

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. What about article 60 of the Constitution?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Under the Constitution certain subjects are given to the State Legislature.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let it be argued.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I want to make a very humble submission to you, to the Government and to this House that time should be given for a discussion on the subject.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI A. D. MANI: In the case of Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, I did put questions to the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister, answering the questions, said that this matter was important and therefore was answering it. I also put questions about Chief Minister Sankar and this matter also was answered. Madam, our country has seen that in Britain one Mr. Charles Foot, who was a Junior Minister, gave his car to somebody who drove it without a licence. That man got involved in an accident and he had to resign.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Mani you have finished.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Here is a case where a Minister knocks down a person and rides away impeding investigation into the matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani, have you finished? I have heard enough about this matter. It really and strictly refers to a State where there is a Governor and an Assembly. However, attention of Government to the matter has been drawn by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Yes. Mr. Chordia.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE ADDRESS BY THE VICE-PRESIDENT, DISCHARGING THE FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT—continued

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, जो उपराष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण के लिये धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव विचारार्थ लिया जा रहा है, उसमें मैंने भी कुछ संशोधन दिये हैं और उन संशोधनों के बारे में कुछ इशारा भी मैं अपने भाषण में करूंगा।

सब से पहले, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भारत की क्या स्थिति है, उसकी चर्चा करना चाहूंगा। उपराष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में चर्चा की है कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय विदेशों में गये, उपराष्ट्रपति महोदय भी विदेशों में गए, हमारे यहां के कई मंत्री महोदय भी विदेशों में गए जहां पर उनका प्रेमपूर्ण स्वागत सत्कार किया गया। विदेशों के कई महापुरुष भी अपने यहां पर आये और उनका भी हमने प्रेमपूर्ण स्वागत किया। इन सारी बातों के बावजूद भी हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में क्या स्थिति है, जगह हम इसपर विचार करें। ऐसा लगता है कि हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में पीछे धकेले जा रहे हैं। चीन से हमारी लड़ाई है ही। किन्तु साथ ही अभी हाल में पाकिस्तान के प्रतिनिधि श्री भुट्टो ने जो सुरक्षा परिषद् में भारत को धमकी दी, उसका काग-निजेंस सुरक्षा परिषद् ने नहीं लिया, क्या यह हमारे प्रति न्यायसंगत व्यवहार का परिचायक है? इसी तरह से ब्रिटेन और चीन का जो समझौता हुआ, वह क्या हमारे प्रति ब्रिटेन की विशेष मित्रता का परिचायक है? इसी तरह से अफ्रीका में जो भारतीय हैं उन्हें वहां से भगाया जा रहा है और लंका तथा ब्रह्मदेश से हमारे भारतीयों को बाहर निकालने के लिये जो आदेश दिया जा रहा है, क्या यह हमारे लिये अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमारे अच्छे सम्बन्धों का परिचायक

है ? अफ्रीका में जो रंगभेद की नीति चल रही है उसके भारतवासी भी शिकार होते जा रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में हमें यह प्रतीत होता है कि हमारी जो विदेश नीति है उसमें हम सफल हो नहीं पा रहे हैं। हम चाहे जितना आदर सत्कार कर लें और करवा लें, पर उसके बावजूद विदेशों में हमारी स्थिति ठीक नहीं हो रही है। इस लिये यह अत्यंत आवश्यक है कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति के भिन्न भिन्न पहलुओं पर पुनर्विचार करके ऐसी नीति का निर्धारण करें जिस से हमारे देश का सम्मान भी बढ़े और हमारे मित्रों की संख्या भी बढ़े। आज हमारी दिशा विपरीत होती जा रही है।

श्री छागला ने हाल ही में सुरक्षा परिषद् में भारत का जिस तरह से प्रतिनिधित्व किया वह सचमुच प्रशंसनीय है। इतना ही नहीं ब्रिटिश प्रतिनिधि मंडल द्वारा जो वहां पर दावत दी गई, उस दावत में श्री छागला नहीं गये और इस प्रकार उन्होंने हमारे सम्मान की बढ़ोत्तरी की है और यह एक पुरुषार्थ का काम करके उन्होंने हमारे सम्मान को बढ़ाया है। पर मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता है कि एक ओर श्री छागला इतना पुरुषार्थ का काम करते हैं और दूसरी ओर चीन द्वारा जो दावतें दी जाती हैं, जो हमारा जानी दुश्मन है, उसकी दावतों में हमारे यहां के प्रतिनिधि भाग लेते रहे हैं। यह दोतरफा जो हमारी सरकार की नीति है, यह कुछ न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होती। मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि भारत के सम्मान की रक्षा के लिये जो हमारे दुश्मन हैं उनकी दावतों में हमें नहीं जाना चाहिये और जैसे पुरुषार्थ का परिचय श्री छागला ने दिया, वैसे ही पुरुषार्थ का परिचय हमारी सरकार को और हमारे अन्य प्रतिनिधियों को भी देना चाहिये और इस बारे में हमारी सरकार की स्पष्ट नीति होनी चाहिये।

अब जहां तक हमारे पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान के और हमारे सम्बन्धों का सवाल है, यह आज की बात नहीं है। देश के विभाजन

से पूर्व कांग्रेस की मुस्लिम लीग के प्रति जो तुष्टीकरण की नीति थी, वही नीति आज भी चली आ रही है। मुस्लिम लीग के मानस पुत्र पाकिस्तान के प्रति तथा जो मुस्लिम लीग के प्रति अपना प्रेम प्रगट करने वाले पाकिस्तानी भारत में विद्यमान है, उनके प्रति भी वही तुष्टीकरण की नीति चली आ रही है। उस नाति का आज तक क्या परिणाम रहा है ? देश का विभाजन उस मुस्लिम लीग के तुष्टीकरण की नाति के परिणामस्वरूप ही हुआ, हजारों लोग मारे गए, भ्रंशण नरसंहार हुआ, महिलाओं का सम्मान लूटा गया, सम्पत्ति का नाश हुआ, और आज भी पाकिस्तान में यही चल रहा है। छोटे छोटे बहाने बना करके नरसंहार किया जाता है एवं किया जा रहा है, सम्पत्ति लूटी जाती है एवं लूटी जा रही है और महिलाओं और पुरुषों में से किसी का भी सम्मान वहां पर सुरक्षित नहीं है। क्या यह सब न्यायसंगत है ? क्या यह सब हमारी मित्रता का परिचायक है ? क्या यह नेहरू-लियाकत संधि के अनुरूप काम हो रहा है ? ऐसा लगता है कि हमारी कांग्रेस सरकार की मुस्लिम लीग के प्रति तुष्टीकरण की जो नीति थी और जिसका परिणाम हम आज तक भोगते आ रहे हैं, वही नीति अभी भी चल रही है और उसके परिणामस्वरूप पाकिस्तान चाहे जितना करता जा रहा है मगर हमारी सरकार कुछ नहीं करती है।

जलपाईगुड़ी में पाकिस्तान के कुछ लोग घुस आये और हमारे क्षेत्र से मछलियां पकड़ कर ले गये और जब हमने पूछा कि उनको पकड़ा क्यों नहीं तो प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कहा कि वे भाग गये तथा कहा कि जाहिर है कि भागने वाला तेज भागता है। फिर पाकिस्तान वाले त्रिपुरा के पास घुस कर आकर जम गये, उन्होंने लाठीटीला के हमारे क्षेत्र में अपना कब्जा कर लिया। बेरुवाड़ी के क्षेत्र में हमारे क्षेत्र में पाकिस्तानियों ने कब्जा कर लिया

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया] और हम उनको हटाना नहीं चाहते। हमारी सरकार कहती है कि इन छोटी सी बातों के लिये तनाव बढ़ जायगा। समझ में नहीं आता कि वे भाग जाते हैं तो पकड़े नहीं जाते और रुक जाते हैं तो तनाव बढ़ जाता है, इस भय से कुछ कर नहीं पाते हैं। तो यह जो तुष्टीकरण की नीति चलती है प्रेम भाव बढ़ाने की दृष्टि से, किन्तु प्रेम भाव के स्थान पर वह द्वेष भाव में परिणत हो जाती है तथा उनको शह मिल जाती है और इस शह ही का परिणाम है कि काश्मीर में हज़रत बल का किस्सा हुआ; किया किसने, कराया किसने और उसका नाजायज बहाना ढूँढ कर के पाकिस्तान में हजारों हिन्दुओं को खत्म कर दिया गया, उनका नरसंहार किया गया, उनकी सम्पत्ति तथा सामान लूट लिया, वहाँ से भागने को मजबूर किया। तो हमारी सरकार को इसके बारे में कुछ न कुछ विचार करना होगा। वह यह देखे कि इसका परिणाम क्या हो रहा है।

केवल यह बात ही नहीं कि पाकिस्तानी हमारे क्षेत्र में आकर बैठ गये हैं बल्कि आये दिन कई पाकिस्तानी लोग यहां आकर लूट मार किया करते हैं। ४ महीनों में हमारे बाडेर पर १०१ कैसेज ऐसे हुए जब कि पाकिस्तानियों ने घुस-घुस कर हमारे यहां कैटल-लिफ्टिंग का काम किया, हमारे यहां से महिलाओं को उड़ा कर ले गये, हमारे यहां से पुरुषों को उठा कर ले गये, हमारे यहां की धन-सम्पत्ति को लूट कर ले गये हमारे झाड़ काट कर ले गये और इस तरह पाकिस्तान अपने क्षेत्र में ही नहीं बल्कि भारतीय सीमा में हमारे यहां घुस कर हम लोगों को परेशान किया करता है और हमारी सरकार केवल इतना कहती है कि हमने विरोध-पत्र भेज दिया है। केवल विरोध-पत्र भेज देने से काम चलता नहीं। चीन को भी आपने विरोध-पत्र भेजे और उसका परिणाम हमने देख लिया और पाकिस्तान को भी हम विरोध-पत्र भेजे

रहे हैं और हम देख रहे हैं कि वे वहां की रही की टोकरी की शोभा बढ़ा रहे हैं और इसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि सीमा पर लगे हुए क्षेत्रों के निवासी भयंकर कष्ट का अनुभव कर रहे हैं और हमारी सरकार केवल इसी तरह की वजह से कि तनाव बढ़ जायगा कुछ कर नहीं पा रही है जो कि कुछ न्यायसंगत नहीं प्रतीत होता है।

इतना ही नहीं, हमारी सरकार की तुष्टीकरण की नीति बड़ी विचित्र है। हमारी भारत सरकार को करोड़ों रुपया पाकिस्तान सरकार से लेना है और उसकी किस्में सन् १९५२ ई० से ड्यू हो चुकी हैं और १० किस्तों में पाकिस्तान को उसे चुका देना चाहिये था लेकिन दोनों सरकारें अभी तक यह तय नहीं कर पाई हैं कि कितना रुपया उसे लेना है तो फिर किस्त लेने की क्या बात है। मगर पाकिस्तान को जो देना है वह हमारी सरकार बड़ी उदारता से देती रहती है। वह यह नहीं कहती कि जब तक सारा हिसाब नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम एक पैसा देने वाले नहीं हैं। तो इस बारे में हमारी सरकार कुछ करती नहीं। स्पष्टतः इसका कारण यह है कि उसकी मुस्लिम लीग के प्रति जैसी तुष्टीकरण की नीति विभाजन के पूर्व थी वही तुष्टीकरण की नीति आज भी पाकिस्तान के प्रति है और पाकिस्तान के प्रति अपनी सद्भावना रखने वाले जितने लोग भारत में हैं उनके लिये भी वही तुष्टीकरण की नीति है और उसी का दुष्परिणाम हमें देखना पड़ रहा है।

कलकत्ता में जो किस्सा हुआ वह किसी से छिपा नहीं है। कलकत्ता का शिव मन्दिर तोड़ा गया, विवेकानन्द शताब्दी की प्रदर्शनी जला दी गई। जहां मुस्लिम बहु-संख्या में हैं वहीं पर दंगा-फिसाद शुरू हुआ। विद्यार्थियों का जो जुलूस निकला उस पर भी हमला किया गया। जब पुलिस मुस्लिम कारपोरेट्स को पकड़ने गई तो मुसलमानों ने मुस्लिम का सामना किया। कई स्थानों पर

पुलिस से टकराहट हुई। और इसी प्रकार की कई दुर्घटनाएँ हुई। तो वे किस बात का प्रमाण हैं, वे क्या बताती हैं? मस्जिदों में चीन और पाकिस्तान के शस्त्र निकले। ये मस्जिद थीं, धार्मिक स्थान थे या ये बैटल-फील्ड की सामग्री के स्टोर थे, कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है। तो इस तरह की ये जो घटनाएँ हैं उनसे कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि जब से चीन और पाकिस्तान की मैत्री हुई है तब से यहां पर जितने प्रो-चाइना और प्रो-पाकिस्तानी हैं वे दोनों मिल कर के भारत में अराजकता की स्थिति पैदा करना चाहते हैं। हमारे भारत-वर्ष में ऐसे पंचमांगियों का जाल इतना व्यापक फैला हुआ है कि अगर सरकार ने समय रहते मजबूती से दृढ़ नीति अपना कर इन लोगों को समाप्त नहीं किया तो जैसी कि कलकत्ता में अराजकता की स्थिति पैदा हुई उसी तरह का भाव सारे भारतवर्ष में फैल सकता है। अगर हमारी सरकार अभी भी मुस्लिम लीग के प्रति उसकी जो तुष्टीकरण की नीति थी उसको छोड़ करके जितने भी पंचमांगी हैं—चाहे वे कम्युनिस्ट पंचमांगी हों या पाकिस्तान के पंचमांगी हों दोनों पर—उनके खिलाफ एक सख्त नीति अपना कर सख्ती के साथ कार्यवाही नहीं करेगी तो हमारे देश में निकट भविष्य में ही ऐसी अराजकता फैल जायेगी कि जिस पर नियंत्रण चाहे वह श्री गुलजारीलाल नन्दा हों चाहे वह शास्त्री जी हों उनके बस की बात नहीं रहेगी। इसलिए अत्यन्त आवश्यक है और मैं चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे जितने पंचमांगी तत्व हमारे देश में फैले हुए हैं जो कि देश में अराजकता पैदा करने पर तुले हुए हैं उनके खिलाफ सख्त कार्यवाही की जानी चाहिये अन्यथा स्थिति सभ्यता नहीं जा सकेगी।

इसके साथ ही साथ उपराष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण में चर्चा की गई है कि “औद्योगिक उत्पादन बराबर बढ़ता रहा है” और

“खेती के काम को बढ़ाने के लिये बराबर कोशिश की गई है।” अब देखिये कि औद्योगिक उत्पादन तो बढ़ रहा है मगर कीमतें भी बढ़ती जा रही हैं। १९६२ ई० में नन्दा साहब ने एक कमेटी बनाई थी कीमतों के स्थिरीकरण के लिये और उस कमेटी का कार्यक्रम किसी दिशा में भी चला या नहीं यह तो मैं नहीं कह सकता मगर हमारे यहां जो महंगाई बढ़ती जा रही है उस से ऐसा लगता है कि कमेटी बना देने से या भाषण दे देने से ही महंगाई कम हो जायेगी ऐसा नहीं है। अगर ऐसा हो तो मैं सारे संसद् सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह रघुपति राघव राजा राम की जगह यह कहने लग जायें कि भाव कम हो जाय भाव कम हो जाय और यह भाषण देना प्रारम्भ कर दें, मगर इस तरह तो काम होता नहीं। हमारे देश की आर्थिक नीति भी विचित्र है। हम जो कुछ उत्पादन का टारगेट बनाते हैं वह पूरा हो नहीं पाता है। औद्योगिक उत्पादन बराबर बढ़ता जा रहा है मगर चीजें भी बग़ावर महंगी होती जा रही हैं। भाव को बढ़ाने में अन्य फैक्टर्स भी होते हैं मगर जब तक मांग के आधार पर सप्लाय नहीं होगी तब तक भाव जरूर बढ़ेंगे; तो हमारे यहां चूकि औद्योगिक उत्पादन मांग के रूप अनुरूप हो नहीं पा रहा है इसी के परिणामस्वरूप भाव बराबर बढ़ते जा रहे हैं।

यह कहा गया है कि “खेती के काम को बढ़ाने के लिए बराबर कोशिश की गई है”। मगर जब से आजादी मिली है तब से ही जितने नेता लोग भाषण देते हैं यह कहते हैं कि खेती को प्रोत्साहित करना चाहिये। खेती यहां का मुख्य उद्योग है मगर दुख की बात है कि खेती के बारे में जो एक बेसिक बात है उसके ऊपर अभी तक विचार नहीं किया गया है कि एक एकड़ उत्पादन में कितना खर्च पड़ता है, उसकी क्या कीमत होनी

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]
चाहिये। कितना उत्पादन होता है और कितना खर्च पड़ता है, इसकी जांच अभी तक नहीं की गई है। आज मोटरकार की कीमत तय करनी होती है तो मालिकों से मिल कर के कास्ट एकाउंटेंसी के हिसाब से अगर ६ हजार की कीमत बैठती होगी तो मोटर कार की कीमत १० हजार बना दी जाती है। मगर इसका निर्धारण नहीं किया जाता है कि काश्तकार का एक एकड़ उत्पादन में क्या खर्च पड़ता है और उसको क्या मिलना चाहिये। आज तक हमारी सरकार ने यह नहीं किया है और उसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि हमारे ७५ प्रतिशत जो काश्तकार हैं वे भूखों मरते हैं और तरह तरह के भयंकर कष्ट उठाते हैं और कड़ी मेहनत करते हैं फिर भी भूखों मरते हैं क्योंकि उनका प्रतिनिधित्व पूरी तरह से हो नहीं पाता है। अगर मजदूरों की तरफ कुछ हो जाता है तो हमारे जो मजदूरों के नेता हैं वे आ जाते हैं, कर्मचारियों की तरफ कुछ हो जाता है तो कर्मचारियों की ओर से प्रतिनिधित्व हो जाता है मगर गरीब काश्तकारों की तरफ से जोकि ७५ प्रतिशत हैं कोई प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं हो पाता है कि उन्हें उनकी मेहनत का क्या मूल्य मिलना चाहिये। आज तक हमारी यह सरकार इस का निर्धारण नहीं कर पाई है। हाँ, वह सद्भावनायें जरूर बताती रही है कि हमें यह करना चाहिये। तो मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस दिशा में भी हमारी सरकार प्रयत्न करे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

इस अभिभाषण में यह भी कहा गया है कि "खेती की खास खान फसलों का भाव ठीक रखने की नीति से, ऐसा समझा जाता है कि खेती की पैदावार भी बढ़ेगी और उत्पादन की क्षमता भी।" लेकिन जब तक कि खास खास फसलों की पैदावार की कीमत क्या होनी चाहिये इसका निर्धारण नहीं होता है तब तक क्या होगा। उपसभापति महोदया, पांच साल का जो सकल है—कभी अच्छा साल होता है

