

the year ending the 31st March, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-838/63.].

(xv) Annual Report of the Development Council for Food Processing Industries for the year 1961-62. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-839/63.]

(xvi) Annual Report of the Development Council for Heavy Electrical Industries for the year ended the 31st March, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-840/63.]

(xvii) Annual Report of the Development Council for Organic Chemical Industries for the year ending the 31st March, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-841/63.]

(xviii) Annual Report of the Development Council for Glass and Ceramics for the year ending the 31st March, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-842/63.].

(xix) Annual Report of the Development Council for Internal Combustion Engines, Power Driven Pumps, Air Compressors and Fans and Blowers for the year ending the 31st March, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-843/63.].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE EXTRADITION ACT, 1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, on behalf of Smt. Lakshmi N. Menon, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 35 of the Extradition Act, 1962, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of External Affairs:—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 55, dated the 5th January, 1963.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 55, dated the 5th January, 1963.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-858/63, for (i) and (ii).]

THE WEALTH-TAX (EXEMPTION OF HEIRLOOM JEWELLERY OF RULERS) AMENDMENT RULES, 1963

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, also on behalf of Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of section 46 of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957, a copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 128, dated the 19th January, 1963, publishing the Wealth-tax (Exemption of Heirloom Jewellery of Rulers) Amendment Rules, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-859/63.].

THE TRIPURA LAND REVENUE AND LAND REFORMS (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1962

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH (DR. SUSHILA NAYAR): Sir, on behalf of Shrimati Maragatham Chandrasekhar I beg to lay on the Table, under section 198 of the Tripura Land Revenue and Land Reforms Act, 1960, a copy of Notification No. F.39(38)-Rev/61, dated the 1st October, 1962, publishing the Tripura Land Revenue and Land Reforms (Amendment) Rules, 1962, issued by the Tripura Administration. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-851/63.]

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, The President has in his own inimitable way focused our attention both on our internal and external problems. Our approach to them, despite what the Opposition Members might say, is on the whole both wise and right. One of the big questions which we have to consider is as to how we can meet the challenge which is not merely of a military character which China has posed for us. It has no doubt become impera-

[Shri P. N. Saprui.]

tive for us to develop our defence capacity. We have to induce our youth to join our Armed Forces and to equip them properly. But I suggest that even our defence capacity cannot be developed merely by external military and either from the West or from the East, the necessity for which I do not deny, unless we are able to work our democratic system so as to make possible for it:—

- (a) to bring the basic industries which we must build up under a system of public ownership or control which gives to our workers a sense of pride in being partners in their actual running;
- (b) to run our planned economic system in such a manner as to combine controls in the economic sphere with freedom and initiative for the cultural and spiritual development of the common man;
- (c) to redistribute our national dividend in such a manner as to secure social justice for the unfortunate sections of our community.

Our Government, no doubt, appreciates the importance of these principles but, nevertheless, we need to introduce an element of speed in our efforts. For one thing, it is not possible to achieve these objectives without breaking up the arbitrary power of monopoly capital, and fusing our people who are divided into groups of those who have the good things of life and those who have not, into the unity called the nation.

Sir, the ideal of fraternity, to which reference has been made by the President, and which is emphasised by our Constitution, cannot be achieved by pursuing or adhering to policies which accentuate class differences and ignore the hardships suffered by our common folk. We

have to be vigilant in seeing that this is done. The difficulties of the common man in the existing conditions are real and we have to take note of them.

We are a democratic state and we pride ourselves on that fact. But if we wish to run our democracy successfully, we must discover some method of combining real and important differences with a much deeper underlying unity among those who compete for the vote of the electorate and for power. I am mentioning all this for in a few days we shall have presented before us a Budget which is bound to impose upon us heavy burdens. That burden should fall fairly and squarely on those who are in a position to bear it. And in framing our taxation proposals we should bear in mind the picture of the poverty-stricken man in our villages and in our towns. After all, our agriculturists form the large mass of our population. Can we say that there has been an overall increase in agricultural production in the first two years of the Third Five Year Plan? Weather and climatic conditions, despite our irrigation projects, continue to influence our agricultural production to a considerable extent. Our objective was to achieve a 6 per cent. annual increase in our agricultural production, with a target of over a hundred million tons. But we have not achieved that target yet; we have not reached anywhere near that. Actually there has been a fall in the production of rice in West Bengal and Bihar and a significant fall in the production of jowar in U.P., Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh. Emphasis should, therefore, be laid not only on major but also minor irrigation works, soil conservation, supply of fertilisers and manures, distribution and popularisation of agricultural programmes.

There should be a more definite move—and I would like to emphasise this—in the direction of co-operative farming, consolidation of holdings and multi-purpose co-operatives. Non-

official machinery drawn from all classes of society should be associated with the fixation of prices. There should be some machinery of price control for the consumer. We need the appointment of a Central committee and State committees to examine the whole problem of prices.

Industrial production has, no doubt, increased to about 9 per cent. Fortunately, there is a Cabinet Minister now in charge of our Defence Production. But what steps are being taken to associate our workers with the actual running of these industries? Our directorates continue to be drawn more or less exclusively from the business community, the civil services and the professional classes. The working man has no place in our directorates. We have made some move in the direction of Whitley Councils but I would go further and plead that the workers even in private industries should be treated as shareholders and given the right of electing a certain number of directors to their concerns. Our goal should be to work for a form of socialism in which workers run their own concerns. We have no official report as yet on the effect of our planning programmes on the re-distribution of our income so far as the various sections of our community are concerned.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Has the income of the lower middle group increased? Has the income of the middle class not gone down? These are questions on which I would like light to be thrown and I think it is important that in this connection work should be speeded up so that we may have a clear picture of how our Plan has affected the various sections of our community.

I am opposed to any pruning of our Five Year Plan which, considering the needs of this country, is on the whole, a moderate one. Too much reliance on foreign aid which may be necessary for the immediate moment,

should, as far as possible, be avoided. Ultimately our aim should be to be self-sufficient so far as it is possible for any nation to be in the matter of our defence production for foreign aid, howsoever indispensable to meet our immediate needs, cannot permanently solve our defence problems.

There are politicians in this country who are not merely critical of our foreign policy but who question its very basic assumptions or character. I fail to understand how in a world divided into two rival blocs, each of about equal strength and possessing nuclear powers, it would have been, speaking not from an idealistic but from a realistic point of view, wise for us to align ourselves with one bloc or the other. Such a policy might have won for us the friendship of one at the expense of the hostility of the other. Looking therefore at the question from the point of view of our permanent interests, it would have been highly impolitic for us to identify ourselves with one bloc or the other. Alignment could not have avoided the Chinese invasion. I have not been able to understand how we could have avoided the Chinese invasion. China invaded Korea notwithstanding the fact that the U.S.A. was in the field. Our non-alignment has helped the maintenance of peace in the world. Certainly it has helped us not only to preserve our hard-won freedom but it has also helped us to push forward the movement for colonial freedom all the world over. Six of the non-aligned countries have produced a plan which, if accepted by China, can provide the basis for talks and then for negotiations with that country. Had they merely denounced China—and it is easy to denounce China or for that matter any country—they could not have rendered any service to us because they are not great powers—I say it with all respect to them—in a military sense. Their strength lies in the just and impartial attitude that they have, on the whole, adopted.

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

Much of the credit for the Colombo proposals which are, by and large, fair, goes to the U.A.R. and Ceylon. While remaining firm on certain principles, and the Prime Minister has enunciated those principles in the various speeches that he has made, we have not ruled out negotiations and insisted upon conditions which are impossible of fulfilment. Wisdom has to be combined with strength and reasonableness with firmness. Diplomatic victories cannot be won by Slogans and the strength of a country cannot be built up by heroic attitudes and refusal to face realities. The attitude has to be firm and yet reasonable. There are people and parties who think that it is possible for us to do in this 20th Century, without planning and rely more and more on private enterprise with the assistance of Dalmias, Shanti Prasad Jains and Sriyans Prasad Jains for our economic development. No one denies that in a democracy, differences among groups representing the Right, Centre and Left are inevitable and it may well be that it is only through a clash of competing ideas that correct policies are evolved but our rightist friends should remember that if the necessary economic adjustments fail to be made by the democratic process, they will inevitably be carried out by dictatorship, whether of the left or of the right. Rightist policy such as is advocated by them, can only be worked in a poor country such as ours, by a Fascist dictatorship with frightful disasters and abuses which will make this country a home of reaction and all the evils that go with it.

An extension of public ownership which can take many forms—I need not dilate on the many forms that it can take—and control over the monetary and banking policies are essential prerequisites for a successful functioning of our planned economy. For the efficient running of democracy there must be same agreement on the basic issues among poli-

tical parties but if the basis itself is attacked, then there is, I venture to think, danger to the democratic way of life itself.

Reference was made by my respected friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, and some others belonging both to the right and the left to the so-called abuse of emergency powers by the Government and they have pleaded for the release of those who are being kept under detention. Personally, Madam Deputy Chairman, I have a profound dislike for all repressive legislation and while I am not prepared to say that emergency powers were unnecessary or have been abused by Government to the extent that the Opposition makes out, it has, nevertheless, become necessary for us to review the extent to which they can be relaxed in the altered circumstances of the country, consistently with the interests of public order. We are going to have by-elections and they cannot be held without a free expression of opinion by political parties. It is also important for us to remember that communist parties all the world over have not, by and large, supported the Chinese action.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time would you need?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: What time have I taken please?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken about twenty minutes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I will finish in another two minutes. The character of communism has been undergoing modifications. Let us by all means take action against those who are working against national interests. But in our attempt to do so we should discriminate between those who constitute a danger to the integrity of our country and those who take only a somewhat different view as to how the Chinese menace should be fought from that which appeals to us. This vital consideration should be borne in mind by our authorities.

After all, the emergency cannot be a permanent one and I hope that the Government is alive to this fact. A large number of people are in detention. Are there adequate reasons to hold that all of them are pro-Chinese? Why must we proceed on the assumption that Indian communists or for that matter, members of other parties are worse than Italian or French communists? Anti-national activities cannot be fought successfully by policies of negation. The fact is that as Mr. John Strachey remarks in his "Strangled Cry", experience shows that:

"Unless economic changes can be made rapidly, a modern industrial society runs amok in alternate war and stagnation. But if these indispensable economic modifications can be made by democratic means then the central dilemma of our epoch can be resolved."

We have to show that democracy is capable of solving our problems and that it is capable of remodelling our economic and social systems in accordance with the will and interests of 99 per cent of our population. If we can do so, then we shall have shown the superiority of our economic system over the Chinese one and be able to rely upon the loyalty of our people.

Finally, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to say a word about Kashmir. This is a delicate issue and I do earnestly hope and pray that the negotiations which our respected friend Sardar Swaran Singh has been conducting so ably will bear fruit. It is vital in the interests of this sub-continent that there should be unity between India and Pakistan, for without that unity we shall lack the strength which is needed to face struggles in the modern world. We cannot, of course, achieve that unity at the sacrifice of principles.

I would like to conclude, Madam Deputy Chairman, with a few words

to our friends of the opposition and I would say to them that they must understand that representative institutions for their successful working require that real and important differences should be reconciled with a deeper understanding of the various forces which are working in the community.

Thank you very much for the indulgence that you have given me, Madam Deputy Chairman.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nonimaged): Madam Deputy Chairman, in speaking on the President's Address delivered to the Members of Parliament I wish to confine myself largely to one basic and fundamental question to which the President also felt compelled to give the largest space in his Address. I am referring to the situation created by the Chinese, not aggression, but the Chinese annexation of a part of India. This development in the nation's history has many consequences, temporary and permanent. It has consequences which are political, consequences which are social, consequences which are economic. It is impossible in the brief space of time allotted to me to deal with these various aspects properly. I shall, therefore, confine myself to one single aspect of the question, namely, how to solve the problem created by the Chinese annexation and how to prepare for and prevent further developments, whether of military or political character.

There is no question that India is deeply committed to methods of peace. It was this deep committal to methods of peace which possibly has led to these unfortunate developments. It was also not realised by China that India was capable of resisting with methods which cannot be termed peaceful. And so we pursue this road of peaceful methods. But it will be unrealistic and unwise and imprudent if we do not take an objective view of what is going to happen as a result of the pursuit of

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram.]
these peaceful methods. What are these peaceful methods? Direct talks, mediation, some kind of judicial arbitration. But we are dealing not with a normally constituted political mind. We are dealing with an abnormally constituted Chinese political mind and the experience gained during the last few years and particularly during the last few months, makes us not to give up the methods of peaceful approach but to give up the hopes of achieving results thereby. If we deceive ourselves with extraordinary hopes, then we are likely to have further reverses of various kinds.

Now, what is the make-up of the Chinese mind of which we have had experience? The Prime Minister of China directly met our Prime Minister a few years ago in Delhi. They had talks, and the talks related to the boundary question. The impression left on the mind of our Prime Minister as a result of those talks was that the border disputes would be easily solved, or as if it did not really exist. Yet within a very brief time this understanding and impression created on our Prime Minister's mind were repudiated. It may not be known to many, perhaps it may be known to many members, that the Prime Minister is in the habit of recording every night the main happenings of the day and the most important discussions he held on vital issues. And yet the Prime Minister of China repudiated what he had told our Prime Minister. We had then many happenings on the border and notes have been exchanged for the last seven or eight years. What is our experience. Not a single inch has been yielded by the Chinese mind as a result of the exchange of notes. What happened thereafter? Our officials and Chinese officials met for eight long months and discussed the facts of the case and as a result of that eight months' discussion we found that the Chinese mind had not yielded an inch. After that we had correspondence between our Prime Minister and the Prime

Minister of China. That correspondence also showed that not an inch was yielded. We had then the Colombo Powers' intervention, well-intentioned intervention. They had a formula. They put it before the two countries. China did not see her way to accepting it though she created an impression that she had as good as accepted it. Six weeks have passed since then, more than six weeks since the Colombo Powers met, and we find that China is not in a mood to yield a single inch.

I do not think that any talks that will take place are going to make the Chinese withdraw from the area which they have developed and the roads which they have constructed because they consider it part of their territory and they consider the roads vital for the defence of Tibet and Sinkiang. People have expectations from these peace talks; I too would wish to have. But as day passes after day, I get convinced that though we may have talks, the talks will not solve the problem and the annexation of the Ladakh area will, probably in its entirety, remain undone. It is not, however, a question of even *status quo*. There is a delicate situation developing in NEFA. Conditions are not static there though apparently static. I think our Government and the nation is faced with a very difficult and delicate problem, not only in NEFA but also in the neighbourhood. This is part of our territory, admitted by China to be controlled by India. The Mac Mahon Line is, the limit of our control and yet today we are not able to send in there our normal armed police which is always stationed in that area for the maintenance of law and order. The effect of this on the morale of the people, on the prestige of our Government, on our moral authority and the attempts which the Chinese are making to make ideological infiltration into that area are all such developments that we cannot allow things to remain as they are. Members may be knowing that

the Chinese have removed certain individuals from NEFA, taken them with themselves for the purpose of re-infiltration back into Assam and other parts of India. They have taken from there men belonging to Manipur whom they will indoctrinate and see that they are available to them for work in Manipur. They have taken from there men belonging to Sikkim for the purpose of sending them back to serve their objectives in Sikkim. So also, they have taken men belonging to NEFA itself whom they will be sending back there for China's own purposes.

In the face of these difficult and delicate aspects of the situation, our Government has the very arduous task of maintaining its basic policies and also preserving the security and integrity of our country. We are driven compulsorily, despite the heritage of Gandhiji's movement, to depend on other methods of self-defence and even Gandhiji permitted the method of armed self-defence. Now, when we are faced with this problem of developing our armed strength, we come across certain difficulties. The nation faces these difficulties, the Government faces these difficulties. After all, India and our Government want to be friendly with all nations. We do not believe only in Afro-Asian solidarity. As a matter of fact, Afro-Asian solidarity has got an anti-complex against the rest of the world who are not Africans and Asians. That is not the basic policy of India and should not be. We wish to be friendly to all nations and we expect all nations to be friendly to us. At this particular moment when we feel that we have to develop our military and armed strength, we expect assistance and help from all friendly nations but unfortunately, on account of certain ideological commitments, on account of certain political views, on account of certain basic differences in outlook and approach to problems, Russia is not able to do what we may wish it to do. That is how I may put it. Rus-

1225RSD—4.

sia has made it clear, when the question of the delivery to us of the MIG planes arose—she made it plain to China and to her own friends—that it was not possible for Russia to send these planes while India is in conflict with China. In a confidential letter sent by the Communist Party of Russia to all the Communist Parties of the world, this is how Russia explains its position with regard to the delay in the despatch of the MIG planes. This is what the letter says:

"The Russians say that they had no choice but to stop arms delivery to India during the Chinese attacks but once the Chinese halted their attacks, the Russians came to the conclusion that there were no grounds for not fulfilling their obligations to India and the Soviet Union is now fulfilling its commitments and will continue to fulfil them."

Now, I do not want to discuss the merits and demerits of her decision but we have to take it as a dead certain fact that Russia, in the case of a direct armed conflict between China and India, will remain disabled by its political views, by its ideological commitments, by its distant international objectives, to rush to the aid of India. Now, that leaves us with the only alternative of looking to other friendly nations. Now, I believe that India is wise in following a policy of non-alignment and I think experience has also shown to every nation, in either camps in the world, that that non-alignment policy of India is wise and that it should not be disturbed.

But what is happening in our own country? While India wants to be friendly with all nations and at this critical time more than before wants to maintain that friendly relationship which enables India to develop its own strength, we find that attempts are being made to queer the pitch for this, attempts are being made to spoil

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram.]

the relationship between India and the countries which are inclined to assist us. Their inclination to assist us is the result of our own request, of our own invitation, of our agreements. Seeing the situation as it is and understanding the objective necessities of that situation we have invited and requested certain powers to help us to strengthen our military machine and our defences. At this time a new trend is developing in our country to spoil those relationships.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Very old trend.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: It is not a question of Right Reaction or any other such Reaction. I belong to a fairly independent school of thought both with my personal history behind me whatever it may be and my personal views but I sometimes feel that what is developing in India is a Left Reaction, that is, forces apparently leftist are coming in the way of the interests of the country, so shaping their policies as to create an unfavourable atmosphere for building up our defence. This is what one of the parties in our country has repeatedly said in a recent resolution. I am reading from the Resolution of the Communist Party which is as recent as February 12th. These are the type of remarks which are not merely contained in this Resolution but which are going to be the basis of propaganda by the Communist Party in the country not only through their Communist organisations but through all the cultural, literary and other organisations which they are able to infiltrate into and influence. May I take a minute or two of the House and read those few relevant sentences to give an idea as to what is the thought that is sought to be generated and how our international relationships are attempted to be spoiled?

This is what the Communists say:

"Any further delay in accepting the Colombo proposals in full on the part of China only facilitates the manoeuvres of imperialism."

That means the manoeuvres of the Commonwealth and the United States.

They further say:

"During the crisis created by the Chinese aggression India's policy of non-alignment has been viciously attacked by imperialists which see in the abandonment of this policy the fulfilment of their dreams." And they say again: "The imperialists have singled out non-alignment as the main target by of their attack."

Then they say:

"The U.S. and other imperialists are trying to embroil India and China in a prolonged war".

It was also said by one of their spokesmen here that "the imperialist pressures have grown on the country and the Government."

In the face of a definite, clear and specific statement by our Prime Minister that whatever help we are being given to strengthen the defences of the country is on our own request and invitation to certain countries, it is not correct, it is not proper, it is not wise, it is not patriotic to try to spoil our relationships with these countries. The Commonwealth and America might be considered her enemies by Russia but surely they are not the enemies of India. Therefore a party within India cannot generate this kind of outlook and this kind of view in the country. As I said, it is not patriotic and if the Communists want to retrieve the honour which they got when the Prime Minister told them that the original Resolution of the Communist Party was cent per cent nationalist, then all this kind of propaganda is wrong, apart from the fact that it is unwise and anti-national. I do hope that all parties in India, whatever their other differences, will on the matter of defence be firm and united.

We may try to regain all that we have lost and we may try to prevent the further developments that we apprehend by the methods of peaceful talks or through the Hague Tribunal which China is not going to accept because they consider it a bourgeois Tribunal. Nor is China going to accept any other arbitrament because arbitrament means give and take a compromise solution. That means that you do not really solve the problem, and regain what you have lost but live with the problem unsolved. Therefore in view of the present situation and the coming situation—and when I say the coming situation I have in my mind the very significant word used by the President, he used the word 'menace' as late as February 18—in view of all this, I hold that there is no alternative except to develop the armed strength of the country. After all the doves which are fluttering on the shoulders of the Premier of the Soviet Union, the doves of peace, the milk-white doves or the milk-white doves of peace which are fluttering on the shoulders of the President of America may have nuclear teeth as either of them is discovering. Therefore let us speak from strength. I feel that India is going through a very very important transitional stage and I think that India of the future, if it cannot depend upon the non-violence of the strong of Gandhiji, has no alternative but to develop the strength of its arms and any attempt by any Party to vitiate the atmosphere here for this is the greatest possible disservice to the country.

