty to put their house in order and to give the country a leadership and a correct way of administration by which all the difficulties through which the common man is passing are put an end to and our prestige, both in the national and international field, is reestablished.

That is all I have to say. Thank ye\*.

1 PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated):  
Madam Deputy Chairman, it is the duty of everyone of us to be thankful to the Vice-President for the Address that he was pleased to deliver at the beginning of this Session. It is an important document. We look forward to it every year because it is a resume of what the Government has been doing in the last year, and also it is a statement of the policy for the coming year. But I regret to say that the Address, on the whole, strikes me as a very lean document, both in what the Government claims to have done and in what they propose to do. I shall briefly touch on just a few points.

The one question that has been agitating the minds of all of us at the present moment is the question of Kashmir as debated in the Security Council. We are indeed perturbed and rightly perturbed by the attitude of Britain's representative in the United Nations. He has been pleading for a plebiscite which we accepted years ago under certain conditions. Those conditions have not been fulfilled, but India is called upon to accept a plebiscite. We are rightly disillusioned. We rightly feel angry with the British representative. But let us review the position in a calm fashion and we find that India herself is responsible for the sad 'situation in which she finds' herself at the present moment. The Maharaja of Kashmir acceded to India. It was legally done and legally accepted. The vast majority of Kashmiris are Muslims and under the leadership of Sheikh Abdullah they accepted the accession. Therefore, whether from the legal standpoint or from the moral standpoint, the position of India is unassailable. Pakistan knew it and, therefore, took refuge to force, which is the argument of the weak. She invaded India and it was our duty to have repelled that invasion. Our Army fared splendidly. We were in a position to drive out every one of the invaders from the soil of India. That

would have solved the problem. Unfortunately, in a week moment we agreed to a cease-fire. We agreed to refer the question to the United Nations. Today our strong case has been made to appear before the world as if it is a weak case. We have become the accused when we were in a position to become the accusers. That is the position. Unfortunately a great error we committed. After committing this error it was open to India to cultivate world opinion about the rightness of our cause. Unfortunately that also was not done and especially after the departure of Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar we have had representatives in the United Nations who have been extremely clever but who have not had the gift of persuading people, not gifted with suavity of tongue, which is an essential quality in any one who holds an ambassadorial position. And the representative of India at the United Nations is really an ambassador for India. The result is that we lose our friends. Bull baiting does not pay in a straight fight.

Today we are all proud of the extremely fine stand taken up by our representative Mr. Chagla. We are proud of his brilliant address, given with legal precision, with moral conviction and with the suavity of a gentleman. It is a pity that he comes on the scene so late. I have often asked myself after reading his address if he had been sent to the United Nations five years earlier, what a great difference it would have made to the position of India. An atmosphere of friendliness would have been created and the Tightness of India would have been accepted. That has not been done.

I do not know really what the position is going to be in future and how long this sort of tussle will go on. After all, the exchange of notes does not lead to a solution of a living problem. In the meantime, the position

of the British delegate has given a fillip to the idea which has been seized by interested parties that India should cease to be a member of the Commonwealth. Well, it would be very suicidal for India to do so at the present stage. After all the Chinese threat is still there and though we all feel that the emergency is not very acute, the Government is very firm in saying that the emergency exists. We accept that position because the safety of India is in the hands of the Government. But in our temporary irritation we should not forget that Britain was the first to come to our assistance in our hour of trial. We should not forget that. Nor should we forget the subsequent assistance and military stores and all that we have been receiving from Britain and if it comes to pass that the Chinese attack us again, it may not do for us to have Britain on the wrong side. Therefore, membership of the Commonwealth is an important part and should continue to be an important part of our foreign policy.

So far as the home front is concerned, there are very peculiar expressions which we find on page 2. In para 7 the Address says:

"... the overall rate of economic growth has lagged behind the Plan target."

The opening sentence of the next paragraph says:

"There has been a steady expansion in the overall agricultural effort ..."

But the very next paragraph preceeds to say:

"Shortfalls in the production of foodgrains have had a disturbing effect on price levels."

These are statements which do not inspire confidence. It means that our Plans have failed. We have not been able to reach the target that we laid

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.] down. I do not wish to say anything more on this point because there will shortly be an opportunity for us to discuss the whole policy of planning. But on the present occasion I may be permitted to say that the only people who have benefited from the Plan are Government servants, architects, engineers and contractors. The people who are most interested in the Plan are the consumers and the interests of the consumers have suffered extremely badly, and as a result of it there is really need for a radical change in our planning outlook.

