

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I accept your explanation, but the time of meeting is 2.30. As such, some senior Minister should have been present here. Mr. Pathak.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*continued.*

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Motion 'of Thanks and also join in the tributes, rich tributes, paid to Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the retiring President. He is the symbol of India's greatness. He combines simplicity of life with dignity of office. He combines scholarly habits with high statesmanship. He represents the ideal Indian life. All his actions are actuated by a true spirit of service to the people. He has built -up traditions which I am sure will be followed for a long time to come and for ever. I join in the wishes expressed by the hon. Members who spoke before me and I wish and pray that "he may live long and may have many, many years of useful service to the nation.

Madam, before I deal with one or two aspects of the Address of the President, I might be permitted to deal with one question which emerges from the speech made by the hon. Member who spoke before me. That question is one of grave constitutional importance. The hon. Member was certainly entitled to criticise the Government. He has levelled scathing criticism against the policies of the Government. He was certainly entitled to do so. But the question is whether he could advocate separation of a territory of India, whether he could advocate self-determination or could call a group of people as a nation in India. Madam, this is a question which is one of grave constitutional importance. We are here in Parliament, the highest Legislature in this country. We are here after "having oath on the Constitution. All

of us have taken an oath that we shall bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution. The freedom of speech which is permitted to us under article 105 of the Constitution is subject to the provisions of the Constitution. The question, therefore, is whether any hon. Member of this House can, after having taken oath on the Constitution, plead separation of any territory on the basis of self-determination or any other basis. Madam, our Constitution does not permit any separation by any citizen of India. It is not open to any citizen of India to say that he wants to have a territory separated from the Union. Even individual States cannot ask for separation, much less individual citizens or groups of citizens residing in any territory. That is opposed to the indissoluble character of our federal Constitution. And when an hon. Member, after having taken oath on the Constitution, wants that unity to be disrupted^ that raises a very important question. We must remember that in the very Preamble of our Constitution the unity of the nation is prominently mentioned. If the matter had been raised in any other federal country, we know what the answer would have been. The example of a State, Texas by name, is well known. Texas wanted to separate from the federation of the United States. The matter went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court there decided that the federal Constitution was indissoluble. It is not open to any State to secede from the Union and to say that it wants to form an independent State. That was the case of Texas *versus* the White.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): In Australia also, South Australia wanted to secede.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: There are other such examples. I will not trouble you by citing other examples. The matter is important. It is much more important, because it is not a State, but a group of citizens residing in a particular territory who want to

secede from the Union. If that were permissible, it would have been open to any group of citizens to claim secession. It would have been 'open to any town to claim secession. It should have been open to residents of any street to claim secession. It would have been open to any citizen to ask for a small bit of territory. Could such a thing be ever contemplated by our Constitution? It is opposed to the very structure, framework, intent and nature of our Constitution. Madame, we must remember that even the Prime Minister—I am mentioning the Prime Minister because reference has been made to the Prime Minister's speeches—is not competent to permit any secession from the Union of India.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): I think not even the Parliament.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Not even the Parliament, nobody. Now, the important matter is whether a Member who has taken an oath can in his speech plead something which is opposed to the Constitution? I submit, Madam Deputy Chairman, that a question may arise later—we have given all the indulgence, it is not indulgence, it is the privilege of a Member who makes a maiden speech; we did not interrupt; on this question a point of order could have been raised at that stage—a question may arise which the Chair may have to decide whether it is open to any Member to make such a speech in this House. I am not making this observation in any spirit of anger or hostility. I am merely pointing out with respect that this speech which the hon. Member has made on this question was unconstitutional and could not have been made. He has spoken of self-determination. Self-determination is an expression which has been very often abused. You cannot talk of self-determination as between the citizen of a State and the State itself.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Where already a constitution exist. 204 R.S.—5.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: The point of importance is that when self-determination is talked of, we forget that self-determination can be talked of only when there is a foreign ruler, not otherwise, the reason being that when a Constituent Assembly sits to frame the Constitution, all the people in the country who are sovereign are present in the Constituent Assembly through their representatives. When the people themselves frame an indissoluble union, is it open to any citizen or any person or group of persons in the State to destroy the unity or to act contrary to the Preamble in the Constitution? Now, self-determination is a term which has been wrongly used and cannot be applied, nor can it be said that any group of people constitute a nation within the Indian nation—the word "nation" was also used by the hon. Member. Therefore, I submit that the hon. Member's speech was based, and I say this with all respect, upon a gross misappreciation of the Constitution and our constitutional obligations. Our Constitution is based upon common brotherhood. We are parts of the same nation. We may have different languages. The hon. Member probably does not know that in the North steps are being taken to educate people in the southern languages, and I hope that we Members of this House, as representatives of our constituencies, will consider ourselves as Members whose duty it is to promote the unity of the nation, whose duty it is to advance all the principles which form the bedrock of this Constitution. The example of Berubari is not any analogy at all. There it was a transaction between us and another sovereign State. There cannot be such a transaction between the State and a citizen. Pakistan again is not an analogy. At the time when Pakistan separated, we must remember that Pakistan separated under a British parliamentary statute.