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, इससे पहले कि मैं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर अपने विचार प्रकट करूं मैं सदन का ध्यान लीबिया देश की ओर खींचना चाहता हूं जो इस समय ईश्वरीय-प्रकोप से पीड़ित है। वहां पर ५०० से अधिक आदमी मर गये और कई हजार आदमी बेघर के हो गये। जो लोग मर गये उसके लिये मैं सदन की ओर से श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करता हूं और जो बेघर हो गये उनके

प्रति सहानुभूति। मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि वे लोग अपने को फिर से बसाने में जल्दी सकल होंगे।

राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण हर साल के शुरू में दिया जाता है और इस अभिभाषण में राष्ट्रपति उन बातों की ओर सदन का ध्यान आकषित करते हैं जो कि साल भर के भीतर हुई है और उस बात का संकेत करते हैं जो कि भविष्य में होने वाली है। जब इस पर बहस हो रही थी तो मेरे भाई तारिक जी ने इन बात पर खेद प्रकट किया कि राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में जवानों की वीरता के बारे में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया है। मैं अदब के साथ तारिक साहब का ध्यान पृष्ठ ३ पर दिलाना चाहूंगा जिसमें कि पैरा ७ में यह कहा गया है :

“नवम्बर के महीने में हमारी संसद ने राष्ट्र का इस मामले में नेतृत्व किया और समूचे भारत में हमारी जनता ने इस नेतृत्व का दिल से अनुसरण किया।”

और वह प्रस्ताव संसद का क्या था ? उसमें जवानों के बारे में यह कहा गया था :

“This House places on record its high appreciation of the brilliant struggle of the men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our motherland.”

यह संसद का प्रस्ताव है। जो राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण होता है वह संसद की नीति का और सरकार की नीति का परिचायक होता है। इसलिये यह बिल्कुल आवश्यक नहीं था कि इस बात को बार बार दोहराया जाये।

इसके बाद कहा जाता है कि देश में इमरजेंसी की जो संकटकालीन स्थिति है उसके सुतत्विक कार्य नहीं हो रहा है ; जो हमारा

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव]

उद्देश्य है उसको पूरा करने की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की जा रही है। इस सम्बन्ध में भी मैं १४ नवम्बर, के प्रस्ताव की ओर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसके अंतिम पैरा में यह कहा गया था कि :

"With hope and faith this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

कोई भी प्रस्ताव तब तक वर्तमान रूप से माना जाता है जब तक कि वह प्रस्ताव रद्द न कर दिया जाये, या कोई ऐसा प्रस्ताव पास न कर दिया जाये जिससे कि पिछला प्रस्ताव रद्द समझा जाये। हमने इस प्रस्ताव को पास करने के बाद कोलम्बो राष्ट्रों के प्रस्ताव पर विचार किया, बहस की, हर एक सदस्य ने अपने विचार प्रकट किए। लेकिन कोई प्रस्ताव पास नहीं हुआ। इसलिये जो उद्देश्य था वही उद्देश्य आज भी है जो कि १४ नवम्बर के रिजोल्यूशन में दिया गया है और उस उद्देश्य से कोई पीछे नहीं हट सकता। शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से बात करने के यह मानी नहीं कि हम अपने उद्देश्यों से हट गए हैं। और इसका पूरा परिचय हमको राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के तीसरे पैराग्राफ में मिलता है, जहाँ वे कहते हैं :

"मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि यह ससद् जो हमारी नीति और राष्ट्र की रहनुमाई के लिये पूरी तरह से जिम्मेदार है, इन बड़े कामों को हौसले और समझदारी से तथा बर्दाश्त और सहयोग की भावना से पूरा करेगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपकी कोशिशें सफल हों, जिस से हमारी जनता और दुनिया का भला हो।"

और फिर यह जो आपरेटिव्ह सेन्टेन्स है, यह सब से ज़्यादा अहमियत की लाइन है :

"उठो, जागो, जो अवसर आपको प्राप्त हैं उनको समझों और जब तक लक्ष्य प्राप्त न हो जाए तब तक मत रुको।"

तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि किस प्रकार से, किस बात में ढिलाई की जा रही है।

मेरे भाई श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने अपने भाषण के शुरु में एक प्रश्न सदन के सामने रखा था और वह प्रश्न यह था कि कम्युनिस्ट चीन का आक्रमण क्यों हुआ ? मैं तो यह चाहता था कि इस प्रश्न का हल वाजपेयी जी खुद सदन के सामने रखते, लेकिन उन्होंने प्रश्न तो कर दिया, हल ढूँढ़ने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया। मैं इन तीन, चार महीनों से बहुत सोच रहा हूँ कि आखिर चीन ने शान्तिपूर्ण भारत पर क्यों आक्रमण किया और मेरी समझ में आज तक कोई बात नहीं आई और मैं इस प्रश्न का उत्तर केवल एक शब्द में दे देना चाहता हूँ और वह है ईर्ष्या। ईर्ष्या के सिवाय कोई दूसरा कारण मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि क्यों चीन ने भारत पर आक्रमण किया। मैं देश-विदेश के अखबारों को कतरने पढ़ रहा था और जो बात मैंने ईर्ष्या की कही, उसका समर्थन मुझे स्वीडन के अखबारों में मिला जो इस प्रकार है :

"It is not necessary to doubt China's goal—the Chinese dictatorship fears competition from Indian democracy and wants to put an end to it. Still, eight or ten years ago, China could consider India as a friend, a supporter. The possibilities that India by means of socialism could develop against communism were regarded as great in Peking."

A democratic India could have been regarded calmly in Peking as long as India remained weak. An India struggling with inner political difficulties, an India with a steadily worsening economy, could eventually become ripe for communism. Development in India showed, however,

economic betterment a stabilisation which threatened to frustrate Chinese plans for the future. Hence, China's excuse of fictitious irregularities in the border struggle.

The formal reason given for Chinese claims is that the border, the so-called MacMahon Line, was established by British imperialists. They accuse Indians of trying wrongfully to take over what these imperialists are said to have stolen from China, or rather from Tibet. Apart from the fact that this argumentation is quite unreasonable from the point of view of international law, it is a fact that China has on several occasions, among others, at the so-called Simla Conference in 1914, accepted this delineation of the border. It is also a fact that the border was drawn on the basis of history and tradition and also on the basis of geographical, ethnical and religious conditions.

The Chinese argument naturally does not hold water as regards international law. If this border which was agreed by responsible governments and which besides has basis in history is not valid, then no borders are valid."

If all is true, can there be any doubt about Chinese intentions?

अगर इन सब को सही माना जाय तो चाइना का जो उद्देश्य है उसके बारे में किसी को कोई शंका नहीं रह सकती और शंका रहने की गुंजाइश इसलिये भी नहीं रहती कि अगर हम इतिहास के पिछले पन्नों को उलटें तो हमको मालूम होगा कि क्या हो रहा है। १९५२-५३ तक चाइना और हिन्दुस्तान दोस्त थे। तब तक हमारी कोई पंचवर्षीय योजना चालू हो कर उपयोग में नहीं आ रही थी। १९५२ से पंचवर्षीय योजना शुरू हुई और १९५४ से चाइना और हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा का प्रश्न शुरू हुआ। उसके बाद १९५७ में हमारी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना शुरू हुई और १९६२ में वह खत्म होने को थी और उन्होंने समझा कि भाई अब तो

भारत एक रास्ते पर चल निकला है और अगर इसकी पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं पूरी होती रहीं तो ये हमसे आगे निकल जायेंगे। वैसे ही, उन्होंने देखा कि इनकी शक्ति क्या थी, १९४७ में ये आजाद हुए, कोई सैनिक बल नहीं था इनका लेकिन थोड़े से ही अरसे में इनके प्रधान मंत्री को संसार के राष्ट्रों ने इस प्रकार का प्रवक्ता बना दिया कि हर मामले पर उनकी राय जान लेना देशों के लिये आवश्यक समझा जाने लगा। इसलिये जैसे जैसे हमारी प्रगति होती गई उसी प्रकार उनकी ईर्ष्या बढ़ती गई और इसीलिये स्वीडन के अखबारों का जो अंतिम पैरा है वह भी काफी दिलचस्प है। वह इस तरह है :

"It is clear to the opinion in Asia and Europe that, China is exhibiting purely aggressive policy towards India. Attempts are being made to humiliate India and disturb its economic construction with the aim of demonstrating the invincibility and strength of communism. Attempts are made to convince other peoples."

This is very important:

"... of Asia that they should choose the way of Chinese communism rather than of Indian democracy. In the long run Chinese expansionism applies to all Asia and, then perhaps, also to the Russian part of Asia."

तो यह बात तो बिल्कुल साफ हो गई कि चाइना के उद्देश्य क्या हैं और क्यों वह हिन्दुस्तान से एक निरन्तर की तकरार रखना चाहता है। यह मैं मानने के लिये बिल्कुल तैयार नहीं हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान चाइना को हरा सकता है या चाइना हिन्दुस्तान को हरा सकता है, यह बिल्कुल नामुमकिन बात है। परिस्थितियां ऐसी नहीं हैं कि हममें से कोई भी एक दूसरे को हरा सके। इसीलिये प्रधान मंत्री जी कहने हैं कि हमको बहुत अरसे के लड़ाई-झगड़े के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये और तैयारी के लिये

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव]

कुछ चीजों की आवश्यकता होती है। यह कहना कि लड़ाई की तैयारियां नहीं होतीं और जब भारत पर आक्रमण हुआ तो हमारी सरकार अपनी सुध-बुध खो बैठी, जैसा कि हमारे प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के वक्ता ने दूसरे सदन में कहा, ठीक नहीं है। यह कहने से भी काम नहीं चलेगा कि साहब, जब आक्रमण हुआ तो युनाइटेड स्टेट्स आफ अमेरिका ने आसाम को बचा लिया। नहीं तो क्या होता? आखिर अमेरिका को मदद के लिये किस ने बुलाया?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY) in the Chair.

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं देश की रक्षा की बात कर रहा था जबकि सदन खाने के लिये उठा। देश की रक्षा जिस तरह हमारे श्री गंगा शरण जी चाहते हैं उस तरह भी नहीं हो सकती है। हर छोटी बात के लिये हम अपने मित्र देशों के पास जायें और कहें कि भाई आपकी क्या सलाह है, हम यह काम करें या नहीं? देश की रक्षा के लिये हमें अपने आपको तैयार करना होगा और जो कुछ उचित मालूम पड़ता है वह करना होगा। यह तो जो दायें-बायें का ख्याल किया जा रहा है कि दायें की बात मत कीजिये, बायें की बात मत कीजिये, इन सब को बंद करना पड़ेगा। देश की स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिये प्रधान मंत्री जी को बिल्कुल स्वतंत्रता देनी होगी, जिम तरह से वे चाहें उस तरह से अपनी तैयारी करें और जब भी उनको सैनिक एडवाइस मिले उस समय हमला करें। यह नहीं हो सकता कि

ढोल पीटकर देश की रक्षा की तैयारी की जाय। देश की रक्षा की तैयारी करने का तरीका और होता है। मैं अपने माननीय वरिष्ठ नेता श्री गंगा शरण जी से नम्रता के साथ प्रार्थना करूंगा कि उन को जो कुछ खामियां रक्षा के सम्बन्ध में लगती हैं उनके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जी से जाकर स्वयं बात-चीत करें। उनका सदन में आकर यह कहना कि यहां यह हो रहा है, वहां यह हो रहा है, यहां यह नहीं किया जा रहा है, वहां यह नहीं किया जा रहा है, इससे रक्षा के कामों में सहायता नहीं मिलती है।

प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की ओर से जो दूसरे नेता श्री चन्द्र शेखर बोले थे उन की मैं क्या चर्चा करूं। जिस लहजे में उन्होंने पंडित जी के बारे में सारी बातें कहीं उससे ऐसा लगता था कि वे एक बहुत ऊंचे और सब सदस्यों में अक्लमन्द आदमी हैं और पंडित जी एक ऐसे आदमी हैं जिनके बारे में कुछ भी कहा जा सकता है। क्या यह तरीका रक्षा की तैयारी करने के लिये है? अगर आपको रक्षा की तैयारी करनी है तो प्रधान मंत्री जी के हाथ मजबूत करने होंगे और उनको सब अधिकार और शक्ति देनी होगी। यह नहीं हो सकता है कि आप एक तरह यह कह रहे कि रक्षा की तैयारियां की जायें और दूसरी तरफ पब्लिक प्लेटफार्म से, सदन के अन्दर, सब तरफ यह कहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कार्य नहीं किया, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने वह कार्य नहीं किया। ये सब बातें बंद करनी होंगी, अगर रक्षा की तैयारी करना आप सब लोग चाहते हैं। मुझे जरा भी किसी तरह की शंका नहीं है कि सदन का हर सदस्य यह चाहता है कि भारत रक्षा की तैयारी जल्द से जल्द करे और फिर जो जमीन हमारे दुश्मन के हाथ में है उसको वापस लेने का प्रयत्न करें।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू केवल राष्ट्र के नेता, राष्ट्र के नायक ही नहीं हैं बल्कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू राष्ट्र-निर्माता, जन जागरण के प्रेरक, देश की एकता के स्तम्भ, भारत की आशा के केन्द्र, देशवासियों के हृदय-सम्राट और हम सब के पथ-प्रदर्शक हैं। अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि हर तरह से, हर प्रकार से पंडित जवाहरलाल जी राष्ट्र के प्रतीक हैं तो इसमें कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी।

हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री ए० डी० मणि साहब जिनके बारे में मुझे मालूम पड़ा कि उनको कहीं से आनरेरी डाक्टर की डिग्री प्राप्त हुई है, इसलिये मैं बड़े अदब से उनको डा० मणि साहब कहूँगा, उन्होंने कहा कि अगर कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को चीन नहीं मानता है तो आप भी कह दीजिये कि हम नहीं मानते हैं। संसार के मैदान में शतरंज की चालें चली जाती हैं और कोई चाल एक बार चलने के बाद वापस नहीं ली जाती। इस बात का इन्तजार किया जाता है कि दूसरी तरफ से क्या चाल आने वाली है और जब दूसरी तरफ से चाल आ जाती है तब हमको उसका जवाब देना पड़ता है। इस समय जो शतरंज की चाल थी वह हमने चल दी और कोलम्बो प्रपोजल्स के बारे में यह कहा कि हम इनको स्वीकार करते हैं। भारत हमेशा से एक शांतिपूर्ण देश रहा है और शांतिपूर्ण तरीकों पर विश्वास करता है और जब तक शांति के तरीकों से कोई भी फैसला हो सकता है तब तक वह हिंसा का प्रयोग नहीं करेगा। मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि इस सदन में कोई भी ऐसा सदस्य नहीं होगा जो यह चाहेगा कि ऐसी दीवार से सिर टकराया जाय जिससे सिर चूर चूर हो जाय। अगर हम अपने प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के लोगों की बात मानकर चलें तो हम चीन की जो दीवार है उससे अपना सिर टकरा देंगे इस बात की परवाह किये बिना कि हमारे सिर का क्या होता है। क्या यह सही नीति है ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : आपने सिर टकरा लिया है।

श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भागंठ : आप चाहते कि टकराकर चकनाचूर किया जाय ? यह तो श्री मणि साहब की बात थी। अब मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त की बात कहना चाहूँगा। जब मैं "भारत रक्षा विधेयक" पर बोल रहा था तो मैंने यह कहा था कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त एक बड़ी दुविधा में पड़े हुए हैं, संकट में पड़े हुए हैं कि क्या करूँ, क्या न करूँ। उन्होंने जो अमेन्डमेन्ट दिये हैं उनसे उनका यह संकट बिल्कुल साबित हो जाता है। उन्होंने ६६ अमेन्डमेन्ट दिये हैं। शुरू के जो दो अमेन्डमेन्ट हैं उनमें उन्होंने सरकार की तारीफ भी की है और ६४ अमेन्डमेन्टों में सरकार की बुराई की है। उनका संकट क्या है ? अपने देश में, अपना जो प्रदेश बंगाल है, वहाँ उनकी कोई स्थिति नहीं रही। बंगाल में वे जा नहीं सकते, बोल नहीं सकते क्योंकि उनके जितने साथी हैं, जिनसे उन्हें बल मिलता है अपनी कार्यवाहियों के कारण सीखचों में बंद पड़े हुए हैं।

श्री नीरेन घोष (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : किन कारणों से बंद हैं ?

श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भागंठ : यह आप भी जानते हैं और मैं भी जानता हूँ। दोस्तों को खबर देने के कारण बंद पड़े हुये हैं। आप वहाँ तो जा नहीं सकते हैं इसलिये दिल्ली में आपको कुछ न कुछ कार्यवाही करनी ही चाहिये। आप सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि वे सदन में बहुत व्यस्त रहते हैं और सदन को चलाने में वे अपना काफी टाइम लगाते हैं, इसके लिए वे हमेशा बधाई के पात्र हैं। उनकी सदन के बाहर भी कुछ कार्यवाही होती है। इस कार्यवाही में उन्होंने लोगों में यह कानाफसी करना शुरू कर दिया कि पंडित जी को अमुक अमुक आदमी निकालना चाहते हैं और उन्हें हर तरह से खबरदार रहना चाहिये। यह उनका स्टेटेमेंट है जो उन्होंने सदन में दिया :

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव]

"In the later days it was to be demonstrated that the same forces which were vociferous for the downfall of Mr. Menon were working for the downfall of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and were waiting to hear when he would go to the Radio to announce his resignation."

वाह भाई भूपेश गुप्त जी, कमाल कर दिया आपने। पहले तो रेडियो में जा कर कोई अपना इस्तीफा नहीं बताता। श्री मेनन ने अपना इस्तीफा पहले पार्टी मीटिंग में दिया, इसके बारे में उन्होंने बाहर कुछ नहीं कहा। मेरा श्री भूपेश गुप्त को यह चलेन्ज है कि वे इस सदन के किसी ऐसे सदस्य का नाम बतायें या दूसरे सदन के किसी ऐसे सदस्य का नाम बतायें जो यह चाहता है कि पंडित जी प्रधान मंत्री का पद छोड़ दे। यह एक भ्रम है जो वे फैला रहे हैं और इसके क्या माने हैं? बाहर के तो वे बड़े वफादार हैं, हर बात में पंडित जी की तारीफ करते हैं, प्रशंसा करते हैं, लेकिन अन्दरूनी यह चाहते हैं कि किसी तरह से पंडित जी कमजोर हो जायें, किसी तरह से ऐसी व्यवस्था कर दी जाये कि पंडित जी हट जायें और फिर हमारा बोलवाला हो जाये। श्री भूपेश गुप्त को यह बात मालूम होनी चाहिये कि देश का हर देशवासी यह जानता है कि पंडित जी क्या हैं और पंडित जी के साथ देश का हर आदमी है चाहे कम्युनिस्ट कितना ही भ्रम क्यों न फैलायें, उनकी चलेगी नहीं और इस भ्रम में जो फंसा हुआ है वह बहुत बड़ी गलती पर है। पंडित जी की शक्ति देश का हर एक आदमी है और जब तक देश के आदमियों का विश्वास उनको प्राप्त है, कोई भी दल पंडित जी का बाल बांका नहीं कर सकता।

हमारे अटल बिहारी जी वाजपेयी बड़े जोर-शोर से बोलते हैं। हिन्दी में उनके मुकामिल का वक्ता शायद कोई नहीं है।

तो उन्होंने कहा कि दिल्ली के देवता सो रहे हैं। अरे भाई, दिल्ली के देवता किधर सो सकते हैं। दिल्ली के देवताओं को तो सोने का मौका ही नहीं है। इतनी जोर की आवाज हो रही है, उनके पुजारी भी कभी कभी करते हैं और वे लोग तो करते ही हैं जिनको उन पर विश्वास नहीं है और जो यह चाहते हैं कि वे हट जायें। ऐसी आवाज में, इतनी बड़ी आवाज में क्या कोई सो सकता है। मेरी तो शिकायत उनसे दूसरी है और वह यह है कि पंडित जी को जगाना कोई मुश्किल बात नहीं है, लेकिन आवाज इतनी जोर की हो रही है कि हमारे शत्रु जो बैठे हुये हैं पीकिंग में, वे भी हमारी आवाज सुन रहे हैं और वे भी जान रहे हैं कि भारत देश में क्या हो रहा है; किस तरह से नेता के साथ व्यवहार कर रहे हैं, किस तरह की पब्लिक प्लेटफार्म पर और संसद् के सदन में आलोचना की जाती है, किस तरह यह कहा जाता है कि नेता यह तैयारी करने में असफल रहा, नेता वह तैयारी करने में असफल रहा। ये सब बातें कोई मजबूती देने की नहीं हैं। ये बातें केवल वे ही लोग कर सकते हैं जो देश को शक्तिशाली बनाना नहीं चाहते।

अब हमारे अटल बिहारी जी ने एक अमेंडमेंट दिया है। वह १०८ नम्बर का अमेंडमेंट है। उसमें वे यह चाहते हैं कि यह डिक्लेरेशन किया जाये कि जम्मू और काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का ही अंग है और यह बताया जाये कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह और श्री भुट्टो में क्या बातचीत हो रही है। मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि इस समय कोई ऐसा अवसर नहीं है कि जिसमें यह बात दोहराई जाये कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का अंग है। काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का अंग है और हिन्दुस्तान का अंग रहेगा और कोई भी शक्ति बाहर की चाहे कितना चाहे, उस अंग को हिन्दुस्तान से जुदा नहीं कर सकती।

— ११७ नम्बर का अमेंडमेंट भी श्री अटल बिहारी जी वाजपेयी ने दिया है। उससे मैं कुछ सहमत जरूर हूँ। लेकिन वह राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का अंग नहीं बन सकता। उसमें वे यह चाहते हैं :

“but regret that the Address makes no mention of the failure of the administration to suppress firmly the fifth column activities.”