There is one good feature to be noted and that is the appointment of a Central Vigilance Commission. Some time ago we were told by the speakers for Government that there was no corruption. Or we were told that the existence of corruption was grossly exaggerated. Today it is a happy sign that the Government is conscious of the fact that corruption does exist, and that explains the appointment of the Central Vigilance Commission. But I wonder if they will tackle the root cause of this corruption. The root cause is the policy of licences and controls. It is all right for the Government to say that businessmen should be honest and that they should not take to bribery. Very wise sentiment, correct sentiment; but the businessmen are also human beings. They have to live and more than one businessman has told me that unless they bribe, there is not the slightest chance of their getting a licence or permit. If they were honest, if they did not bribe, somebody else would do so and they would lose and they would have to close their offices. Therefore, I hope the Central Vigilance Commission will also take into consideration not merely concrete cases of corruption but also the root cause which makes for that corruption.

Madam Deputy Chairman, as an educationist I feel very sorry that in

the whole Address there is no reference to education. Education is, I may safely call it, the main cause, the main basis for a nation's existence, for a nation's progress. I am conscious that we have been spending crores on education. I am conscious that there are more schools, more colleges, more universities. That is good so far as it goes, but there is a widespread feeling not merely among educationists but among the public at large that the standard all round has been falling; in other words, we do not get an adequate return for the vast sums of money that we are spending on education although there is room for much larger amounts to be spent on education. Now it seems to me that the root cause of the falling standards is the weakness of our secondary education. It is the weakest link in our educational system. Mr. Chagla has been cleansing the "Augean Stables" of the Ministry of Education. With a stroke of his pen, he has abolished some hundreds of committees with thousands of members. I trust that he will have the courage to take one more step. He has retained the Central Advisory Board of Education. But the real need of our education is to strike out that word "Advisory" and to constitute a Central Board of Education consisting of all Ministers of Education, D.P.s, Vice-Chancellors or any other educationists that they might care to include. It should be their business to lay down the policy and it should be the business of the State Government to carry it out. At the present members it is a case of divided responsibility. The Central Government gives money on a very generous scale to the States, but the attitude of the States is, give us money but do not ask questions. That is a very suicidal thing. There is no guarantee that the money is spent in the way in which it is expected to be spent. Therefore, it is no use merely having a very costly advisory machinery at the Centre. What we want is something more. It may be that we require revision of the

Constitution, I am personally against revising the Constitution, but this is a case where a revision is needed in the interests of India and of Indians. I would not mind such a change if it makes for better education by the Government.

Lastly, Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the other Members who have spoken in the expression of good wishes for the health of the President and the health of the Prime Minister because we look to both of them for the guidance and the leadership that the country gets from them.

SHRI S. C. DEB (Assam): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks moved by our hon. friend. I would like to share the feelings expressed by many Members for the speedy recovery of our Prime Minister and our revered President.

Now I would like to come to the question of Pakistan. Our Vice-President in his Address mentioned the question of Pakistan and its anti-Indian propaganda. Regarding that I have something to say. Here, as far as Pakistan's present activities are concerned, some specific questions are involved. One is the Kashmir issue. Another is its treatment of minorities in East Pakistan. Since partition all these years Pakistan is carrying on anti-Indian propaganda. They are out for it deliberately. They are out to create conditions of communal tension in their country and also in India. They are carrying on their atrocious behaviour on the minorities in East Pakistan. They are carrying on their policy of squeezing out the minorities from East Pakistan. So the lives and properties of the minorities in East Pakistan are very unsafe and they have to take shelter in India. In all these years millions of East Pakistan refugees have entered India, and we are faced with a grave situation. Our Government has been trying to tackle the problem of their rehabilita-

tion from time to time, whenever we are faced with this situation.

We are trying to give them all assistance. We have a responsibility towards the minorities of East Pakistan. We cannot shirk that responsibility and have to discharge that responsibility. India is trying its utmost to rehabilitate those people.

There are other aspects also. When Pakistan is determined to create trouble, a certain situation is created in India also. Communal tension is created because Pakistani elements also seem to be active within India for creating communal trouble. As India is a secular and democratic State as our Constitution demands, our Government has a duty and we should be on our guard because we have pledged ourselves to secularism and democracy. We are faced with this situation. That is the test and the country should honour the Constitution and secularism and democracy.

Now, circumstances are created. In the present context, the circumstance was created in the Khulna District of East Pakistan. That was an atrocious behaviour and there was repercussion in Calcutta and West Bengal. But our Government speedily and with determination faced that situation and tackled it well. But in Pakistan atrocities went on from district to district. Now, when we are faced with such things, we must take a decision. The decision is to create a world opinion so that the interests of the minorities in East Pakistan are focussed. Not only that. For some time past the minorities from East Pakistan are squeezed out and they are taking shelter here. We must put forward a claim for compensation and also for land from Pakistan. We must take out the figures of the people who have been squeezed out from Pakistan and create a claim and that claim should be put forward before the world powers, and we must take determined action so that Pakistan is forced to admit its wrong.