फिर बुरा साल होता है, फिर अच्छा साल होता है, फिर बुरा साल होता है इस तरह का जो सकल है—उस आधार पर जब तक कीमत का निर्धारण नहीं होता है तब तक हम यह अपेक्षा करें कि काश्तकार खेती के उत्पादन में अपना जी-जान लगा देगा, बेकार है। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखें कि हमारे काश्तकारों को क्या कीमत मिलनी चाहिये। जब बाजार में उसका गेहूं जाता है तब वह १४ रु० और १५ रु० मन बिकता है लेकिन जब उसके पास से वह निकल जाता है तब वही गेहूं ३० रु० मन हो जाता है। यह हमारे सरकार की आर्थिक नीति है कि काश्तकार के पास से जब गेहूं आवे तो उसे १५ रु० मन मिले और जब वह सेठ साहूकार या व्यापारी के पास पहुंच जाय तो उसका भाव ३० रु० मन हो जाय। तो मैं इसकी निन्दा करता हूं; इसको योजना नहीं कहते। योजना के जो लक्ष्य हैं वे भी पूरे नहीं होते और कीमतें भी दुगुनी होती जाती हैं। तो यह जो हमारी सरकार की नीति है वह कुछ ठीक नहीं लगती है।

अब शीत-लहरी की ओर मैं शासन का ध्यान आकषित करूंगा। शीत-लहरी के परिणामस्वरूप हजारों मन अनाज समाप्त हो गया। हजारों मन धनिया जल गया, हजारों मन चना जल गया और बहुत नुकसान हुआ। हमारे क्षेत्र में भी अफीम की खेती होती है और हमारी सरकार के नियमों के अनुसार अफीम का उत्पादन करने वालों को एक निश्चित पैदावार देनी चाहिये अन्यथा उनके अनुज्ञापत्र निरसित कर दिये जायेंगे। लेकिन इस शीत-लहरी के परिणामस्वरूप उन लोगों की यह ताकत नहीं है कि सरकार ने जो तखमीना लगा रखी है उसी आधार पर उतना ही उत्पादन दे सकें। इसलिए मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि उनके रेवेन्यू बोर्ड के जो रुस्त बने हैं कि एक एकड़ में इतना उत्पादन होना चाहिये उसमें थोड़ी ढिलाई कर दें। वह अभी से अपने कर्मचारियों को

भेज कर के सर्वे करा लें कि शीत-लहरी के परिणामस्वरूप उत्पादन में कितना फर्क पड़ा है और उसी आधार पर नियमों में परिवर्तन कर के उन्हें राहत दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

अन्त में महंगाई के बारे में एक मिनट में कुछ निवेदन कर के समाप्त कर दूंगा । हमारी सरकार ज्यों ज्यों चाहती है कि महंगाई कम हो त्यों त्यों महंगाई बढ़ती जाती है । हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने बड़ी उदारता के साथ कहा है कि हम दो रुपया बढ़ा देंगे, पांच रुपया बढ़ा देंगे, १० रुपया बढ़ा देंगे । मगर मैंने एक छोट से चपरासी से पूछा कि यह दो रुपया बढ़ा तो क्या हालत है तो उसने कहा कि इससे तो शक्कर का जो भाव बढ़ा है वह भी पूरा नहीं होगा, गेहूं की तो बात ही क्या । हमारे कर्मचारी कहते हैं कि कोट की जगह बुशशर्ट, पेंट की जगह ह्वाफपेंट, पूरी कमीज की जगह आधी बांह की कमीज पहन कर तो चले आ सकते हैं मगर पेट पर पट्टी बांध कर तो नहीं आ सकते, भूखे पेट तो नहीं आ सकते । यह जो गेहूं के भाव १५ रु० से ३० रु० मन है, यह कोई ठीक नहीं है । अगर सरकार समय रहते इस पर नियंत्रण नहीं कर सकी, इसको ठीक बाम पर नहीं ला सकी तो ये पंचमांगी तो अपना काम कर ही रहे हैं लेकिन पेट की मार भी हमको अराजकता की ओर ले जायगी और अगर हमारी सरकार समय रहते नहीं जागेगी तो हमारे देश की हालत खराब होगी ।

आपने समय दिया उसके लिये धन्यवाद । यों बहुत सी बातें, काश्मीर के बारे में, आई० एन० ए० के बारे में कहने को थीं मगर समय नहीं है इसलिये फिर कभी उन्हें कहने का अवसर मिलेगा तो प्रस्तुत करूंगा ।

PROF. (MRS.) G. PARTHASARATHY (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to thank the Vice-President for his Address giving us a picture of the

achievements of our Government and our country in the last year. Taking an overall view of this picture, we must, I think, congratulate the Government on their achievements in basic industries like coal and steel and in the essential sphere of foreign trade.

But to the great regret of some of us, the Vice-President's Address did not even glance at the vital subject of education, which is surely the foundation upon which we must build the structure of democratic socialism, which we are attempting to raise in this country. In every sphere of activity that matters in a country's life, it is the human material that will ultimately count most. It is on the human material, that goes into any project, that the success or failure of a project depends. Today we get aid from many foreign countries by way of the most up to date and modern machinery. We get aid from England, the United States, Russia and other European countries and though in the beginning their technicians might help us by coming here to erect the plants and put up the machinery—which mean so much to the material development of our country—we must remember that ultimately and in the future, which is particularly important, the running of all these projects will depend on the skill and training of our own people who man them. And today while our new projects have the machinery that, they want and have to a considerable extent the foreign exchange that they need for the raw materials required, we all agree that they woefully lack the trained technicians and personnel to keep them running at their best. We notice that at the opening of every new project, it is almost always mentioned that the right type of engineer or technician is not available, and, in fact, the reports of most of our public sector projects bear this fact out because we rarely reach our target of production. We have a great deal of wastage by way of machinery lying idle and by way of raw materials not being used in time, all of which factors really hinge upon the human material in those projects. Yet,

[Prof. (Mrs.) G. Parthasarathy.]
on the other hand, there are large numbers of educated unemployed eating their hearts out for lack of employment.

This, I think, is a sad reflection on the lack of planning in the essential sphere of education. We are no doubt increasing the number of our technical schools and universities, though even in this respect the increase bears no proportion to our requirements and certainly no proportion to our growing population. But even while we increase our schools we do not take into account the type of trained personnel that we require. Every year large numbers of humanists and economists leave our institutions when what we need are men and women specially trained in electronics. Or again, we have long lines of civil engineers leaving our engineering colleges and not finding suitable employment, when what we need are hydraulic engineers in plenty. This means that while we have an overall plan for the material welfare of our country, our education on which the Plan must fall or stand is itself growing without any plan at all. For such a co-ordination between our needs and our practical educational policies, it is surely the Central Government that must be responsible. It is high time, then, that the Centre should give up its merely advisory functions *vis-a-vis* the States and take a more active part in planning our educational policies and programmes.

Again, today everybody is hoarse, crying out against the weaknesses in the management of our projects, against corruption and maladministration in Government. Here again, when you come to think of it, in the ultimate analysis it is the individual human being who is responsible for such weaknesses. The appointment of a Vigilance Commission may eradicate a great deal of this corruption—we hope it will—but let us remember that the Vigilance Commission will only act upon the negative motive of fear and that is a very important aspect of

our life because it should act upon the positive and not the negative motive. When we come to such a pass that we think of tackling maladministration and corruption in our administration, we have really by implicit meaning accepted the disease and what we are doing is to try to cure that disease. Surely, prevention is better than cure and the prevention of corruption is what we should really aim at. We can only bring about the prevention of corruption by a healthy system of education, and in this context I do not mean by education the accumulation of B.As. M.As. and M.Sc.s. mean a healthy civic education particularly at the secondary education stage, for it is only to our youngsters in secondary schools that we can teach the values of life and instill into them those principles that will stand them in good stead in later life and make them withstand the temptation of bribery and malpractices when they find themselves in positions of responsibility. But to make our educational system, which is now a motiveless system, an instrument of true education, we need to breathe into it a new spirit and we do hope—most of us—that in the Fourth Plan there will be particular attention paid to education, both from the point of view of co-ordinating its objects with our needs and making education the vital source of building our national character.

Before I close, I would like to say how extremely anxious Members of Parliament and the whole country have been about the health of our revered President and our well loved Prime Minister and we wish them both speedy recovery and many more years of useful service to our country.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras):
Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the Vice-President for his Address to the joint Session of Parliament. Although I come towards the fag end of this the fifth and final day of this great debate, I have nevertheless some twenty-seven points which are quite new. But I feel that within the fifteen minutes that

I am now allowed, I must concentrate upon the first point which I consider to be the fundamental among fundamentals, namely, the security of the State. I know that many leading lights of Parliament in this House and the other House have given expression to their observations. Nevertheless, I feel I have got a contribution to make which, in a sense, will be quite unique. I am therefore, reminded of the wonderful couplet from Urdu poetry which best explains my preface:—

اوروں کا پیغام اور ہے میرا پیغام اور ہے -
عشق کے درد مند کا طرز کلام اور ہے -

†[‘‘میروں کا پیغام اور ہے میرا پیغام اور ہے ।
عشق کے درد مند کا طرز کلام اور ہے ।]

Now, I do not want to observe any more silence and let me speak from out of my soul for the good of my country:

یہ خاموشی کہاں تک
لڑتے لڑیاد پیدا کر
زمین پر تو ہو اور تیری
صدا ہو آسمانوں میں
سن اے فاضل صدا میری
یہ ایسی چیز ہے جس کو
وظیفہ جان کر پڑھتے ہیں
طاؤر ہومستانوں میں
وطن کی فکر کو نادان
مصوبت آنے والی ہے
نئی بربادیوں کے مشورہ
میں آسمانوں میں
نہ سمجھو گے تو سب جاوے
اے ہلندوستان والو
تمہاری داستان تک بھی
نہ ہوگی داستانوں میں

†[‘‘یہ خاموشی کہاں تک
لڑتے لڑیاد پیدا کر ।
زمین پر تو ہو اور تیری
صدا ہو آسمانوں میں ।
سُن اے غافل ! صدا میری
یہ ایسی چیز ہے جس کو
بھیڑا جان کر پڑھتے ہیں
طاؤر ہومستانوں میں ।
وطن کی فکر کر نادان
مصوبت آنے والی ہے،
تیری بربادیوں کے مشورے
ہیں آسمانوں میں ।
نہ سمجھو گے تو سب جاوے
اے ہندوستان والو !
تمہاری داستان تک بھی
نہ ہوگی داستانوں میں ।]

Madam, what is the *summum bonum* of the Security Council debate that we have witnessed these fourteen or fifteen long years on the Kashmir dispute? I feel most disheartened to make this observation, but nevertheless I have to make it even if I should be in the minority of one, to express my views with courage and conviction and candour. These debates which went on for these fourteen or fifteen years have revealed only one thing. As for the spokesmen of Pakistan, right from Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan down to Sahibzada Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, every spokesman of Pakistan has argued the case like the most ingenious criminal lawyer and got the accused away, declared “not guilty” and, therefore, not hanged on the gallows—thanks to the Gentlemen of the Jury, the hon. Members of the Security Council of the United Nations. And what is our side of the picture? I am very sorry to say it—but nevertheless truth sometimes is stranger than fiction and must be faced, however bitter—I have to express it, and that is, right from Sir, N. Gopalaswamy Iyengar down to Mr. M. C. Chagla, the Spokesmen of India have very brilliantly argued the case, each more brilliantly than his predecessor. But what is the result? The

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

proof of the pudding is in the eating, not in the apologies and consolations that we have to tender unto ourselves and comfort the heart of the nation; that is not going to remedy the situation; if anything, that will only mislead us further into a quandary. Unfortunately, Madam—and this is what really pains me to say—it looks as though we have deputed very great surgeons, and Mr. Chagla was indeed the greatest of surgeons; congratulations for his surgery, but what has happened? The surgery was good, the operation was successful but the patient died, and died every time. Why? What is this psychopathology about? For that we must have to turn the searchlight of introspection and look within and find out what really is this malady of the heart of the nation, which has brought so much of world opinion against our stand.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I feel, and this is exactly what I would wish you to understand, that this time when the patient died, lo and behold, even our only veto power in the Security Council, Russia, joined the funeral, and what is her funeral note? This is what is really a very agonising reappraisal of our case in the United Nations, before the bar of world opinion. Madam, remember that it is Russia that says this, not the United Kingdom which has got a historic role, not the United States which has got an alliance with Pakistan, but it is Russia which used veto in our favour every time, which places this verdict of world opinion, this consensus of benediction, this conscience of humanity against India and Pakistan equally, and let me repeat the observation that Russia has made before that great tribunal of world opinion:

"The recent events both in India where as a result of communal strife Muslims were victimised, and in Pakistan where Hindus suffered from persecution, indicated again that it was necessary to

overcome this animosity as speedily as possible."

This is the unkindest cut of all. Madam Deputy Chairman, our country which has been preaching the highest moral values for the world right from time immemorial, our country which has got the proudest, priceless possession of spiritual heritage has today got to take from the world the elementary principles, the A. B. C., of how best we have got to be good neighbours. I am very sorry that the table should have been turned against the conduct of India. What a crying shame, my countrymen!

I must say why this has happened. We are proud that we have got in our spiritual heritage such basic virtues of truth and non-violence which the Father of the Nation brought to our memory time and again and which he bequeathed to the nation amongst his most valuable injunctions. Nevertheless, I have to give expression to my strongest feelings as a Muslim that I feel most unhappy over the reports that we have received from Pakistan. It is a disgrace against Islam that Pakistan should have even violated or abused or dishonoured a single individual no matter to whichever community he may belong. But, Madam, as a citizen of India I feel equally ashamed and I tell you that in our country there cannot be an answer for it even by way of retaliation. I feel that there is no justification for this when we are wedded to the highest principles of secularism and much more than that to the highest spiritual heritage of Hinduism; it is a crying shame that even a single individual should have been touched, should have been dishonoured, should have suffered sacrilege. It was the "Times" of London which said that the relations between India and Pakistan hang on a single hair. What does that wonderful incident at Hazratbal demonstrate to the world? Even for the single hair of the Holy Prophet if there is so much of sanctity attached which has brought together as the rallying point the different communities—not only

the Muslims but the Hindus, the Sikhs, the Buddhists and Christians of Jammu and Kashmir—that only is a lesson before the world that the Prophet of Islam wants that not a single hair of any mother's child shall be desecrated, shall be abused, shall be dishonoured. That is the miracle, the message of this holy hair which Kashmiris have unitedly observed right through.

Madam, Pakistan is not the only Muslim country in this world that it must have to preserve the traditions of Islam. There are 30 or 35 Muslim countries in the world where they do not have this minority problem, although there are minorities in every one of these countries. But if in Pakistan they have got it, it is a crying shame, and we have got to carry conviction with the Muslim world, some 30 or 35 members of the United Nations, as to how Pakistan had gone back on the highest principles of Islamic equality and brotherhood and fraternity. But that is no excuse for India and particularly I say for the leading lights of our Hindu community who must be proud of the spiritual heritage of non-violence that has been bequeathed to us through the centuries, that gives us no authority to see that we should have to place people belonging to the minority community entrusted to their care in jeopardy, their life in peril, their culture in jeopardy and their very property in doldrums. Madam, there can be no justification for it. I speak in the name of humanity, and I am sure every good Hindu will certainly agree with me that the remarkable thing which delighted my heart in spite of the holocaust in the sub-continent of India and Pakistan was the report, that I had from many, many quarters, that there were Muslims in Pakistan who even gave up their lives in protecting the honour and security of the Hindu minority. That is the true religion of Islam. Equally in our country there are many who belong to the different communities, the Hindus, the Sikhs, the Christians, the Jains, the Parsees, and the Buddhists who

went to the succour and help of the Muslim community in distress, and that stands to the glory of our spiritual heritage.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I am not able to understand with what justification we call ourselves a civilised society. After all, what is this State for? When man emerged from the beast—it is not that I believe in the Darwin's Theory of Evolution but I speak from the History of Man—he ordained through the machinery of the State for the good conduct and behaviour of the society, to protect his person and property, and entrusted the powers for the elementary discharge of law and order to the government; and when that first fundamental security has been violated, transgressed, I believe that we cease to call ourselves, whether in India or in Pakistan, a cultured society or a civilised State. Indeed, we have behaved worse than criminal tribes and betrayed the culture of a culture. Pakistan may glory in the name of Islam but, believe me, no country in the world has done greater harm to the glorious heritage of equality, brotherhood and fraternity that Islam has preached than what Pakistan has practised. The Hindus live only in one country and it is the great country of India, and if the Hindus are not able to demonstrate those highest traditions and ideals of Hinduism which we have seen through the centuries in their spiritual heritage, they will cease to be Hindus and they will not be able to proclaim from the house-tops the glory of Hindu culture and civilisation. This is what we have seen in the carnage that has occurred in the three hundred or four hundred villages of West Bengal. Believe me, I feel very much agitated over the tragedy that has happened all over the sub-continent of India and Pakistan and wonder how we can account for this tragic thing.

I was applying my mind a little seriously as to the reasons why such a tremendous tragedy should be occurring in the sub-continent every

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]
now and then, killing the innocent lives of the minorities. (*Time bell rings*) Excuse me. I have got plenty of ideas. Just give me ten minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you will be keeping out someone else.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am having quite a serious point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That would do. You said that you would be finishing it in fifteen minutes but you have taken seventeen minutes.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I have to say one thing. After all, when I listened to my good friend, Mr. Mani, yesterday demanding that we must quit the Commonwealth, the British Commonwealth (*Interruptions*) I felt very sorry that he, an Independent Member that he is, should have come forward with that suggestion. Commonwealth membership is not like his membership of the Chelmsford Club.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): It is worse than that.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I tell you, Madam, that I am very sorry that Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, for whose intellect, I have got the greatest appreciation, should have surrendered to emotions and come round to this view. After all, if you want to suggest that our country must leave the British Commonwealth of Nations, we are only playing into the hands of Pakistan and thereby even alienating what little sympathies we have in the British Commonwealth, which has stood by us in our crisis with China. Is that what we want to achieve for our country? Despite all the differences that we may have for the moment with the United Kingdom, that wonderful island of Cardinal Wolsey has got still millions of lessons to teach us in the arts of diplomacy. That is cold-blooded logic.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: We are still in the nursery school in the arts of diplomacy, and of seasoned statesmanship. We have yet to learn and practise the way how best to convert enemies into friends. That is the point that we have to learn. (*Interruptions*). It is not a reflection upon anybody but I have got to tell the truth. I have got to warn my countrymen of what is going to befall them if this is the kind of shadow-boxing and soap-box oratory which some of our naughty boys are displaying from the Chowpathy Beach.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Chowpathy Beach?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: And I can understand . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anwar, give the truth in a nut-shell.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Madam, I am only sorry that I have no time but this is the point that I make. Is there not one single seasoned statesman of the calibre of Sir Stafford Cripps in this country of 450 millions . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Plenty.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: . . . who can convert an enemy into a friend in the middle of the conflict as he did during the second world war and during our Independence struggle? We have got enemies on two fronts, and very few friends left. And we are having politicians to the north, to the south, to the east and to the west, from end to end, of the Himalayas, who have kindled the flames of hatred and set the Himalayas on fire. And what is going to fall upon this country if the deadly lava of fear and hatred, instead of milk and honey of love and goodwill, flows down the Ganges through the sub-continent of India and Pakistan? I shudder to imagine the horrors of the morrow. People who have been preaching world peace have got to understand that it is much more difficult to maintain peace. It is infinitely much easier

to kindle a war. Any devil can do that. We are already sitting on the edge of a volcano. We therefore want that there should be a Sir Stafford Cripps from amongst our countrymen, who can go and see that we can at least try to get Britain or the United States, or (*Interruptions*) both the powers on our side.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): What has happened to your points?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am very sorry that Mr. . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): It is Sir Stafford Cripps who divided the country and created the two-nation theory.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am very sorry that today there is no Mahatma Gandhi, with his truth and non-violence, with his ideal of secularism, living in our country, but Quaed-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah's two-nation theory seems to have captivated the imagination of the sub-continent. Are we to play into the hands of Pakistan? Are we to maintain our law and order situation in accordance with what Pakistan orders about? That is something of a crying shame. We have still got greater virtues of law and order in our country. Therefore, I am most happy that one of the wisest acts of our Prime Minister—and I must pray that he lives long and gives the best of his services still in the year to come to the country—was when he deputed Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to Srinagar to bring about a solution of that most explosive issue of Hazratbal, and he deputed the right man to the right place at the right time with the right overcoat for the right solution.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: And yours is the right appreciation.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Thank you.