यह सही है कि हमारे देश को जितनी हानि हमारे फिफ्थ कालमिस्ट्स से हुई है, उतनी शायद और किसी से नहीं हुई है और इसी लिए मैं अपने गृह-मंत्री जी से सविनय निवेदन करूंगा कि फिफ्थ कालम ऐक्टिविटीज को रोकने के लिये जो भी कदम उठाने की जरूरत हो, उनको उठाने की कृपा करें।

अब हमारे सोशलिस्ट दोस्तों के बारे में जितना कम कहा जाये उतना ही अच्छा है। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के दिन उन्होंने जो कुछ किया उसके बारे में सदन के सभी लोगों ने अपनी राय जाहिर की है और उसके बारे में कुछ कहना जरूरी नहीं है।

अब एक अंतिम बात जिसके बारे में मैं कहना चाहूंगा वह है कांग्रेस कार्य समिति के प्रस्ताव के बारे में। उसके बारे में कई लोगों ने चर्चा की, हमारे अटल बिहारी जी वाजपेयी ने चर्चा की और हमारे मणि साहब ने चर्चा की। आखिर यह प्रस्ताव क्यों पास किया गया, कार्य समिति के द्वारा। अगर मैं वह प्रस्ताव आप के सामने रख दूँ तो बात बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो जायेगी कि किस खयाल से वह प्रस्ताव पास किया गया। वह प्रस्ताव इस प्रकार है :

“The Committee considered the issue of public utterances by some responsible Congressmen who had criticised the accepted Congress policy. It was decided that their

explanations should be obtained and should be placed before the Working Committee for further consideration.”

यह प्रस्ताव का पहला अंग है। प्रस्ताव का दूसरा अंग, जिसके बारे में चर्चा खास तौर पर की गई है, वह यह है :

“The Committee also decided that no Congressman should join or associate with any function.”

—mark the words—

“organised or sponsored by any communal organisations like the Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha, the Muslim League or by the Communists or by groups or persons opposed to the declared policy of the Congress. It was also decided that Congressmen should not accept invitations from the MRA.”

यह प्रस्ताव सुनने के बाद मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि किसी के दिमाग में इस बात की शंका नहीं रह गई होगी कि इस प्रस्ताव को लाने की क्या जरूरत पड़ी। जहां तक भारत के रक्षा-प्रयत्नों का सवाल है, उसके बारे में किसी प्रकार का प्रतिबन्ध नहीं लगाया गया है और वहां तक डिफ्लेयंड पालिसी बिल्कुल साफ है और उसके अनुसार कांग्रेसजन सम्मिलित हो सकते हैं।

देश इस समय बड़ी नाजुक स्थिति से निकल रहा है और उसमें हर कदम को बड़े सोच-विचार के साथ लेना पड़ेगा और उसमें पूरी शक्ति प्रधान मंत्री जी को लगानी पड़ेगी। जो हम लोगों को करना है वह एक छोटी सी बात है। यह कह कर अब मैं खत्म करूंगा।

देश को बचाना होगा वफ़ादारी के ठेकेदारों से, चाटुकारों से, भक्कारों से और गद्दारों से।

SHRI M. C. SHAH (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to

[Shri M. C. Shah.]

you for giving me an opportunity to associate myself with the Motion of Thanks proposed by our friend here to our President. Usually, the President, in his inaugural Address, reviews the various policies and programmes of the Government that were enunciated last year and the future policies and programmes of the Government for the coming year. It is very necessary that Members of Parliament, and the nation also, should know what are the immediate policies and programmes; how we are going to implement them; how in the last year we faced any difficulties, if any; and how far and to what extent the Government was able to fulfil its promises by way of policies and programmes. Therefore, if we view the Address from this angle, it will be seen that the President has very rightly stated that the Chinese aggression is the main problem before the nation and that everything else has to be seen through that context. The Chinese aggression, we all know, is not merely an aggression; but China has taken over a large chunk of our territory. It is therefore just and proper that our attention should be drawn to what we should do, what our present duty is and how the nation shall face this menace. I may give the House some historical facts; both China and India became free practically at the same time, in 1947-48. China and India are two great countries of Asia and somehow, it was the wish of Providence that China accepted the communist way of life and became a totalitarian country, and India accepted parliamentary democracy, parliamentary way of life. Both countries have huge populations, both have common ills. Both have got poverty and illiteracy and both suffer from various common ills. Both countries have decided that they should come up and have a status among the highly progressive countries of the world. But both countries accepted different ways of life, and the countries in the world were very watchful to find out how far a great country like India

can provide the economic balance for this nation of forty-four crores of people by the parliamentary way of life. Equally so was the problem for China. China was a totalitarian country; it was a communist country, but the aim was to build up the Chinese nation. Crores of people in China have also been peace-loving. Now we have seen our India, and our Government, in their own way, formulated various Five Year Plans, and tried to see that the nation as a whole succeeded in its aim of economic well-being. It has been admitted even by foreign critics that India did well in pushing through these Five Year Plans and there was substantial progress in our country. As for China, as I said earlier, it is a totalitarian country, where the press is controlled, and the outside world can only know what the Chinese Government permits others to know. But even then we find that the big promises that were given by the Chinese Government to the Chinese people were not fulfilled. That slogan, that big leap forward in agricultural produce, has gone out and it is very clear that the Chinese Government has not been able to do for the Chinese people what it promised at the time when this new Communist Government took charge of the country. It is very natural therefore that the various countries of the world looked upon India as a model country and saw how crores and crores of people could be benefited in a peaceful way of life, in a parliamentary democratic way of life, and therefore the countries in Asia and Africa looked upon India as a model country, to see how it can serve the people best. Of course India never claimed it but there was the general impression that the various countries of Asia and Africa looked upon India as a model country, as leader of Asia and Africa. I know the Indian Government or the Indian people do not claim that. But the facts are there. The various countries that became independent much later than our country and are on the way to development looked upon India as

a model country and they tried to copy the various schemes enunciated by the Indian Government to help their people and to bring them to a fair standard of life. This perhaps China did not like. China had a desire to be the leader of Asian countries, but China was foiled in that desire. As there was no other better way, India had adopted a peaceful way of life. Our Government has been trying, during these fifteen years after independence, to build up the economic life in the country, and as a poor country it cannot afford to spend money on military equipment or defence potential simultaneously. Of course now we realise that we had neglected our defence requirements and looking to that weakness of our country China tried to invade the country, and we cannot but acknowledge the fact that it was a humiliating thing to see that in NEFA and in Ladakh we had to face several reverses. That does not mean that there is any permanent humiliation since the country to a man has decided to face this challenge, and we are trying our best to build up our defence potential by executing defence programmes. It was also a tribute to our policy of non-alignment that at the time of crisis our friends, the Western countries, specially the U.S.A. and the U.K., came to our help, and that might be one of the reasons which prevented China from committing further aggression and which made her declare an unilateral cease-fire. The question arises: What shall we do now? Our friend Jairamdasji was quite right when he said that India was a peace-loving country. India has accepted the policy of peace not for itself alone but for the rest of the world. But now, confronted as we are with China, how shall we proceed and what shall we do although we are for peace and have been peace-loving all along? We have now to face the military strength of a great country like China with its inscrutable mind. We have to think again and we have to see how India as a nation can face

this challenge. It is very necessary to face it, and in spite of our acceptance of a peaceful way of life we shall have to change over, and it will be necessary for us to make all preparations for the defence of our country and to face aggressive China. For that purpose we will have to accept aid from friendly countries. We are grateful to those countries which have given us aid at the time of our crisis but, as was said by our Prime Minister, defence is the responsibility of the country and the nation; we cannot afford to depend upon friendly countries for all time to come. If necessary, we may have to prune some of our schemes. If necessary, we may have to postpone our development programmes but defence has to be accelerated and in a modern way, and therefore it is expected that in the new Budget we shall have to increase our defence programmes. In the last Budget it was only Rs. 300 crores and by Supplementary Demands it was increased to something like Rs. 700 crores but, faced as we are, it is very necessary that we shall have to spend a very huge sum for our defence preparations and for our defence programmes.

—

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You have to conclude, Mr. Shah.

—

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Yes, Sir. The nation has stood as one man and China has realised that India as a nation has sterling qualities to face such a situation and it has also realised that it is not easy to make India crumble down or make India seek its favour. Under these circumstances it is very necessary that defence preparations have to be augmented, augmented very seriously and at any cost we should see that India defends its honour and integrity and it continues to retain its status in the comity of nations.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب): وائس چورمین صاحب مجھے اکثر علی خاں صاحب کی تجویز سے بہت حد تک نہیں بلکہ پورا اذق ہے - مجھے بہارگو صاحب نے جو دائیں بائیں تلوار چلاتے ہوئے پلذت جی کی مہما بیان کی اس سے بھی سو فیصدی اذق ہے۔۔۔

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Twelve minutes, Shri Ghani.

شری عبدالغنی: صبح سے ہم سن رہے ہیں ان کی طرف سے - ہمیں بھی تھوڑا موقع دیا جائے -

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Please proceed; do not waste time.

شری عبدالغنی: میں ریٹیشن نہیں کروں گا - لیکن میں اسہد کرتا ہوں کہ مجھے بھی پورا موقع دیا جائیگا -

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Please go on. We have to cover two more speakers.

شری عبدالغنی: ان کو صبح سے ہی سن رہا ہوں ایوزیشن پارٹی کو...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Yes, go on.

شری عبدالغنی: لیکن ایک بات بہارگو صاحب کے ذہن میں رہنی چاہئے کہ دیکتی کتلا ہی ہوا ہو

جماعت اس سے بڑی ہوتی ہے اور جماعت کتنی ہی بڑی ہو دیش اس سے بڑا ہے - اگر ہمارے محبوب نیتا کوئی غلطی کرتے ہیں تو وہ زیادہ مذمت کے مستحق ہیں کیونکہ ان کو ۳۰ یا ۳۲ کروڑ بلدگان خدا کا بہار حاصل ہے - کیا پلذت جوامرلال نہروہ ان کی سرکار یا ان کی سرکاری پارٹی یہ جواب دے سکتی ہے کہ جو پاپ انہوں نے مارچ ۱۹۳۷ میں کیا تھا بھارت کے دو ٹکڑے کرنے کا - انہوں نے جو ریزولیشن اپنی ورکلنگ کمیٹی میں پاس کیا تھا - جس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا تھا کہ ہزاروں بلدگان خدا - مہری بھلیں اور مہری بیٹھیاں ہمارے بھائی اور باپ - شہید ہوئے بے گناہ - بغیر کسی وجہ کے - اس تقسیم کے تجربہ کے بعد جو تلخ تجربہ ہمیں ہوا اس کے بعد ہم کیوں یہ ایک نئی تقسیم کا تجربہ وائس چورمین صاحب کرنے جا رہے ہیں - میں نے دیکھا دنیا کے سامنے کئی بار کئی ملک کے پراپلس آئے - کوریا کا آیا - سمجھداروں نے جو دنیا کے اکوا کہلاتے ہیں انہوں نے اس کی تقسیم کر دی - تو کیا وہ مسئلہ حل ہو گیا - جرمنی کا آیا اور جرمنی کے دو ٹکڑے کر دیے - ایک برلن وال بن گئی تو کیا اس کا 3 P.M. مسئلہ حل ہو گیا - ہلد چوں میں تقسیم ہوئی تو کیا لس کی حالت ہے - آپ مجھے معاف کریں اگر میں یہ بات

کہوں کہ یہ کون ہیں جو یہ کہیں
 کہ کشمیر کا جو مسئلہ کشمیر کی
 سالمیت کا جو مسئلہ ہے اس کا حل
 کشمیر کی تقسیم ہے بجائے اس کے کہ
 اس کا راشٹریتی جی کے ایڈریس میں
 ذکر ہونا ہے - بجائے اس کے کہ ہم
 پلڈت جواہرلال جی کے زبان مبارک
 سے اس کو سنتے ہیں - آج ہم سردار
 سورن سنگھ کے بارے میں سنتے ہیں
 کہ جو ہمارا گھبراہٹا ہوا ہے جسے
 پاکستان آزاد کشمیر کا علاقہ کہتا ہے
 جو انہوں نے زبردستی خلاف قانون
 خلاف انسانیت اپنے قبضہ میں کیا
 ہوا ہے اس کی واپسی کی بات چیت
 اس کی بحث کو وہی چلا رہے ہیں -
 جس تکرار کے لئے ان پلڈر سولہ
 برسوں میں نہ کوئی قدم اٹھایا گیا ہے
 نہ اٹھانے جا رہے ہیں - میرے کانوں
 میں یہاں یہ آواز پڑی کہ سیز فائر
 لائن مان لو اور راجوری، پونچھ،
 ادوی وغیرہ کو دیکر کڑی فیصلہ کر لو -
 یہ کون فیصلہ کرنے والے ہیں - بھارت
 کی زمین کو دینے والے کون ہیں؟
 کتنا ہی بڑا کوئی پارٹی میں ہو
 محکمہ وطن ہندوستانی کا دھرم ہے
 کہ وہ تقسیم کشمیر کی خلاف پروتست
 کرے - جو لوگ کشمیر کو تقسیم کرنے
 کی بات سوچتے ہیں وہی کہتے ہیں
 کہ کشمیر سیکولرزم کی ایک ضمانت
 ہے - یہ ایک معافظ ہے پانچ کروڑ
 مسلمانوں کی حفاظت کے لئے - یہ

ضروری ہے کہ کشمیر بھارت کے ساتھ
 رہے - بھارت کے رہنے والے کشمیری
 لوگ بھی بھارت کے ساتھ رہنا چاہتے
 تھے اسی لئے انہوں نے بھارت کے ساتھ
 ملنے کے لئے شیخ عبداللہ کی رہنمائی
 میں جد و جہد کی تھی اور اپنا وہ
 جتنا حصہ بچا سکتے تھے انہوں نے
 بچایا تھا - اور اگر آج کوئی نئی وجہ
 ہو کہ جس سے اس کی تقسیم کا
 خیال کسی کے دماغ میں آتا ہے تو
 وائس چیمبرمین صاحب میں آپ کے
 ذریعہ ان کے کانوں تک پہنچانا چاہتا
 ہوں کہ انہیں خون کے آنسو بہانے
 ہونگے اور اسکے آنسو بہانے والے کام ان
 کو کبھی معاف نہیں کریں گے - آج
 وطن کی عزت کا سوال ہے - آج جھٹکا
 اس بات کا ہے کہ چائڈا نے جو ہماری
 توہین کی ہے ہمارے بھارت کا ایمان
 کیا اس کا کسی طرح بدلہ لیا جائے
 تو اس میں آپ کیا چاہتے ہیں کہ
 سب کی زبان پر تالے لگے ہوں -
 بھارت کو صاحب کی بات کو ماننے کے
 لئے میں تیار ہوں - لیکن وہ یہ
 بات سوچ لیں کہ سردار سورن سنگھ
 پاکستان اور ہندوستان کے پیار کا نام
 لیکر کشمیر کی سالمیت کو نہیں
 بدل سکتے - یہ عجیب بات ہے
 وائس چیمبرمین صاحب کہ جب
 کشمیر کشمیریوں کا ہے اور انہوں نے
 اعلان کر رکھا ہے کہ ہم بھارت کے ساتھ
 ہیں تو وہ چائڈا جا رہے ہیں

[شہری عبدالغنی]

کشمیر کے ہزاروں میل حصہ دیلمے کے لئے - صلح صفائی کرنے کے لئے - اور ادھر بھارگو صاحب اور سرکار اور ان کی محبوب پڑتی یہ کہتی ہے کہ لدانج میں تو پہاڑیاں ہیں وہاں گھاس ہوتی ہے وہاں تو کچھ ہوتا ہی نہیں ہے - ان کا کیا ہے - میں یقین دلاتا ہوں کہ اگر بھارت کی زمین کا ایک ایک انچ ان کو پیارا نہیں ہے جو کہتے تھے کہ اس کا ہر ذرا ہمارے لئے دیوتا ہے اور جس کو میں بھی مانتا ہوں - چاہے وہ نہ مانیں بھارت میں جو یہ بلندگوں خدا بستے ہیں وہ سب کے سب ایک ایک کر کے آواز اٹھائیں گے اور پلٹتے جی اور ان کے ساتھیوں کو مسجدوں کرینگے کہ وہ بھارت کی ایک ایک انچ زمین کو واپس لینے کے لئے جد و جہد کریں - مگر میں یہ بھی کہتا ہوں کہ یہاں ہارس میں میں جانتا ہوں اپنے حقیقت کو کہ میں کچھ نہیں ہوں - لیکن یہ میرے ساتھی ہے - میں ان کا ساتھی تھا اور ہم نے ملکر ملک کی آزادی کے لئے جد و جہد کی تھی - اگر آج طاقت نے کھلتے میں آکر کیونکہ ان کے ہاتھ میں طاقت ہے ایمرجلیسی کا نام لیکر یہ ہی کشمیر کی تقسیم کی چرچا کرینگے تو ملک ان کو تھوڑا آوت کر دیکھا - ان کی حکومت نہیں دھینگی - اپنے اندر ابھیمان پیدا کر دے طاقت پیدا کر دے -

آپ پالیسیسٹ اس لئے نہیں چاہتے کہ کیونکہ اگر وہ ہوا تو اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوگا کہ یہاں مسلمانوں پر تباہی آتی ہے - میں خود کہتا ہوں کہ پالیسیسٹ نہ ہو - میرا کوئی تذکرہ نہیں تھا - لیکن اگر پالیسیسٹ نہیں ہو تو تمہیں یہ کیا ہو گیا ہے - یہ کس واسطے کس بات پر بات چیت چل رہی ہے - کشمیر کی وادی کو پاکستان کے دیلمے کے لئے - جبکہ آپ سیکولرازم کے حامی ہیں - اس طرح سے پورے کے پورے مسلمانی علاقہ کو دیکر آپ سیکولرازم کی بنیاد کو ہٹا دیں گے - آپ یہ فرقہ پرستی کی بات سوچ رہے ہیں - آپ ایک اکثریت کو اقلیت میں بدلنے کی کوشش کر رہے ہیں - یہی ہندوستان کے اندر جہاں مسلمان اکثریت میں ہیں بھی وہاں ان کو اقلیت میں بدلنا چاہتے ہیں اور بڑی میٹھی زبان سے بڑے پیار سے اوریاں دیکر ملانا چاہتے ہیں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ملک والوں سے یہ بڑی بے انصافی ہے - اس لئے میں نے چاہا تھا کہ میرے املدس اُنہیں اور منظور ہوں - بدقسمتی سے میں نہیں تھا - لیکن میں نے آپ سے کہا کہ دیکھ میں اس کا تذکرہ کہوں ہے -

اب وائس چیرمین صاحب - دوسری بات جو میں عرض کرنا چاہتا

ہوں وہ ہے چائڈا کا وہ غلط قدم اس
کی زیادتی جس سے ہمیں ایک بڑا
سبق ملا - کیا اس سے ہماری آنکھیں
کھلی ہیں اور کیا ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ
چائڈا کے ساتھ ہمارا کوئی مناسب
فیصلہ ہو - اس سے پیشتر کہ میں
اس طرف آؤں مسٹر وائس چیرمین
صاحب میں امریکہ، برطانیہ اور روس
تینوں سے اپیل کرتا ہوں کہ کشمیر کے
معاملہ میں اگر ہمارے محبوب نیت
سرکار کے محبوب کے ناتے 'وناہی کالیہ
وپریت بدھی' اگر ہماری سرکار کی
ہو بھی جائے تو بھی وہ کشمیر کی
سالہیت کو نشہ نہ ہونے دیں کیونکہ
اس کا بہت برا ری ایکشن ہوگا -
امریکہ میں بیٹھے ہوئے جو ہمارے
ہمدرد ہیں ان سے اپیل کرتا ہوں
کہ وہ ہندوستان سے کشمیر کو کسی
طرح بھی الگ کرنے کی کوشش نہ
کریں - اور سرکار سے درخواست کرتا
ہوں کہ یہ تریڈ کمشنر کیسا - جموں
اور کشمیر بھارت کا انگ ہے - بڑے
زور سے بھارت کو صاحب نے کہا کہ انگ
ہے اور انگ ہی رہیگا - جو اگلے چڑ
رہا ہے لیکن دھ کا انگ ہی - اور
کشمیر اس کو مان لیتے جو ان کے
خیال میں کشمیر رہیگا - تریڈ تریڈ
کمشنر کیسا یہ امتیاز کیسا کہ کشمیر
پر فلاں بل لاگو ہوگا فلاں نہیں لاگو ہوگا -
جس کی ہمت ہو وہ اس بات کو
صاف کرے کہ کشمیر کی نہ تقسیم