AN HON. MEMBER: With our agreement.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: With our agreement and under a British parliamentary statute. At the time when

some people claimed separation, we were under a foreign, rule. It was possible for some to talk of self-determination then, not after the Dominion came into existence, not after that. Therefore, that also is no analogy.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Abraham Lincoln fought Civil War to preserve the unity of the United States.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: When we read books dealing with international history or with the political history of big countries, we find that ultimately the majority, almost all the people, strove for the unity of nation, and it was this striving, this continuous effort which gave birth to big nations. If you want to have small nations, even if it were possible under the Constitution, it is not practicable in fact. In the mid-twentieth century small independent territories cannot exist.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAVARGIYA (Madhya Pradesh): May I ask one question, whether parties advocating it can be recognised?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: No. Parties are mere groups of citizens. When one citizen cannot advocate it, a group cannot. The law for one is the law for many. The law depends upon the nature and character of the claimant. If he is a citizen, then by merely adding to the number he cannot escape from the law.

Madam, I will deal only with one aspect of the President's Address, and that is, our membership of the Disarmament Committee of eighteen nations. The President has said that there has not been appreci-3 P.M. able success in the deliberations at Geneva. Under the present conditions, it is not surprising that there should be no success. And surprising as it may appear, ac-

ording to recorded history the first Disarmament Conference took place in the year 546 B.C. At that conference, representatives of fourteen Chinese States sat to secure disarmament. That ended in failure. Since then, thousands and thousands of words have been spoken and Written against war and in favour of disarmament. Disarmament conferences have taken place; peace conferences have taken place; Committees of the General Assembly have sat year after year always and uniformly without success. What is the reason? As time passed, as science progressed, technical knowledge grew; more and more dangerous weapons were made. The question of disarmament became linked up with many other questions. Increasingly, the problem became complicated. New dangers came into existence. It is a matter of common occurrence today that one nation may have peripheral and penetrative reconnaissance in the air over the territory of another country. That is a matter of common occurrence—nuclear tests, research in nuclear bomb, Sputniks and all the rest. Weapons of offence, defence and anti-defence are in preparation. Tests are being conducted under the sea, in the atmosphere, above the atmosphere, and the latest report is that it is considered necessary by some State to put a 500 megaton* bomb in a satellite with the view to see whether it is possible to allow it to burst on the ground underneath at any chosen place. This is the present position. Now, for some time past, it appears that considerable changes have come over certain Governments and in their attitudes. There was a time when knowledge of science was common. The military was merely applying knowledge which was common knowledge in the production of their weapons. Now, the emphasis has shifted, has at least partially shifted, and is shifting from the civil to the military. Political decisions are being dominated by military influences. The research and the con-

struction of these diabolical weapons involve huge expenditure and knowledge which was common is secret now, is kept secret, within the recesses of the military and the defence ministries, if I may say so, of big countries. This is the situation and the result is that whenever there might be a possibility of an agreement, the military decision or the military influence will dominate the political decision.