Therefore, Madam, this was only one miracle, and that belongs to the short man of our Cabinet . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time is up. Please wind up.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: And there is another miracle which belongs to the tall man of the Cabinet, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda. After the event, he rose to Himalayan heights of courage in trying to see that the mischief was nipped in the bud and he brought sanctity and glory to Hinduism. He brought also grandeur for the cause of secularism at least by trying to prevent the carnage and holocaust from spreading—better late than never.

I have got one point which I will now finish and that is that, I want the special status for Kashmir to continue undisturbed. I know that many of our friends in this House and in the other House plead that Kashmir must be integrated in full with India despite article 370 of the Constitution. But I tell you, the founding fathers in their wisdom have given a guarantee that Kashmir will be treated with a special status.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, certainly no.

SEVERAL OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Ah! Now I have got a reason to believe why it must be continued, because of your agitational attitude.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Have you seen the Constitution?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Yes, I have seen it and now I am also looking into your own 'constitution' when I am saying that.

Madam, why do I suggest that? India and Pakistan have been charged with the same crime of communal violence by the majority against the minority, and have been branded as communal the world over. whereas

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]
that lovely land that Nature has created on the highest pedestals at the foot of the Himalayas, Kashmir, is the most eloquent testimony to the ideals of secularism that the world has ever produced. I do not speak of the Armed Forces there where naturally you have got a preponderant majority community from India. But I speak of the State Government of Kashmir and Jammu. At the head of the State you have got a Hindu as the Sadr-i-Riyasat. That is the only State where—among all our sixteen States—the Muslims are in an absolute and preponderant majority, 85 per cent. And what glorious account they have given of Islam and their secularism. In the Cabinet, they have got the minority community of 15 per cent in absolute majority seven out of twelve Ministers. They have got the minority community in virtual power, in key position and in absolute majority in most services. Moreover the Speaker of the Assembly and the Chairman of the Council and the Chief Justice of the High Court belong to the minority. In ever so many walks of life, they have got the minority community and the majority community happily together in joint enterprise. Even in the Assembly and the Council they are a considerable percentage. And that is the kind of example that we have to emulate in our country.

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): May I ask my hon. friend? Would that be abolished if Kashmir were to be fully integrated with India or if it were to remain as it is?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: All the entire sixteen States should come up to the highest standard of that Himalayan State and we should emulate the wonderful atmosphere that obtains there where all the communities have been living in perfect peace and harmony, despite provocations from many quarters. Why do you want it? I know

the intentions that prompt some of our hon. friends to disturb the balance of the population there; in the name of integration they try a major upset to wipe out the noble tradition that that Muslim majority of 85 per cent has demonstrated for the preservation of communal harmony in the most glorious and unique manner which Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, leader of Jan Sangh, must remember at least a million times if he is sincere to the cause of secularism.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, after the hurricane of Mr. Anwar's eloquence, my speech may appear like a wet blanket because, with all due respect to the Vice-President who delivered the Presidential Address this year, I look upon it as an uninspiring document. It looks as if it had been produced by some secretariat official. One indication is the numbering of the paragraphs in the speech, as if it was a memorandum submitted by somebody in the secretariat. And the Bills that are to be introduced in the course of the next year are also an uninspiring lot—amendments to a number of Acts already in operation, not dealing with any great subject of political, administrative or economic reform. It looks like the statement of a captain of a ship in the doldrums, of a captain who looks back with sorrow at the storm through which he has passed and is looking with despondency upon the future course of the ship.

Take first the matter of agricultural production. The Address notes that there is a fall of 3.3 per cent, and this lag in agricultural production is attributed to bad agricultural seasons. It is like a bad workman quarrelling with his tools. Bad agricultural seasons or failure of the monsoons is a fact of life in India; these monsoons or their failures have been facts throughout the course of Indian history. How did the former rulers face the possibility of bad agricultural seasons? Well, they took precautions against the failure of the

monsoons. The great Chola and Pandyan kings built a large number of tanks which served as reservoirs of water and thus provided for the time when rains might fail. The English proverb is 'saying for a rainy day'. But we do nothing to save for the rainless days with which we may be faced.

As regards industrial production there has been a slight increase only about 9 per cent. And may I note the singular absence of figures in order to support the statements in the Address? In paragraphs 4 and 5 we read a number of vague statements but nothing substantial in the form of figures to support those statements. Where the Address deals with the past, it speaks of shortfalls and lags in production. Where it speaks in the future tense about the future it indulges in vague hopes and expectation.

The one bright spot in the Address is the reference to the appointment of a Vigilance Commission. The Vigilance Commission is not the one that we expected, not the *Ombudsman* for which the Swatantra Party has argued, a commissioner of citizens' rights, a Citizens' Commissioner who would listen to all the grievances of citizens against the Government, against members of the Government, however highly placed they may be. A citizens' commission would be endowed with powers of initiative. They would not wait as this Vigilance Commission would have to wait for cases being brought by private citizens against this or that official. A real citizens' commission would be endowed with powers of initiative, of taking the initiative itself and investigating into any reported or even suspected cases of corruption or maladministration, and it would not baulk an inquiry into ministerial conduct. It is all very well to say that Ministers are responsible to a popular legislature. But when the Ministries are supported by such large and unwavering majorities as the Ministries in India are supported, how can there

be any hope of Ministers being brought to the bar of criticism in Parliament and of suspension by Parliament? And I do not think it was a very wise thing to appoint a Judge to be the head of this Vigilance Commission. A Judge is used to, especially if he has been long on the Bench, to long proceedings, to a complicated procedure, and he wants a standard of evidence which cannot be procured in these cases of corruption and maladministration. I think a man with wide administrative experience, a man of independence and of judgment, a man who knows the ways of Government and administration would have been a much better head of this Vigilance Commission.

In foreign affairs the Government still sticks in the mud of non-alignment, and argument is put forward that this policy, this negative policy of non-alignment, is receiving support and admiration at international gatherings and from Asian-African countries. We are reduced to this position that we depend for the endorsement of our foreign policy on these children among nations. We are told that non-alignment is approved by the East as well as the West, by the Eastern Bloc as well as by the Western Bloc. The Western Bloc approves of non-alignment because worse might follow, worse might be the alternative. They do not like India to go over to the Communist Bloc. And the Communist Bloc welcomes non-alignment because the area of neutrality is expanded, and when the 'D' Day arrives, the Western powers, which stand for freedom and democracy, will be isolated, will have very few powers to support them.

In this connection, much has been said, no doubt, about the Kashmir question and about how it was dealt with at the recent meeting of the Security Council I join with others in congratulating our representative who put the case so well and so affably, in striking contrast to his predecessor in that position. On account of a

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.] certain attitude taken by the British representative it has been voiced both here and outside that it is time India left the Commonwealth. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, we are not in the Commonwealth for the blue eyes of British statesmen, nor even for the blue eyes of the present aristocratic Prime Minister of England. We are in the Commonwealth because it serves our interests to be in the Commonwealth, because it helps our national and international position. We are there because it is useful to us, not because of any ideal or any theory, international or national. And if the British representative took a certain line we may criticise it, but we have no right to resent it, because one of the principles and conventions of the British Commonwealth is that each member should be independent, not only in regard to its national policy but also in regard to its international policy. And here I must deprecate the action of certain Members of Parliament, who have gone on a deputation to the High Commissioner, waiting in his ante-room in order to convert the British to our 1 P.M. point of view. Whatever criticism we may have to offer, we must offer on the floor of the Parliament and it is not in keeping with our self-respect.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): He is entitled to protest.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Even for that, to protest in the ante-room of the British High Commission is beneath our dignity. It is not in keeping with the self-respect of Members of Parliament to go on protesting to a representative of the British Government in order to convert him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What do you like? Do you like Indonesia?

(Interruptions.)

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Do what you ought to do, indulge in self-respecting criticism from proper place . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When the cause is great, one does not stand on one's prestige as Member of Parliament . . .

(Interruptions.)

AN. HON. MEMBER: Ask him to come and protest against the behaviour of the British . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The issue was so big that in that way they behaved . . .

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): It was organised by the Communist Party

(Interruptions.)

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It was his friends. We also joined them.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: The issue was so great that Members of Parliament did a small thing.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right. We will find some other way. I hope he will help and I hope he will join, Madam.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Generally our foreign policy has been passive. We are not taking the initiative in a signal way. Look at Premier Chou En-lai going from country to country in Asia and Africa in order to enlist their sympathy for China. At this rate, with no initiative taken at the Ministry of External Affairs, with no initiative taken by our representatives outside, we shall be left in isolation. Already that is the aim of the Chinese foreign policy, to isolate India so that it will stand in isolation and when the 'D' day arrives for the full-fledged invasion by China, India will, have no friends to look to. Well, the foreign policy of non-alignment reminds one of the mid-Victorian policy for which Lord

Salisbury, the Tory Prime Minister, was responsible—a policy of “masterly inactivity” and “splendid isolation.” The isolation may be splendid but it is of no use to our country.

May I say in passing, in this matter of foreign policy that we should have a whole-time Foreign Minister. We all regret the illness of the Prime Minister. We wish him long years of useful activity as Prime Minister but the Ministry of External Affairs is such a large Ministry, such an important Ministry, such a difficult Ministry that it cannot do with a Minister who gives only half his time to its business. Let him remain as Prime Minister having an overall look over the several departments of the Government but I think it is necessary for the Ministry of External Affairs to have a full-time Minister. Six months ago I advised—it was rather impertinent of me—the Prime Minister to divest himself of the Ministry of External Affairs and confine himself, as other Prime Ministers do, to overseeing duties and jurisdiction. Now that he has been struck down by illness,—we are glad that he has recovered since—I hope he will think it over again and I hope his colleagues in the Cabinet will be able to persuade him to give up this direction of such an important Ministry and devote himself purely to the strictly circumscribed duties of Prime Minister.

Lastly, in this depressing document we find no bright prospects of better things in the future. It is not on account of the incompetence of the Ministers, not on account of the weakness of the present Government but it is on account of the ideology that they are professing, the ideology of socialism. It is on account of that handicap that the economic progress has been so slow. It is because instead of aiming directly at the promotion of the national interests, they try to promote the national interest, the economic progress of the country, through an ‘ism’, through an ideol-

ogy. No doubt there will be some progress but that progress will not be so great, will not be so rapid, as when the progress is aimed at directly and straightforwardly. Both in the international sphere and in the national sphere what we want is that the influencing principle ought to be the promotion of the national interests directly and straightly, not through the medium of any ‘ism’, however celebrated it may be.

श्री माधो राम शर्मा (पंजाब) : मैडम डिपुटी चेरमैन, यह जो तहरीक वाइस प्रेसीडेंट साहब को शुक्रिया देने के लिए मूव की गई है, मैं उसको सपोर्ट करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

वाइस प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने अपने ऐड्रेस में एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि इस गवर्नमेंट ने बहुत से डैम बनाए, बिजली पैदा की और एग्रीकल्चर को तरक्की देने के लिए बहुत से कारनामों किए हैं। लेकिन उसके बावजूद आज जो पैदावार है वह ज्यादा नहीं हो रही है और इस की वजह हमें देखनी है। एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में यह नहीं कहा जा सकता, जैसा कि किसी इन्डस्ट्री के बारे में कहा जा सकता है, कि आप अच्छी मशीन लगाइए, ज्यादा रो मैटीरियल दीजिए, अच्छे टेक्निकल हेन्ड उस में इम्प्लाय कीजिए तो जो प्रोडक्शन है वह ज्यादा हो जायेगा, पैदावार ज्यादा हो जायेगी। इन्डस्ट्री में ऐसा हो सकता है, लेकिन एग्रीकल्चर के अंदर जो बाहर के फैक्टर्स हैं, बारिश की और दूसरी जो वजूहात हैं, वे स्क्वाटें भी डाल सकती हैं और वस्तु पर बारिश आने से और दूसरी हालत होने से बम्पर क्राप भी हो सकती है।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में जो कोशिशें हुई हैं उनके बारे में मैं अपने ख्याल के मुताबिक कह सकता हूँ कि वे काफी अच्छी की गई हैं।

[श्री माधो राम शर्मा]

लेकिन उसके साथ साथ बहुत सी ऐसी बातें भी हुई हैं जिस से कि एग्रीकल्चर को ज्यादा फायदा नहीं पहुंचा, जैसेकि फर्टिलाइजर की बात है। हर एक सूब के अन्दर आप ऐसे केसेज देखेंगे कि बावजूद इसके कि हुकुमन ने इसकी कोशिश की कि छोटे जमींदारों को और फर्टिलाइजर दिया जाय ताकि पैदावार ज्यादा हो, मगर ज्यादातर ऐसे लोगों को वह फर्टिलाइजर दिया और फर्ज के तौर पर दिया जिन के पास न जमीन थी और न जो कभी काफ्त करते थे और इस तरीके से फर्टिलाइजर ले कर उन्होंने ने बाजार में बेच दिया। बजाय इस के कि जो वह एक अंग्रेजी खाद थी वह उस काम के लिये इस्तेमाल होती जिस से कि अनाज की पैदावार ज्यादा होती, वह जाकर के सन्जियों और दूसरी चीजों में इस्तेमाल होने लगी और इस तरीके पर गवर्नमेंट के मुलाजमीन ने जो एग्रीकल्चर को प्रोत्साहन देना था जो ग्रहमियत देनी थी, जो तरक्की देनी थी, वह नहीं दी जा सकी और उसके अन्दर ब्कावर्टे आई। तो इस किस्म की जो बुराइयाँ हैं, इस किस्म की जो खामिया हैं एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की तरफ से, वे दूर होनी चाहियें।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं एक बात और कहूंगा और वह यह है कि वाइस प्रसीडेंट साहब ने कीमतों के बारे में, खासतौर से एसेशियल कम्पोजिटीज और अनाजों की कीमतों के बारे में अपने ऐड्रेस में कहा है। लेकिन यह देखने में आया है कि जब कभी कोई मिनिस्टर या कोई आफिसर स्टेटमेंट या बयान देता है कि हम कीमतों को जरूर कम रखेंगे और बढ़ने नहीं देंगे तो मुल्क के अन्दर २ या ४ रुपये भाव चीजों में बढ़ जाते हैं। आखिर इसकी क्या वजह है? जब गवर्नमेंट की ओर से या मिनिस्टर की ओर से कोई बयान दिया जाता है तो आम व्यापारी समझ लेता है कि गवर्नमेंट कमजोर है, माल की कमी है और वह प्राइसेज को नहीं रोक

सकेगी। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि व्यापारी माल का स्टॉक करना शुरू कर देता है जिसकी वजह से कीमतें चीजों की बढ़ने लगती हैं। जब कभी सरकार द्वारा मुलाजमीन की तनख्वाह बढ़ाने के बारे में एलान किया जाता है तो कीमत चढ़ जाती है और व्यापारी समझता है कि अब मैं ज्यादा वसूल कर सकता हूँ। मैं इस चीज को देख कर आज भी हैरान हूँ कि जब गवर्नमेंट के पास स्टॉक है और पी० एल० ४८० के मातहत उसने अनाज का बफर स्टॉक बना रखा है तो फिर अनाज के दाम क्यों बढ़ रहे हैं? सरकार कहती है कि हम ने जो अनाज का बफर स्टॉक बना रखा है वह प्राइसेज को कम करने के लिए और प्राइसेज को कंट्रोल में रखने के लिए बना रखा है ताकि जब कभी भी मुल्क में अनाज की जरूरत पड़े तो यह अनाज दिया जा सके जिसकी वजह से प्राइसेज में कंट्रोल रह सके। लेकिन मैं यह देख कर हैरान हूँ कि जब गदुम की फसल आई या चावल की फसल आई—पिछले साल गदुम की फसल बहुत कम थी और उसका भाव १४ रु० मन था और जो घटिया किस्म की गदुम थी उसका भाव करीब १३ रु० मन था। ग्राहिस्ते ग्राहिस्ते गदुम की कीमत ज्यादा होने लगी और उस वक्त क्या गवर्नमेंट के अफसरान को यह रियलाइज नहीं करना चाहिये था कि गदुम की कीमत क्यों ज्यादा होने लगी है? गवर्नमेंट के पास जो गदुम का स्टॉक था उसको उसे मार्केट में लाना चाहिये था ताकि प्राइसेज को बढ़ने से रोका जा सकता। लेकिन देखने में यह आता है कि जब चीजों की कीमत बढ़ने लगती है तो हमारे मिनिस्टर और अफसरान बयानात देने लगते हैं कि हम गदुम की कीमत को ज्यादा नहीं होने देंगे और गवर्नमेंट के पास जो गदुम है उसको मार्केट में लाया जायेगा लेकिन वह एकचुबली आती नहीं और एक दो महीने के बाद मार्केट में आती है। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि इस बारे में अफसरान और व्यापारियों का मेलजोल है ताकि व्यापारी गदुम के दाम बढ़ा दें। हैरानी

की बात तो यह है कि गवर्नमेंट का जो गंदुम है वह १४ रु० ५० नया पेंसा मन बिक रहा है जब कि देशी गंदुम के भाव २८ रु० से लेकर ३० रु० मन तक हैं। अगर मुनासिब वक्त पर गवर्नमेंट के स्टोर से गंदुम आ जाता तो कीमतें इतनी नहीं बढ़ने पातीं।