ہوئی نہ کشمیر کی ایک انچ زمین
کسی غیر کے قبضہ میں رہے گی
جائیدگی -

وائس چیرمین صاحب - میں
عرض کروں کہ کولمبو پروپوزل جن کا بڑا
ہی تذکرہ یہاں چلا - میں ایمانداری سے
یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ اور پلڈت جی کی
وہ بات کہ ۷ ستمبر والی بات مان لی
جائے دونوں میں زمین آسمان کا فرق
ہے - پلڈت جی نے جو بات کہی تھی
اس کا مطلب نہ صرف میں نے بلکہ
ساری دنیا نے یہ لیا تھا کہ ۸ ستمبر
تک بالاشکر ہمارا اپنا انتظام ہوگا -
ہماری اپنی فوجیں ہوں گی - ہمارے
اپنے قلعے ہونگے - ہماری اپنی چوکیاں
ہونگی - یہ قطعی نہیں تھا کہ
جیسا کہ پروپوزل میں تھا کہ بھائی
ملیٹری تو چھن کی ہٹ جائے گی
لیکن وہاں جو تھوڑا سا ابھی انتظام
رہے گا وہ دونوں ملکوں کا مل جل کر
انتظام ہوگا - میں ایسا نہیں مانتا
ہوں - اس کے بجائے اگر ان میں یہ
ہمت ہے یہ اخلاقی جرات ہے تو یہ
کہیں وہ آج کے حالات کا تقاضہ یہ ہے کہ
اس وقت کولمبو پروپوزل زیادہ سے زیادہ
مناسب ہیں - ان کو ہم قبول کر
سکتے ہیں - قبول کرنا چاہئے -
اس پر تو میں دھیان دے سکتا
ہوں - لیکن یہ بات کرنا کہ پروپوزل
اس سے بہتر ہے یہ بالکل ظاہر ہے -
آپ سمجھتے ہیں کہ جیسے یہاں

[شری عبدالغنی]

سب بالکل ان پڑے لوگ بیٹھے ہیں جن کی عقل پر تالے لگے پڑے ہیں اور جو ہم کہیں گے قبول کر لیں گے۔ ایسی بات نہیں ہے۔ تو ہمیں کس طرح سے چلنا ہے۔ اگر مان لیجئے جیسا کہ بھارگو صاحب نے کہا ہے کہ یہ کوئی بچوں کا کھیل نہیں ہے جا کر حملہ کر دینا۔ حملہ نہ کیجئے۔ لیکن اس بات کو نہ بھلائیے کہ چین جس علاقہ کو اداسائی چھو کر رہا ہے جو کہ عربی کا ایک لفظ ہے جس کے معنی ہوتے ہیں کہ چین کی سرحد۔ اگر فرض کیجئے وہ چین نہ تو پھر اس کو سرحد کہنے کی کیا ضرورت تھی اس کو بھی چین نے ایذا علاقہ کر دیا ہے۔ تو اگر آپ گولمبو پورپوزل پر جا رہے ہیں تو یہ بھی یاد رکھئے کہ آپ گولمبو پورپوزل کے پورے میں یا کسی کے دباؤ میں آ کر اس زمین کو چھوڑنا چاہیں جو چاہے نیفا کی طرف ہو چاہے لدانج کی طرف ہو ایک انچ بھی جو ہماری زمین ہے وہ ہمارے بھارت کا انگ ہے اور بالکل اسی طرح سے ہے جیسے وائس چیرمین صاحب جسم میں ایک انگلی ہوتی ہے اس میں اگر درد ہوتا ہے تو سارے جسم کو تکلیف ہوتی ہے۔ ہم اپنے انگ کو کاٹ کر کسی اور کو دے نہیں سکتے۔ کیا ایسا کر کے سمجھوتہ ہو سکتا ہے۔ اسی طرح سے ہم ایک ہو کر کے رہیں جس طرح سے ہزارہا برس سے رہ رہے تھے۔

یہ ناممکن ہے کہ آپ یہاں آ کر بے طاقت کے کھنڈ میں یہ بات کہیں کہ کوئی اگر تیار ہے تو وہی ہے جو ہمارا محبوب نہتا کرے۔ اگر محبوب نہتا نے کرنا ہے تو کس کے سہارے کرنا ہے۔ سارے دیس کے سہارے۔ اور اگر سارے دیس سے آپ سہیوگ لینا چاہتے ہیں تو یہ ضروری ہے کہ وہ سہیوگ تب ہی آپ کو مل سکتا ہے جبکہ آپ کے سامنے صحیح ہوں۔ اگر آپ کے سامنے صحیح نہیں ہیں تو آپ اپنی طاقت کا استعمال کیجئے جبکہ آپ طاقت چلا سکتے ہیں۔ ایمرجنسی میں ہم نے اس دیس کو سنبھالنا ہے۔ اس لئے آپ کو بہت اچھی طرح سے اپنی طاقت کا استعمال کرنا ہوگا۔ میں بڑے ادب کے ساتھ تین سچھار دیتا ہوں۔ پہلا سچھا یہ ہے اور جسکی بڑی آویںکتا ہے کہ سرکار کی جو طاقت ہے وہ پبلک سروس کو کرپٹ کرنے میں صرف ہو رہی ہے۔ آپ کہتے ہیں کہ ایسا نہیں ہے۔ آپ یہی کہیں گے۔ آپ یہی کہیں گے کہ عبدالغنی پاگل ہے یا پاگل ہو گیا ہے۔ میں آپ سے درخواست کرتا ہوں اور عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ابھی حال میں انکلیڈ کے ایک وزیر نے ایک ایسے نوجوان کو اپنی کار چلانے کو دیدی جس کا لائسنس پہلے سے ضبط ہو چکا تھا۔ جب اس وزیر کو نوجوان کے بارے میں اپنی غلطی محسوس ہوئی کہ

میں نے ایک غیر قانونی کام کر دیا ہے جس کو کہ مجھے نہیں کرنا چاہئے تھا۔ اس پر انہوں نے اپنے پرائم منسٹر شری میک میلن کو ایک پتھر اپنے ریفرنڈیشن کا لکھ دیا کہ مجھے ہے ایک بڑی بھاری بھول ہو گئی ہے اور برطانیہ کے عظیم نام پر ایک دھبہ آیا ہے۔ شری میک میلن نے کہا کہ بہتر یہی ہوگا کہ آپ اپنی جگہ سے چلے جائیں اور انہوں نے ان کا استعفیٰ منظور کر لیا۔ اس طرح سے انہوں نے اپنے ملک کا ایک نمونہ پیش کیا۔ لیکن یہاں ہم یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ وائس چورمیں صاحب اس سنٹرل گورنمنٹ کے منسٹروں کے بیٹے استیٹ کے چیف منسٹروں کے بیٹے اس سے کروڑوں روپیہ بنا رہے ہیں۔ اس بات کا پتہ سب لوگوں کو ہے۔ پارلیمنٹری بورڈ کو بھی ہے۔ وہ کنسٹرکٹو ریسپانسبلٹی چیف منسٹر پر ڈالتے ہیں تو کیا اس کی وجہ سے ان لوگوں کو اپنی جگہ سے ریٹائر نہیں کرنا چاہئے۔ آج ہمارے دیس کی یہ حالت ہے۔ اور اس طرح کا نقشہ ہے۔ اس لئے میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر دیس کو سنبھالنا ہے تو اس طرح کی باتوں کو بند کرنا ہوگا اور انکیلیڈ کی پیروی کرنی ہوگی۔ آپ جانتے ہیں کہ اس وقت ہر اسٹیٹ میں پولیس ڈیپارٹمنٹ ہے۔ سیمو پولیس رکشا دل میں ہوم گارڈ ہیں۔ میرا اس

کے متعلق یہ عرض کرنا ہے کہ آپ ان سب کو ملٹری کے طور پر آرگنائز کریں اور ان سب کی طاقت سنٹرل گورنمنٹ اپنے ہاتھ میں لے۔ آپ کو اس طرح کی پولیس اور رکشا دل اور ہوم گارڈ کو اسٹیٹ منسٹر اور قیدی منسٹروں کے ہاتھ میں نہیں دینا چاہئے۔ اور اس کو سنٹرل گورنمنٹ کے ہاتھ میں لایا جانا چاہئے۔ تاکہ وہ مصیبت کے وقت اس کا اچھی طرح استعمال کر سکے۔

اسکے ساتھ مجھے یہ بھی کہنا ہے کہ انصاف کے لئے آپ جوتھری کو ایگزیکٹو سے الگ کریں۔ تاکہ لوگوں کو انصاف مل سکے۔ ہم یہ ماننے ہیں کہ ایمرجنسی میں سنٹرل گورنمنٹ کی بڑی طاقت ہے۔ لیکن ہم یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹ اس ایمرجنسی میں اپنی طاقت کا ناجائز استعمال کر رہی ہے۔ سرکار طاقت کے نشہ میں ڈانٹیں ہاتھوں تلوار سے قبل کر رہی ہے۔ میں نے یہ سمجھا تھا کہ اس بارے میں سرکار کچھ کہے گی اور طاقت کے نشہ میں اس طرح کی بات نہیں کرے گی۔ سرکار کو یہ بات سمجھانی چاہئے کہ وہ ایوزیشن کے لوگوں کو ساتھ لیکر ایمرجنسی کو کامیاب بنا سکتی ہے۔ مگر وہ ایسا نہیں کر رہی ہے۔ اگر سرکار نہیں اور لداخ کے بارے میں ایوزیشن والوں کے رائے کا

[شہری عبد الغنی]

خیال کرپکی اور ایسا کوئی کام نہیں
 کرپکی کہ جس سے دیہے نے پور
 تکرے ہوں تو ملک میں ہتھی
 ایوزیشن پارتیاں ہیں وہ سب ان کا
 ساتھ دیں گی - مگر سرکار ایسا کام
 کر رہی ہے جیسا اس نے بھارت
 تقسیم کے وقت کیا تھا - اس نے اس
 سمے گاندھی جی تک کو بھی نہیں
 پوچھا - ان کو کانفیڈینس میں نہیں
 لیا تھا اور آج بھی وہ پور کشمیر کے
 بارے میں اپنی بات کرنے کی
 کوشش کر رہے ہیں - اور ملک کی
 جلتا کو کانفیڈینس میں لے کر
 تیار نہیں ہیں - تو اس کا جواب
 تو ایک ہی ہوگا کہ اس
 کے خلاف بغاوت ہوگی - اور اس
 بغاوت میں جو لوگ مارے جائیں
 گے اس میں عبدالغنی کی بھی جان
 جائے گی - ہمارا ملک بہت بڑا ہے -
 اور اسکے پچھلے ایک ہسٹری ہے -
 جس میں مہارانا پرتاپ ہیں، جہاں
 بہکول رام ہیں، جہاں بہکوان کرشن ہیں -
 جہاں گروگوبند سنگھ ہیں جہاں مہاتما
 گاندھی جی ہیں - مجھے اس بات کا
 خیال ہے کہ ونوبا جی اپنی ساری
 سرگرمیاں کشمیر کی سلامتی کے لئے
 وقف کر دیں گے - امریکہ اور دوسرے
 ملک جو اثر ڈال رہے ہیں اس کو
 روکنے کے لئے اگر لگاتے تو بہت ہی
 اچھا ہوتا - اگر ایسا کریں گے تو میں

[श्री अम्बुल शंती (पंजाब) : वाइस चैरमैन साहब ! मुझे अकबर अली खान साहब की तजवीज़ से बहुत हद तक नहीं बल्कि पूरा इतफाक है। मुझे भा.ग. साहब ने जो दायें बायें तलवार चलाते हुए पंडित जी की महिमा बयान की उस से भी सी फी पदो इतफाक है . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Twelve minutes, Shri Ghani.

श्री अम्बुलक्ष्मी : सुबह से हम सुन रहे हैं
उनकी तरफ से। हमें भी थोड़ा मौका दिया
जाय।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Please proceed; do not waste time.

श्री अम्बुल गनी : मैं रिपिटिशन नहीं
 कहूँगा, लेकिन मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मुझे
 भी पूरा मौका दिया जायेगा ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Please go on. We have to cover two more speakers.

श्री अब्दुल गनी: इनका मुकदमा से ही मुन रहा हूं अपनी इन पार्टी को...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Yes, go on.

श्री अब्दुल गनी: लेकिन एक बात मार्ग साहब के जहन में रहनी चाहिए कि व्यक्ति कितना ही बड़ा हो जमाया उनसे बड़ी होता है और जमाया कितनी ही बड़ी हो देश उनसे बड़ा है। अगर हमारे महबूब नेता कोई चलती करते हैं तो वह ज्यादा मजहूमत के मुश्किल हैं क्योंकि उनको चालीस या चालीस करोड़ बन्दगाने खुदा का प्यार हासिल है। क्या पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू उनकी सरकार या उनकी सरकारी पार्टी यह जवाब दे सकती है कि जो पाप उन्होंने मार्च मई १९४७ में किया था भारत के टुकड़े करने का—उन्होंने जो रेजोल्यूशन अपनी वर्किंग कमेटी में पाम किया था—जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ था कि हजारों बन्दगाने खुदा—मेरी बहने और मेरी बेटियां, हमारे भाई और बाप—शहीद हुए वेगुनाह बगैर किसी बजह के। इस तकसीम के तर्जुमें के बाद जो तनख़ा तर्जुमा हमें हुआ उनके बाद हम क्यों फिर यह एक नई तकसीम का तर्जुमा, वाइस चायरमैन साहब, करने जा रहे हैं। मैंने दुनिया के सामने कई बार कई मुल्क के प्राबलम आये। कोरिया का आया। समझदारों ने जो दुनिया के अगुवा कहलाते हैं उन्होंने उसकी तकसीम करी तो क्या वह ममला हल हो गया। जर्मनी में सवाल आया और जर्मनी के दो टुकड़े कर दिये गये। एक बर्लिन बाल बन गई तो क्या उसका ममला हल हो गया। हिन्द-चीन में तकसीम हुई तो आज क्या उसकी हालत है। आप मुझे माफ करें अगर मैं यह बात कहूँ कि यह कौन है जो यह कहें कि कश्मीर

का जो ममला है, कश्मीर की सालिमयत का जो ममला है इसका हल कश्मीर की तकसीम है, बजाये इसके कि इसका राष्ट्रपति जी के ऐड्रेस में जिक्र होता है। बजाये इसके कि हम पंडित जवाहरलाल जी की जुवान मुबारक से सुनते कि कश्मीर तकसीम नहीं होगा। आज हम सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह के बारे में सुनते कि जो हमारा दबाया हुआ टुकड़ा वहां पड़ा हुआ है जिसे पाकिस्तान आजाद कश्मीर का इलाका कहता है जो उन्होंने जबरदस्ती खिलाफ कानून, खिलाफ इन्मानियन अपने कब्जे में किया हुआ है उसकी वापसी की बातचीत उसकी बहस की वह चला रहे हैं। जिस टुकड़े के लिए इन पन्द्रह सोलह वर्षों में न कोई कदम उठाया गया है न अब उठने जा रहे हैं। मेरे कानों में था यह आवाज पड़ी कि सीज-फायर सहा मान लो और राजोरी पृथ, उड़ी वगैरह को देकर कोई फैसला कर लो। यह कौन फैसला करने वाला है। यह भारत की कश्मीर को देने वाले कौन हैं? कितना ही बड़ा कोई पार्टी में हो, हर महबुलबान हिन्दुस्तानी का धर्म है कि वह तकसीम कश्मीर के खिलाफ प्रोटेस्ट करे। जो लोग कश्मीर को तकसीम करने की बात सोचते हैं वही कहते हैं कि कश्मीर सेक्युलरिज्म को एक जमानत है। यह एक मुहाफिज है ५ करोड़ मुसलमानों की हिफाजत के लिए। यह जरूरी है कि कश्मीर भारत के साथ रहे। भारत के रहने वाले कश्मीरी लोग भी भारत के साथ रहना चाहते थे इसलिये उन्होंने भारत के साथ मिलने के लिये शेख अब्दुल्ला की रहनुमाई में जहोजहेद की थी। अपना वह जितना हिस्सा बचा सकते थे उन्होंने बचाया था। और अगर आज कोई नई वजह हो कि जिस से उसकी तकसीम का खयाल किसी के दिमाग में आता है तो वाइस चायरमैन साहब, मैं आपके जगिये उनके कानों तक पहुंचाना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें खून के आपू बहाने होंगे और उन के आसू बहाने वाले काम उनको कभी माफ नहीं करेंगे। आज वतन की इज्जत का सवाल है आज झगडा इस बात का है कि चाइना ने जो हमारा तोहीन

3. P.M.

[श्री मन्दुल गनी]

की है, हमारे भारत का अपमान किया है उसका किस तरह बदला लिया जाये। तो स में आप क्या चाहते हैं कि सब की जुबान पर ताले लगे हों। भागव साहब की बात को मानने के लिए मैं तैयार हूँ। लेकिन वह यह बात सोच लें कि यह सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के प्यार का नाम लेकर काश्मीर की सल्मियत को नहीं बदल सकते। यह अजीब बात है, वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, कि जब काश्मीर कश्मीरियों का है और उन्होंने एलान कर रखा है कि हम भारत के साथ हैं तो उधर पाकिस्तानी वज्जिर चाइना जा रहे हैं और काश्मीर का हजारों मील हिस्सा देने के लिए। सुल्ह-सफाई करने के लिये। और घर भागव साहब और सरकार और उनकी महबूब पार्टी यह कहती है कि लद्दाख में तो पहाड़ियां हैं वहां घास होती है वहां तो कुछ होता ही नहीं है। उनका क्या है। मैं यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि अगर भारत की जमीन का एक एक इंच उनको प्यारा नहीं है जो कहते हैं कि इसका हर रंग हमारे लिए देवता है और जिसको मैं भी मानता हूँ चाहे वह न माने। भारत में जो यह बन्दशाने-खुदा बसते हैं वह सब के सब एक एक कर के आवाज उठायेगे और डिट जो और उनके साथियों को मजबूर करेंगे कि भारत की एक-एक इंच जमीन को वापस लेने के लिये जद्दो जहद करें। मगर मैं यह भी कहता हूँ कि यहां हाउस में मैं जानता हूँ अपनी हकीकत को कि मैं कुछ नहीं हूँ। लेकिन यह मेरे साथी थे। मैं उनका साथी था और हमने मिलकर मुल्क की आजादी के लिये जद्दोजहद की थी। अगर आज ताकत के घमंड में आकर, क्योंकि उनके हाथ में ताकत है, एमरजेंसी का नाम लेकर ये ही काश्मीर की तकसीम की चर्चा करेंगे तो मुल्क उनको धो आऊट कर देगा। उनकी हुकूमत नहीं रहेगी। अपने अन्दर इमान पैदा करो ताकत पैदा करो। आप प्लेबेसाइट इसलिये नहीं चाहते कि क्योंकि

अगर वह हुआ तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि यहां मुसलमानों पर तबाही आती है। मैं खुद कहता हूँ कि प्लेबेसाइट न हो। मेरा कोई तजकरा नहीं था, लेकिन अगर प्लेबेसाइट नहीं हो तो तुम्हें फिर क्या हो गया है? यह किस वास्ते, किस बात पर बातचीत चल रही है। काश्मीर की वादी को पाकिस्तान को देने के लिये। जबकि आप सेक्यूलरिज्म के हामी हैं। इस तरह से पूरे के पूरे मुसलमानी इलाके को देकर आप सेक्यूलरिज्म की बुनियाद को हटा देंगे। आप यह फिरका-परस्ती की बात सोच रहे हैं। आप एक अक्सरियत को अक्लियत में बदलने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। यानी हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जहां मुसलमान अक्सरियत में हैं वहां उनको अक्लियत में बदलना चाहते हैं और बड़ी मीठी जबान से, बड़े प्यार से लोरियां देकर मुलाना चाहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह काश्मीर वालों से बड़ी बेइन्साफी है। इसलिये मैंने चाहा था कि मेरे अमेंडेमेंट्स आयें और मंजूर हों। बदकिस्मती से मैं नहीं था लेकिन मैंने आपसे कहा कि देश में इसका तजकरा क्यों नहीं है।

अब वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, दूसरी बात जो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह है चाइना का वह गलत कदम, उसकी ज्यादाती जिससे हमें एक बड़ा सबक मिला। क्या इससे हमारी आंखें खुली हैं और क्या हम चाहते हैं कि चाइना के साथ हमारा कोई मुनासिब फैसला हो? इससे पेशतर कि मैं इस तरफ आऊँ, मिस्टर वाइस चैयरमैन साहब मैं अमरीका, बर्तानिया और रूस तीनों से अपील करता हूँ कि काश्मीर के मामले में अगर हमारे महबूब नेता, सरकार के महबूब नेता 'बिनाशकाले विपरीत बुद्धि' का शिकार हों, अगर हमारी सरकार की बुद्धि नष्ट हो जाय तो भी वह काश्मीर की सल्मियत को नष्ट न होने दें, क्योंकि उसका बहुत बुरा रिएक्शन होगा। अमरीका में बैठे हुये जो हमारे हमदर्द हैं उनसे अपील करता हूँ कि वे हिन्दुस्तान से काश्मीर

को किसी तरह भी अलग करने की कोशिश न करें। और सरकार से दरखास्त करता हूँ कि यह ट्रेड कमिश्नर कैसा ? जम्मू और कश्मीर भारत का अंग है। बड़े जोर से भार्गव साहब ने कहा कि अंग है और अंग ही रहेगा। जो कटने जा रहा है लेकिन रहेगा अंग ही। और कश्मीर उसको मान लेंगे जो उनके ख्याल में कश्मीर रहेगा। तो यह ट्रेड कमिश्नर कैसा ? यह इम्तिയാज कैसा ? कि कश्मीर पर फलां बिल लागू होगा फलां नहीं लागू होगा। जिसकी हिम्मत हो और वह इस बात को साफ करे कि कश्मीर की न तकसीम होगी और न कश्मीर की एक इंच ज़मीन किसी ग़ैर के कब्जे में रहने दी जायेगी।

वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, मैं अज़ब करूँ कि कोलम्बो प्रोपोज़ल्स जिनका बड़ा ही तज़करा यहां चला। मैं ईमानदारी से यह समझता हूँ कि वह और पंडित जी की वह बात कि आठ सितम्बर वाली बात मान ली जाय दोनों में ज़मीन आसमान का फर्क है। पंडित जी ने जो बात कही थी उसका मतलब न सिर्फ मैंने बल्कि सारी दुनिया ने यह लिया था कि ८ सितम्बर तक बिलशकूक हमारा अपना इन्तज़ाम होगा हमारी अपनी फौजें होंगी, हमारे अपने किले होंगे, हमारी अपनी चौकियां होंगी। यह कतई नहीं था कि जैसा कि प्रोपोजल में था कि भाई मिलिटरी तो चीन की हट जायेगी लेकिन वहां जो थोड़ा सा अभी इन्तज़ाम रहेगा वह दोनों मुल्कों का मिल-जुल कर इन्तज़ाम होगा। मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता हूँ। इसके बजाय अगर उनमें यह हिम्मत है यह इखलाकी ज़ुरत है तो यह कहें कि आज के हालात का तकाजा यह है कि इस वक्त कोलम्बो प्रोपोज़ल ज़्यादा से ज़्यादा मुनासिब हैं। उनको हम कबूल कर सकते हैं। कबूल करना चाहिये। इस पर तो मैं ध्यान दे सकता हूँ लेकिन यह बात करना कि प्रोपोजल इससे बेहतर हैं, यह बिलकुल जाहिर है। आप समझते हैं कि जैसे यहां सब बिलकुल

अनपढ़ लोग बैठे हैं जिनकी अकल पर ताले लगे पड़े हैं और जो हम कहेंगे कबूल कर लेंगे। ऐसी बात नहीं है। तो हमें किस तरह से चलना है। अगर मान लीजिये जैसा कि भार्गव साहब ने कहा है कि यह कोई बच्चों का खेल नहीं है, जाकर हमला कर देना। हमला न कीजिए। लेकिन इस बात को न भुलाइये कि चीन जिस इलाके को अक्सर चीन कहता है जो कि अरबी का एक लपज है जिसके माइने होते हैं कि चीन की सरहद। अगर फर्ज कीजिये कि वह चीन था तो फिर उसको सरहद कहने की क्या ज़रूरत थी ? उसमें सड़कें बना कर उसको भी चीन ने अपना इलाका कर दिया है। तो अगर आप कोलम्बो प्रोपोज़ल्स पर जा रहे हैं तो यह भी याद रखिये कि आप कोलम्बो प्रोपोज़ल्स के पर्दे में या किसी के दबाव में आकर इस ज़मीन को छोड़ना चाहें, जो चाहे नेफा की तरफ हो चाहे लद्दाख की तरफ हो, एक इंच भी जो हमारी ज़मीन है वह हमारे भारत का अंग है और बिलकुल इसी तरह से जैसे चैयरमैन साहब, जिसमें एक उंगली होती है उसमें अगर दर्द होता है तो सारे जिस्म को तकलीफ होती है। हम अपने अंग को काट कर किसी और को दे नहीं सकते। क्या ऐसा करके समझौता हो सकता है। इसी तरह से हम एक होकर के रहें जिस तरह से हजारहा वर्ष से रह रहे थे। यह नामुमकिन है कि आप यहां आकर के, ताकत के घमंड में यह बात कहें कि कोई अगर तैयारी है तो वही है जो हमारा महबूब नेता करे। अगर महबूब नेता ने करना है तो किसके सहारे करना है। सारे देश के सहारे और अगर सारे देश से आप सहयोग लेना चाहते हैं तो यह ज़रूरी है कि वह सहयोग तब ही आपको मिल सकता है जब कि आपके साधन सही हों। अगर आपके साधन सही नहीं हैं तो आप अपनी ताकत का इस्तेमाल कीजिये, जितनी आप ताकत चला सकते हैं। एमरजेंसी में हमने इस देश को संभालना है। इसलिये आपको बहुत अच्छी तरह से अपनी ताकत का इस्तेमाल करना

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

होगा। मैं बड़े अदब के साथ तीन सुझाव वेता हूँ। पहला सुझाव यह है और जिसकी बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि सरकार की जो ताकत है वह पब्लिक लाइफ और सर्विसेज को करण्ट करने में सफ़र हो रही है। आप कहते हैं कि ऐसा नहीं है। आप यही कहेंगे। आप यही कहेंगे कि अब्दुल गनी पागल है या पागल हो गया है। मैं आप से दरखास्त करता हूँ और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी हाल में इंग्लैंड के एक वजीर ने एक ऐसे नौजवान को अपनी फार चलाने को दे दी जिसका लाइसेंस पहले से जप्त हो चुका था। जब उस वजीर को नौजवान के बारे में अपनी गलती महसूस हुई कि मैंने एक गैर कानूनी काम कर दिया है जिसको कि मुझे नहीं करना चाहिये था। इस पर उन्होंने अपने प्राइम-मिनिस्टर श्री मैकमिलन को एक पत्र अपने रेजिनेशन का लिख दिया कि मुझसे एक बड़ी भारी भूल हो गई है और बर्तानिया के अजीम नाम पर एक धब्बा आया है। श्री मैकमिलन ने कहा कि बेहतर यही होगा कि आप अपनी जगह से चले जायें और उन्होंने उनका इस्तीफा मंजूर कर लिया। इसी तरह से उन्होंने अपने मुल्क का एक नमूना पेश किया, लेकिन यहां हम यह देखते हैं कि वाइस चैंसरमैन साहब इस सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के मिनिस्ट्रों के बेटे स्टेट के चीफ मिनिस्ट्रों के बेटे सरकारी असर से करोड़ों रुपया बना रहे हैं। इस बात का पता सब लोगों को है। पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड को भी है। वह कन्स्ट्रक्टिव रिसर्पोसिबिलिटी चीफ मिनिस्टर पर डालते हैं तो फिर क्या इसकी वजह से उन लोगों को अपनी जगह से रिजाइन नहीं करना चाहिये? आज हमारे देश की यह हालत है। और इसी तरह का नक्शा है। इसलिये मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर बेश को संभालना है तो इस तरह की बातों को बन्द करना होगा और इंग्लैंड की पैरवी करनी होगी आप जानते हैं कि इस वक्त हर स्टेट में पुलिस डिपार्टमेंट है।

सभी पुलिस रक्षा दल हैं। होम गार्ड हैं। मुझे इसके मुतल्लिक यह अर्ज करना है कि आप इन सबको मिलिट्री के तौर पर आर्गनाइज करें और उन सबकी ताकत सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपने हाथ में ले। आपको इसी तरह की पुलिस और रक्षा-दल और होम गार्ड को स्टेट मिनिस्टर और डिप्टी मिनिस्ट्रों के हाथ में नहीं देनी चाहिये। और उसको सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में लाया जाना चाहिये ताकि वह मुसीबत के वक्त इसका अच्छी तरह इस्तेमाल कर सके।

इसके साथ मुझे यह भी कहना है कि इन्साफ के लिये आप जूडिशियरी को एक्जेक्टिव से अलग करें। ताकि लोगों को इन्साफ मिल सके। हम यह मानते हैं कि इमरजेंसी में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की बड़ी ताकत है कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट इस इमरजेंसी में अपनी ताकत का नाजायज इस्तेमाल कर रही है। सरकार ताकत के नशे में दार्य-बायें तलवार से कतल कर रही है। मैंने यह समझा था कि इस बारे में सरकार कुछ कहेगी और ताकत के नशे में इस तरह की बात नहीं करेगी। सरकार को यह बात समझनी चाहिये कि अपोजीशन के लोगों को साथ लेकर इमरजेंसी को कामयाब बना सकती है। मगर वह ऐसा नहीं कर रही है। अगर सरकार नेफा और लद्दाख के बारे में अपोजीशन वालों की राय का खयाल करेगी और ऐसा कोई काम नहीं करेगी जिससे देश के फिर टुकड़े हों तो मुल्क में जितनी अपोजीशन पार्टियां हैं वह सब उनका साथ देंगी। मगर सरकार ऐसा काम कर रही है जैसा उसने भारत तकसीम के वक्त किया था। उसने उस समय गांधी जी तक को भी नहीं पूछा। उनको कान्फीडेंस में नहीं लिया था और आज भी वह फिर काश्मीर के बारे में वही बात करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। और मुल्क की जनता को कान्फीडेंस में लेने को बीबार नहीं है तो इसका जबाब तो एक ही

होगा कि इसके खिलाफ बगावत होगी और इस बगावत में जो लोग मारे जायेंगे उसमें अब्दुल गनी की भी जान जायेगी। हमारा मुल्क बहुत बड़ा है। और उसके पीछे एक हिस्ट्री है। जिसमें महाराणा प्रताप है जहां भगवान राम हैं। जहां भगवान कृष्ण हैं। जहां गुरु गोविन्द सिंह हैं, जहां महात्मा गांधी जी हैं। मुझे इस बात का ख्याल है कि विनोबा जी अपनी सारी सरगमियां काश्मीर की सलामती के लिये बर्क कर देंगे। अमरीका और दूसरे मुल्क जो असर डाल रहे हैं उसको रोकने के लिये जोर लगायें तो बहुत ही अच्छा होगा। अगर ऐसा करें तो मैं समझता हूं कि उनकी जय जयकार होगी। जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि पंडित जी हमारे हृदय के सम्राट हैं ऐसे हैं वैसे हैं। आज अगर रिफ्लेड हुआ तो उनको पता चल जायेगा कि दुनिया कहां है। वह मौका आ रहा है। इलेक्शन आ रहे हैं। तब मालूम होगा कि वह सम्राट बन सकते हैं कि नहीं। सम्राट बनने के लिये आप अपने ईमान को मजबूत करें और कहें कि हम काश्मीर के टुकड़े नहीं होने देंगे और न हम चीन को कोई इलाका देने को तैयार हैं। अगर आपका ईमान इतना मजबूत है तो हम आपका साथ देने के लिये तैयार हैं। जय हिन्द।]

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I associate myself with the Motion moved by Shri Akbar Ali Khan conveying our gratefulness to the President for his Address to the Joint Session of the Parliament on the 18th of this month. Our President is an embodiment of Indian wisdom and intelligence and he, in a very precise and concise manner, laid down the policy of the Government of India in his Address. During the discussions on his Address, the use of emergency powers has been criticised. One of the Members of the Communist Party said that the emergency had been utilised for furthering the ends of the

Congress Party. He said that under the Defence of India Rules only the Communists were arrested. One of the Members of the Socialist Party said that one Member of Parliament of his Party was arrested when he was addressing a meeting convened for the purpose of furthering defence measures and only when he criticised the Congress he was arrested but I doubt very much whether this information is correct because I have my personal experience that in the name of attending meetings convened for the purpose of defence measures, I found some Members saying: "After all what is this? Whether China comes or we are under the Congress Government, it is all the same. You tillers will have to till the land." That was one kind of speech. Another kind of speech made by some anti-social elements was like this that it is easier to fight the Chinese, it is more difficult to fight the Government servants who are all corrupt and the businessmen all of whom are blackmarketeers. If such speeches are delivered in meetings convened for the purpose of defence efforts, particularly in areas like Assam, which are in the forefront of the Chinese aggression, was it or was it not a speech which was prejudicial to the defence of the country? If in such circumstances, some people were arrested, it cannot be said that the Defence of India Act was utilised only for furthering the purpose of the Congress Party.

I can also inform the House that not only the Communists and men of the Socialist Party were arrested but the Congressmen were also not spared. Congressmen suspected of anti-social activities were also arrested under the D.I.R., kept in custody and bail refused. There was no undue influence whatsoever to see that such people were released. Therefore it was not justified at all for hon. Members to suggest that the D.I.R. were utilised only for the benefit of the Congress Party.

[Shri Baharul Islam].

Then there was criticism of the foreign policy. It was stated by Shri Vajpayee that our foreign policy was absolutely wrong. He illustrated it by saying that if our foreign policy was right, why was India invaded by China as if from the fact that India was invaded by China, the inference could be drawn that our foreign policy was wrong. I may ask the hon. Member that Pakistan has not been invaded by China or any other country. Can he say that the foreign policy of Pakistan is correct and therefore Pakistan has not been invaded? Therefore, that inference cannot be drawn. I may also ask another question of my friend, Why was Mahatma Gandhi assassinated by a man of his own country, for the freedom of which he sacrificed his whole life? Was it because the policy of Mahatma Gandhi was wrong? Therefore from the fact that a country has been invaded by another country because its foreign policy was wrong or a man was assassinated because his policy was wrong is not correct. Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated because his policy differed from the policy of the assassin and the latter could not tolerate it. Similarly, China has invaded India not because the foreign policy of India was wrong but because China could not tolerate India with a different ideology to rise so high in international reputation. The Opposition justified their criticism of India's foreign policy from the fact that India was invaded by China. On the other hand, it can be said that because the foreign policy of India was right, therefore, during the days of its difficulty India has been able to get friendly help from different countries of both the blocs as also from non-aligned countries. Furthermore, in this time of conflict China has lost so many friends; it has got more of enemies than friends; rather it has got no friends whatsoever. Therefore, Sir, the hon. Member was not justified in saying that the foreign policy of India was wrong. I will submit that the foreign policy of India was quite justified. Actually, if India had not stood for a non-aligned policy,

that is, a policy of not joining the either bloc, there would have been a third world war by now and to that end India has been able to contribute a good deal for the maintenance of world peace.

After all, Sir, what is the purpose of a foreign policy? The purpose of a foreign policy is to keep the country in such a way that it is at peace with other countries. And such a thing is not possible unless and until there is international peace. Therefore, if by its foreign policy, India has been able to contribute as much to international peace as possible, we must say that the foreign policy of India has been successful.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

In paragraph 15 of his Address our President was pleased to observe:

"In view of the great burdens cast on us by the Chinese aggression and the steps taken to meet it, the question arose as to how far our Third Five Year Plan could be carried through without considerable change. On full consideration of the matter, our Government came to the conclusion that a very great part of the Plan was essential for strengthening the nation and its implementation was, therefore, necessary even from the point of view of defence. Economic development and industrial growth are the very basis of our defence preparedness. To stop or slow down this process of economic development would result in weakening the country. It has therefore been decided to continue implementing the Third Five Year Plan with such minor modifications as may be necessitated by the circumstances, and by reorienting our industrial pattern so as to give priority to defence needs. . . ."

It is very necessary and I fully agree with the President. Because there is now the Chinese aggression on India, it is very essential for India to build up our industrial pattern so that this Chinese aggression could be met.

Sir, so far as the eastern region of India namely, NEFA, Assam, Nagaland, Manipur and Tripura, is concerned, this entire area is very backward. Assam and NEFA are at the very forefront of the Chinese attack. I would request the Government of India through you Sir, to improve the communication system of this area. Unless and until this area is fully developed—its communications particularly are improved, there is more power, the supply position is bettered—it will not be possible to free the country from the dangers of the Chinese threat. I therefore, appeal to the Government of India through you, Sir, not only not to prune the Third Plan allocations so far as the eastern region of India is concerned, but to increase them.

Let me say a few words with regard to Hindi. Sir, the other day an unhappy incident took place, when the President was presenting his Address, over the use of Hindi. Nobody will deny that Hindi should be the national language of India. The use of Hindi as the national language is a question of prestige. But the question is whether the time is opportune for India to introduce Hindi as its national language. We have built up a culture on the English language for a very long time. If all of a sudden we do away with this language and introduce Hindi, a vast majority of the population of India will become practically illiterate, the eastern region of India and the Southern India particularly. Therefore, Sir, it will be nice on the part of the Hindi-speaking majority people to wait for some time and allow the eastern and the southern regions to develop a lot. Then and then only should Hindi be introduced as the national language of India.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): It is the official language.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: Whether it is the national language or the official language, it will be resented if Hindi is introduced now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, not resented.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Hindi is not the national language but the official language.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: I am speaking about Hindi being introduced as the official language. If Hindi is introduced as the official language to day, difficulty will be experienced by the southern and eastern regions because that language will have to be used in inter-State communications, in the communications between States and the Union or as the language of High Courts.

So far as the question of medium of instruction in universities is concerned, there is a section of people who say that regional languages should be the medium of instruction, not Hindi. But I will respectfully submit that English, until it is replaced by Hindi, should be the medium of instruction in universities because that will contribute a lot to the integration of the country.

At the end, Sir, I beg your leave to record a sense of appreciation for the yeoman's services rendered by the students in Assam, particularly the students of Tezpur, Mangaldoi, Gauhati, Nowgong and Dibrugarh. You will be pleased to know that during the actual attack by the Chinese, when a large number of evacuees came down to the Assam Valley, these students worked for these evacuees round the clock. They not only drew water for them, not only cooked for them, but even carried their luggages and washed the clothes and even the bodies of the children. Therefore, with your permission, Sir, I record a sense of appreciation for these young men and women.

With these words I conclude my speech. Jai Hind.

श्री दयाल दास कुर्रे (मध्य प्रदेश) :
सभापति महोदय, यूं तो पालियामेंट में यह परम्परा है कि वित्तीय वर्ष प्रारम्भ होने के पहले बजट जब कि प्रस्तुत होता है, तो राष्ट्र-

[श्री दयाल दास कुर्रे]

पति जी का अभिभाषण बराबर होता है। परन्तु इस वर्ष १८ फरवरी को राष्ट्रपति जी ने पार्लियामेंट के दोनों सदनों के सामने जो अपना अभिभाषण दिया है, उसका एक अलग ही स्थान है, उसका एक विशेष महत्व है और वह महत्व में इस दृष्टि से देखता हूँ कि भारत में जो आपत्ति के बादल छाये हुये थे, वे बादल कुछ भारतीय जनों के सहयोग से और कुछ ईश्वरीय कृपा से आज जब प्रच्छन्न हो गये हैं तो ऐसी स्थिति में हम देखते हैं कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण एक अजीब और एक आश्चर्यजनक रूप को ले करके आता है। हमने यह देखा कि हमारी योजनायें थी और उन योजनाओं का सफलीभूत होना भी हमारे सामने एक महत्वपूर्ण स्थान रखता था। जब हमारे देश पर यह विपत्ति के बादल आये तो उस समय हमें इस बात की गंका थी कि ऐसा हो सकता है कि हमारी योजनाओं के ऊपर एक बहुत बड़ा आघात पहुँचे। लेकिन हमने देखा कि हमारी योजनाओं में कोई कमी नहीं आई। हमने खेती में, औद्योगीकरण में और खास कर के शिक्षा में काफी प्रगति की है और उसमें किसी प्रकार की रुकावट नहीं आई है। इसलिये आज सदन के सामने हमारे बयोवृद्ध मित्र श्री अब्दुल अली खान ने इस भाषण की स्वीकृति के लिये जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया है उसका हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ और मैं इस भाषण का भी हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ। हम देखते हैं कि जब हम स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद अपने देश को आगे बढ़ाने में लगे हुये थे, हम देश की गरीबी को दूर करने में लगे हुये थे, हम शिक्षा को बढ़ाने में लगे हुये थे, हम औद्योगीकरण को बढ़ाने में लगे हुये थे—हमारी योजनायें बनी, प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना बनी और उसमें हम सफल हुये और दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना बनी और उसमें हम सफल हुये और इन योजनाओं पर अमल होने से हमारी काफी प्रगति हुई, और आज तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना चल रही

है और उसका द्वितीय वर्ष, उसके दो पद, हम पार कर चुके हैं—जब हम सफलता की ओर जा रहे थे, ऐसे समय में हमारे पड़ोसी ने—जो कल हमारा मित्र था और आज हमारे शत्रु के रूप में है—हम पर २० अक्टूबर १९६२ को, नेफा और सहाय पर, एक जबरदस्त हमला किया। यह हमारे लिये बड़े दुख की बात है और हमारे लिये ही नहीं सारे विश्व के लिये एक बड़े दुख की बात रही है। ऐसे समय में हमने अपना धैर्य नहीं छोड़ा, और हमने उसका सामना करने के लिये अपनी जनता में एक अपूर्व उत्साह देखा। हमारे प्रजातांत्रिक देश में जनता ने एक बहुत बड़ा अनोखा उत्साह दिखाया और हमने अपने अद्वेय पूज्य बयोवृद्ध नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के नेतृत्व में आगे बढ़ने और इस विपत्ति काल के बादल को भी हटाने में अपनी वैदेशिक नीति से पंडित नेहरू के नेतृत्व में अपनी वैदेशिक नीति से—बड़ी सफलता प्राप्त की।

चीन ने हमारी उन्नति को देख कर के—जैसा कि भगवत् साहब ने कहा—ईर्ष्या की भावना से हमारे ऊपर चढ़ाई की। मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि चूँकि चीन की आबादी ६०, ६५ करोड़ से भी अधिक है और वह अपनी गरीबी को भगाने नहीं सका है इसलिये जनता का ध्यान वहाँ से हटाने के लिये और वार की तरफ लगाने के लिये यह युक्ति निकाली जिससे कि वहाँ जो आंदोलन होने वाला था उसमें रुकावट पड़े और उस दृष्टिकोण से उसने हम पर चढ़ाई की। हम कोएंगिसट्रेस के ऊपर विश्वास करते हैं, पंचशील के सिद्धांतों को मानते हैं और हम किसी दूसरे देश के ऊपर आक्रमण करना नहीं चाहते जब कि चीन इन सिद्धांतों के बिल्कुल विरुद्ध है। उसने हम पर जो आक्रमण किया उसके सम्बंध में संसार के जितने देश हैं उनमें से ६० देशों ने उस आक्रमण को रोकने की दिशा में हमें अपनी सहमति दी और इतना ही नहीं बल्कि अमेरिका और रूस आदि देशों ने हमें आर्थिक सहायता और वार मेंटीरियल्स की