Now, Madam, we talk of local inspection, control and so on and so forth. A day is soon coming when local inspection might not be necessary because there is further progress in science and from the other territories you can inspect what is being done in one territory. On the other hand, local inspection will be useless because these tests are going to be conducted above the atmosphere. All this talk, therefore, would result in nothing unless there is realisation that there may be complete annihilation. Now, all this is being done in defiance of international law; all this is being done in defiance of the Charter which is talked of so often. It is not complicated international law when one says that it is not possible for one nation to appropriate any part of the sea to itself and to conduct tests there to interfere with the rights of navigation, the rights of fishing and other rights belonging to other States, to spread the effects of the tests far and wide, sometimes thousands and thousands of miles away. Jurists tell them that it is against international law; Jurists tell them that even if you have an atomic test or a nuclear test in your own territory, but its effects cross over to other territories and affect the health of other peoples, then you cannot conduct tests even in your own territory. Such tests are against international law. Scientists tell them that these tests are a hazard to the health of the humanity. There was a committee of scientists appointed by the United Nations. This was their una-

nimous report. Now, they are all doing this against international law, against the opinions of the scientists; they are all doing this against the spirit of the Charter because the chief aim of the Charter is to prevent the scourge of war. Did the Charter contemplate that you can go on creating war psychology, you can go on preparing for war and that should be the method of preventing the scourge of war?

Now, Madam, appeals have been made to these two big nations. An appeal was made to Soviet Russia at one time. An appeal was made recently to the United States; an appeal was made at the Belgrade Conference. Nothing avails and the result of it is that we exist in great peril; our very existence is in peril; we live in continuous terror. Our whole future is at the mercy of two Powers, our whole future is mortgaged with them against our will. And we must remember that a future war cannot be confined in its effects only to the belligerents. The modern weapons do not recognise frontiers and boundaries. Their effects cross the frontiers and would affect neutral nations. Now, Madam, it is not only the future which is in danger; we are being directly affected today by this race for armaments. What are these pacts and military alliances? Are they not mere extensions of the schemes and plans for armaments? Are they not intended to create bases? Are they not intended to prepare the ground for jumping off or to create grounds from where military operations may be conducted? And when military aid under such alliances is given to small nations, what is the result? Small nations are not concerned with Russia and the United States so much. They are concerned with their own enemies. And it is this military aid which is partly responsible for the unreasonable attitude of Pakistan. It is this military aid which is responsible for these continuous threats of military

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

action which have been offered by Pakistan from time to time. It is this military aid which is responsible for Pakistan's persistence in the absurd claim to our territory, Kashmir a claim based on aggression.

Madam, it is commonsense that you cannot have any success in disarmament proposals unless the ruthless government, ruling more than 600 million people, can be subjected to the control of popular opinion and can be a party to the disarmament scheme. China is a country which, according to all evidence, believes in the inevitability of war for carrying out its purposes. Now, we are leaving out that country. We are not allowing that country to be represented in the United Nations. We cannot exercise any control over that country. How can we then have any success in this disarmament business? This problem, therefore, cannot be viewed in isolation. Its ramifications have got to be studied and unless it is met in all its aspects, there is no hope of any success. Now, the Government and our delegations have been engaged in ceaseless efforts in securing some solution to this problem because it is a problem in which the whole mankind is interested. We have our interest too. All that we can do is to make appeals. All appeals have proved fruitless so far. We can also mobilise public opinion, not only in our country but also in Asia and Africa, discuss this matter with all non-aligned nations and we can have influence of world public opinion felt.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, there were other matters too I wished to mention, but I will stop here expressing my gratitude to you for the indulgence that you have shown me, and I thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I associate ray-

self and my party with the sentiments that have been expressed here in this House towards the President of the Indian Republic. I need not say much about his qualities. These are well-known. Only I hope that wherever he is placed, his statesmanship, wisdom, counsel and experience will be available not merely to one party but to the people at large for helping our country, to find our bearings in the midst of certain very wrong things that are happening today under the Congress rule. I say this thing because it is necessary for a man of stature, not in public office, to rise above small petty party considerations. There must be a common *modus vivendi* of those who stand for progress and prosperity of the people, and I hope that Dr. Rajendra Prasad, a man of vast experience and unquestioned wisdom, will find that *modus vivendi* with the rest of the country which is trying to evolve a correct approach to the problems that face us.