इसके साथ ही साथ एक बात यह भी हुई कि पंजाब में जो गंदुम पैदा होता है उसको स्टोर किया गया और स्टोर से ही वह दूसरे सुबों को जाता रहा। लेकिन पंजाब गवर्नमेंट वि और गवर्नमेंट इंडिया ने इस बात को रियलाइज नहीं किया कि पंजाब का गंदुम तो दूसरे सुबों को भेजा जा रहा है और यहां साल भर की खपत के लिए कहां से आयेगा? जब यहां पर गंदुम की कमी हो गई, गंदुम कम पैदा हुआ, तो व्यापारियों ने ज्यादा दाम वसूल किये। पंजाब के गंदुम को बाहर भेजने का नतीजा यह हुआ कि पंजाब में गंदुम की कमी पड़ गई और महंगी कीमत पर बाहर का गंदुम लाया गया और अब गवर्नमेंट के बम्बई स्टोर से पंजाब में गंदुम लाया जा रहा है। इस चीज का नतीजा यह हुआ कि पंजाब में गंदुम की कमी की वजह से दाम बढ़ गये और बम्बई से गंदुम लाने का खर्चा भी ज्यादा बढ़ गया। इस तरह से एक जगह से दूसरी जगह गंदुम ले जाने और लाने में रेलवे वगणों का भी फजूल इस्तेमाल होता है और खर्च भी लाने ले जाने पर होता है। पंजाब का गंदुम बम्बई ले जाया जाय और वहां से फिर पंजाब में लाया जाय, यह चीज कहां तक मुनासिब मालूम देती है? इस तरह से हम रेलवे वगणों के इस्तेमाल को एवाइड कर सकते हैं और इस चीज को सरकार को रोकना चाहिये। इन सब बातों का नतीजा यह होता है कि वक्त पर कंट्रोल नहीं हो पाता है जिसको सरकार करना चाहती है। इसलिए सरकार से मेरी अज्ञ है कि वह एक सूबे से दूसरे सूबे को जब अनाज भेजती है तो खूब सोच समझ कर भेजे ताकि दुबारा उसी सूबे से न बंगाना पड़े।

दूसरी बात मैं करप्शन के बारे में कहना चाहूंगा। यह ठीक है कि सरकार ने एक विजिलेन्स कमीशन बना दिया है और उम्मीद करनी चाहिये कि वह करप्शन को देश से दूर कर देगा। लेकिन हमारे देश में करप्शन इतना फैल चुका है और इसको दूर करने के लिए हमारी सरकार ने जो कानून बनाये हैं वे इतने नाकाफी हैं कि मैं नहीं समझता कि करप्शन को दूर करने में उनसे कोई बड़ी कामयाबी होगी। आप ने इस हाउस में और लोक सभा में भी सुना होगा कि दिल्ली में बड़े बड़े बिजनेसमैन अपने आदमी रखते हैं जो गवर्नमेंट के आफिसरों से कांटेक्ट करते रहते हैं। ये लोग अपने फर्म के लिए इम्पोर्ट और एक्सपोर्ट लाइसेंस लेने के लिए सरकार के बड़े बड़े अफसरों से मेलजोल बनाये रखते हैं और इसके लिए हजारों और लाखों रुपया बतौर रिश्वत के दिया करते हैं। यह तो बड़ी बड़ी फर्म की बातें हैं जो कि करोड़ों रुपयों का व्यापार करती हैं। लेकिन जो छोटे छोटे व्यापारी हैं, जो ५०० या १,००० या २,००० रु० का लाइसेंस लेते हैं, वे सूबे की सरकार से इसकी मंजूरी करवा लेते हैं लेकिन लाइसेंस बनाने के लिए उन्हें दिल्ली ही आना पड़ता है। जब वे दिल्ली लाइसेंस बनाने के लिए आते हैं तो उन्हें कम से कम ५० चक्कर काटने पड़ते हैं तब भी उनका लाइसेंस नहीं बन पाता है। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि दिल्ली में जो छोटे छोटे मुलाजमीन हैं, जो इन लाइसेंस बनाने वाले दफ्तरों में काम करते हैं या वहां से रिटायर्ड तथा सस्पेंड हो चुके हों, वे इन व्यापारियों से मिलते हैं कि हम तुम्हारा लाइसेंस आसानी के साथ बना देंगे। जिस तरह से कोई आदमी अदालत में अपना मुकदमा लड़ने के लिए वकील रखता है और उसको फीस देकर मुकदमा लड़ने के लिए कहता है चाहे वह हारे या जीते, उसी तरह से व्यापारी भी लाइसेंस लेने के लिए इस तरह के लोगों के पास जाते हैं जो कहते हैं कि हम तुम्हें घर बैठ कर ही लाइसेंस दिला देंगे, तुम्हें दफ्तर के चक्कर काटने की जरूरत नहीं है और न

[श्री माधो राम शर्मा]
 जाने की जरूरत है। वे लोग १० परसेंट के हिसाब से लाइसेंस बनाने की बात तय कर लेते हैं और इस तरह से जो लाइसेंस चाहता है उसके घर में पहुंचा देते हैं। १० परसेंट के हिसाब से ये लोग १,००० रु० के लाइसेंस पर १०० रु० ले लेते हैं और २,००० रु० के लाइसेंस पर २०० रु० ले लेते हैं और कहते हैं कि तुम्हें दफ्तर जाने की जरूरत नहीं है, लाइसेंस तुम्हारे घर ही पहुंच जायेगा। जिस तरह से वकील सिनसियरली और एनेस्टली केस को जीतने की कोशिश करता है उसी तरह से ये पैसा लेने वाले लोग भी लाइसेंस बनवा कर व्यापारियों के घर में ही पहुंचा देते हैं और इन लोगों को कभी भी दफ्तर की शक्ल भी देखने की जरूरत नहीं होती है। वे लोग इस बात को महसूस करते हैं कि दफ्तर के चक्कर काटने से एक तो वक्त बर्बाद होता है और ज्यादा पैसा खर्च होता है। ऐसी हालत में मैं यह महसूस करता हूं कि जो विजिलेंस कमीशन बनाया गया है वह करप्शन को दूर करने में कहां तक सहायक हो सकेगा? आपने विजिलेंस कमीशन कायम कर दिया है और अगर किसी के खिलाफ कोई हुआ तो उसके बारे में एन्क्वायरी होगी और केस फिर बाद में केस कोर्ट में जायेगा। जब केस कोर्ट में चला जाता है तो उसमें काफी समय लग जाता है और गवाहों का इन्टरेस्ट भी खत्म हो जाता है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक आप अपने कानूनों को नहीं बदलेंगे तब तक आप ऐसे लोगों को, जो करप्शन करते हैं, सजा दिला सकेंगे, इस में मुझे संदेह है।

श्री गोड़े मुराहरी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
 बाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, हमारे राष्ट्रपति की जगह जो उपराष्ट्रपति ने अभिभाषण किया उस में उन्होंने पिछले साल में सरकार की ओर से जो काम किये गये हैं और आगे जो सरकार काम करने वाली है, उनका न्योरा दिया है। लेकिन पूरे अभिभाषण को पढ़ने के बाद मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि शायद उन्होंने जानबूझ करके अपनी आंख बन्द कर ली है, जो जो

करामान पिछले साल भर में इस सरकार ने किये, उनकी ओर से और जो बातें अभी हाल में हो रही हैं उनकी ओर से। पिछले साल में हम ने क्या देखा? एक तरफ राजस्थान, पंजाब और मध्य प्रदेश के कुछ इलाकों में हम ने अकाल पड़ते देखा, और दूसरी तरफ देश के कई हिस्सों में हम ने जाड़े की वजह से लोगों को मरते हुए देखा और हर जरूरी वस्तुओं के दाम बढ़ते हुए देखा। इन चीजों के बारे में उन्होंने कोई चिन्तन नहीं किया। देश की गरीबी जो दिन पर दिन बढ़ती जा रही है उसके बारे में भी उन्होंने कोई चिन्तन नहीं किया। यह गरीबी क्यों बढ़ती जा रही है? कुछ लोग जो कमाते हैं, वे तो खूब कमाते हैं, लेकिन जो गरीब हैं उनकी गरीबी बढ़ती जा रही है। जब आमदमी बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और आप की आमदनी नहीं बढ़ती है, तो फिर देश में गरीबी बढ़ती ही जायेगी। इन तमाम चीजों के बारे में वे बिलकुल खामोश रहे।

विदेश नीति के बारे में जो उन्होंने बताया उसमें उन्होंने यह दुःख प्रगट किया कि पाकिस्तान के ओर हमारे सम्बंध ठीक नहीं हैं और चीन का जो मसला है वह भी अभी तक हल नहीं हुआ है। अगर हम सरकार की विदेश नीति को ले करके देखें, तो यह १६ साल की जो नीति है उसमें शायद कोई भी ऐसी चीज आप को नहीं मिलेगी जहां इन्होंने सफलता पाई हो। तो फिर क्या चीज है जो हमारी सरकार ने की है और पिछले कुछ सालों में इनकी क्या कामयाबी रही है? मैं आप लोगों से पूछना चाहूंगा, मैं इस सरकार से पूछना चाहूंगा कि ऐसी कौन सी चीज है जिस में उसने सफलता हासिल की है?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आंख खोल करके देखिये। हर चीज में सफलता मिली है।

श्री गोड़े मुराहरी : हम बहुत देख चुके हैं। पिछले १६ साल से देखते आ रहे हैं आप लोगों की करामात। तो मैं तो यही कहता

चाहूंगा कि सरकार की ओर से जो भी नीतियां अभी तक चलती आ रही हैं, सभी असफल रही हैं और न सिर्फ असफल रहो हैं बल्कि ग़लत नीतियां चलाई जा रही हैं क्योंकि एक खास मतलब के साथ ये नीतियां चलाई जा रही हैं। देश में कुछ उच्चवर्ग के लोग हैं जो अपना उल्लू सीधा करना चाहते हैं और दूसरी जनता से उनका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। नीति चाहे शिक्षा की हो, चाहे भाषा की हो, चाहे आर्थिक हो, सभी नीतियां उस उच्चवर्ग के लिये इस देश में चलाई जा रही हैं और उनसे जनता का कोई मतलब नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक चीज़ का जिक्र करूंगा। एक तरफ आप कहते हैं कि जो खेती साढ़े छः एकड़ से कम की है उसमें मुनाफा नहीं होता है, लेकिन उस पर आप लगान लेते हैं। यानी १६ साल में आप कोई ऐसी नीति नहीं बना पाये हैं कि जो बेमुनाफा की खेती है उस पर लगान न लिया जाय। फिर भी यह सरकार कहती है कि इस देश में हम समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं। समाजवाद का नारा लगाने के साथ साथ, जो गरीब बेमुनाफा खेती करता है और जो उधार पर अपना काम चलाता है, उसका लगान अगर आप नहीं हटाते हैं, तो यह नीति कैसे चलेगी ?

एक ओर अभिभाषण में यह कहा गया है कि कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ नहीं पाया। क्यों नहीं बढ़ पाया ? बार बार हम सुनते आ रहे हैं कि हम इतने साल में सेल्फसफिशियंट हो जायेंगे, हमारा कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ जायेगा और फिर हमें बाहर से अनाज खरीदने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। लेकिन हर साल उत्पादन में कमी होती जाती है। यह जो कमी होती जाती है, इसकी वजह क्या है ? इस सिलसिले में मैं एक चीज़ यहां बताना चाहूंगा। पी० एल० ४८० का यहां पर जिक्र आया। पी० एल० ४८० के अन्तर्गत यहां पर कुछ गेहूं लाया गया था और यह कहा गया था कि बफर स्टॉक बनायेंगे। लेकिन यह पी० एल० ४८० के अन्तर्गत जो गेहूं यहां लाया गया था, वह

कलकत्ता के बाज़ार में रद्दी के तौर पर बेचा गया। बड़े बड़े सेठों ने उसको खरीद करके रद्दी गेहूं को अलग किया और अच्छे गेहूं को अलग किया। फिर उन्होंने जो अच्छा गेहूं था उसको बाज़ार में ब्लैकमार्केट में बेचा और जो रद्दी गेहूं था उसको फिर सरकार को ज्यादा दाम पर बेचा। यह चीज़ हमारे देश में चल रही है। अगर आप ऐसी नाति चलायेंगे कि अमेरिका से जो गेहूं आप लाते हैं जनता को खिलाने के लिये, उसको आप बड़े बड़े सेठों को मुनाफा कमाने के लिये देंगे, तो फिर कैसे चलेगा आपका समाजवाद ? किस के लिये आप अपनी सरकार चला रहे हैं ? इन सब बातों के बारे में यह प्रश्न मैं सरकार से करमा चाहूंगा कि क्या मतलब है आपका ?

अब विदेश नीति को लीजिये। अभी तो बहुत हंगामा मचा हुआ है सारी हमारी उत्तरी सीमाओं पर। एक तरफ चीन से युद्ध करना है, लेकिन आप युद्ध कहां करते हैं ? युद्ध हो ही नहीं रहा। कहा यह जाता है कि बांडर डिसप्यूट चला रहे हैं। साथ साथ पाकिस्तान से भी एक डिसप्यूट चला रहे हैं। यह १६ साल में आपकी विदेश नीति का प्रतिफल है कि एक तरफ तो हजारों वर्ग मील आप खो बैठे हैं चीन को और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान के साथ झगड़े को कायम रखे हुए हैं। मैं तो यह कहना चाहूंगा कि सरकार ने जानबूझ कर के यह पाकिस्तान का झगड़ा कायम रखा है और पाकिस्तान का मसला हल नहीं किया है क्योंकि इन लोगों ने सोचा कि हम इसका राजनैतिक लाभ उठावेंगे। लेकिन आज यह मसला इस तरह से खड़ा हो गया है कि सरकार की समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि कैसे इसको हल किया जाय। इसलिये विदेश नीति के मामले में पिछले १६ साल में इन चीज़ों को शामिल करने की कोशिश हुई है, यानी काश्मीर का मसला हल न करके बँसा ही कायम रखो और दूसरे सवालियों को पैदा करो ताकि इलेक्शन में वोट मिलें या और कोई राजनैतिक फायदा उठाया जाय। इस

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

तरह की जो चीज का गई है इन १६ सालों में, उसका नतीजा आज यह निकल रहा है कि वह मसला हल नहीं हो रहा है और यहां घरों में आग लगाई जा रहा है। इसलिये मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर इस मसले का कोई हल सोचा नहीं जाता है तो फिर यह हमारे देश में जो आग लग रही है, हिन्दू मुसलमानों के जो दंगे हो रहे हैं, इनको हम रोक नहीं सकते। कोई भी देश जो अपने को सिविलाइज्ड कहता है, वह अपने देश में किसी भी कम्युनिटी के लोगों को मारते हुए या उनके घरों में आग लगाते हुए देख नहीं सकता है। इसलिये मैं यह कहूंगा कि अगर मुसलमानों को यहां पर सुरक्षित रखना है या आप जो सेक्युलेरिज्म का नारा लगाते हैं, उसको अगर आप सचमुच कार्यान्वित करना चाहते हैं, तो फिर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में जो आजकल दंगे हो रहे हैं उनका कोई हल निकालना पड़ेगा। उसका हल एक हो सकता है। आर्थिक ढंग से भी हम लोगों को कुछ सोचना पड़ेगा कि पाकिस्तान को कोयला देना बन्द करना होगा या नहीं। हम लोगों को इस आर्थिक सैक्शन को भी सोचना पड़ेगा क्योंकि जब तक जो पूर्वी पाकिस्तान की सरकार है उसको समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का कोई मजबूती से कदम उठायेगी और वहां का जो माइनारिटी कम्युनिटी है उन की जान खतरे में नहीं रहने देगी, तबतक वह कोई अच्छी बात समझने वाली नहीं है। लेकिन साथ साथ हम लोगों को यह भी नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में भी ऐसे लोग हैं और ऐसी राजनैतिक पार्टियां हैं जो अयूब खां की जो साजिशें हैं उनके खिलाफ आवाज उठाती हैं। अभी मैंने एक अखबार में अवामी नींग के मौलाना भाशानी का वक्तव्य पढ़ा और उससे साफ जाहिर है कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में अभी भी ऐसे लोग हैं और बहुत बड़ी तादाद में हैं जो कि ऐसी चीजें पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। जब पाकिस्तान की सरकार यह सब करवा रही है तो फिर हमारी सरकार को भी कोई

ऐसी नीति अपनानी पड़ेगी कि यह जो इस ढंग की राजनैतिक भावना पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में है उसको हम लोग इस्तेमाल करें और वहां पर कोई इस चीज की रोक करें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Murahari, how much time would you take?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Another five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): If you take five minutes it is all right, we will continue. Otherwise we will meet after lunch.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : और हम लोगों को पाकिस्तान के बारे में सोचते वक्त काश्मीर के मामले का सामना करना पड़ेगा। अभी हाल में जो कुछ काश्मीर में हुआ है वह एक बड़ा ड्रामा हुआ है। इस सदन में नन्दा जी ने आकर एक बयान दिया कि हमको दो तीन दिन और चाहिये जो हजरतबल में चोरी हुई थी उस चोरी के बारे में जिनको गिरफ्तार किया गया उनका नाम पढ़ने के लिये, उन्होंने वक्त मांगा और वक्त दिया गया। बाद में वह आये और उन्होंने ४, ५ नाम यहां गिनाए और नाम ऐसे गिनाये कि हमको शक होता था कि शायद बक्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद का नाम वह गिना रहे हैं, शायद कोई अब्दुल रशीद एम० पी० का नाम सुन रहे हैं। फिर बाद में उन्होंने कई और नाम सुनाए और फिर चार घंटे के बाद . . .

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am sure and definite that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad has not stolen the relic.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: But I had the suspicion; from the names I heard it looked as if Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, Abdul Rashid and all these people were being named and these names are very current in Kashmir if you go today.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आपको इलहाम हुआ था ?