सहायता दी। जिन देशों ने हमें रास्ते पर लाने के लिये और चीन का मुकाबिला करने के लिये सहायता दी है वे आज धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं और आज हम उनकी प्रशंसा किये बिना नहीं रह सकते।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण के कड़िका नं० ४ अं० १६ में इस बात का जिक्र किया है कि हमने कृषि की दिशा में काफी प्रगति की है। इस संबंध में हमारे मित्रों ने—खासकर श्री चौरडिया जो ने—प्रकाश डाला है और कहा है कि खेती में हमारी किसी प्रकार की तरक्की नहीं हुई है और राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में जो कुछ कहा है उसमें वे बहुत सी बातों में कमी पाते हैं—में उनके इस कथन से सहमत नहीं हूँ और मैं उनके इस कथन का विरोध करता हूँ। मैं देखता हूँ कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद कृषि के संबंध में हमने काफी प्रगति की है। हमने नये नये औजार और अच्छे अच्छे बीज किसानों को दिये हैं और नये साधन अपनाये हैं तथा लोगों को खेती की ओर उत्साहित किया है। हमने सिंचाई के साधन बढ़ाये हैं और उसके फलस्वरूप खेती की दिशा में हम आज काफी प्रगति पर हैं। उनका यह जो कथन है कि खेती में कोई तरक्की नहीं हुई है उसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में, कड़िका ४ में, बताया है :

“खेती-बाड़ी हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था का सब से अहम पहलू है।”

और उसके बाद उन्होंने कहा है :

“खेती में अधिक पैदावार के कार्यक्रम से पिछले वर्ष की अपेक्षा इस वर्ष चावल की प्रति एकड़ पैदावार में पन्द्रह से इक्कीस प्रतिशत ... की वृद्धि हुई है।”

हम देखते हैं कि भारतवर्ष के अधिकांश भाग में चावल खाने वाले लोग अधिक हैं और इसलिये चावल की पैदावार बढ़ाना अत्यंत आवश्यक

है। चावल की पैदावार के जो क्षेत्र हैं उनमें मध्य प्रदेश का एक मुख्य स्थान है। देश में जो चावल की मांग है उसकी ५० प्रतिशत से अधिक मध्य प्रदेश पूर्ति करता है। अब आप देखें कि मध्य प्रदेश में जहां चावल की पैदावार अधिक है वह मध्य प्रदेश का छत्तीसगढ़ का क्षेत्र है लेकिन छत्तीसगढ़ में हम देखते हैं कि सिंचाई के साधन वही हैं जो कि पूर्व समय में थे। यदि हम सिंचाई के साधन के अभाव को दूर कर सकें तो इसमें कोई अशुक्ति नहीं है कि भारतवर्ष में चावल की जितनी मांग है वह हम मध्य प्रदेश के छत्तीसगढ़ के भाग से पूरा कर सकेंगे। हमने यह देखा कि गत वर्ष जब कि देश को चावल की जरूरत थी तो मध्य प्रदेश के उस भाग ने ५ लाख टन चावल दिया और विशेष कर के छत्तीसगढ़ क्षेत्र के बिलासपुर जिले ने इस चावल की मांग को पूरा किया। किन्तु, आज वहां पर सिंचाई के साधनों की विशेष आवश्यकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने सदन के सामने अपना विचार एक और समय पहले प्रकट किया था। हमारे छत्तीसगढ़ की ओर खास कर के हमारे जिले की दो प्रमुख योजनायें हैं, एक तो आगर-हफ-योजना है जो कि ढाई करोड़ की है और दूसरी भैंसाताल की योजना है जो कि अरपा नदी पर है और जो कि लगभग दो करोड़ की है। यदि किसी तरह से ये दोनों योजनायें हम अपने हाथ में ले लें तो मैं कह सकता हूँ कि इनके पूरा होने के बाद चावल के उत्पादन को हम बहुत अधिक बढ़ा सकेंगे और देश की इस मांग को हम पूरा कर सकेंगे। इन योजनाओं पर अधिक खर्च की आवश्यकता भी नहीं है। मध्यम दर्जे की योजनायें हैं और लगभग ४ या ५ करोड़ रुपये लगा कर हम इनको सफल बना सकते हैं। तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि जो समय की आवश्यकता है उसे हम मध्य प्रदेश के निवासी पूरा करने में अधिक आगे आ सकते हैं और चावल की इस बड़ी मांग को पूरा कर सकते हैं यदि यह कार्य पूरा हो जाये।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण के कड़िका नं० १८ में एक और विषय की

[श्री दयाल दास कुर्रे]

और सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है और उस में उन्होंने बताया है कि ऐसे विपत्ति के समय में हमें आवश्यकता से अधिक खर्च नहीं करना चाहिये । उन्होंने यह कहा है :

“खर्च में कमी करना, चीजों को ज़ायाने होने देना, अपने सीमित साधनों को बचाए रखना और संभाल कर उनका इस्तेमाल करना — हमेशा ही ज़रूरी होता है, लेकिन आज इसकी खास अहमियत है ।”

समय की मांग को देखते हुए यह बहुत ही आवश्यक है । तो इस संबंध में मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि मध्य प्रदेश में चार बड़े बड़े राज्य विद्योत हुए—जैसे कि महाकोशल का भाग, विध्य प्रदेश, और मध्य भारत का भाग और भोपाल राज्य—और इन राज्यों में जो छोटे छोटे जिले थे वे आज भी उसी तरह से हैं और उनकी संख्या ४३ से भी अधिक है । उन जिलों को देखें तो कई जिले ऐसे हैं जिन में २२ या २५ लाख की आबादी है लेकिन बहुतों में ४ या ५ लाख की आबादी है । अब शासन की दृष्टि से एक एक कलेक्टर हर जिले में रखना पड़ता है । तो मैं हाउस से निवेदन करूंगा कि इस आपत्ति के समय में जब कि अपनी आवश्यकता को देखते हुए हमें खर्च में कटौती करनी है और किफायत से चलना है तब हमें उन जिलों की सीमाओं को भी बदलना पड़ेगा । मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि जिलों की संख्या कुछ सीमित की जाय और उनकी सीमायें बराबर की जाय जिससे कि हमें कुछ कम कलेक्टर रखने पड़ें और हमें शासन पर जो अधिक खर्च करना पड़ता है उसको हम कुछ कम कर सकें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मैं हाउस के सामने अपनी यह प्रसन्नता व्यक्त करता हूँ कि मध्य प्रदेश राज्य ने पंजाब के जो सैनिक हमारी सीमा की रक्षा के लिये गये हुए हैं, जो अपनी

जान को हथेली पर रखकर देश की रक्षा कार्य में जुटे हुए हैं, ऐसे सैनिकों के बाल बच्चों की, उनके परिवारों की सुरक्षा के लिये एक लाख एकड़ भूमि दान में देने के लिये प्रतिज्ञा की है जिससे उनका पोषण हो सके और आज उस विषय में सरवे भी हो रहा है और हम चाहते हैं कि पंजाब के वे सैनिक जो वहां बसना चाहते हैं जितनी जल्दी हो सकेगा हम उनके परिवारों को बसा सकें । हमारी प्रान्तीय सरकार इस दिशा में प्रयत्नशील है ।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि मध्य प्रदेश का एक तिहाई भाग आदिवासी और हरिजनों से भरा पड़ा है । आपको यह विदित ही है कि मध्य प्रदेश का भाग अधिकांश जंगलों से भरा पड़ा है । दंड-कारण्य की स्कीम मध्य प्रदेश के एक बहुत बड़े भाग में चल रही है । वहां के निवासियों की हालत हम देखें तो उन आदिवासी और हरिजनों के पास जमीन नहीं है । हरिजनों की दशा को बताऊँ कि लगभग १० प्रतिशत लोग ही ऐसे होंगे जिन के पास जमीन है, बाकी लोगों को अन्य मजदूरी और रोजगार में अल्प-वेतन में काम करना पड़ता है । आज जब हम अपने देश में कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ाने जा रहे हैं ऐसी स्थिति में हमारे इन आदिवासियों और हरिजनों के पास जमीन का होना बड़ा आवश्यक है । वे मेहनती हैं, वे चाहते हैं कि आगे आएँ, उन्हें जमीन मिले और वे जमीन की उर्वरा शक्ति बढ़ा सकें । आज सरकार इस दिशा में प्रयत्नशील है । मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि सरकार के पास जो परती जमीन है, वेस्ट लैन्ड है वह उनको दी जानी चाहिये । दूसरा उपाय यह है कि लैन्ड की सीलिंग स्थिर की जाय ताकि जिसके पास अतिरिक्त जमीन है उसको निकाल कर हम उन लोगों के उपयोग के वास्ते दे सकें । पर मुझे इस विषय में कुछ अफसोस होता है कि सीलिंग के द्वारा भी बहुत कम जमीन

मिल रही है, हम इसके द्वारा भूमिहीनों को मदद नहीं दे पा रहे हैं। अगर इस दिशा में कुछ अधिक प्रगति दिखाई जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम अधिक जमीन उन गरीब लोगों को, उन ट्राइबल लोगों को जो जंगलों में मेहनत करके गुजर बसर करते हैं, दे सकेंगे।

आज भूदान और ग्राम दान के द्वारा हमें १९६० तक लगभग ४.४ मिलियन एकड़ जमीन मिली जिसमें से हम ८७ मिलियन वितरित कर चुके। ग्रामदान में ४,६४३ एकड़ मिला। मैंने देखा कि मध्य प्रदेश में सन् १९६० तक हम शिङ्गूल्ड कास्ट और शिङ्गूल्ड ट्राइब के लोगों को ३ लाख एकड़ जमीन का वितरण कर सके, जब कि वहाँ पर मैंने पाया कि शिङ्गूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों को लगभग १२ हजार और १५००० एकड़ वितरित कर सके। उनकी संख्या की देखते हुये मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ कि यह जमीन बहुत कम है।

अन में मैं राष्ट्रपति के इस अभिभाषण पर हार्दिक प्रसन्नता प्रगट करता हूँ। हम प्रगति की दिशा में बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और हमारी आपत्तियाँ और बाधाएँ विच्छिन्न होती जा रही हैं और हम सफलता की ओर आगे बढ़ने चले जा रहे हैं। राष्ट्रपति जी ने हमें एक प्रगति का रास्ता बताया है, उससे हमें आगे बढ़ने के लिये उत्साह मिलता है। हम अपने राष्ट्र के नायक पंडित नेहरू के नेतृत्व में हम प्रगति की दिशा में जा रहे हैं और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारा भविष्य उज्ज्वल रहेगा।

धन्यवाद।

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, the debate on the Address has, as is usual, covered a wide range of topics. It is a little difficult for me to deal

with every suggestion made or criticism put forward. I welcome many of these suggestions, more particularly those in regard to our development schemes and Plans. The President, in the Address he has been pleased to deliver, has laid stress on the problems facing us, the Chinese aggression and the invasion of India and our economic development. The two indeed are basically connected. There can be no military strength today in a nation without economic and industrial development. In the course of the speeches delivered, many points have been raised and a vast number of amendments have been moved to the Motion of Thanks. There are, I believe, 143 amendments. Of these, Sir, Shri Bhupesh Gupta is responsible for 68. In looking at these amendments and listening to some of the speeches made by some of the Members, I have been inclined to wonder how far there is a feeling of emergency among them. Much has been talked about emergency here and we have been sometimes informed that we are not keeping up the tempo of emergency. Yet, listening to the many speeches here, good no doubt as they were, apart from the few strong speeches and strong statements, the sense of urgency and emergency was strangely lacking. I do not deny that many of the points that were mentioned were not deserving of consideration but, surely, when one has to deal with a critical situation, one concentrates on the main points and not wanders about a forest of amendments or puts them forward. The fact remains that we are facing a critical situation and we have to concentrate on the vital matters. I shall, therefore, venture to say something about these important matters and perhaps also refer to some of the other matters, subsidiary matters, later on.

Now, very soon after the Chinese aggression on October 20, last year I said, in the course of a radio broadcast that we had been living in an unreal world from which we were waking up. This statement of mine

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

was interpreted in various ways. I had not only referred to myself living in an unreal world but rather that our outlook in this country as a whole was to some extent unrealistic and we were giving a great deal of our thinking to relatively secondary issues and not to the primary issues before the country. When we achieved independence after a long struggle, we had a feeling by and large of having reached a safe harbour and being safely anchored. Not that we did not have very big problems; we had enormous problems, we all knew that, economic and social, but on the whole our outlook was that we had done with national struggles in that sense or that any country was going or was likely to attack us. It is true that soon after we had troubles with Pakistan which rather shook us in that belief. Nevertheless, our trouble with Pakistan, difficult as it was, was very irritating to us, irritating not only because of the practical consequences of it but the fact that we had to indulge in war with Pakistan over Kashmir, etc., was annoying to us. It seemed to upset our thinking which we had followed for long years before, prior to independence and after but there it was and it shook us. Even so, it was not realised by most of us that in this world wars still play a very important part. I will not say that it was not realised because at the back of our mind it was always there and our very quest for peace means that we were afraid of war. Hence, we wanted peace. We thought then also of war and peace in world terms because the coming of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction had made war such a tremendously tragic and dangerous thing that it was no longer a question of ethics and morality but of practical good sense that the world should avoid this. If there was a war on a big scale, one of the results, major for us but minor from the point of view of the world, was that all our efforts at economic and social progress would be hit hard and the rest of the world would suffer also. I am putting this before the

House; this was the background which we had. We realised the importance of development in India, social and economic, and we realised that peace was essential for that development. There was an essential conflict between war and development, whether it was war in India or world war and we tried to concentrate on this peaceful progress, our Five Year Plans and the rest of it. But even from the point of view of preparing for war we realised that real strength came only from economic development, industrial development, and therefore that too led us to the conclusion that we must concentrate on this, on the economic side and the social side and we were convinced that we should aim at social justice, at a socialist structure of society and democratic methods. We hoped to adhere to peaceful methods too. Now, much has happened since then, but nothing that has happened, may I say, has shaken our belief in the fundamental principles for which we have laboured during these years since independence; those fundamental principles, in which the belief in peaceful methods being better than war, in not aligning ourselves to military blocs of nations and in our earnest desire to achieve a broad socialism, appears to me to be even more important in the crisis today than at any other previous time. But keeping these ideals in view a change has taken place by force of circumstances in our approach to our problems as well as to our view of other countries. That change, important as it is, does not involve a change in our basic approach to life's problems or to our country's problems, but it is important nevertheless.

One or more Members referred in their speeches here to a conference that was held some months back, eight or nine months ago, the anti-nuclear weapons conference. I believe he referred to it in a somewhat disdainful or contemptuous way. I believe still that the purpose of that conference was a right one, was an important one and still remains important but we must see every

purpose in the right context even if that conference contained some eminent people who were pleased to say that India should disarm herself in pursuance of the policy of ahimsa and non-violence, should disarm herself completely. The odd thing is that some of those eminent people today complain that we were not adequately armed and further talk about not only our defending ourselves but of liberating Tibet and the like. Now, there is an essential difference between those two points of view—it is obvious—in disarming ourselves and allowing only non-violent resistance to flourish even in case of possible invasion and the second view in which we have not only to arm ourselves to the teeth but to carry forward our armed warfare in order, as it is called, to liberate Tibet. It shows a lack of firm, reasonable, logical principle governing our thoughts when the same persons say one thing at one time and six months later say something entirely, hundred per cent opposed to it. I do not think that we, that is, the Government, and I think this House also, have been so illogical about these matters. We may be criticised, we may be accused of not laying stress on something, not arming the country adequately or more than it was. That may or may not be justified because none of these things can be taken in the air. It has to be seen in the context of things but we cannot be criticised at one time for not arming adequately and at the same time told that we should not have armed at all. The two are absolutely contradictory.

Now, Sir, in regard to non-violence—I do not know whether it is necessary for me to say so—I should like to make the situation quite clear. I am clear on my own part and clear even on the part, if I may say so, of the great organisation to which I belong, the National Congress, to which not only we on this side but many hon. Members on the other side have also belonged at some time or

another. We were greatly attracted to Mahatma Gandhi, greatly influenced by him, sometimes carried away by him, by the force of his personality and by the great teaching he put forward before us. We accepted wholly and fully his doctrine of peaceful methods in our struggle but at no time that I am aware of did we accept non-violence as a doctrine to govern a nation's activities completely, more especially when that nation was attacked and an invasion took place. In fact when an argument took place about this in the early years of the last great war we were presumptuous enough, if I may say so, not to agree with Gandhiji to the extent that he actually resigned from the Congress Working Committee or from the Congress at that time because he felt that he must. We were talking about non-violence after independence, not keeping armies, navies, etc. and we could not in good conscience accept something which we thought we would be unable to live up to. Not that I am speaking personally; not that I did not believe in non-violence. I do believe that non-violence is in theory, in principle, the right thing and an ideal thing provided—and it is a big proviso—the people generally can live up to it, are trained to it mentally, physically and in every sense, and can indeed face any danger unhesitatingly even unto death without submitting to evil or aggression or anything. There was that big proviso; it was a tremendous proviso for a whole nation to function like that. We all recognise the mighty change that Gandhiji brought about in the people of India and made even weak persons like many of us behave rather heroically on many occasions. It is one thing. That was a tremendous achievement. But to say that 400 million people of India can function in that way under great stress and trial is a very difficult matter and the alternative was this. If they do not live up as they should under a non-violent method, the alternative is a terrible alternative. They become

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

cowards and they run away from danger or they compromise with evil and all that. And Gandhiji had told us repeatedly that nothing is worse than cowardice. It is better to have violence than cowardice. He said it any number of times. Therefore, applying even his own ultimate test and looking at the context of things and the context of the people, not only in India but also in the world, we came to the conclusion then that it would be inevitable for us to have an Army, Navy and an Air Force, etc. even in an independent India. And if we are to have an Army and Navy, naturally we should have a competent Army and Navy. We do not have an Army with bows and arrows and such like weapons of an ancient age. That was our outlook. But it is true that that basic outlook in favour of peace and non-violence coloured our thinking to some extent. It coloured it even more so because we felt that real strength came from economic and industrial development, from our capacity to manufacture many things, more especially the weapons of war which we wanted. If we relied on importing them to a large extent, the result would be—it might perhaps have benefited us for the time being or saved us from some immediate trouble—it would leave us weak both economically and militarily all the time. That was the broad policy. So, while we wanted to develop militarily also, we wanted to develop, as far as possible, with our own efforts, by producing goods ourselves. That fitted in with our broad policy too and fitted in with our planned approach to economic problems.

Now, today more so even than in Mahatmaji's time, the question of war and violence on a major scale has become, what shall I say, wholly out of the range of reasonable men—unless when they are excited they can do anything, they can go mad—when war leads to no victory, no success. I am talking about this major war, nuclear war, etc., when it is likely to destroy a large part of

mankind. Well, then, war does not become a weapon to achieve something unless it is pure hatred and destruction that we wish to achieve. Therefore, from the most practical point of view, war and warlike methods have to be avoided, again I repeat, on a world scale, and we have to work, as we have worked, for peace in the world. That does not mean naturally that in an invasion, in an aggression we have to submit to it. Obviously we cannot, no self-respecting country can, and certainly it is an impossible thing for any decent country to do that. What I am venturing to submit is this. We talk about non-violence and, as I said, I accept the basic theory and principle of non-violence, as I may accept the basic theory and principle of truth. But the fact is that this world is not always truthful. The fact is that even though many of us may presume to be non-violent in deed, we are full of violence in our thoughts and I think the first thing that one should do in non-violence is to control, to prevent one's thoughts running away with hatred and all the progeny of hatred. That is the basic thing. It is better to hit the man with a sword than harbour always hatred against him. That is more non-violent, even though you may hit that man with a sword. However, these are rather metaphysical discussions and I am not going into them. What I was venturing to say is that because of this it may be said that we laid a little less stress on the military aspect of our situation than we might have done with hindsight, foresight, or call it what you like. Really the pressure upon us was always for economic development, which we considered important and vital and which could only be given up, and which had to be given up or partly curtailed, if we spent very much more on purely military items. It was always a difficult choice and repeatedly we had to spend large sums of money on aircraft and other things at the cost of important developments in India.