I would like to deal with the Address from different angles. Madam Deputy Chairman, right at the beginning I must say that this Address recapitulates the old *mantras* of the Congress rule, and it refuses, even after the third General Elections, to take into account the facts of our national life. The failure, therefore, is on two scores. It lacks in approach. The Address lacks in perspective. The Address lacks, in the sense of realism that the Government should develop. That is why I find that there is no leadership in this Address although with this Address the new Parliament or the new Lok Sabha have been initiated to the tasks and labour that lie ahead. In that respect the Address is disappointing, to put it mildly.

There are many problems which I can discuss in the House. But, naturally, I would like to start with the problem of peace and war. I feel I am not in a position to answer right at the beginning and repudiate the speech that

was made by Mr. Annadurai when he advocated his dangerous theory of separation. I can tell him point blank from this side of the House that India is united and one. Whatever may be our quarrels between the various parties, the unity of India shall be maintained at all costs. Mr. Annadurai may be flourishing in his own ideas and dangerous thoughts, but I have no doubt in my mind that the democratic movement in the South will combine with the democratic movement of the working people in the rest of the country, to give a burial to this dangerous theory of separatism by going outside the Republic of India. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would not like to say much on this subject at this stage. Let me proceed to my other theme, a theme of supreme importance and urgency for all mankind, namely, the question of peace and war. To avert war and deliver mankind from the threat of thermal nuclear war should be considered by all right-thinking men, irrespective of party or other affiliations, as the most sacred task that we can fulfil today. It is a universal appeal, full of humanism, and it carries forward the highest ideals of mankind in the sense that we want to save mankind from this terrible threat of nuclear war.

In this connection, I am distressed sometimes when I hear some hon. Members equating the Soviet Union with the United States of America. I would invite those hon. Members' attention to the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in which the question of peace and war has been dealt with and placed before the Soviet people as a task of prime and supreme urgency and importance, in which the entire Soviet humanity is called upon to dedicate itself to the service of humanity, for the cause of preservation of world peace, for peaceful co-existence and in particular, for the realisation of the objective of com-

plete and general disarmament. It is the Soviet Union, Madam Deputy Chairman, that listens to India's plea for peace. It is the Soviet Union today and its leaders who responded instantaneously to the appeals made by the Prime Minister of this country and accepted the compromise formula that was presented the other day in Geneva by the eight non-aligned countries for a ban on nuclear weapon tests. It is Mr. Dean Rusk of the United States of America on the other hand, who summarily rejected these ideas and proposals even when they came from the non-aligned nations.""" Are we then to put them both in the same category? It is the Soviet Union which unilaterally stopped nuclear weapon tests when the Prime Minister made that appeal, whereas the NATO Powers, the Western Powers were still carrying out these tests through France. Although some of them, the United States and England, had stopped them, France was carrying them out. What would you have thought! if, for example, Czechoslovakia, a member of the Warsaw Treaty Powers, had continued or started the nuclear tests while the Soviet Union had stopped them? You would certainly have then said that the Socialist Powers were carrying on their tests. Therefore, I say

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: France is not there in that context.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ' Yes, France was carrying on atomic tests. They were doing it and therefore, they have to be put in the same category. As far as the Communists are concerned, or the Communist Party, with your blessings, Madam Deputy Chairman, and with the blessings at this House, that Party is in control of the Government of the Soviet Union and they are today building communism. After the complete and final victory of socialism, they are building communism. The full-scale construction of communism they

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

have started there and mankind and the people of Soviet Union are promised the completion and the creation of the technical and material basis of communism in a matter of twenty years, and they say in their programme itself: "Peace is our ally". Peace is the ally of communism and this is how the Communist Party and the world communist movement view the problem. The Soviet Union is carrying out this policy, in its internal life, in the construction of communism. Therefore, it is an article of faith with them. Peace and communism go together. Either they have peace or they face something else. That is why today the Soviet Union talks of peaceful co-existence. You must relate it to their deepest thoughts and to the task that they are fulfilling and to the objectives which they have set before the nation. So, they cannot be put in the same category with those in the United States of America. In the U.S.A. it is said that peaceful co-existence is a most dangerous idea of our times. According to them peaceful co-existence is the most dangerous idea. To the people of the Soviet Union, of the Socialist countries, the Communist parties of the world, the idea of peaceful co-existence is a sacred idea, a most important idea, to which 40 million communists all over the world have dedicated themselves. That is how you should view this matter.