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : इलहाम नहीं, ऐसा लगता था कि उनकी जगह और कोई अब्दुल रहीद और कोई बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद और कोई बट्ट को ला कर के खड़ा किया गया है क्योंकि इसमें एतबार नहीं होता, चार घंटे के बाद एक नाम बदल कर के कोई और नाम कादिर बट्ट बताया गया। समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार को क्या हुआ है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : बख्शी साहब का नाम वह नहीं कह रहे थे लेकिन आपके कान में ऐसा मालूम पड़ रहा था।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is his view.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : जो नाम सुबह पड़ा गया था उसको बदला गया शाम को, यानी सरकार को खुद पता नहीं है कि किसको गिरफ्तार किया है। गिरफ्तार किये हुए कई दिन हो गये हैं और कई दिन के बाद नाम बताया गया है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : तार से खबर आती है तथा उसमें गलती हो जाने की सम्भावना रहती है।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : समय भी मांगा गया और उसके बावजूद भी जो नाम पड़ा गया उसे चार घंटे के बाद बदला गया। हो सकता है कि जिनको गिरफ्तार करना था उनको भी बदल कर के और किसी को गिरफ्तार किया गया हो। यह हो सकता है, असम्भव बात नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान में जिस ढंग से काम चल रहा है उसमें यह सब सम्भव है क्योंकि जब कहीं पर करप्शन की बात की जाती है तो कहते हैं कि इक्वायरी हो रही है। क्या इक्वायरी होती है, आजकल कितनी इक्वायरीज हिन्दुस्तान में चल रही हैं ? मैं जानना चाहूंगा सरकार से कि कितनी

इक्वायरीज चल रही हैं और अगर इक्वायरी की कोई रिपोर्ट हुई और उस पर कोई कार्य-वाही हुई हो तो मैं उसे जानना चाहूंगा। कितनी ही कम्पनियों के बारे में इक्वायरी हुई है और सब की रिपोर्ट बन रही है, सब के इन्वेस्टिगेशंस चल रहे हैं। सालों तो इन्वेस्टिगेशंस चलते हैं और कहीं कहीं तो कोई रिपोर्ट आई है तो उसे दबाया गया है। तो अगर इस ढंग से काम चलेगा किसी देश में तो कोई चीज भी सम्भव हो सकती है। सरकार भ्रष्टाचार मिटाने की बड़ी बात करती है तो मैं नन्दा जी को यह सलाह दूंगा कि वह खुद अपना घर ठीक करें। जब तक अपना घर ठीक नहीं करते हैं तब तक कुछ होने वाला नहीं है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उनका घर ठीक है आप अपना घर ठीक कीजिए।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : वह अपने घर का पता लगायें। जब वह बैठते हैं तो सौराष्ट्र के मुख्य मंत्री भी आते हैं, प्रतापसिंह कैरो भी आते हैं और श्री वीरेन्द्र मित्र, जो कि सिराजुद्दीन के मामले में हैं, वह भी आते हैं और वह उनसे सलाह-मशविरा करते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में भ्रष्टाचार को कैसे मिटाया जाय, तो फिर क्या कोई चीज सम्भव हो सकती है। जिनके ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार का इल्जाम है उनको यहां पर बुला कर यह तय करे कि भ्रष्टाचार कैसे मिटाया जाय, यह आपकी पालिसी है ? तो यहां पर कोई चीज हल हो, किसी कसले का हल हो इसकी सम्भावना हमें नहीं दीखती।

तो मैं काश्मीर के बारे में कह रहा था। मेरा तो यही कहना है कि जब तक काश्मीर का अन्दरूनी मामला ठीक नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम दुनिया में जा कर काश्मीर के बारे में कोई प्रचार करें उसका कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है। मैं तो चाहूंगा कि वहां पर शेख अब्दुल्ला को तुरन्त रिहा किया जाय। कोई वजह नहीं है कि इतन साल तक उन पर केस

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

चलाया जाय और उनका कोई परिणाम नहीं निकले और फिर भी उनको जेल में रखा जाय। इसके साथ साथ आज जो परिस्थिति है, आज वहां जो सरकार है वह लोकप्रिय नहीं है, उसको वहां से हटा देना चाहिये। उसको वहां रहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है क्योंकि काश्मीर में ऐसा लोग कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानी रुपये की वहां सिर्फ १५ आने कीमत है क्योंकि १ आना तो बख्शी ब्रदर्स कारपोरेशन को जाता है। यह काश्मीर में सुना जाता है। तो जबतक इस तरह का भ्रष्टाचार चलता है, भ्रष्टाचार का वातावरण है . . .

श्री एन० एम० अनवर : बहुत कम डिसकाउंट है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : यह खुलेआम चोरी का इल्जाम लगा रहे हैं।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : तो इस तरह का जब वहां पर वातावरण है और यह सरकार वहां पर लोकप्रिय नहीं है तो उसको हटा देना चाहिये। इसलिये इतना मैं कहूंगा कि जो हिन्दुस्तान की परिस्थिति है उसमें इन सब चीजों को ठीक करना है तो जब तक यह सरकार बदलती नहीं तब तक कुछ नहीं होता।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : खुलेआम इन्होंने कहा है कि बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद एक रुपये में से १५ आने स्कीम में खर्च करते हैं तथा १ आना अपने परिवार के लिये रख लेते हैं।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : आप बैठ जाइए।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : वाइसचेयरमैन साहब, यह बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद के खिलाफ बुसखोरी का इल्जाम लगाते हैं, इसको एक्सपोज किया जाय।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : आप जरा बैठ जाइये, आप भी इल्जाम लगाते हैं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं वाइसचेयरमैन साहब से कह रहा हूं कि जो आदमी मौजूद नहीं है उसके खिलाफ वह यह सब कह रहे हैं।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : अब मैं बोल रहा हूं, तो आप बैठ जाइए।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : १६ आने में १ आना हिस्सा बख्शी साहब का हो जाता है यह वाइल्ड एलिगेशन है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is a very direct statement.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: What I said was that there is a rumour in Kashmir that the Indian rupee is worth only fifteen annas and one anna goes to the B.B.C., whatever that may mean, Bakshi Brothers Corporation or anything.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: The name of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad was mentioned by him.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I am not naming Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. I am saying Bakshi Brothers Corporation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think the name of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, if used, will be expunged.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: It is not good humour to depend upon bad rumour.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It is not good humour either to go into a lot of corruption in Kashmir. That is no humour at all.

इसलिये मैं आपसे यही कहूंगा कि इन सब मामलों का अगर कोई हल होना है तो सरकार बदलनी चाहिये। यह सरकार बदलनी चाहिये और अगर ऐसा नहीं है तो जो भी सरकार है उसके जो चलाने वाले हैं उनका ठीक तरीका हो तो कोई बात नहीं लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री बीमार हैं और मैं तो यही

कहूंगा कि बीमार प्रधान मंत्री के लिये इन सब मसलों का सामना करना असम्भव है। इसलिये उनकी जगह अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी कोई दूसरे नेता को अपना नेता बना ले तो अच्छा होगा क्योंकि वह उन का काम भी ठीकठाक चला सकेंगे और जो गलत काम वह कर रहे हैं वह ठीक से कर सकेंगे। अभी बीमार प्रधान मंत्री ने गलत काम, न अच्छा काम ठीक से कर पायेंगे, यही मेरा कहना है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): The House stands adjourned till 2.45 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-eight minutes past one of the clock.

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

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are all shocked at the recent events in East Pakistan and West Bengal and also by the discussion in the Security Council. Naturally in the discussion on the Vice-President's Address these subjects dominated. I share the view expressed by most of our friends here about the treachery of our so-called friends, U.K. and the U.S.A., in the matter. I also feel, as some hon. Member has pointed out, that we are having many troubles. All along the border from Kashmir to NEFA we are in trouble. I am afraid we are developing a dangerous tendency to live with our troubles and make it a part of our life. The other day when Shri Mani spoke, he told the Government that without a fresh mandate from Parliament they should not try to settle the Chinese dispute. What is needed is not a fresh mandate from Parliament. What is really needed is a fresh effort on the part of the Government of India to settle not only the Chinese issue but all

the disputes that we are faced with. For example, for the last sixteen years another issue in the South, in Ceylon, is pending. Nearly one million persons are Stateless subjects in Ceylon. They are all of Indian origin. Now, Ceylon is a friendly country. No new trouble is being created there but still you cannot allow things to linger on like this. So, my request is that we should earmark 1964 as an year for determined efforts and fresh initiative on the part of the Government to settle the disputes that are still pending.

Now, coming to the Vice-President's Address, what I feel is that it has failed to reflect the grave political crisis in which we are, and also to reflect the economic reality that confronts this country. A tall claim is made in the Address that in spite of difficulties we are marching forward through democracy to a socialist order. Is that the reality? During the last sixteen years, I do not feel there was a time when the man in the street started doubting the efficacy of democracy as he is doing today. Now, the Chinese aggression has done one good thing at that time. The entire nation, irrespective of political differences, stood behind the Government to defend our country, but even Chinese aggression has failed to end factionalism within the Congress, the ruling Party.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: In your Party also there is factionalism.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: During the last one year, was there one State where there was not one crisis or another?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Madras.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Since you are the ruling Party, any crisis within your Party becomes a State crisis. That is the difference.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): They are responsible for the crisis in your Party. You must hold them responsible for it.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Now, look at it. Even this morning we had to spend some time over Punjab. I do not know whether there is any other subject that has attracted so much attention of this House as the affairs in Punjab.

Now everybody is agreed that all is not well in Kashmir. It is not only the Pak duplicity. There the internal affairs are bad and it is high time that we find a political solution to the problems confronting that State.

Now, I will come to my State. From Srinagar I take you to Trivandrum.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Why so down?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Now the other day Shri Mani pointed out that in the U.K. when a State car was driven by somebody who had no licence, the Minister had to resign. Here in our State on the 8th December, a State car was driven by a Minister who did not have licence on that day.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Was it Mr. Chathan, who was a communist Minister, who had been driving without a licence?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: He is in the old world. He still thinks that the communists are ruling there. Wait for some time for the communist rule. Now, it was such a serious offence, according to parliamentary practice, to drive a car without a licence, so that there a Minister had to resign. Here the things are different. Not only that. When the Minister drives the car without licence and meets with an accident, the Collector comes forward with a statement that the driver would be prosecuted. After a few days the Minister himself admitted that he was driving the car. Now,

what is the position? I do not want to go into all the details.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): He has resigned.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The fact of the matter is that during the last two or three months, the rule of law has broken down.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Question.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Yes. The Home Ministry is not functioning. It was only two days ago that the portfolio was handed over to the Chief Minister. Till then what was the position? The Home Minister was not attending to ministerial work. He had left his official residence in protest and he was staying elsewhere. Not only that. Even the Congress leaders, even the Chief Minister there is in a very difficult predicament. Hooligan elements are dominating the public life in the State today.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: It will be there as long as the Communist Party is there.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: On February 4, there was a reception organised to the Congress President, Shri Kamaraj. Three thousand people from Kottayam, supporters of the Home Minister, came to receive Shri Kamaraj and what they did both at the airport and on their way back is all very well reported in the Congress papers. The KPCC President was also there to receive Shri Kamaraj. His car was attacked. Strong editorials have been written. Now, the same people got into the M.L.A. quarters, broke open the room of an M.L.A., manhandled him, broke his watch, and took away his Bhagavad Gita. Then, a few months ago, the KPCC wanted to hold an election. They arranged a hall but unfortunately inspired by some of the Ministers the whole hall was occupied by people who had

nothing to do with the K.P.C.C. They could not hold the election. Of course, you may say that it was a party matter, but all sections of people in our State protested against this behaviour.

Now, it becomes the common practice, Shri Kamaraj is trying to mediate and solve the problem. He has been flying from Delhi to Kerala, from Kerala to Madras, then again to Kerala; Ministers are coming here and going back. But the root cause of the present trouble in Kerala is Kamadev.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Not Kamaraj.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: However great Shri Kamaraj may be, he cannot defeat Kamadev, and that is the problem.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Sir, on a point of order. Last time when Mr. Govindan Nair had been in Trivandrum, there was a controversy between Mr. A. K. Gopalan and Mr. Govindan Nair, and their followers started all sorts of goondaism. It was their Party affair. So we never interfered. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would ask Shrimati Bharathi to start a hungerstrike so that he would stop interruptions.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: This is the level to which the Congress factions in Kerala have fallen. He is not worried that in the M.L.A. quarters, an elected member of the Legislature cannot live without the protection of the police. The Speaker had to order protection. He wanted to go home. He could not go in an ordinary bus. Police protection had to be sent.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): May I know how are these things relevant to the present debate on the Vice-President's Address? (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: They are very much relevant.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am very much surprised that an hon. Member like Shri Sapru should raise that question. (*Interruptions*). My point is that from Kashmir to Kerala all the faction fights, that are going on, are creating a threat to democracy. You claim that democracy is progressing in India. Unfortunately, even though the form is there, because of the factional fights . . .

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Your time is up. You have completed fifteen minutes.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: All these interruptions have taken time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Please wind up.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: My point is, when such things are happening in the country, they undermine the faith of the ordinary man in democracy. In a country where unfortunately the opposition parties are not strong enough to take over, the result will be that people will lose faith in democracy, and that will lead to dangerous consequences. That is why I say that these internal quarrels within the Congress Party are not merely a party affair, but they are something which will very seriously affect the nation.

I want a few minutes more. It has been said in the Vice-President's Address that we are progressing towards socialism. There cannot be a more blatant travesty of truth than this. I cannot understand how such a statement can come in the Address of the Vice-President. At Bhubaneswar when the ruling party met in their Congress session, everyone was saying that there was concentration of wealth. The terrible concentration of wealth in the hands of monopolies was one of the themes on which there was a lot of speech.

3 P.M.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Your party's inspiration worked there.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is not only our party. The developments of the last ten years have proved this fact. I request the Chair to give me some time to prove this point. It is not our party's work. The Government of India appointed a Commission, the Mahalanobis Commission, to look into the matter in 1960. Till 1964 the report has not come out. But we come to know that it is alive due to certain leakages that off and on come out in the papers. I think it is time that the Government appointed another Committee to find out when this Commission will complete its work. Anyway from the facts, that have already been out, this is clear. Exactly 20 families control as many as 1,073 companies with a share capital of Rs. 352 crores and with a gross capital block of Rs. 1,102 crores. This is 80 per cent. of the entire share-holdings in the country.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that paper?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: This paper is called "Blitz". Then, a small coterie, representing a fractional 0.5 per cent. of the shareholding, accounted for 56.5 per cent. of the total value of shares in 70 major companies with a paid-up capital of Rs. 212 crores, the market price of which today amounts to Rs. 417 crores. Even within the 20 houses who control 80 per cent. of our industrial, commercial and trade economy in the private sector, one house alone—whose name is well known to the country and specially to the Congressmen—controls a share capital of Rs. 108 crores or one in every ten shares in the country. So, this is the concentration that is taking place and you claim that you are building up socialism. Can you slander socialism in a worse way than

this? Why is this happening? It is due to the wrong policies that are pursued by the Government.

In the working of these joint stock companies the main source of resources was borrowing, and from where did they borrow? Here in a publication of the Reserve Bank "Trend and Progress of Banking in India in 1960", it is stated:

"In the first five years up to 1955, roughly covering the First Plan period, advances of scheduled banks rose by Rs. 169 crores of which only Rs. 69 crores or 41 per cent. was accounted for by credit extended to industries. In the next quinquennium bank credit swelled by Rs. 451 crores of which as much as Rs. 342 crores or 75 per cent. of the total constituted an increase in advance to industry."

That is to say, all the loans advanced by the banks, 75 per cent. went to these big industries. As far as the small industries are concerned, advances to them amounted only to Rs. 35 crores or barely 6 per cent. Again, as far as the credit to the rural sector is concerned, rural credit was less than 1 per cent. So, all these commercial banks were financing these industrialists. And you should remember that the small industrialists and the rural population have not benefited from this commercial banking. Secondly, the LIC has advanced something like Rs. 92 crores to these private industries. Here I am reading out not from 'The New Age' but from the 'Economist' of London—

"But the argument most dangerous to banks in the context of present concern over the concentration of economic power is that five units control little less than half of all privately held deposits. Again, 188 directors of the top twenty banks hold directorships of 1,100 companies. The

Government will have to try to convince its followers that the growing share of the state-owned banking sector, together with legal curbs placed on bank managements, can provide effective safeguards against concentration."

This is the opinion of the 'Economist', London. As far as this concentration of wealth is concerned and the role of the banks in this matter . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Govindan Nair, I cannot allow you any further. There are other speakers also.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I only want this to be said, please.

It was a very good sign that 56 M.Ps. of the ruling party signed a memorandum asking the Government to nationalise the banks in this context. Again, it is a heartening thing that eight provincial units of the ruling party passed resolutions asking for the nationalisation of the banks. Unfortunately, what is the Government doing? At a time when in the whole country there is a cry for the nationalisation of the banks, our Finance Minister has permitted another foreign bank to establish itself in this country.

Again, before I sit down, I should be permitted to draw the attention of this House to certain very important statements by some important persons. One is our Finance Minister who has already given an assurance to the banks that they are not going to nationalise them. Shri C. Subramaniam, Minister of Steel, Mines and Heavy Engineering, on an occasion said that he was overawed with the present cry for the nationalisation of banking. That is the opinion of Shri C. Subramaniam. Then, Shri R. Venkataraman, Industries Minister of Madras, was blaming the Reserve Bank for not giving a free hand to

these banks. On the one side, there is a demand for the nationalisation of the banks so that this kind of concentration of wealth, that has happened during the last ten years, may not be there. On the other hand, here, people in office like our Finance Minister and Shri Subramaniam, and people of influence like Shri Venkataraman who also hails from the land of Shri Kamaraj, these people are putting up a very different case. So, you did not learn a lesson from the past. The working of the last ten years has proved that even though wealth is increasing in this country, even though the national income has increased, it has gone only to a few people. Even today there is a report in the papers that Prof. Mahalanobis has pointed out that the condition of villagers during the last ten years has deteriorated in spite of all your attempts. This should have opened your eyes. But you are not prepared to change your policy and you claim through the Vice-President's Address that you are progressing towards democracy and socialism. I warn this House that if the Government does not change its policy, if it does not realise its mistakes and tries to chalk out a new path whereby real democracy and socialism are strengthened. I do not know what is in store for us.

Thank you.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion in all sincerity. I earnestly hope that our President and our Prime Minister will soon regain the best of health and vigour and guide the nation in its march towards the attainment of lasting peace and prosperity. I pray to God for that. At the same time, I appeal to all my countrymen not to create unnecessary problems and situations that would compel them to strain their nerves during this period.

[Shri Dhananjoy Mohanty]

Within the space of the last one year, several events of historical importance have taken place in our country. I would refer to some of them. The stirring Kamaraj Plan, that prompted several of our leaders to lay down their offices and encouraged them to work among the people for the upliftment of the society, is a very timely step to save the society from the evils of stagnation, corruption and party strifes. It will, I am confident, create new enthusiasm among the people and lend vital support to the Government to forge ahead with the successful planning and development of the country. I will be failing in my duty if I do not pay my tributes to Shri Kamaraj and Shri Biju Patnaik, the real sponsor of the plan, and also to those leaders who by their high sense of sacrifice voluntarily relinquished their lofty positions in Government and have thereby created an unparalleled record in the political history of the world.

This was followed by the most heartening resolution on Democratic Socialism adopted by the AICC at its Bhubaneshwar session, the session which has been so uncharitably commented upon by an hon. Member of this House. He has been shocked, though not electrocuted, at the dazzling lights he saw at Bhubaneshwar. He tried to estimate the cost of the show but probably failed as it was to him a show unimaginably bigger than the biggest one his party has ever had.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: What else could it be?

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY: His remark lacked a sense of proportion. He should have known that it was a historic durbar of the people of India. The illumination was a necessity. It meant business and no show of light.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In New Delhi there is the durbar.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY: He should not be surprised that the power came from the mighty Hirakud Dam, the symbol of all achievements in post-independence Orissa. The liquidated Ganatantra Party of Orissa to which the hon. Member belonged, opposed the very construction of this project tooth and nail.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I did not oppose it at all.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY: Your party. They had once tried to propagate . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, you must kindly allow me. He is making a wrong statement. It is not I who objected to it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): But he has not yielded.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY: . . . that the vital content of the water of the Mahanadi would be taken out in the process of generating electricity and that this strained water bereft of substance would be released for irrigation which, according to their wisdom, would turn the land barren. The same party has transformed itself into the Swatantra Party. But the same is the wine though in a new bottle. They have just started a wild campaign against the proposed Tikerpara Dam, the fortune-building project envisaged by no less an architect than Dr. Khosla, an engineer of world repute and the present Governor of Orissa; so also against the Paradip Port. They even grudge the enhancement of the grant that is made to Orissa for this year of the Plan.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is purely a wrong statement that he is making.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY:
An allocation of Rs. 160 crores was the original estimate which has since been raised to Rs. 230 crores. There has been opposition to that even.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Not opposition; he is making a wrong statement completely. What has been objected to is that . . .