We had to balance these things. It may be perfectly right now, for hon. Members or for anyone else to point out this mistake or that mistake. But I can say that the criticism made—it is made often enough by people who ought to know better that our Army was badly equipped, badly armed, badly fed, badly clothed—is incorrect, is wrong. It is a slander on our Army to say all these things. If you want to say, it was badly armed, you may say so. It did not have as many automatic weapons as a modern army should have. That is correct. It had automatic weapons. It has had them for years. It was fully armed as our army has been armed all this time. It was fully equipped. It was said that they did not have boots. I really do not understand it. They were well shod, well clothed. But there are certain things. It could not be compared from that point of view, that is, arming from the point of view of modern armies. It was a little out of date. It is true. And the reason for this is—apart from the various reasons that I have pointed out—essentially the cost of it and always the question of spending such large sums of money when we could ill-afford them. We could not. We did not ask other countries to aid us in regard to arms, etc., as some other countries have done, notably our neighbouring country Pakistan. The aid they gave was applied to civil developments. So that all we had to spend on our Army, Navy and Air Force had to come out of our normal revenues and it was a painful thing to think that we allowed those things to suffer and thereby allowed ourselves to be ultimately weaker even in the military sense. Therefore, one had to think in terms of timing. Should we expect some kind of attack, a major attack, which involved fighting on us within one year, two years or ten years, whatever it may be? Always when one prepares for war or for anything, one has to take that into consideration, the timing of it, because timing means you get more time to prepare, to get it, or you do not get any time. Would

you like it at an enormous expense? And it may be said that we had timed it wrongly and that would be true. We did not think that a major invasion like this would take place so soon. What could we have done otherwise? What methods could we have adopted? Would hon. Members, any Member present here, have liked us to accept the Chinese methods of preparing our country? I imagine not. Certainly I would not like to do that because that would be a greater surrender to what we think wrong than anything else. That was the difficult choice that we always had. So, we decided, we hoped that such a challenge might not come to us within a few years and by that time we should push ahead in our economic development, even in our military development, by producing the goods required for the defence in India. That was our whole objective. We were not, I should like to add, at any time complacent about China. It seems to amuse some hon. Members to talk about “bhai bhai” and all that. Of course it is completely right saying “bhai bhai” with everybody in the world. Do we go about cursing them? Are we such ignorant and backward people as to be governed always by hatred of anybody? I justify that and I would say that again when the Chinese come. We want to make friends with every people in the world. Because a person denies us friendship or betrays us or attacks us and therefore our trying to make friends with him or acting correctly at a time is wrong? That is a philosophy I am unable to understand wholly. You need not go very far in your researches in history, but go back only ten, twenty, thirty or forty years in our lifetime. We have seen countries very friendly become bitter enemies, and we have seen bitter enemies become very friendly. Today see them, see Germany and France, countries with a thousand years of quarrels and bitterness and enmity, becoming close friends today. See Japan. Do you remember what was said about Japan at the time of the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

War? "Oh, Japan is a great country", and people are very friendly to it, those who attacked it. These things come and go, but it is always right, I submit, to try to gain the friendship of other countries regardless of their policies, whatever they may do. That is the right thing. It does not mean your changing your policy, it is always right, and that does not mean submitting to them, that does not mean surrendering to them in any way.

So, from the very first day that the Chinese came to Tibet twelve years ago or thirteen years ago or thereabouts the question came before us that this brought a new danger to our country, danger in the Tibetan frontier. Not that we expected them to attack us immediately or in the near future, but it was obvious that this brought a new danger and this tremendous frontier of 2,500 miles had become a live and dangerous frontier. We thought about it, what steps to take. Some hon. Members still go on harping on the old tune that we were wrong to recognise the Chinese suzerainty or sovereignty in Tibet. It passes my comprehension what they expect now, with hindsight, that we should have done at the time. I cannot understand it. It was a physical impossibility for us to do anything. Then some people tell us: "Oh, maybe, but morally we would have been superior if we had said, 'No, we do not recognise it'." The persons who talk so much about morality forget it completely, the course of discussion and other phases and all things. The nation does not act as perhaps an individual might. In regard to Tibet, we inherited something, inherited the Government of India from the British, we inherited our present frontiers, we inherited our relationships with other countries which it was open for us to change and we have changed them. We inherited the Tibetan position from the British Government, and our own examination of it told us that we could not challenge it in law, in constitutional law or anything, apart from

the practical difficulties of challenging it. We adhered to that position. But what else could we have done except in a helpless inane way to shout in anger and do nothing which is a bad thing for a nation to do? Can anyone imagine our having marched armies then, ten or twelve years ago, into Tibet? It is a fantastic proposition. We could not have done it and expressed ourselves in a way which would have led immediately to a conflict with China on our borders which we have to face today. I should leave it to hon. Members to think how far that could be considered in the slightest degree justifiable for us.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Are you prepared to say . . .

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not prepared to say anything to you. I am just pointing out that some hon. Members seem to live in a fool's paradise.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: As for the last fifteen years we have been . . .

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They do not seem to realise that any country, much less India, newly independent, faced with this problem of China at that stage or this stage would not have been able to face it immediately with success. It was tremendous. We have to face a country which we all know. Do not forget what has happened in China, what is China. That does not mean that we are not strong enough or may not be strong enough to deal with it adequately. But we must not imagine that the resolutions or strong speeches that we make are enough to win a military struggle of a major kind. We have seen China functioning in a war-like way in other countries too, very big countries, and functioning not without success. Whether it was right or wrong is another matter. What surprises me, Sir, is—I say so with all deference—the unreality in many of the speeches that are made here, the unreality in the sense of not realising the facts that we have to face, facts

in this world today. There are only two ways of thinking here by some hon. Members. One is that we should have devoted all our energies to strengthening ourselves in a military way presumably at the cost of all our development. The second is that, because perhaps we could not do that then or now, we should ask somebody else to do it on our behalf, enter into military alliances and the like. Now both these ways of thinking are wrong, practically wrong. I forget the ideologies behind it. The first one that we should devote all our energies towards that does not bring strength. I venture to say that it does not build strength whatever you would have done. You have to build up an industrial base in this country. The Chinese have built up an industrial base and largely succeeded. How have they succeeded? By authoritarian, autocratic methods, by enormous suffering in their country. Are hon. Members prepared for that? Obviously not because we do not like that method. We dislike it, and it is partly because we dislike it, apart from other reasons, that we react so strongly against the Chinese coming to India. About the other thing, about basing our defence on the strength of others, I venture to say that others can help. They are helping us, considerably, and we are grateful to them, and we hope to get more help from them in this business. But to expect that others will do this job—we can see other countries faced with this problem. The only time when others help, have helped really is where the country itself has borne the burden, and it has been helped by others. The moment you give up this idea of a country bearing the burden, the heat of the fray, etc.,—other help is good for the moment, maybe for an incident, not for a major war. When I said several months ago soon after the October invasion that we were in for years of trouble—five years I mentioned casually—always we have had this concept that we are in for a long struggle. Do you expect any country, however good it may be, to undertake, to underwrite five years' or ten years' struggle and

everything? The whole concept is not a practical one. To help is one thing, to underwrite, to undertake it on your behalf is another. No country is going to do it.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): What is NATO then?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: "What is NATO then?" the hon. Member asks. What is SEATO then? I should like to ask. What is CENTO then? They have all failed. NATO has not failed completely, I will admit; NATO has not. At a particular moment in the history of the world, after the war, a situation arose where a number of countries feared dangers, etc. and they joined in the NATO alliance. It is not for me to say whether it is right or wrong. But I do say that these two alliances, the SEATO and the CENTO, have failed, failed completely and miserably, and instead of strengthening the parties that held on to them, have weakened them or strengthened the opposition to them. But all these are the many factors, geographical factors. They were alliances, by and large, of countries geographically near each other and which affected, whatever might happen, the other countries. You cannot, and I say that apart from other things, it is a fundamentally wrong thing to do for us in India in the context in which we are. The moment we do it, we lose our own self-respect for ourselves. I certainly feel that way. It is quite another thing to take all the help we can, and we will. Unfortunately, what the hon. Member seems to think is quite possible is not thought to be so by the person whom he wants to help us. It is an extraordinary position. And I can only imagine that this can be due to the fact of having permanent cold feet and being frightened as to what might happen and that we cannot hold ourselves. I do not believe in the weakness of India, I do not believe in India submitting to evil whatever the forces against us. I am all very well, I believe. I do not wish to talk in a way which is removed from actuality.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Naturally, if we have to fight in a military sense, we have to have weapons, the latest weapons, we have to have arms, aircraft and all that. That is perfectly true. But all the aircraft in the world do not take the place of a stout people determined to resist. That is the essential thing and the moment you sell your right of defence to somebody else or give it to him, you lose that sense of stoutness, of standing on your own feet. That is the essential thing, and if you lose it, you lose everything. It does not matter what the other country might do or might not do. Therefore, we have to maintain that essential thing at all costs, and undertake great burdens for it and at the same time get as much help as we can, and we are getting it. As I ventured to point out, the other countries which help us realise this. They do not want to underwrite India in this way, they do not want to take the defence of India completely in their hands and it is not for us to merely look on. It is not a practical proposition. It is a definitely harmful proposition so far as we are concerned.

So, in effect, the question does not arise. It is not our decision. But it is nobody's case that it should be done. Except some hon. Members, ladies and gentlemen of the hon. Member's party, nobody suggested it. Nobody suggested it in the wide world. The other countries do not suggest it, do not want it, do not encourage us into thinking in that way. I really do not understand in what world some hon. Members live. That is why I say that we have not got rid of our lack of realism in considering the problems we are facing. What has happened in China, not now but during the last ten years, is one of the major happenings in the world—let us realise it—which is going to affect, is affecting and will affect, the whole world. Not only India but the world realises it. It is not merely because of the largeness of China. That is an important factor, its vast population. We have a vast population also. But rather it is due to the

narrow-minded bigotry of China, to the brand of Communism that they have developed. I say, it is the brand of Communism that they have developed to their old ideals of expansiveness, added to this narrow-minded bigotry, that has made them dangerous to India, to Asia and to the world. Their hostility was concentrated on America, the United States of America, to begin with. Now, it is concentrated on us. Of course, it is on America also, but chiefly on us. But observe it. That hostility is today directed quite adequately, why considerably, towards the Soviet Union. And you see how it is directed, in effect, towards everybody, to any country which is not prepared to fall in line with them and carry out their wishes. It is a menace not only to us but to many other countries of Asia, Africa and the world. And yet they pose, they take up the position in Africa especially, maybe in Asia too as liberators. And some people are sometimes taken in, not for long, I think. And because of that, it decries India; it dislikes the whole concept of non-alignment for which we have stood. It is very interesting to know that at the present moment those hon. Members who do not like our policy of non-alignment are supporting fully the theory and policy and actually the desire of the Chinese Government. It is extraordinary these extremes meeting in this way. China, as it is at present, is a manifest danger to peace and to the world at large. This fact is increasingly recognised even by these countries which, through fear or otherwise, dare not say so. Now, destiny has made India at the present moment the main target of Chinese attack. It is a challenge which we cannot ignore which we will not ignore. We have a duty to ourselves but we have a duty to the world even, to Asia and to the world, in this matter. But in trying to meet that challenge, if we give up the principles for which we have stood, that is a greater surrender to China than anything else we can do or we can suffer. When we are to meet China to defend the very principle for which we stand, if

we give up those principles in meeting the challenge, what do we defend? Just a physical patch of territory? That is important enough, no doubt. But a territory, a country, stands for some principles. If you are prepared to give up those principles, your precious little is left in theory to defend from China. Of course, you have given in to it. We have therefore to meet this challenge fully and adequately and at the same time adhere to those principles which have guided us, whether in our domestic policy or foreign policy. In our domestic policy these principles are to labour with all our strength to go towards the socialistic structure and thus to release the vast strength of the nation for productive effort. The very magnificent response of our people to this crisis has made it incumbent on us that we should play fair to them and we should try for social justice. Indeed, from the point of view of a military effort, that is essential. We cannot fight any country, fight a great war, with just some trained armies, without the people behind us. We want a nation, not an army alone, mentally at arms, mentally supporting us completely. I would beg of the House to forgive me for reminding it that the very first and the basic thing that we have to do is to have that mentality in the country to resist to the death, if necessary, and not to submit. If that is missing if we weaken that resolve, whatever we do, whatever armies we may get we are undermined. Now in our foreign policy we shall therefore adhere to friendship with all countries without alignment to any military bloc. Obviously no question of alignment or non-alignment arises when we had conflict with a particular country. There is no question of being aligned or non-aligned to China with whom we had conflict. We are talking about military blocs. We shall take every help from all countries that are willing to help us. In a basic struggle for life and freedom it would be absurd for us not to take that help, but in taking that help we must keep that very freedom, to preserve which we take that help, in-

tact, and our principles intact. Now, when this invasion took place on the 20th of October, immediately after we approached many countries for their sympathy and help, and as the House knows, a number of countries helped us immediately, and the quickest in doing so were the United States and the United Kingdom. They did so and they have done so subsequently without any hint even of strings attached to their help, or any other conditions. There is no question of our being inhibited from asking them for any help or their refusing it or hinting that they will refuse it. If they find some difficulty sometimes in giving that help, it is entirely for different reasons, their own, their own commitments, their own difficulties and all that, none of our creation. And as I have said, they themselves realise that it is advantageous not only to us but in a different way to them for us not to be aligned with them in that way, in a military alliance. They do not want it. We do not want it; neither do they. I am not going into the reason why they do not want it. Some hon. Members may think it is a natural thing but they do not want it because it is not to their interest. It is too much of a burden for them to carry; they do not want to. They would much rather help us without that commitment. Now what is the world today? Wherever we may say, we seldom manage to catch up to conditions as they are. We are backward of course in our scientific and technological progress, but such progress is the essence of the world today, because that gives the strength, not a gun that we may buy from France or Germany or some other place or some other country, lots of it. If we have to be, in a military sense, strong we have to be industrially developed; there is no other way and any other course would ultimately reduce us. In fact, if we are not militarily strong, there would be some justification even for the non-violent struggle, because that has some strength behind it, the strength of a people at least, not the second-rate arms produced by some other country.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

Now, during the last generation or more, enormous improvements have taken place in technology and science. They have changed the shape of the world. We have to do that ourselves, to change our shape. We are doing it. We have succeeded in a large measure in science. We are doing well, pretty well in technology and we will do better. It takes a little time. No country can skip over every stage of development and arrive at the goal but apart from that, for the last dozen years or so, there has been a cold war of which we have heard so much in Europe and the world. We have reacted against it. Now what is happening? The whole context of the cold war is changing today. It is still continuing, the cold war, I do not deny that, but even then these blocs of nations, the so-called Western Bloc and the Eastern Bloc have their internal troubles and difficulties. We all know very well of the conflict, the internal conflict between the Soviet Union and China, and I beg of the House to remember that this need not be considered a mere ideological argument, a *shastrarth* going on between two sets of *pandits* of communism. It is something deeper, much deeper than that. Fundamentally the differences between nations are seldom governed by pure ideology. It does not matter what they may say. They are governed by their material interests, national interests. Where nations come into conflict, it is because behind that there is a national conflict, and as between the Soviet Union and China two land masses of enormous magnitude are confronting each other. There are a large number of conflicting elements coming and I think this difference is likely to endure. Anyhow what I am pointing out is this. In this cold war business on one side, which is the Soviet Union, China and the East European communist countries, that is cracking up, the unity of that bloc. Obviously it is. On the other side, in the Western Bloc of nations, one also sees this process of cracking

up. It is very obvious between France and England, France and America and Germany. The whole process is one of cracking up. How far it will go I cannot say. I cannot be a prophet, but what I am venturing to say is this that the whole cold war, the force marshalled on either side is cracking up. And apart from that there are new approaches to end this cold war. I do not know if hon. Members have noticed that. In spite of occasional slanging at each other there is a very definite improvement in the relations of the United States and the Soviet Union, and constantly they are probing how to find a way out, first of all, of this test ban business, then possibly disarmament. The whole picture is changing. Yet we remain still stuck in thinking of a picture which is long past, which is not there now. We saw only recently the dreadful prospect of a nuclear war over Cuba. That was some months ago, in October last, but both the United States and the Soviet Union exercised restraint and moderation and were successful in avoiding it. It was a remarkable thing because when passions are roused, as they were roused, and people think of their prestige, these countries' prestige, then they do not think of the consequences. They rush in. But they did not allow either country to rush in and the matter was settled peacefully. Ever since then other approaches have been made. Only recently Cuba has again come up in this talk of strong language on either side, "If this happens we will do this and that," in America, in Russia, in both, but the fact of the matter is that the leaders of both these great countries, the President of the United States of America, Mr. Kennedy, and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, are both, the House will observe, trying to tone down these passions, trying to settle this by some friendly agreement. There are others, both in the United States and in the Soviet Union too, although there is no such freedom of expression in the Soviet Union as there is in the United States, but in both countries

there are people who want trouble, who want war, and yet it so happens, it is a good fortune for the world that the leaders of these two countries, President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev who have great power, great influence in their countries, are bent on peace. They are both devoted to peace. Now, therefore, what I am suggesting is, gradually the old shape of things is changing and new alignments are taking place and we should welcome this, not that that helps us much in our present trouble but in considering our present troubles, we have to keep this in view and not think of things as they were in the bygone ages. That is my difficulty. Most of our Members on the side of the Opposition or on this side even, sometimes live in an age that has gone by, an age of thought that has nothing to do with the present. Not only do they not realise the present problems before us. That hon. Member sitting on the back of the House who interrupted me is a typical example of living in a world of his own which has nothing to do with either reality or decency. That reminds me—it is an extraordinary thing—I believe the hon. Member belongs to the Party which calls itself socialist.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Sir, I would like to say . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Please be silent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister is addressing the House.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not propose to give in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is continuing.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: He cannot go on making indecent remarks.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What I was venturing to say was, a thing which is a matter of continuous surprise to me is the Socialist Party. Where is socialism coming in it? Why do you call them a Socialist Party? To some extent, I would venture, with all respect to ask, even about the other party that calls itself socialist, how far they believe in socialism, because in other matters they are shoulder to shoulder and close bed-fellows of the most anti-social and reactionary people in the country. Where does socialism come in?

(Interruptions)

It is well known that domestic policy and foreign policy are closely allied but some hon. Members here of other parties seem to think that we can be very brave and gallant in one thing and completely different and follow a different path in something else. Surely socialism is an integrated creed, not something in which you can separate or act differently. Your family life is different, in your family life you can have a caste-system with all its limitations . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI: All this applies to you particularly (Interruptions).

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: But so far as the Socialist Party is concerned, I will only say one thing more and that is, a Party which deliberately functions in the way it functioned when the President delivered his Address, certainly cannot be called Socialist nor can it be called civilised or decent.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Mr. Chairman, I seriously object to this terminology 'not civilised or decent'.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have objected. Please sit down.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: This is not the way.

(Interruptions)

HON. MEMBERS: Obey the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister is addressing the House. He has not yielded.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: He cannot bandy about remarks like this, because the Government has been breaking the Constitution.

(Interruptions)

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not giving in and the hon. Member must give in and must sit down. I was merely saying that the behaviour of the Socialist Party on the occasion of the President's Address was uncivilised and indecent and I repeat that and it has nothing to do with socialism

Therefore, I would beg the House to consider the problems, and the context of things logically and reasonably, what they are. Let us not live in an age which has passed but consider the problems as they are. For instance many of the hon. Members go on talking of the Colombo Conference proposals. We discussed them for 2 or 3 days here fully and we came to certain conclusions and we acted upon them. Yet they go on repeating the same arguments as if nothing has happened to the world, nothing has happened to the Colombo Conference proposals. It is extraordinary. It seems to me extraordinary how people simply live in a mental cell of their own regardless of what is happening in the outside world. Our position is, to quote again from the President's speech:

"Our country, committed as it is to peaceful methods, will always endeavour to solve disputes peace-

fully, provided this is in consonance with our honour and freedom. But whatever may happen, we cannot and will not submit to dictation backed by military force."

We shall always keep the peaceful end in view. We shall always remember that this approach, which is perhaps a natural approach, that anger and hatred should be avoided as far as possible. I believe in non-violence to that extent and I should try—I do not succeed—to condition my mind to it but it is obvious that we have to meet this peril on our frontiers with armed might and for armed might we have to be a nation in arms. We have to produce things. We shall have to take such help as we can from others but essentially we have to rely on ourselves. Now so far as the Colombo proposals are concerned, we have accepted them with their clarifications in their entirety. The Government of China continue to quibble about them and apparently are not prepared to accept them. There the matter stands. If the Chinese Government accepts them ultimately, we are prepared to act accordingly. If not, then those proposals fall to the ground. Some people have thought that these proposals come in our way. They do not come in our way at all because we are not bound by them or by anything. We are only bound by what we think as proper, by our own limitations, not by the Chinese decisions or lack of decisions. Also I would like to make it clear that those proposals themselves brought about a transitional stage of our discussing matters. There was no question of any cease-fire line being accepted by us as a permanent line.

Now in regard to Sikkim and Bhutan—they have been referred to—we have treaty relations with Sikkim, under which the defence of Sikkim is the responsibility of the Government of India. We recognise fully that responsibility and we shall endeavour to discharge it fully. We have made

arrangements to that end. We have a Treaty of Friendship with Bhutan. So far as we know, there has been no threat to the territorial integrity of Bhutan. Should, however, any such threat arise, the Government of India will, on a request by the Bhutan Government, be prepared to give them all necessary assistance for the defence of the territorial integrity of Bhutan. Meanwhile, whatever happens to the Colombo proposals, we propose to go on taking steps to strengthen our defences with the help, to the extent possible, of friendly countries and obviously with the help of our own people, which is most important. I would say, in all honesty to this House that while fully realising the strength of the menace before us, the strength of China, I have no sense at all of fear in me from China or from any other country. I am convinced that we shall succeed in our endeavour. It may take time, it may take years, I do not know, but we have to persevere whatever forces are ranged against us or whatever may happen in between.