SHRI SRI RAMA REDDY: Does it include China?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I say this because we have got in the Soviet Union a staunch, redoubtable ally and a fighter for the cause of peace. Friends are there and I think the Prime Minister to an extent, certainly recognises this role of the Soviet Union.

Madam Deputy Chairman, as far as war is concerned, we have known

many wars, but nothing of the kind that we envisage, should come to another world war. But we know that preparations for another war are there. The world is spending today 100,000 million dollars, or roughly Rs. 50,000 crores annually on these. All this money and human energy are being wasted for destructive purposes. Imagine what would happen to the world if all these resources and creative energy were to be utilised for the well-being of the people of all countries, especially of the under-developed regions.

Therefore, we find that this question of disarmament and complete and general disarmament, has become a matter of vital importance today. This is how we proceed towards peaceful co-existence. We fight for peaceful co-existence in order to see that durable peace comes and mankind is saved from the threat of another war. To achieve this objective it has become necessary today that this frantic expenditure on war preparations is stopped and we come to an agreement on complete and general disarmament. Here is the objective on which we have to work together. I must say that Diwan Chaman Lall who sits in this House has taken considerable initiative in this matter to mobilise right-minded people in this country to fulfil and serve this noble objective of our people and to save mankind. I wish him luck and to all those people who feel like him in the promotion of this great cause.

Just as here we are discussing the international situation and the question of peace and war, they are having in London a meeting of the CENTO and there discussions are going on how to equip Pakistan with modern weapons. We know against whom the weapons will be directed and to what political results and tensions that will lead. I would ask the Government of India to lodge a strong and powerful protest against the

attitude of the United Kingdom in this matter and also of the United States of America, because to help and encourage Pakistan on this sub-continent is to rouse and foment tension and to create misgivings and to bring about factors that make for war and to counter factors that make for peace. In a matter of two or three days again, in Athens, there will be the meeting of the NATO Council to plan and formulate schemes and so on, to equip West Germany with nuclear weapons. Everything is ready and the mad men of Hitler regime will be given nuclear weapons to play with the fate of mankind once again. We know how the former Nazis, the military Generals, the murderers, assassins, hooligans, plunged mankind twice in one generation into a holocaust and terrible disaster. They are once again to be armed but now with nuclear weapons, with which to throw the world again into a holocaust. That is the prospect that America presents and I think the voice of our Parliament should be raised loudly so that the appeal is heard. We have the moral stature. I agree with Mr. Pathak that we have some moral stature in the world today and that should be fully utilised in this service to humanity. I think if the Indian people as represented by this Parliament today wish well of all those who are working for peace, for complete and general disarmament, for a treaty for that purpose, for a ban on the test of nuclear weapons, we shall have associated ourselves with the rest of the right-minded world, and, not only that, We would have attracted the blessings of all the anxious humanity which today wants to see the blessings of peace coming on earth. This is how we should view the matter. In this connection I think that efforts in the direction of arriving at an agreement or treaty for complete disarmament should be pursued and I wish good luck to our representatives in Geneva. India has played a noble part in this matter and every Indian today who loves

humanity and wants to uphold the traditions and heritage of this country will be happy to note that still greater efforts are made in that direction. But that apart, efforts should be made also at the non-official level because public opinion is an important factor. Madam Deputy Chairman, fortunately for mankind, because of the triumph of the camp of socialism, the tremendous successes that are being achieved in every field of life and on account of the rise of the newly liberated nations shaking off the yoke of imperialism, we are in a position today to mobilise these forces of peace in order to forestall the forces of war and see that peace is won within a very short time by the combined efforts of all peace-loving forces. To that task we must naturally direct ourselves and our efforts.