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY:
I do not yield to these interruptions. My time is short.

Peculiar is the conduct of such parties and such representatives of the people who are out to mar the destiny of the nation.

The hon. Member should have appreciated that the organisers of the Bhubaneswar Congress session could make it a success at a modest cost, perhaps the lowest of the amounts spent in the preceding sessions of the A.I.C.C. held elsewhere.

Let me next come to the most condemnable occurrence of barbarous atrocities perpetrated on thousands of innocent Hindus in East Pakistan and its natural reaction on this side of the border. Many learned Members have discussed this matter and have expressed their feelings. All that I wish to say is to express my deepest sympathy for the hordes of horror-stricken people migrating into our country for shelter. I thank the Government for their kind attitude towards them and I am grateful to those States which have readily offered to provide suitable land for their rehabilitation.

Despite all their wrongs the matter was taken to the Security Council by Pakistan. Thanks to Mr. Chagla, the Leader of the Indian Delegation, he could so ably put our case before the Security Council. The only outcome of the long-drawn debate has been the discovery of the unseen hand of the British, the creators of the communal State of Pakistan, behind all communal disturbances bet-

ween the two States. They quitted India but they are still lurking in the pockets they created on either side. Pakistan offers them the consolation that their Indian Empire is not wholly liquidated. We have to be extra cautious in our future deal with those who can so openly and undignifiedly betray our sincere friendship at times so crucial.

The World has witnessed with what a heavy hand our Government restored law and order and protected the minorities in the disturbed areas of Bengal. Should not Pakistan be made to realise the true consequences of their foul play? Time will come when they will have to acknowledge the soberness of our nation, which they have so far misjudged or mistook for weakness or cowardice.

Among other matters of importance it is gratifying to note that our respected Home Minister has announced his bold determination to root out corruption from the administration. In this context, I would submit that we should not go by the impression that public administration is the only seat of corruption. Corruption is increasing in our present day society, due mainly to the fact that the society is becoming more and more money-based. Attempts should therefore be made to root out corruption from the society as a whole. I hope our Home Minister will appreciate the spirit of my statement and would try to root out corruption of all sorts prevailing in the society as a whole in the country as a whole. I wish him due success and I am confident that he will get appreciable co-operation from all quarters. I do not mean co-operation in the form of speeches made here or elsewhere by our friends in the opposition, who make violent and baseless attacks on persons at their back. They should remember that such a conduct is in itself a corruption. I regret for such attacks that were made today in this House against Shri Bakshi and Shri Biren Mitra.

[Shri Dhananjoy Mohanty.]

Now I would like to say something about our growing population and its impact on our economy. I am not a scientist, nor an economist. I hope the hon. Members of this House will bear with me when I say that population increases where there is poverty. In rich families, where there is plenty, the birth rate is generally low. The first thing we need is food. When we have plenty to eat, the other conditions, such as health and education, will gradually improve. With diverted attention no satisfactory achievement is possible. Our Plan aims at all-round development. It is wisdom no doubt, but it should not aim everything to come up simultaneously. We should give top priority to agriculture and family planning. Other subjects will of course receive due attention or such attention as our limited resources would permit. Otherwise I am afraid we may labour only to be jack of all trades

How to reach our target in agriculture is a thing of primary consideration. I would request everybody to think seriously over this matter. Let us look back and see how far we have been successful in creating circumstances favourable for agriculture. Except a little provision for irrigation here and there, and except production of some chemical manures, what else have we done? On the other hand, we have devastated our forests; we have neglected our cattle wealth, and we have, directly or indirectly, discouraged and weakened the farmer in every way. We burn the cow-dung and throw away our refuse. We export the oil cake only to import, at high cost, some fertilizer plants and some chemical manures. We go out for improved seeds and modern implements. We do not pause to think how many farmers of our country could have the means to purchase tractors as substitute for or in addition to their bullocks. How many of our farmers could afford to have all the chemical manures they need? What is our experience as regards cost

of production in our mechanised farms, wherever they exist?

Let us carefully see what are the real problems of our farmers. Weather conditions being normal, means to have plough, bullocks and manure are the first thing they need. Then come the means to employ the required number of agricultural labourers for the different agricultural operations. These operations have to be carried out at the proper time. They cannot wait, and delay means failure and disappointment. At the same time, there are not enough men available these days to work in the fields though unemployment is too high on record. These unskilled labourers may be skilled enough for agriculture, but the modern amenities provided by various industries have turned their mind away from agriculture and have been a great attraction to the common man. In the absence of a job in an industry, or in any concern like the P.W.D. and the Railways they prefer unemployment to working in an agricultural field

I am finishing Sir. One finds temporary employment in agriculture, or seasonal employment. Moreover, he has to labour hard quite exposed to weather and that too for comparatively less wages; but how can an agriculturist afford to pay more when, under the existing conditions, the cost of production is more than the price of the yield? If we expect higher production, the State must provide certain incentives. The farmer should be given a reasonable price support or some subsidy, at least to the extent we can afford to spend on our imports of food grains. Certain types of work should be directed to be closed—the type of work which attracts and absorbs unskilled labour—during the season of agricultural operations, such as plantation, weeding and harvesting so that the men engaged there would return to the fields.

I would now turn back to the basic factor that I raised earlier. That is about our cattle wealth. With our

present resources we cannot think of mechanised cultivation throughout the country. We may adopt it progressively but in view of the length and breadth of this country or sub-continent it seems to be a far-fetched idea, and I am doubtless about it that a great majority of our farmers would for many more decades to come cultivate their lands with bullockdrawn ploughs. Besides ploughing, for all ages to come mankind must depend on cows for milk which is so vital for human life. I grieve very much to say that this important aspect is always forgotten or neglected. We do not have any respect for our old culture and tradition. I am sure, no one would boast or deny that India's welfare lay in the welfare of our cattle, but what have we really done about it? We have hardly two ounces of milk per head while some other countries have two pounds per head. We have not been able to increase a drop of milk though we are now in the third year of our Third Plan. Have we maintained or even found as much pastoral land as we need? Have we ever thought of the fodder famine? Do we keep any note of the wanton slaughter of cows of excellent breed, which have to play so vital a role in our economy?

It appears as if we all have forgotten why Gandhiji refused to take cow's milk. Sant Vinoba has advised us to take proper care of our cattle. He has not approved of the idea of mechanised farming in India because it replaces human labour whereas we have a problem of surplus labour. According to him, it is no good aping America as America has about 14 acres of land per head while India has only three-fourths of an acre of land per head. So cattle is a necessity here and needs all protection by legislation. Let me read out a speech recently delivered by him in Calcutta. I hope the House will give its dispassionate consideration to it. It is a very short passage.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Leave it for the future. Mr. Bhuwalka.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr Mohanty made some charges and he was not charitable enough to give way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have called another speaker.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Kindly give me two minutes only.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY: It is a very useful passage . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You ought to have done it earlier.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Mohanty says that my eyes were probably dazzled by the lights. In fact, the lights were so dazzling that they really dazzled my eyes and I do not believe nor my party believes in grandeur . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Give your personal explanation.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It was a manifestation of grandeur at somebody else's cost, it was at the contractors' cost. He alleged that I was against the Tikarpara Dam. I am not alone against that dam. This Tikarpara Dam would dislocate about six lakhs of people, and to a question in this House the Minister replied that the scheme has neither been scrutinised nor has been sanctioned by the Planning Commission, while the Orissa Government have given the people of Orissa to believe that the sanction . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That was made very clear in the House. You need not explain it.

SHRI DHANANJOY MOHANTY: That is not my point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Shri Bhuwalka.

श्री आर० के० भुवालका (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय देवकीनंदन नारायण जी ने जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव उपराष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर दिया है, उसका समर्थन करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

अभी जितने माननीय सदस्यों ने पांच दिन की बहस में हिस्सा लिया और स्पीचे दी उनमें काश्मीर, चाइना और पाकिस्तान की बाबद बहुत सी बहसे हुईं । मैं उस विषय में कुछ बोलना नहीं चाहता । मैं अपने घर को मजबूत करने के बारे में जो मेरे विचार हैं उनको आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ ।

अभी देश में तीन बातों की बहुत जरूरत है । कम्पलसरी मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग, कम्पलसरी एजुकेशन, कम्पलसरी फेमिली प्लानिंग । कम्पलसरी मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग के बिना देश में नैतिकता नहीं आ सकती और खास कर हमारे विद्यार्थियों में, स्टूडेंट्स में नैतिकता का लाना बहुत जरूरी है क्योंकि जब तक स्टूडेंट्स में यह विचार नहीं आया तब तक वे कैसे समझेंगे कि देश हमारा है और उसके प्रति हमारा क्या कर्तव्य है । आज जो अवस्था स्टूडेंट्स की है वह सब को घिदित है । मैंने बहुत दफे बंगाल में भी कहा था और आज आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग नहीं होगी तब तक देश के प्रति भक्ति की भावना हमारे नौजवान लड़कों में नहीं आ सकती । इसलिए जितने भी हमारे कान्जेज और यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं उनमें कम्पलसरी मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग होनी चाहिए ।

एजुकेशन को हमने बहुत बढ़ाया है लेकिन उसका स्तर जब तक हम नहीं बढ़ायेगे, तब तक देशभक्ति लड़कों में आना मुश्किल है । इस लिए एजुकेशन अच्छी होनी चाहिये, और कम्पलसरी होनी चाहिये और हमारे देश के नौजवान लड़कों को पढ़ने का मौका मिले ।

अभी हम देखते हैं कि सिनेमा हाउसेज में जब नेशनल एन्थम बजता है तो हमारे लोग खड़े नहीं होते हैं, इसका क्या कारण है ? हमारे देश को स्वतंत्र हुए १७ वर्ष हों गए लेकिन अभी तक देश में यह भावना नहीं आई कि नेशनल एन्थम क्या होता है । इसलिये मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग की बहुत जरूरत है । दूसरे एजुकेशन अच्छी होनी चाहिये और ऐसी होनी चाहिये कि हमारे देश में नैतिकता बढ़े ।

तीसरी बात है फेमिली प्लानिंग की । पहले भी मैं इस पर कई दफा कह चुका हूँ और आज मैं फिर आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ । मेरे सामने आज का हिन्दी अखबार है "हिन्दुस्तान" । उसमें एक मेन आर्टिकल इस प्रकार है :

"लोकतंत्र के लिए अदृश्य खतरा

गत १२ मास में ही संसार की आबादी ६ करोड़ बढ़ गई है । यह संख्या अमरीका की वर्तमान आबादी की लगभग तिहाई है । इन सब लोगों के लिये आवास, भोजन, शिक्षा, रोजगार और स्वास्थ्य सेवाओं की व्यवस्था करनी होगी । विशेषज्ञों ने हिसाब लगाया है कि यदि इसी अनुपात से आबादी बढ़ती रही तो अगले चालीस साल में संसार की आबादी दुगुनी हो जाएगी और उस के आगे फिर चालीस साल से कम समय में ही संसार की आबादी उस दुगुनी की भी दुगुनी हो जायगी । अर्थात् इस शताब्दी के अन्त तक संसार की आबादी जहां पांच अरब के आसपास होगी वहां सन २०६४ में तो वह १५ अरब के आसपास पहुंच जायगी । १५ अरब ? किसी सुदूर ग्रह नक्षत्र की दूरी बताने वाली यह संख्या नहीं, किन्तु इसी ठोस धरती

पर बसने वाले हमारे और आपके जैसे हस्तपादादि सयुक्त मानवों की यह ठोस संख्या होगी। संसार की अब जितनी आबादी है उसी को अभावग्रस्तता से बचाने के लिए संसार भर के सम्मिलित प्रयत्न भी सफल नहीं हो पा रहे हैं, फिर 'सुरक्षा के मुह' की तरह लगातार बढ़ने वाली आबादी को अभावग्रस्तता से बचाने के लिये क्या संसार के वर्तमान साधन-स्रोत समर्थ होंगे? यदि 'शहर के अंदर से काजी को दुबला' न होने की नमीहत दी जाय और यह सिर-दर्द वैज्ञानिकों के लिए ही छोड़ दिया जाए, तब भी विशेषज्ञों की चेतावनी पर तो ध्यान देना ही होगा।"

यह अवस्था होने वाली है।

आपने देखा कि हमारी पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना में ६५ लाख रुपये फेमिली प्लानिंग के लिए रखा गया जो कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में बढ़ा कर ५ करोड़ कर दिया गया और अब तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसको २७ करोड़ रुपया कर दिया गया है। लेकिन अभी तक के तीन वर्षों में उस पर—२ करोड़ ४२ लाख रुपये खर्च हुए हैं। सन् १९६१-६२ में, ३ करोड़ १४ लाख रुपये खर्च हुए हैं, १९६२-६३ में और ३ करोड़ २७ लाख ८० १९६३-६४ में खर्च होने की व्यवस्था है। ऐसी अवस्था में हमें यह देखना है कि अगर हमारी आबादी इस तरह बढ़ती गई और हम उसकी रोक थाम नहीं करेंगे तो हमारे देश की क्या हालत होगी। प्रोडक्शन जितना हमारा बढ़ता है उससे ज्यादा आबादी बढ़ती जाती है। यहां हर साल में एक करोड़ १५ लाख आदमी बढ़ जाते हैं। अभी हाल में कलकत्ते में इकानिमिस्टों की एक कॉन्फ्रेंस हुई थी जिसमें बतलाया गया कि :

"ALARMING GROWTH

Next to China, India is the most heavily populated country in the world. India has to support about 14 per cent. of the world's population with nearly 2.3 per cent. of the world's total land area. India's population was 236 million in 1901 and there was a rapid increase in the subsequent decades. It has been officially estimated that the increase in our population between 1951 and 1961 (about 78 million) was nearly as large as the increase (about 82 million) in the two preceding decades. The present population is about 440 million and it is expected to jump to 625 million by 1976."

ऐसी अवस्था में हमारे देश की क्या दशा होगी इसको हमारे देश के विचारकों को विचारना चाहिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके सामने यह कहना चाहता हूँ और मैंने यह बात कई दफा कही है और ऐसा मालूम देता है कि हमारी सरकार ने इस ओर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट को अपना काम जितनी तेजी के साथ करना चाहिए था उतनी तेजी के साथ नहीं हो रहा है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट सुस्त तरीके से अपना काम करती है। जब जब भी कोई काम करना होता है तो उसमें सुस्ती ही देखी गई, उनका कोई भी काम जल्दी नहीं होता है। यह मैंने अपने जीवन में देखा है और मैं सरकार से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर व्यापारी जल्दी कोई काम करता है तो उसे १०० में से ६८ में फायदा होता है और २ में नुकसान होता है। अगर वह कोई काम धीरे करता है तो उसे १०० में से २ काम में फायदा होता है और ६८ काम में नुकसान होता है। हमारी सरकार भी अपना काम धीरे ही करती है और उसको हर चीज में नुकसान ही होता रहता है। इसलिए मैं गवर्नमेंट से यह निवेदन करूंगा कि उसको जो काम सब से पहले

[श्री आर० के० भुवालका]
करने चाहिये उन्हें पहले करे और जो पीछे करने चाहिये उन्हें पीछे करे। लेकिन हमारी गवर्नमेंट अभी तक जो भी काम करती आ रही है वह पीछे करने वाले काम करती आ रही है और जल्दी वाले कामों को करने की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देती है। मेरी सरकार से यह सिफारिश है कि वह इस बात की तरफ ध्यान देगी और जो काम पहले होने चाहिये उनको पहले पूर्ण करेगी।

आज देश की यह अवस्था हो गई है कि हमारे यहां साल का उत्पादन तो कम होता चल जा रहा है और खपत ज्यादा होती चली जा रही है जिसकी वजह से मिडिल क्लास वाले लोगों और पूअर क्लास के लोगों को तकलीफ का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। जैसे जैसे हमारे देश में महंगाई बढ़ती चली जा रही है वैसे वैसे हम पीछे की तरफ हटते चले जा रहे हैं। अभी कुछ माननीय मेम्बरों ने इस बात की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान खींचा और मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह अपना काम जल्दी ही करे।

अभी थोड़े दिन पहले हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब श्री नन्दा जी ने कहा था कि मैं दो वर्ष के अन्दर देश के करप्शन को हटा दूंगा। लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि माननीय नन्दा जी के पास ऐसा कौनसा जादू है जिसके जरिये वे दो वर्ष के भीतर देश के करप्शन को हटा देंगे। देश से करप्शन को हटाना कोई जादू का खेल नहीं है। जब तक देश में कंट्रोल रहेगा तब तक करप्शन नहीं हटाया जा सकता है चाहे दुनिया की कोई भी शक्ति क्यों न आ जाय। जब तक हमारे देश में कंट्रोल रहेगा तब तक करप्शन बढ़ने ही वाला है घटने वाला नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या फलड कंट्रोल ?