Now there are one or two other matters with which I will briefly deal. I am sorry, I have taken so much time. Much has been said about Defence Fund collections that there has been coercion. Obviously I cannot say. If cases are sent to me, I can enquire but one thing I should like to make clear that I consider any pressure applied for collections very wrong, very harmful and highly objectionable. There is no doubt about it. I have made that and others have made it very clear to all our State Governments and I go on making it clear. The State Governments have also made it clear. Unfortunately petty officials sometimes go beyond their brief to show their competence, I suppose. Then again something has been said about the Moshi Conference. I do not want to say much about it, but I want to make this clear first of all that it was a non-official body. Those who went to it were non-officials. We did not, the Government

did not, nominate them or pay them their expenses, their foreign exchange or anything. We did not. We could have prevented them from going, but then we did not stop them. Whether it was worth while for them to go or not, that is a matter for each person's judgment. I think, in the balance, it was worth while for them to go. Everything did not happen rightly there. But with the conditions as they were, it might have been much worse if they had not gone

There has been some talk about arrests of people under the Defence of India Act or its Rules. Now, it is painful to me to have these people arrested. The matter is, of course, in the hands of the State Governments and we have repeatedly requested them to look into every case of arrest and they have, in fact, reviewed them and they go on continually reviewing them. They have released, I believe, about 200 persons more or less recently.

Then I have to say a few words about prices. The trend in prices can be mainly judged from wholesale price indices. The general trend of wholesale prices continued to decline up to the end of December 1962 due to seasonal and other factors. Such increase in prices as has taken place during the last three or four weeks is of a marginal character. As for retail prices it is difficult to collect data for a vast range of commodities in a large number of markets scattered all over the country. Steps are being taken to secure information of a systematic and reliable character. The National Sample Survey and other agencies are collecting data on retail prices prevailing in rural and urban areas. The available information on retail prices relating to cereals and subsidiary food articles shows that there has been some decline in the retail prices of these articles in some centres. The prices of cloth and other items of essential use are at a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

satisfactory level due to easy supply position. Nevertheless the Government is fully seized of this problem and arrangements for the supply of essential goods are being made through the agency of consumer co-operative stores, fair price shops and licensed retail dealers. For instance, under one scheme 200 wholesale co-operative stores and 4,000 primary co-operative stores are being set up in the cities and towns with a population of over 50,000 during the next two years. There were no signs of strain in the economy and the general trend of prices was, on the whole, downward.

So far as manufactured articles are concerned, during the last many years there has been no wide fluctuation in prices of manufactured articles.

I need not say much about our desire for increased production. It has been expressed by many hon. Members. In fact, it is the fundamental thing, and we are trying our best for that end. We had some bad time in the last year or two with regard to agricultural production because of bad climatic conditions. It is expected that the production of foodgrains in the current year will be around 81 million tons. Support prices for rice and wheat have already been fixed and the question of fixing similar prices for other foodgrains is under consideration. Minimum prices for sugar and cotton are already effective. The great part of industries recorded increase in production. The improvement was particularly marked with regard to general engineering and electrical engineering items, steel ingots, chemicals and chemical products. I should like the House to remember that the index fails to reflect the truly vast expansion that has taken place in numerous industries which did not exist in 1951 or whose output was negligible at that time and hence were not included in the index.

I am sorry I have taken so much time. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, with your permission, I would like to submit that the hon. Prime Minister has referred to almost everything that is in the Address except one thing which the President had mentioned, namely, the question of Kashmir. I would like to know from the Prime Minister something on that. Something is happening between China and Pakistan on this issue and before Mr. Bhutto left for Peking, our High Commissioner called on him in Pakistan. I would like the Prime Minister to tell us something on this Kashmir problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to say something?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry I did not refer to the Kashmir question. There is not much to refer to. Our general position is well-known to this House and I did not wish to discuss it. I did not think it advisable to discuss it when we are having these conversations. Now about the decision for Pakistan and China to sign an agreement or treaty about their border, the House will remember that we took exception to this repeatedly. When this matter first came up, we took exception and last summer even in the U.N. Security Council and later here. Now it has gone a step further and they are actually going to sign the treaty. It is obvious that this is not only objectionable in itself but the timing of it is quite extraordinary and one would almost think it was deliberately timed to upset our talks. Indeed the announcement of it when the talks were going to take place at Rawalpindi was itself amazingly timed. So we have given our reactions to this in adequate language to the Pakistan Government. That is all I can say, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall first put the amendments to vote.

The question is:

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

'and the House notes with satisfaction the reference in the Address to India's efforts for the cause of world peace and for cultivating friendly and cooperative relations with all countries, avoiding military alliances and the House fervently hopes that such efforts will be continued with even greater vigour in the service of the international community.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and the House notes with satisfaction that our country, committed as it is to peaceful methods, will always endeavour to solve the India-China border dispute peacefully in consonance with our honour and freedom.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show awareness of the moves both within our country and outside among Western Powers to put pressure on India's policy of peace and non-alignment with a view first to undermining it and ultimately driving India to the arms of the Western Camp.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not recognise that the state of

emergency under the democratic Constitution as well as of the emergency powers in a democratic parliamentary set-up does not constitute the way of life to which a democratic people can reconcile indefinitely and except on grounds of unavoidable necessity.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any awareness of the need for reviewing the question of the continuance of the state of emergency in the light of latest developments as well as experience.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any concern for the virtual negation of certain fundamental rights under the emergency nor does it give assurance for remedying the situation.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the serious criticisms that have been made in a number of newspapers in the country about the manner in which the powers under the emergency are being used in different States.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.

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

'but regret that the Address does not live up to the spirit of our Constitution inasmuch as it ignores that the emergency powers and the Defence of India Rules are being used to cripple the Communist Party of India which is the principal Opposition in our parliamentary set-up.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not recognise that when the principal Opposition in a parliamentary set-up is thus attacked in the name of emergency what really suffers is not merely the victim of attack but the democratic and parliamentary system as a whole.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that 10 members of Parliament, nearly 40 members of the State Legislatures in India and almost half the number of members of the Tripura Territorial Council all belonging to the Communist Party and Communist Bloc have been detained without trial under the Defence of India Rules, causing thereby a serious injury to the parliamentary system itself and robbing vast numbers of electors and people and a large number of constituencies their representation in Parliament and State Legislatures.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any awareness to the fact that these large-scale attacks against the Communist Party including its members in Parliament and State Legislatures, trade unionists and members of Kisan Sabhas have only created sorrow and apprehensions in the minds of India's friends abroad and indeed in the democratic circles throughout the world.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that many newspapers in foreign countries, friendly to India and her cause, have been forced to the painful necessity of criticising the Government of India for these arrests and detentions of Communists and other progressives under the Defence of India Rules, and that the Government should not have thought it fit to display any sensitiveness to such criticisms coming from friendly quarters.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that whereas the powers of Defence of India Rules are primarily meant, among other things, for preventing any action prejudicial to the defence of India, these powers have, however, been used to put into prison without trial nearly 800 Communists despite the fact that the Communist Party and all its members stand

for the defence of the country and for building up its defence potential'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the Defence of India Rules have been used for arresting trade unionists in order to oust them from the trade union field and thus serve the interests of the employers and certain other elements.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the powers of the Defence of India Rules are being utilised to arrest members of local bodies such as municipalities, Zila Parishads and Panchayats to change their composition and in some cases for finding an alibi for superseding municipal bodies.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the Union Government, instead of trying to restrain the State Governments and other authorities in the matter of the abuse of the powers under the Defence of India Rules, are on the contrary in some cases at least prodding the State Governments to continue arrests and persecutions of the Communists and others.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address reconciles to the large scale arrests and detention without trial under the Defence of India Rules although there is no mentionable obstruction of any kind to our defence efforts.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any awareness that arrests and detentions without trial in the name of emergency are not only unwarranted but are contrary to the fundamental principles of our Constitution and the ways of democracy.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any aliveness to the fact that under the emergency and the Defence of India Rules, the police and the bureaucracy have been invested with unbridled powers and are acting in a manner extremely harmful to India's fair name and democracy.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any serious concern about the fact that in many cases the emergency powers and the powers under the Defence of India Rules are being utilised for reasons of political vendetta and

even for satisfying some grudge against Communists, Trade Unionists and others.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any serious concern for the fact that in Tripura which is a Union Territory, over 70 Communists have been arrested and detained without trial under the Defence of India Rules and that most of these detenus have been removed to Hazaribagh central jail in Bihar thus denying them the opportunities of even interviews with their families.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address in this connection does not take note of the fact that Tripura has only two seats in the Lok Sabha and both the elected representatives from that Union territory in the Lok Sabha are now under detention without trial, thereby denying, in fact, the electorate and the people of Tripura their rightful representation in the Lok Sabha.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to note that the Address does not show an awareness of the serious economic situation facing the country.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that contrary to the claims made in the Address, the agricultural production, especially of foodgrains, has come down from 79.7 million tons in 1960-61 to 78.6 million tons in 1961-62 and there is no possibility of improvement since then.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the rate of growth of industrial production has been declining and the declaration of emergency has not helped the country to reach better results.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that while the working class has sacrificed a lot to increase the production, the owners have utilized the emergency to shut down factories, to retrench workers and create serious unrest.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Government has not done anything to curb the rapacity of the big business while at the same time has used the emergency powers to cripple the working class movement.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that no efforts have been made to utilise the huge idle capacity in various industries, especially, the Engineering Industry which could serve the Defence purposes.

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the claim made in the Address that the National Defence Fund has met with generous response is practically true inasmuch as only the ordinary people have responded while the well-to-do people and especially the big-business have not responded.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that Government and bureaucracy have used the emergency powers to coerce and browbeat the common people while leaving the rich people free from any obligations.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state the Address has failed to notice the anti-national activities of the employers who have under the guise and protection of emergency sought to take undue advantage

for narrow selfish ends by (i) dismissing and victimising in other ways Trade Union leaders and functionaries, (ii) refusing out of hand offers of arbitration, (iii) intensification of the process of issuing charge-sheets, suspension notices and imposition of fines, (iv) curtailing even normal production, (v) unilateral non-observance of normal labour laws and regulations etc.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Address is a certificate of merit to the big business for obligations they have not cared to discharge.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to say that the emergency powers have been used by the Government, the bureaucracy and the Congress Party machinery for narrow partisan political ends, for wreaking vengeance on political opponents.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Address has failed to take note of the worsening unemployment in the country.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address has failed to take cognisance of the failure of the gold control scheme to disgorge the huge hoards of bullion held by rich people including the erstwhile Maharajas, the Nizam and other persons.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Address is silent on the immense suffering caused to the five million goldsmiths throughout the country by the new gold control scheme.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Address does not mention any measures to alleviate the sufferings of the goldsmiths.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Address does not make any mention of any proposal to take over the huge hoards of gold in bullion held by the princes and businessmen.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to state that the Address does not make any men-

tion of the Government's intention to amend the Constitution in order to legalise certain land reform measures declared *ultra vires* of the Constitution by High Courts and the Supreme Court.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not give any assurance that the status of Jammu and Kashmir as a constituent State of the Indian Union will not be made, directly or indirectly, a subject matter of negotiation in the Indo-Pakistan talks or otherwise.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not give any assurance that the basic policies of the Government with regard to the public sector will not be in any manner modified and that no new concessions will be given to the private sector and to the detriment of the public sector.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any concern at the decision to remove the restriction on foreign participation in the Indian shipping.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any concern at the present moves for wider concessions to private sector in defence industries.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not give a clear assurance that the defence industries in India will be developed in the public sector alone'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that unemployment in West Bengal is growing and that last year nearly 4 lakhs of unemployed persons registered their names in the Employment Exchanges but did not get employment.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the fact that the price of rice is rising in places like West Bengal and there is a shortfall in production.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not still recognise the need for

nationalisation of banking, mining, jute and sugar industries with a view to meeting the urgent needs of development.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that some influential daily papers in Calcutta and other places are inciting people to violence against the Communist Party, trade unions and are carrying on vicious attacks against India's basic policies such as the policy of non-alignment as well as personal and scurrilous attacks against the Prime Minister and Acharya Vinoba Bhave.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not draw the attention of the country to the serious threat posed to its future by the forces of Right reaction.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the fact that the so-called Defence Committees are being filled with people who are avowed opponents of India's basic policies.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that Journals, supporting the basic policies of the Government of India, have been ordered to furnish security deposits under the Defence of India Rules, as for example, *Tripura Katha* in *Agartala*.'"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the resumption of the underground nuclear test by the U.S.A. in disregard of the appeal of the U.N. General Assembly for a nuclear test ban agreement.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not warn the people of the country against pressures on India by Western Powers over the question of Kashmir.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not tell the people that in order to build up defence and strengthen the country, India, a peace-loving nation, does not require any war-like propaganda or war hysteria of any kind.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the use of such expressions as 'war efforts', 'preparing for a long war' in official utterances does not conform to India's basic policy and only helps her position misunderstood.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not caution the country against the legitimate sentiments of the people for strong national defence being exploited by reactionary forces with ulterior political designs'.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no steps have been taken to curb the control of newspapers in the country by a handful of big business houses and monopolists.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not recognise the danger to democracy arising out of the control of India's newspapers by a handful of industrialists and millionaires.'

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Government have not taken effective steps under the Gold Control Order to compel the owners of gold bars, gold bullions etc., to declare such non-ornament gold in their possession'"

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Government did not take steps in time to prepare an inventory of all gold deposits in the security safes in the banks, thereby helping the gold there to disappear.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not see the need for at least suspension of all payment of privy purses to the wealthy former Princes during the emergency.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take serious note of the fact that the big business families have made insignificant contributions to the National Defence

Fund from their personal funds, while trying to pass off the contributions of the companies under their control as their own personal contribution.'" "

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Government are permitting the private sector to enter certain fields of defence industries.'" "

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the pitiable condition of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, the Buddhists and the weaker sections of the country'" "

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the help given by Soviet Russia in economic and defence spheres and the policy adopted by her which has helped India much'" "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

negligence on the part of the Government for not recruiting to reserved posts from the duly qualified Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes candidates particularly to the posts of Grade I and II."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Union Government have failed to—

(a) solve the land problems;

(b) implement the land reforms by fixing ceiling of land holdings; and

(c) distribute the cultivable lands to the landless people in the country.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address has failed to show the measures by which the standard of living of the common people is proposed to be raised.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address has not taken any note of the large-scale unemployment prevailing in the country, particularly among urban landless agricultural

labourers and has failed to suggest a concrete and extensive programme for the solution of these burning problems.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the increase in retail prices of essential commodities which are going up gradually.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to note that there has been no mention of the national resolve to recover the territory occupied by the Chinese by aggression and the steps to be taken to implement the national resolve.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to note that there has been no mention of the deteriorating condition in agricultural production and the steps to improve the same.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret to note that the Address significantly does not

mention the programme of social security contemplated in the Third Five Year Plan and creates doubt in the minds of the weaker sections of the community of being neglected in the emergency."

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is.

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

'but regret that the Address fails to reiterate the nation's firm resolve, as solemnly and unanimously expressed by Parliament on November 14, 1962, 'to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be'."

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret the omission in the Address to indicate concrete plans or measures to prosecute vigorously the war for the liberation of the Indian territory from Communist China's occupation and for the restoration of India's territorial integrity'."

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret that in spite of the continued occupation of India's territory by the Chinese Communists and the need of emergent action to combat it, the undue emphasis laid in the Address on peaceful methods is calculated to undermine the morale of the

people and rob the national crisis of its content of urgency, and the Proclamation of Emergency is being continued mainly to strengthen the party in power'."

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret the failure of the Government to step up efforts to ensure wholehearted and effective flow of military aid from all friendly countries'."

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address fails to reiterate the nation's solemn resolve embodied in the Resolution unanimously adopted by Parliament on November 14, 1962, 'to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India however long and hard the struggle may be', and further to indicate concrete measures for vigorous prosecution of the war to liberate Indian territory from Communist China's occupation, and for the restoration of our territorial integrity'."

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

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

'but regret the failure to take note of the anaemic stagnation

that has overtaken the national economy, and to formulate effective measures with a view to gearing it up for the urgent requirements of Defence and Development."

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is

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

'but regret the failure to utilise the state of emergency for the maximum mobilisation of the people's energies as reflected in the patriotic upsurge in the wake of the massive invasion of our country by Communist China.'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret that the Address does not make a mention of the tendency of Government of amending the Constitution according to its convenience and acting sometimes even against the original spirit of the Constitution'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret that while a feeling has been expressed that ever since the constitution of our Republic, the Parliament has had to face difficult problems and to shoulder heavy responsibilities, the Address does not make a mention of many of the problems that cropped up because of the mistakes on the part of Govern-

ment and owing to the fact that they had been living in the world of 'imagination' "

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the failures and the wastage in various projects'

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

but regret that the Address does not take note of the deteriorating economic condition and increasing indebtedness of the farmers'

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret that the Address does not suggest any measures to remove unemployment which is on the increase due to industrialisation among working classes, such as oilmen, cobblers, blacksmiths, potters, etc., who are spread all over India'

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN The question is

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

'but regret that the Address

does not take note of the unemployment among the goldsmiths by the new gold policy and of the problems arising 'herefrom'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the acts of highhandedness, looting and incursions, etc. by the Pakistanis in Indian territory'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the land and money that had to be sacrificed as a result of the agreements made with Pakistan.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the excesses made and being made for making collections for the National Defence Fund'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact

that the gold control rules have been formulated in order to conceal the failures of the administration in various measures adopted by it to check the smuggling in gold, resulting in country-wide loss of confidence, disorder and unemployment among the goldsmiths'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not make a mention of the inequality created by Government by arranging for giving one day in a month for the Defence Labour Bank by the people in the rural areas and exempting the people of urban areas therefrom'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the deterioration in foreign trade, foreign exchange and the economic condition of the country'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not suggest appropriate action against those citizens who have extra-territorial loyalties which living in India'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of safeguarding the relics of Indian Art scattered in the different parts of the world.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain any indication of a reconsideration of the decision to make English an associate official language in view of the public opinion aroused against that decision.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the defensive measures taken in view of imminent threat to the borders of Bhutan and Sikkim posed by the concentration of Chinese armies in Chumbi Valley.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of merging NEFA with Assam and of making a change in the policy in regard to NEFA.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take into account the danger posed to the economy of the country as the targets of agricultural production under the Plan have so far been achieved.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the Tripartite Agreement has not been observed in an appropriate manner by the proprietors and mill-owners.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain any direction in regard to recovering Indian territory occupied by China and Pakistan.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the fact that our Army was unprepared in NEFA.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of imparting compulsory military training to able-bodied persons and of repealing the Arms Act.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the declaration regarding Jammu and Kashmir being a part of India has not been reiterated in the Address nor any light thrown therein on the talks being held with Pakistan on the issue of Kashmir.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no indication in the Address regarding the merging of NEFA in Assam and for bringing about fundamental changes in the administration there.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no mention has been made in the Address of the measures to be adopted for ending the crisis created by the illegal entry of Pakistanis into Assam on a large scale.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address is silent about the adoption of effective measures to check the disturbances caused by hostiles in Nagaland.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the widely prevailing public discontent against the decision to make English an associate official language for an indefinite period after 1965.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no assurance has been given for checking the rise in the price of gold that has come about as a result of the gold policy of Government and for speedily providing alternative sources of livelihood to the goldsmiths.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of increasing

the price of sugarcane and of reducing the excise duty on sugar to remove the difficulty which is being faced by the sugar industry as a result of the fall in the production of sugarcane.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no indication has been given for the withdrawal of the action taken against the employees who took part in the last general strike of the employees of the Central Government.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no decision has been taken to give representation to all patriotic parties in the National Defence Council and the Central Citizens' Council.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the failure of the administration to suppress firmly the fifth column activities.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that attention has not been drawn in the Address towards the need of a radical change in the foreign and defence policies of the Government of India which are responsible for the aggression committed by Communist China.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that Address has not drawn attention towards the need for a radical change in the foreign and defence policies of the Government of India and has not condemned the efforts made by the Government of India even now for obtaining recognition for Communist China in the U.N.O.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that Government have not been advised to follow the nationally beneficial policy of starting negotiations only after driving out the Chinese beyond the 15th August 1947 line.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the fact that the Government of India committed a blunder in accepting the Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, has not been mentioned in the Address.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Colombo Proposals were accepted without obtaining the approval of the Parliament.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that attention has not been drawn in the Address towards the failure of Government in all the fields of production, viz., agriculture, industry and arms.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no suggestion has been made for taking effective steps towards securing socio-economic equality for all the citizens.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret the indifference of the Government towards introducing the people's language for the establishment of democracy.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the attention has not been drawn towards the necessity of immediate formulation of a scheme for settling the homeless (nomadic) backward classes.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that attention has not been drawn in the Address towards the non-essentiality of the Defence of India Act in the present hour of cease-fire.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that attention has not been drawn towards the failure of Government in checking the rising prices by bringing about an equitable balance in the prices of vital agricultural and industrial commodities.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that attention has not been drawn in the Address towards the failure of Government's policy in forming a truly

casteless national army during this period of emergency.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that no emphasis has been laid on the need for the formulation of a truly dynamic and independent non-aligned policy in place of the non-aligned foreign policy of the Government of India.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret the failure of Government to replace their plan by a Victory Plan, based upon:—

(i) whatever national resources can be mobilised through only such taxation and public loans as can be raised without endangering the national economy and entrenching too much upon the slender resources of the masses of our country;

(ii) the whole-hearted assistance of all friendly and democratic countries through our firm alliance with them in resisting and containing Communist Chinese expansionism;

(iii) the elimination of all wasteful expenditure.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

MGIPND—RS—1232 RS—19-4-63—554.

'but regret the failure of the Government to indicate any definite steps to protect peasant proprietorship to serve remunerative level of agricultural prices and to provide other incentives to agricultural production.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret the oppressive Gold Control which offends the deepest public sentiments and robs millions of highly skilled artisans of their independent means of livelihood and undermines the rural credit.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the Motion to vote:

The question is:

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

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 18th February, 1963."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Wednesday, the 27th February, 1963.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 27th February, 1963.