Now, as far as war propaganda is concerned, the Soviet Union the other day made a proposal for the banning of war propaganda. The United States of America spells out war and destruction. Every time an American politician opens his mouth, whether in the United Nations or at Geneva or at Washington or in the CENTO or NATO Conferences, he speaks out venom against humanity and he spells out war and destruction. This is what we see. This question then has to be taken up. We should mobilise public opinion and we should discuss this matter as to how this should be achieved. I would like to see war propaganda banned in every country; it should be banned so far as our civilisation is concerned. For a civilised man or woman to talk of war, to speak in these terms is the highest ignominy. This should be the moral sanction behind such a move. We should create such a situation.

In this connection, I would like to request the Government of India, while discussing foreign affairs, to give recognition to the Algerian Provisional Government. There should

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] not be any delay. I do not know why the Government is hesitating. When the sympathies are known and we are in favour of the Provisional Algerian Government, why is there this hesitation? I think the time has come—to help the process of Algerian independence—for the Government of India to extend full recognition to the Provisional Government of Algeria. In this connection also, I would ask them to recognise the German Democratic Republic in order to help the process of lessening tension in Europe and also to disarm ideologically to an extent, if not wholly, the regime which has come to rule the West German Republic.

Let me now come to the problems within the country. Now, here is the Address of the President and it is very interesting. He expresses confident hope in our Parliamentary institutions. I share his sentiments but a politician must be something more than one who merely expresses hope. The Prime Minister, speaking at a Press Conference after the General Elections, dwelt at length upon the rise of the communal forces and that of right reaction. I have in mind the Press Conference held on March 21, 1962, immediately after the elections. He rightly spoke in annoyance and indignation against communal forces and the forces of right reaction. I wish Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Dahyabhai were here.

Now, we share these sentiments. The other day, speaking to the new Members of Parliament, at the general body meeting of the Congress Party, the Prime Minister expressed similar sentiments of concern about the rise of the communal forces and the reactionary forces. Here I find so much of common sentiment between the right-minded, democratically-minded Congressmen and ourselves; but the question today is not merely one of expression of excellent and fine sentiments. The question today is, how

are we going to meet the situation as revealed by the third General Elections of the country? In this connection, I cannot but draw your attention to certain disturbing facts as have emerged from the elections mostly. Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan—leave alone Hariyana—comprise what we call the Hindi region of our country. They account for 17½ crores of the population out of a population of 43 crores and these account for again 197 seats in the Lok Sabha and 1,212 seats in the Assemblies of the country out of 3,000 seats. Now, if the forces of right reaction and communalism grow in that particular region, in Madhya Pradesh, in Uttar Pradesh, in Bihar, in Rajasthan, the Parliamentary balance of the country may easily tip in favour of counter-revolution, reaction and communalism. That is how you should view this matter. Now, therefore, those who cherish the future of the parliamentary institution, who want to see that it grows on secure, solid, secular foundation cannot but take serious note of this advancing menace of right reaction and communalism in the country. How are you going to meet it? The Prime Minister's speeches and utterances at Press Conferences and the Congress Party find no reflection whatsoever in the Address which embodies the Government policy. Am I then to understand that this question is a matter only to be talked about at Press Conferences, at public meetings, at the general body meeting of the Congress Party of the Parliament or is it a serious enough matter to be indicated clearly, embodied clearly, in the policy of the Government in the sphere of State. If it were to be indicated there, taken to the level of State then, of course, it should have been given some expression and consideration in the Address itself which represents the policy of the State, but there is complete silence. All is quiet on the State front. All is vociferous in the front of the Congress Parliamentary Party, talking inside and outside their party meetings. What about the State? Now, let me deal with it:

Take the communal issue. Even in these few days we have information of riots. For example, in Madras, the minority community has been subjected to terror and rioting. Now, it is a serious matter and I do not wish to deal with this matter very much but what are we doing today? It is not a question merely of administrative measures. Undoubtedly, these have to be taken because every time there is any danger of the minority community being attacked we should go all out to protect it; it should be done with all the power that we can command.