श्री आर० के० भुवालका : अगर हमारे देश में कंट्रोल रहेगा तो करप्शन भी नहीं हो सकता है। अगर सरकार यह समझती है कि कंट्रोल के होते हुए करप्शन हट जायेगा तो यह बात मुमकिन नहीं है। इस वास्ते मेरा यह निवेदन है कि सरकार जितनी जल्दी कंट्रोल को हटायेगी उतनी जल्दी लोगों को राहत मिलेगी। मैं अपना अनुभव बतलाता हूं कि जहां कंट्रोल होता है वहां दाम बढ़ जाता है और उसके साथ ही साथ कर शन भी बढ़ता ही चला जाता है। मैंने कलकत्ता में देखा है कि व्यापारी जिस बर्तन के जरिये लोगों को चावल देते थे उसमें भी वे बेईमानी करते थे। वे जब चावल लोगों को देते हैं तो बर्तन के अन्दर सब अगुली डाल देते हैं ताकि उतना अनाज कम हो जाय। इसी तरह से और भी कई तरीके हैं जिससे व्यापारी बेईमानी करते हैं और इस तरह से कंट्रोल के नाम पर तरह तरह की बेईमनिया होती है। इसलिए सरकार से मेरी यह सिफारिश है कि जब तक वह कंट्रोल को नहीं हटायेगी तब तक करप्शन मिट नहीं सकता है। कंट्रोल ही इसकी जड़ है और जब तक जड़ को खत्म नहीं किया जायेगा तब तक आप किसी चीज को खत्म नहीं कर सकते हैं।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि कलकत्ता में बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं जो पावर के अभाव के कारण, रोज २-६-४ घंटे अपना काम बन्द रखते हैं। अगर हमारे कारखाने बन्द रहेगे तो किस तरह से देश में उत्पादन बढ़ेगा। अगर सरकार इन कारखानों को पावर देने का प्रबन्ध नहीं करेगी तो देश की कोई भी इन्डस्ट्री नहीं चल सकती है। इसलिए मेरी सरकार से प्रार्थना है कि वह कलकत्ता में कारखानों को पावर देने का अच्छी तरह से प्रबन्ध करे ताकि देश को उत्पादन की दृष्टि से आगे बढ़ाया जा सके।

अभी पिछले दिनों कलकत्ता में कुछ गड़बड़ हो गई थी जिसके बारे में मैं आपके सामने कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। ईस्ट पाकि-

स्तान में खुलना में जो दंगे हुए और वहाँ अल्पसंख्यक जाति के लोगों को जिस तरह से नुकसान पहुँचाया गया है और जिस तरह से वे लोग अपना घरबार छोड़कर आये, उसमें अब वहाँ पर दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। जो लोग वहाँ से आये उन्होंने कलकत्ते में लोगों को बतलाया कि उन्हें किस तरह से नुकसान पहुँचाया गया और इन सब बातों को सुनकर कलकत्ते में भी कुछ लोगों में यह भावना फैली कि क्यों न यहाँ के लोगों को वहाँ भेजा जाय जिसकी वजह से कलकत्ते में गड़बड़ हो गई। इस गड़बड़ में हिन्दू और मुसलमान दोनों मारे गये। लेकिन जिस तेजी के साथ हमारी बंगाल सरकार और भारत की सरकार ने कार्यवाही की उसने लिए हम उन्हें धन्यवाद देते हैं।

उधर कितने मरे इसकी गिनती भी मैं आप को बतला देना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक मेरा अन्दाजा है पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में करीब १० या १२ हजार हिन्दू मारे गये और हो सकता है इससे भी ज्यादा मारे गये हों। हम ऐसी सरकार को अपना दोस्त कहते हैं जो हमारे आर्दमियों को मारती है। इस वास्ते जब तक हम मजबूत नहीं होंगे तब तक वे हमारे दोस्त नहीं हो सकते हैं। वे हमारी कमजोरी का फायदा उठाते हैं और हमें हर वक्त परेशान करते रहते हैं। मेरा अपना यह ख्याल है कि कमजोर का कोई दोस्त नहीं होता है और जब तक हम कमजोर रहेगे तब तक दुनिया में हमारा कोई दोस्त नहीं होगा। मैं नहीं मानता कि हम कमजोर नहीं हैं। लेकिन जो भी हमारी कमजोरी है उसको हमें निकालना होगा। इसलिए मेरी आप से सिफारिश है कि हमें अपनी जनता को इस प्रकार की शिक्षा देनी चाहिये जिससे यह कमजोरी हट जाय। इसलिए हमें अपने लोगों को मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग देनी होगी ताकि वे हर तरह से मजबूत बने और देश को भी मजबूत बनाये। जब हमारे देश

के ऊपर चीन का हमला हुआ था तो उस समय हमारे देश में सब काम आगे बढ़ा और लोगों को हर तरह से मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग दी गई। लेकिन अब मैं देखता हूँ कि यह मामला ठण्डा पड़ गया है। उस समय आसाम, बंगाल और देश के दूसरे भागों में सब जगह मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग की चर्चा हो रही थी लेकिन आज वह बात देखने में नहीं आती है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूँगा कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके सब को मिलिटरी ट्रेनिंग दी जानी चाहिये।

मेरे सामने कुछ फिगर्स हैं और मुझे यह देखकर खुशी होती है कि हमारे देश ने सन १९६२-६३ में काफी एक्सपोर्ट किया। मैं इसके लिए इन्टरनेशनल ट्रेड मिनिसट्री को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्हें इस क्षेत्र में बहुत अच्छा काम किया है। लेकिन मैं उनके सामने एक मुझाव देना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि जापान वाले अपने यहाँ अगर किसी चीज की खपत १० लाख है तो वे ५ लाख उस चीज का ज्यादा उत्पादन करते हैं और इस पाँच लाख की कीमत वे १० लाख की चीज में ही लगा देते हैं ताकि ५ लाख चीज जो उन्होंने ज्यादा तैयार की उसको वे कम दाम में बाहर के मुल्कों को भेज सकें। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि आज जापान की इन्डस्ट्री इतनी बढ़ गई है कि वहाँ पर किसी चीज का कोई अभाव नहीं है। जब उस देश में इस तरह की बात हो सकती है तो हमारे देश में भी हो सकती है और मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूँगा कि वह इस बात की ओर अवश्य ध्यान देगी ताकि हमारा एक्सपोर्ट भी बढ़े। इतना कह कर मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir I should like to thank you for giving me this opportunity at the fag end of this debate. The debate is continuing in this House for the last three days and almost all the points have been

[Shri R. S. Khandekar]
 covered by the hon. Members. There is very little for me to dilate upon but I will be failing in my duty if I do not express my views on this important occasion. Therefore, I will seek the indulgence of the House for a few minutes.

Sir, it is almost customary nowadays that every year the President addresses a joint session of both the Houses of Parliament and a discussion on that Address is initiated here on the resolution moved by one hon. Member and seconded by another. It gives us an opportunity to take stock of the situation and have a look over the events of the year that has gone. It also gives us an opportunity to look ahead for the year that is to follow. It is a sort of Profit and Loss Account of a firm.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Madam, the Vice-President has said and rightly said that in the year that has just ended the Government and the people of India have had to face problems which were vast in magnitude and complex in character, but it is difficult to agree with him when he says that in spite of difficulties and distractions we have continued to move forward towards our objective of a democratic and socialistic order at home and peace and co-operation in international affairs. Internally, at home, we are not clear about our objective as yet. Although there is much talk of democracy and socialism and a resolution defining the objectives of democracy and socialism has been passed by the ruling party at its annual conference, real socialism is far away. The basic principles of socialism have not been implemented, nor is there any seriousness on the part of the Government to bring it in the country. Internationally also the two powers, China and Pakistan, are creating problems every-day and endangering the peace of the world.

Madam, the mid-term appraisal of our Third Five Year Plan is a valuable document. This House is going to dis-

cuss it extensively. Hence, it is not necessary to go into its details. It is enough to state that it is a revealing document which shows that our plans are in doldrums. Production instead of increasing is going down every year. Agriculture has suffered, it is admitted, but even in the basic industries also there is a substantial lag in production. The mid-term appraisal, on page 70 observes:

"Over the Second Plan, the index number of agricultural production increased from 116.8 in 1955-56 to 139.6 in 1960-61. In 1961-62, the index rose to 141.4, being the highest recorded so far. However, in 1962-63, according to the provisional estimates at present available, the index fell to 136.8".

The report further says at page 120:

"Industrial production in the first two years of the Plan recorded moderate increases over the preceding years. It showed an increase, as represented by the index, of 6.5% in 1961-62 and 8.0% in 1962-63 (base year-1956) as against an average increase of 11% (base year—1950-51) envisaged in the Third Plan."

Madam, the Vice-President in paragraph 7 of his Address states that despite these satisfactory trends, the overall rate of economic growth has lagged behind the Plan target. This is mainly due to the shortage in agricultural production which in 1962-63 shows a fall of 3.3 per cent. The President ascribes the fall to the successive bad agricultural seasons in the course of the Third Five Year Plan, but I submit that it is not correct. The reasons are far different, and must be searched elsewhere. In the first place, there is no definite agricultural policy as such. We laid emphasis on agriculture in the First Five Year Plan. In the Second, we totally neglected it and we laid greater emphasis on industry. The net result was that agriculture suffered a set-back. By the end of the Second Five Year Plan, we

could not achieve the target fixed of 100 million tons. Even after two years of the Third Five Year Plan, this target of 100 million tons is far away. There is no guarantee for the price of the agricultural produce. Land reforms have not been implemented sincerely. They are worked out more to avoid real issues than to implement them in right earnest. I know in my State a very low percentage of landless people might have got land consequent upon the various land reform measures. On account of corruption and red-tapism agriculturist could not get money and materials in time to use. In spite of big irrigation projects, land has not been properly utilised as yet. I remember Mr N V Gadgil—I stand to be corrected if this statement of mine is wrong—once a Minister in the Government said that we were having big irrigation projects throughout India but the people were not prepared. They would have to be taught the methods of wet agriculture. So far, our agriculturists have been used to dry agriculture and they will take some time to get used to wet agriculture and its technique. There are no agencies to educate them in this way. There is a lot of surplus land yet lying unutilised. In my State there are lakhs and lakhs of acres of land lying waste in the bed of the rivers in the shape of ravines and forests also. The ravines must be levelled and this land should be utilised for intensive agriculture. They are good and fertile lands. Concerted efforts have to be made to improve the vast territory of land which is thus lying unutilised. Unless there is a sound agricultural policy, I am afraid we will not be able to achieve self-sufficiency in agriculture.

India, Madam is said to be a predominantly agricultural country but it is a paradox that she is not self-sufficient in foodgrains and she has to import millions of tons to maintain buffer stocks. India being essentially an agricultural country, her entire economy depends on the price of agricultural products. During the harvesting season the middlemen and the

traders corner all the produce at cheap rates because the agriculturists are in a hurry to dispose of their produce. They want money early and they have no space to store their produce. Hence they sell at any price available to them, which is a meagre price or sometimes the lowest price. As soon as the whole of the stock is thus cornered, prices begin to rise to the detriment of agriculturists and the consumers, and the whole of the profit goes into the pockets of the middlemen and traders. These rising prices have a direct effect on other commodities. In a surplus State like my State rice and wheat are sold at unimaginable prices. The Government have failed to check the rise in prices. The only solution is to take over the entire trade in foodgrains in the hands of the State and eliminate speculation and profiteering. If the Government is unable to hold the prices of agricultural commodities, it cannot control the prices of other articles of domestic use. Agricultural commodities are the basic commodities in Indian life. In spite of the larger release of foodgrains from Government stock, the setting up of additional fair price shops and the opening of consumer co-operative stores, the Government has failed to hold the price line. In a recent month, the prices of all agricultural commodities went up by twenty-five to forty per cent without any apparent reason. The man in the street has become desperate and says that the prices have touched the peak and that it is not possible to pull on and meet the expenses with his meagre income.

Madam, the Vice-President has referred in paragraph 13 to the coming into being of Legislative Assemblies and Ministries in many of the States. I do not understand why a small territory like Goa, Diu and Daman should be kept as separate entity as yet. The people of Goa have unreservedly given their verdict in favour of its merger with the neighbouring territory of Maharashtra. There is no justification for keeping them as separate States with separate Assemblies and Council of Ministers. It is a waste of public funds. The sooner they are merged

[Shri R. S. Khandekar]
with the neighbouring territories, the
better it will be.

The Vice-President's reference to the Chinese threat and the absence of any indication to take further steps is the most disappointing feature of the Address. The Chinese threat continues and there is no certainty that they will not give another thrust like the previous one. There are assurances given now and then that we are making adequate preparations but unless we are determined to take back the lost territory and have the aggression vacated, no amount of preparation will give that moral boosting or courage to our Armed Forces which is so essential today. We must categorically declare that we have to take back the territory under Chinese aggression. For that atmosphere has to be created. But our past experience is that dampening statements are made now and then. The emergency is misused and the first voluntary outburst of public enthusiasm and co-operation has been wasted. It could not be properly utilised. The emergency, Defence of India Act and other provisions were used more to strengthen the ruling party than the nation. Today there is inertia in the public. There is no enthusiasm and a feeling of desperateness and frustration is enveloping the country.

It is a good thing that a reference to the assassination of President Kennedy is made in the Address. In his death India lost a genuine friend and the world a great champion of peace and amity. But I am pained to observe here that when many of the heads of states had assembled in America for the last rites of President Kennedy, India, which claimed to be so friendly with America, was conspicuous by the absence of her head of State. Was it not possible for the President, Vice-President or the Prime Minister of India to go there at that time and take part in the ceremony when for much smaller and unimportant occasions our dignitaries

are found flying here and there? I think it was a serious lapse on the part of India.

Much has been said in this House and in the other House about Pakistan's intransigent attitude towards this country in solving the basic problems that confront both the nations. The situation has been aggravated more by Pakistan's illegal treaty with China, by which Pakistan has ceded a great chunk of Indian territory to China. Pakistan has so far failed to stabilise democratic forces in her own country and her people are groaning under the weight of dictatorship. She has failed to solve the basic problems of her people and in order to divert the attention from such problems the communal bogey is created now and then. China is also indirectly helping Pakistan to upset the democratic development that has taken roots in this country, but the greatest surprise is about the attitude of our British friends. It runs counter to the stand taken so far. In fact, Pakistan is a British creation and now they are playing their old game of supporting one against the other. India should take a firm stand and warn these Western allies although they are our friends. We know their game and no kind of flirting or negotiation with any part of this country will be tolerated by us. We cannot make any exception to Britain, Pakistan or China. They must be plainly told that Kashmir was, is and will ever be a part of this country and no negotiation can take place with regard to Kashmir.

Madam, the unhappy incidents that have taken place in East Pakistan and in certain parts of East India are most condemnable and sufficiently grave. A permanent solution to the problem of minorities in East Pakistan must be found out. Those who want to come over to this country must be given all facilities to come and they must be given full facilities of rehabilitation. They are after all

our own flesh and blood and we cannot afford to neglect our brethren and kith and kin. There is no mention in the Vice-President's Address as to how this problem will be tackled in future.

In the end, Madam, the Vice-President has given a legislative programme for the Parliament. But I am sorry to say that there is as yet no measure either taken or thought of to nationalise banks or to take over foodgrains trade. There is also no mention of any measure to control the powers of the Comptroller and Auditor General and bring his activities under the jurisdiction of Parliament. He has so far adopted a policy of touch-me-not. The Auditor General had taken arbitrary steps at the time of the last general strike and as yet many loyal Central Government servants are without job and they have not 4 P.M. been reinstated. In spite of judicial pronouncements many of

the Central Government servants who were either removed or dismissed or whose services were terminated have not been taken back in service. A law therefore to control such arbitrary action on the part of the Comptroller and Auditor General is necessary. I am afraid recognition has also not been restored to the All India Audit and Accounts Association Union in spite of so many protests and representations on the part of the Union.

Madam, it is a good thing that the Government has introduced legislation regarding the removal of certain High Court or Supreme Court Judges who are incompetent, inefficient and of doubtful integrity and character. But as yet a machinery to settle the disputes between the Government and its employees is not set up. The proposed Whitley Councils, I am afraid, will not satisfy the Central Government servants. It is reported that under that scheme the right of strike, which is a fundamental right of any Government servant, is not recognised.

These are some of the points which I would like to raise at the moment.

Madam, we are passing through a very delicate stage. There appears to be a mood of hesitancy and indecision and self-complacency on the part of the Government. Some dynamic policy is required and the people's enthusiasm should be aroused. Our goal must be clear and we must take bold steps without fear or favour. It is the only way to take the nation to our cherished goal of democratic socialism.

Madam, I wanted to speak about the amendments. Most of the points have been covered but if there is time . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have no more time. You should have spoken about the amendments in your speech earlier. Now, there is no time.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: All right. Madam, with these words, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

THE MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Madam Deputy Chairman, without giving a preface or a preamble to my speech, I might, with your permission, refer immediately to the discussions in the Security Council. I know we were rather anxiously awaiting the result of the meeting of the Security Council and I might as well refer or quote the purpose for which the meeting of the Security Council was summoned. I shall not read the whole of the request but briefly it said that "an immediate meeting of the Security Council should be held to consider the grave turn the situation in Jammu and Kashmir has taken and the danger it poses to the peace in the region." So it was mainly on the basis of the situation in Jammu and Kashmir that Pakistan insisted that this matter should be considered by the Security Council immediately. As the House is aware, the Government of India were wholly opposed to the consideration of this matter in the Security Council especially at the present moment. The situation was bad enough, more so in East Pakistan and also in Calcutta in our country, and it was most important that

[Shri La] Bahadur.]

the communal situation in both the countries was handled first. It was our duty to see to it that communal harmony prevailed and minorities in both the countries lived in amity and peace. Unfortunately, Pakistan thought otherwise and instead of taking effective action—which perhaps they did much later—they took a pretty long time to deal with the situation effectively. They did it at a much later stage and in the meanwhile killings took place on a big scale; arson and loot also.

It is unfortunate that seasoned politicians and countries, which have enough experience of our affairs, should have lent their support to the holding of this meeting. I know both the U.K. and the U.S.A. were not entirely in favour of holding this meeting and we are told that they dissuaded Pakistan not to summon the meeting of the Security Council. But in spite of what they did, the U.K. representative took a special and keen interest in the debates in the Security Council. Ivory Coast and Morocco also spoke but, as I said, the U.K. representative should have known the position better and the speech which he delivered has naturally caused much resentment in our country. I have gone through his full speech and I shall not say that Sir Patrick Dean denied the legal accession of Kashmir to India. He did not say that actually, but what he said could be interpreted, more or less, in the same way. He said that the legal accession was not so important. To have said that was to my mind wrong because it created an erroneous impression in the minds of our people in this country. Sir Patrick had very little to say about Pakistan. He did say much about us, but he did not realise what the attitude of Pakistan has been throughout the last few years *vis-a-vis* India. We have tried our level best to keep peace with Pakistan. A number of times our Prime Minister has publicly said that we will never go to war with Pakistan. Even when the last negotiations took place, even during the duration of

the meetings between the two delegations, Pakistan took steps which were highly provocative.

The House fully remembers the way in which Pakistan entered into some kind of agreement with China. And when was it done? It was when our country was faced with a deep crisis and one of the most difficult situations that we had to face. There was aggression by China on our country. When high dignatories from both the countries, the United Kingdom and the United States, came to India, they pressed us to start some kind of talk with Pakistan. It was difficult for the country to swallow that, especially in that context. Yet, the Government of India, under the leadership of our Prime Minister, took a bold step and very courageously decided that we would send a team with one of our Ministers to have a discussion with Pakistan. I do not want to relate the old story, but in their very first visit, suddenly this agreement between China and Pakistan was announced. Naturally, it came as a great shock to Sardar Swaran Singh, who was leading the delegation. He, of course, consulted the Government of India. In spite of that provocation, we decided to continue the discussions. The discussions were held and they broke down. Of course, I have no doubt that the whole House will agree that it was only because of the intransigent attitude of Pakistan. They wanted to discuss nothing else but Kashmir. Our delegation did discuss Kashmir, and mostly Kashmir. What was their demand? Almost they wanted that Jammu and Kashmir not only the valley,—part of Kathua and some subdivisions might be left out—the whole of it should be presented to them on a silver plate. This was the attitude which Pakistan took up. In the circumstances, it was not found possible to carry on the discussion because it would have resulted in nothing.