[Shri S. C. Deb]

But the position is such tha Pakistan can carry on propaganda ant create mischief. They hurry to th< Security Council and try to put ui in the wrong. We have to defend ourselves. But what should be,our attitude? We must take a firm decisioi and say that as far as Kashmir is concerned, its accession is unbreakable, that Kashmir is ours and that no power on earth can crush it We must take a bold decision and mould world opinion in our favours Pakistan out of its own design creates trouble in East Pakistan, goes to the Security Council and there we have to answer the charges of Pakistan. That should not so on for ever. So, our propaganda machinery and our activity at the diplomatic level should be strengthened in such a way that we are not Dut in the wrong by Pakistan.

Now, while Pakistan is doing all this mischief, the Chinese aggression is also there. The Chinese leaders are moving from place to place carrying on their propaganda and putting forward their case in such a way as to show that India is in the wrong. They are moving from country to country and are trying to create opinion in their favour. In that respect also our propaganda machinery should be strengthened. At diplomatic level we should take such steps so that we can face all this mischievous propaganda either by Pakistan or by China with ability and efficiency. About Chinese aggression, they are establishing themselves on our land and are stabilizing the fruits of their aggression and also they are moulding world opinion in their favour. I want to know whether we are very conscious of that and are taking active steps to counteract this move of China also. Of course, we are strengthening our military position, We are developing our defence needs, but in that regard I have to say one thing that unless we are militarily strong we cannot maintain peace: peace here depends on our own military strength **and** Ia that respect v

should be self-sufficient—if you van\* peace here, India should be strong militarily. That position should also be considered by our Government and we must not think that others will give us all the strength and force when another crisis comes. China ia creating opinion in her favour. Not only that, They are also indulging in military activities. In that respect we must see that our activities **are** such that we can face any situation from whatever quarter it comes. That should be the direction of our activities.

Now, our Vice-President ha, referred to many things. I canot deal with all those things in a short space of time. Many Members have given out their impression about these things. As far as industrial development if concerned we are having public sector enterprises all over India. But the industrial development should be such, the cost structure should be moulded in such a fashion, that all the benefits of this industrial development are enjoyed by the common man. With that enlarged vision our industrial development should be taken up, and there also, when we have any public sector enterprise, our administrative machinery should be geared to move in that direction whereby all the advantage of industrial development will be enjoyed by the common man. Unless that is done, as long as that is lacking, industrial development does not mean much. So in that respect also I like to urge upon our Government that small-scale industries—not only big industries—should be developed in every part of the country, in every village, in every backward area. AU the areas of our country should be taken into consideration and small-scale industries, and power generation should be taken up there so that tha common people may feel that it is their India, so that, in whatever corner of the country they may be, they may feel that they are also enjoying the fruits of our independence. Unless that is done, however good the planning may be, however much we may

be thinking of raising ourselves theoretically, as long as the development does not really go for the good of the people, or is not shared by the people at large or enjoyed by the common people, there cannot be a practical solution of the problem. So I urge upon our Government to go in more and more for power generation and spread it everywhere. It is the keynote of industrial development; not only for big industries but also for small-scale industries, power generation is the keynote of any development. At the village level also we are contemplating many things, but unless sufficient power generation is there, no small scale industry can be developed in the villages, and we must, in that way, cover all the areas.

Many things have been said about agricultural production. It is a sorry spectacle that we cannot achieve our target as far as agricultural production is concerned. Many things have been said but whatever may be our theoretical propositions regarding agriculture, unless the common peasants and the common agriculturists are made enthusiastic in their activities, unless they are encouraged and organised properly—that even small agriculturists should be conscious that agricultural production is for their good too, that consciousness has to be created—unless that is done, our agricultural production cannot go ahead

Thank you.

**STATEMENT RE CORRECTION OF THE NAME OF ONE OF THE ACCUSED PERSONS IN THE HAZRATBAL CASE**

THE MINISTER, OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS) : Madam, I seek the indulgence of the House to enable me to make a small correction in the statement made by the Home Minister this morning. The names of the three persons arrested in the Hazratbal case were given as—

- (1) Abdul Rahim Bandey
- (2) Abdul Rashid, and
- (3) Ghulam Mohd. Butt

few 'Ghulam Mohd. Butt' is a mistake, [instead of that the name should be Kadir Butt', not 'Ghulam Mohd. Butt'.

SHM CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): What is the position? Whether the name has been corrected, or the person has been corrected, what is the position?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: The name has been corrected.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: It is a very serious question. I want to have a clarification from the Minister, because it was not a statement made on the spur of the moment. For the last six or seven days the Home Minister was preparing himself to make this statement, and out of three names one name was given incorrectly in the House; and in the evening the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs comes and says that there is a slight correction in the statement. It is a correction of 33 per cent., more than 33 per cent; out of three, in one there is correction, and this statement was made after seven days' preparation. So it is a very serious matter, and I think the Government should be warned by you, Madam, not to repeat this in future.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): There cannot be any confusion between Ghulam Mohd. Butt and Kadir Butt, because these are two different names altogether. So the presumption is they are two different persons; it is not a grammatical mistake or some such mistake. Obviously they are two persons and I would like the Home Minister through you, Madam, to explain what the correct position is.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: What is the situation?