This has been our effort and recently, as I said, we have been trying to maintain peace and communal harmony in our country. We have had

difficult situations. We have had communal riots. The Government of India and the State Governments have done their best to take effective action. No one feels more pained and hurt than our Prime Minister when there is any kind of harassment caused to the minority community in our country. Yet what has happened in East Pakistan is something which is unimaginable. I do not want to quote what the Pakistan newspapers themselves have said in regard to the happenings in East Pakistan. There are a number of telling editorial comments which have appeared in Pakistan newspapers, English and Urdu. I am sorry I have not got them here. They themselves have said that there was constant propaganda and exploitation of the Hazratbal incident in West Pakistan and East Pakistan, especially in East Pakistan. The kind of propaganda, which was made by the newspapers and the radio, did create an impact on the Muslim community that Muslims were being killed and being victimised in this country. What was the fact? As I said, the Hazratbal incident was played up. As the House is aware, what actually happened in the Hazratbal incident? It is highly regrettable that the relic should have been lost. There may be some elements. I do not know who they were. Some of the names have been mentioned. But every section, every community in Jammu and Kashmir highly regretted this incident, in spite of Azad Pakistan radio broadcasts. They tried that there should be some kind of conflict and clash between Hindus and Muslims. They tried all the time to give it a communal colour. Yet, we must pay our compliments and, if I might say so, homage also to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, Hindus and Muslims, who refused to believe that the loss of the relic had anything to do with the Hindu community in the valley. As I said, complete communal harmony and perfect peace prevailed there and peaceful demonstrations were held there. Now Pakistan has said that all demonstrations were made against the Government of India, which is palpably false.

AN HON. MEMBER. Lie.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR. There was no conflict between the Jammu and Kashmir Government and the people there in so far as the importance and the urgency of the recovery of the relic were concerned, and they decided that we should employ our best agency to deal with this matter, and there was a desire expressed that the Intelligence Department of the Government of India should give a helping hand. It was on their wishes that our officers went there, some of our administrative officers, because one did not know what turn it might take because of the wrong kind of propaganda that was being carried on all the time across the border. So our officers went there. There was hardly any question of taking over the Jammu and Kashmir Government. I do not know, perhaps Pakistan would have welcomed it so that it might get an opportunity to say that the Government of India had taken over the Jammu and Kashmir State completely, taken over the rule of the State.

The suggestion that the Government of India tried to shape things, as they liked, in Jammu and Kashmir or that there was a revolution or a severe or serious agitation against the Government of India is, as I said, entirely off the mark. There is no truth in it and the Government of India tried to help them as they did in West Bengal. Pakistan and some friends of Pakistan might say that we did it as we wanted to take over West Bengal also. In West Bengal the situation grew worse, and it was but natural that the Chief Minister should have asked for help from the Government of India, from the Army. Similarly there was a situation in which the Jammu and Kashmir Government felt that they needed our help, the help of the Government of India and we gave it to them. All the time throughout this period and today, it is the Jammu and Kashmir Government which is running the whole administration.

[Shri Lal Bahadur]

So, the purpose of summoning a meeting of the Security Council was basically wrong. To suggest that an immediate meeting should take place to consider the so-called grave turn the situation has taken in Jammu and Kashmir and the danger it poses to the people in the region is wrong. There is no danger at all and there is no grave situation in Jammu and Kashmir. Of course there are certain internal matters with which we will have to deal, and I shall say a few words about that later.

I referred to all this in the context of Sir Patrick Dean's speech. I was telling the House how experienced politicians like Sir Patrick Dean had gone the wrong way. As I said, I can understand some other countries doing that, but to have raised this matter in the Security Council in the way he did, has created a very wrong impression in our minds. In fact, there have been demands both in this House and in the other House that we might as well consider severing our relations or getting out of the Commonwealth. Well, we cannot act in a huff. These are matters which have to be tackled at the diplomatic level. I cannot go into my talks with the High Commissioner of the United Kingdom.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA But are you considering this?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR I am not as hot as Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

DIWAN CHAMAN LAL (Punjab) The High Commissioner was speaking on behalf of the Conservative Government, and the Conservative Government has no permanency in British politics.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR I do not want to repeat what I said in the other House. I had exactly said the same thing. I know their feeling. A delegation of the members of the British Labour Party came to India some time back and I had a long talk with them, and I know how they feel about this question. They have an entirely different

approach. You might have read in the papers that when the same delegation visited Pakistan after visiting India, there were comments that these people were pro-India and that they did not appreciate the difficulties of Pakistan. So, it is not the United Kingdom as a whole that adopts this attitude and we should not look at it that way. There are perhaps two reasons on account of which the United Kingdom tries to lend its support to Pakistan. One is the membership of SEATO. The United Kingdom and Pakistan are both there and they have entered into a military alliance. It is not possible therefore sometimes for the United Kingdom to take a dispassionate view of things. They must help their allies and they must lend their support to them. The other reason I had referred to was the ruling party there at present. The Government there still has not been able to get rid of the old complex, of the old British days when they ruled in India.

AN HON MEMBER What is the complex?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR That complex is, they wanted to rule and govern the country and they had always believed in the policy of divide and rule. Unfortunately, when they went away, they implemented the policy fully, the divide and rule policy, and we have two countries now. It is not possible to know—they are of course secular in their approach, there is no doubt about that—but so far as India is concerned somehow they think only in terms of Hindus and Muslims. In regard to Jammu and Kashmir also they feel "What is the problem there?" Divide the territory and the Muslim majority area should go to a particular State and the Hindu majority area should go to the other State."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Mr Duncan Sandys started this in 1962.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR I do not want to impute motives but they consider this to be a very simple proposition to just divide the territory between Hindus and Muslims. The solu-

tion is not so easy. I was talking to two or three prominent Indian Muslims, to my Muslim friends, only the other day and they said that the entire Muslim community in India stood for the accession of Jammu and Kashmir with India. They said that they were not prepared to accept it for a moment that there was still some integration left to be implemented. The accession is complete and it is final. As I said, there are certain internal matters. In the Security Council as I said these discussions did exhibit ignorance on the part of many of the members who should have understood it much better; They were expected to

Now, about the decision of the Security Council I must say that they have done the right thing. One is not quite clear, yet, the adjournment of the Security Council was quite appropriate and I think the members of the Security Council will, in calmer moments, give further thought to the various aspects of this problem. If there has to be a settlement over the disputes between India and Pakistan, it will have to be done through direct talks and discussions. We have always suggested that we want discussions on all matters pending, not excluding Kashmir. But unfortunately, Pakistan takes the other view. They are prepared to discuss only Kashmir and no other matter. I do not think that even if we find a solution to the satisfaction of Pakistan, there will be complete peace, other matters will be raised after that later on, and it is therefore that our Prime Minister has been suggesting that it would be better to discuss all the matters together. There may be minor matters, there may be bigger matters and there may be this major question of Kashmir. Let us discuss all of them together and try to find a solution. But any kind of intervention from outside creates hurdles and difficulties.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA What about the suggestion made about mediation?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR Shastri, in the Security Council, of course, during the talks and discussions and even in the speeches some kind of a reference was made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA What is there to mediate?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR I know the views of Shri Bhupesh Gupta in regard to that particular problem, but I say this that we will most sincerely try to come to a settlement over various matters. Our efforts should be sincere. I do not claim that we have done everything rightly. Yet, only direct talks and discussions will really help. We still stick to it and we hope that Pakistan will also try to reconsider its attitude.

The question of the Chinese aggression is another difficult and complicated matter and I know how strongly we feel over the aggression which took place and about the way in which China behaved towards India. Well, something better was expected of China. In the beginning, we said that because we were friends. Now, we are all disillusioned. We know how China functions, how its mind works, and China definitely says one thing and does something else. There is a stalemate there at present. The Colombo Proposals are there and it is a glaring example of how China works. The Colombo Proposals were taken to China and discussed with Mr. Chou En-lai first and they said it had appeared in the newspapers—that they had accepted the Colombo Proposals, in fact, the words “without any reservation” were also mentioned. And now, the Colombo Proposals are still hanging in the balance, and nothing has happened so far. In fact, as I said before, China has negatived the proposals in action. We still feel that if the Colombo Proposals are accepted, India would be willing to take further steps in terms of her discussion with the Colombo Powers who had come here.

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

I may not be quite correct, but I feel that these matters should be settled, or an effort should be made at least to bring to an end the present deadlock, if possible early, because it does not pay to any country. About Pakistan, this thing is hanging on for a long time. The Chinese aggression is also there since long. However, it is not in our hands; it is not only in the hands of India to settle these problems, it is in the hands of the other party. However, we have to make our preparations, we have to build up our strength, the defence strength, whether it is the Army or the Air Force or even the Navy. They have all to be built up and developed so that the country and our defence forces really become strong enough to face the Chinese if such a situation arises.

The preparation in itself takes a long time. I mean, we may be critical and sometimes it is possible that the Government work may also not be up to the mark. There might be delays, there might be bottlenecks. But for that the Government should be prepared to rectify its mistakes, its shortcomings. But by and large, we have to realise that the kind of preparation we want to make might take a long time; whether it is technical personnel, training or the manufacture of arms and ammunition, in all those things we have sometimes to take the help of others and we have to produce many of the things in our own country. We have to put up our own industries, own factories. All these things are being done and no one will disagree that these things will take time. And yet, there should be no complacency. There is the emergency. I know that the old feelings do not continue and they cannot continue always but those who are in the midst of work, who are in the midst of preparations, they have to continue the work with the same spirit, whether they are Ministers or whether they are others. But mostly for those, who are working in the

fields and factories, it is essential that they feel what their responsibilities are.

So, we must know; as I said, we should accept the fact that the emergency is there and that we have to build up our strength. However, the point for us to consider sometimes is this. The Prime Minister had suggested once that the matter could be referred to the International Court at the Hague. Later on, he suggested that the matter could even be referred to arbitration. These are peaceful methods; India has pursued these methods, and it is difficult for me to say as to what should be our definite attitude or definite policy. However, it is clear that if we can avoid a major conflict or a major clash, we should do so. However, it is obvious that we cannot do anything; we cannot enter into any kind of agreement which would not be in consonance with the dignity and honour of our country. That is the basic fact, and keeping that basic fact in mind efforts are to be made to resolve these complexities. Well, without giving any explicit view on the matter, I think it would be in the fitness of things if the hon. Members of this House give thought to this problem, to this aspect of it, and at an appropriate time give their advice and lead to the Government.

In this connection I must pay my compliments to the two great men in the world—I am referring to late President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev and in that connection to the policies that both the countries were pursuing before they came to power. The House remembers what the attitude of the U.S. Government was before President Kennedy took over, and what the attitude of the Russian Government was before Mr Khrushchev took over. During the Stalin regime Russia was a closed book; generally the word used in these days was that there was an iron curtain there; you could see nothing; you could;

know nothing. But Premier Khrushchev almost created a revolution, and now Russia is open to us, to others, to go there, to visit their country, to visit their factories, to send for their technicians here, to get into collaboration with them, to enter into trade and commerce and expand our trade and commerce with them.

Similarly, you remember the policy pursued in the United States by the late Mr. Dulles, which was anti-communist; no one would have anything to do with communism; it was almost impossible to talk of communism or negotiate with Russia. In the same manner no one could talk of those who lived in Russia, no one could talk to the Premier or the Prime Minister of Russia. It was almost considered a sacrilege. But in the United States it was President Kennedy who, in spite of the differences he had to face in his own country, extended his hand of friendship to Soviet Russia, and with difficulties in between—which may often happen—President Kennedy continued that attitude till the end of his life. Of course I need not refer to that, but at least for a man like me, the death of President Kennedy is not an ordinary death; it has made a deep and lasting impact on my mind and, I think, on the minds of those who had been associated with Gandhiji in political work even for some time; I mean, it is more or less the same kind of martyrdom as that of Gandhiji. Gandhiji may have been a man of a different stature pursuing a different objective and yet the courage of conviction of President Kennedy was there, and for a man to die so courageously for the views he holds is something which raises the stature and prestige of humanity as a whole.

It is in this new context that I cited these two gentlemen. Now, President Kennedy has gone but Premier Khrushchev has, in the same context, come up with proposals of disarmament, and one of the important

points which are mentioned in those proposals is that in regard to border disputes, in regard to territorial disputes, violence or force should never be used, that these disputes should be discussed amicably, should be discussed round a table and effort should be made to come to an agreement. But if there is no agreement, even then, as far as possible, no violence should be threatened, no violence should be used. To my mind, it is a most welcome proposal. It is easy for a strong country to attack the other country, a smaller country, and take over certain areas or certain territories. There are disputes going on in a number of countries, whether it is Laos or South Viet-Nam or Malaysia: in many countries there are clashes and conflicts, and if the bigger powers intervene, and because of the strength of their brute force take over certain areas and territories, well, they can certainly do so, but it would be monstrous; it would mean that the weaker or the smaller countries could not co-exist side by side with the bigger countries or stronger countries. Therefore this proposal of Premier Khrushchev is most welcome, and our Prime Minister and the Government of India have lent their general support to the proposal made by Premier Khrushchev, and I hope the other countries of the world will also give their earnest consideration to it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Madam, what should the smaller or weaker countries do when they are attacked by a big country? Should they keep quiet?

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): No, we will fight.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: They should not keep quiet; they should resist to the fullest extent. But it is possible that, if these proposals were agreed to, there may be countries, friendly countries, or there may be some agency which will come to the help of the smaller countries and the weaker

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

countries. Then the problem will have to be considered, those attacks will have to be considered in the context of the world situation.

Some points were mentioned about Zanzibar and about some other African countries. I shall only briefly refer to them. It is true that our relations with East Africa countries have been very friendly, and we still have the same feelings and keep on the best of relations with them. Sometimes it happens that in the wake of freedom, well, there are certain urges of the people and they come up to the surface, sometimes in a wrong way. But however, we hope that both in Asia and Africa, those who have gone there from outside and have lived for generations will be allowed to live there and to carry on their avocations in peace. Of course, if there are individuals who do not behave, that is a different matter. But to make any kind of discrimination between one section of the citizens and the other would be rather unfortunate. I have no doubt that when normal conditions are restored, all those who have gone from India or from other Asian countries to those places will get their due place in the social, political and economic life of those countries.

As regards Cyprus, trouble broke out in Cyprus, as you know, over the proposed amendment to the Constitution which was pressed by the Greek Cypriots and opposed by the Turkish people living in Cyprus, and as the House is aware, the British troops went over there at the request of the Cyprus Government in order to restore law and order. The present question, which is under consideration, is some kind of a peace keeping force to be located or stationed in Cyprus. The matter has been under discussion between Great Britain, Cyprus, Turkey and Greece. Nothing has been, as far as I know finally decided but we hope that

there will be some kind of cease fire and these countries will be able to come to an agreement.

Similarly, we know that there have been difficulties in Malaysia, Philippines and Indonesia. The latest report is that Malaysia and Philippines have more or less narrowed down their differences. It is not so in the case of Indonesia, but they are also discussing matters among themselves and we are informed the Thailand is taking keen interest and they have agreed to supervise the cease-fire between them, but nothing yet is final.

I might also say a few words in regard to the non-aligned Conference. As hon. Members know, it was decided between the U.A.R., Ceylon and Yugoslavia that a non-aligned conference might as well be held as early as possible. The House will recall that in the last Session of Parliament our Prime Minister fully supported the initiative and the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the President of the U.A.R., who took the initiative in the matter, got a message from our Prime Minister in this regard. The Prime Minister, in his letters to President Nasser, President Tito and Prime Minister Shrimati Bandaranaike welcomed the initiative to hold a conference of non-aligned countries, and since then the Government of India have kept in touch with the countries concerned on further developments in connection with this joint initiative. It has always been the view of India that the initiative for calling the first preliminary meeting must rest with Ceylon, U.A.R., and Yugoslavia which had taken the initiative in announcing the need for this Conference in joint communiqués issued by them. I might add that the recent press report emanating from Ceylon and referring to the visit of the Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs to Cairo and Belgrade as an attempt on India's part to replace Ceylon in this triumvirate is without basis and quite wrong.

The Government of India hope that as a result of the initiative taken by the Prime Minister of Ceylon, President Nasser and President Tito, arrangements will be made soon for the holding of the conference of non-aligned countries this year.

I do not want to take more time of the House but there is no doubt that we will be internationally strong only when our nation is adequately strong to meet the internal and national problems. I know my other colleagues while replying to the debate will deal with these matters, but there is one lurking fear in my mind and before I conclude, I might mention the visit of Premier Chou En-lai to Pakistan. He is in fact there at the present moment.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: They are both good communists.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: What is happening there one does not know, but it has so coincided that this is just immediately after the Security Council meeting is over. Of course, Mr. Bhutto, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, perhaps might rush to Pakistan or may have already gone there. They will be meeting there and both perhaps consider India to be their enemy and therefore they might hatch up something, one does not know. I do wish that better counsel will prevail but unfortunately the kind of propaganda and broadcasts being made from across our borders are frightening and one does not know what might happen. However, we need not take an alarmist view and we need not feel nervous but yet, the country has to be watchful and be strong enough to meet any situation as it arises.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the beginning of his speech the Minister said that he might have something to say with regard to the Kashmir situa-

tion. He had visited Kashmir. We would like to know what steps he has taken in the direction of bringing about a change in the administration and the Government. He said that he would say something but perhaps he forgot.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I might say a word. So far as the question of the relic is concerned, hon. Members know that it has been settled and finally settled. People are not at all worried on that account. They had the *deedar* on the 21st day of Ramzan which was celebrated with great zeal and enthusiasm. There are other minor matters. They are very minor matters and I might add, that I am going there tomorrow, to Jammu, and I have every hope that those minor matters would be settled soon.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Administrative, internal matters . . .

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: For example, the question of release, enquiry, investigation, who should conduct the case, all these things are not big matters. They could certainly be settled. Of course, there is the political aspect of the problem. I do not want to hide it. It is very important. It is important from the point of view that those who govern must see how the people react to our administration and to our Government. Ultimately we stay here on the wishes of our people. They are our final arbiters and in that context I know everyone responsible in Jammu and Kashmir is furiously thinking as to what further steps should be taken to build up a strong Jammu and Kashmir and a Government which will be able to satisfy the wishes and desires of the people. So from this point of view, I have had some talks in Srinagar and I have to pursue it in Jammu. I expect to get co-operation from every quarter. I have a bad habit of trying to meet each and every one.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: A very good habit. That is the people's habit.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Sometimes it is considered to be a weakness on my part.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: It is only an Indian habit, not a bourgeois habit.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I make every effort to carry every one with me if a good objective is to be achieved. As I said, in regard to political matters also, I hope to get the co-operation of everybody. Of course, if there are difficulties, we will have to face them and face them effectively but so long as we are in a position to get the necessary co-operation, we should try to take advantage of it and bring about the necessary change in Jammu and Kashmir.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tariq, do you want to say anything?

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: No, nothing. after his good speech. He has left nothing for me to ask.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): During the debate more than one hon. Member made the point that our external publicity is very weak, and because of the lack of knowledge about our problem and the reality of our conditions here, a

wrong impression is prevailing in the minds of foreign powers. May I know if the hon. Minister is making any arrangements for strengthening our publicity abroad?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Well, this matter has been receiving the careful consideration of the External Affairs Ministry for some time past, at least for the last six months, because when I was previously in the Government, we had set up a Committee and on that committee the External Affairs Ministry was also represented when necessary. We took certain decisions and those things were to be pursued later on. I am not fully aware of the details at the present moment. I know that the External Affairs Ministry has already taken a number of steps and they will see to it that wherever anything is found lacking, it is improved. Our publicity and especially our external publicity, as has been referred to by the hon. Member, must be as effective as possible and we will work to that end and we fully realise our obligations in that respect.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, there are only a few more minutes. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-seven minutes past four of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 20th February, 1964.