Then you have the chain reactions in Dacca and other places. Our answer to such ugly disturbances in East Bengal would not be retaliation; our answer to that would be greater protection to the minorities in our country, greater affection for them, more effective measures for them and greater integration of the minority with the majority community so that the fabric of Indian unity is founded on solid foundation. That is how we should proceed. This should be our approach.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): We would like to know if the hon. Member can cite an instance where the minority community has been subjected to constant terror in Madras.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Malda; not Madras. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister and I got a reply. I know that we are a secular State and by and large we people are secular-minded despite the provocative and aggressive communalism of the party that has come in this House, the Jana Sangh. And in this matter we do not take the credit alone. We know that we share that credit with many who are sitting on the other side of the House. It is a common creation of the Indian freedom movement, but this heritage has to be protected and maintained at all costs, not in sentiments alone but by taking measures. That is more important.

Madam, that is why I was asking why there was no meeting of the Integration Council that was formed last September. Why has it gone to sleep? The decisions of the National Integration Conference which was held here some months back under the chairmanship of the Chairman of this House are not being implemented in the States at all. Why are the State Governments, for example, or the Chief Ministers of the States who happen to be leaders of the ruling party not calling meetings of the representatives of other secular parties in order to discuss the problem affecting the different States? I, therefore, suggest that the Prime Minister should take immediate initiative in this matter to impress upon the State Governments to call similar conferences, or upon the leaders of the Congress Party who are in control of the Government to call similar conferences, so that the problems of national integration could be discussed very concretely and in a positive manner. I do not share the fantastic suggestion that since we are a nation there is no need for integration of the nation. He thinks there is a contradiction there. Because Mr. Anna-durai spells out his theory of separatism, there is all the more reason why we should develop more vigorous efforts for the integration of the nation, for a nation which is united can be disunited, undermined, subverted, by the forces of communalism and separatism. Let there be no mistake about it. Anyhow, it is all the more reason why we should direct *our* efforts in this direction.

In this connection naturally I think the time has come when we should pay more attention to the problems of minorities. You see how in Bastar the tribal minorities were being exploited by the counter-revolutionary and reactionary forces against the Congress and other secular parties. Reaction thrives on the backwardness of the people; reaction thrives on the grievances of the people and that is what we have seen today in the coun-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] *try*. Therefore, it is essential that we should pay attention to it. The minority problem today has become a major national problem requiring the utmost attention of the statesmanship, wisdom and political leadership of the whole nation combining in a common stream of political activities throughout the country. No doubt we differ on many things but on such questions like communalism, can we not, Congressmen, Communists and others, come out on the common platform and rouse the country's public opinion against such ugly, distorted forces? That is the question I put to the Congress Party on behalf of my Party. We know that we have differences in other matters tout what about here? If today Uttar Pradesh is taken over toy Jana Sangh or if these people become stronger, there will be ruin and disaster all around us and we shall all be pushed from one position to another. The country will be plunged in the uncertainty of fear and terror all the time and the fabric of our national life will be torn asunder. Are we to go in for such a stale of affairs or are we to meet the challenge with statesmanship, courage, unity and resolve so that we suppress the serpent before it comes to toe in a position to bite at the very fundamentals of our institutions? That is how I would view this matter.

Coming to the question of the Swa-tantra Party, Panditji was right when he said that the Swatantra Party was growing largely in the feudal areas. But how is it that after 14 years of independence a Maharani who had never known how to spell politics could get elected with a thumping majority from a State? How is it that 70,000 votes go against the Prime Minister of the country, against men like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? How is it that the Maharani of Jaipur routed a Congress candidate? How is it that some other Congress leaders also were defeated in this manner? Therefore, ideologically, politically, we have not attacked the forces of

reaction. It is not merely enough to say that feudalism helps them. We are not fighting feudalism with all our best. We have not gone there to impart ideas of democracy, organise the masses and rouse them from their stupor of backwardness into the light of democracy; so, the Rajahs and Ranis had the courage to go and seek mandate from the people. It is a shame on us, on each one of us, that in our country after 14 years of independence the toadies and hirelings of imperialism who obstructed at every step the freedom struggle had the temerity to contest the elections, then got votes and now come to Parliament pretending as if they are going to be the first Opposition today and in the Treasury Benches tomorrow. Meet this challenge before it is too late.

In this connection, Madam Deputy Chairman, a question is posed before the country. In a parliamentary system you need Opposition. Today the question before the country is, which Opposition do you need? The choice is restricted on the one hand to the Communist Party and other progressive parties and on the other to those people in the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra, and a choice has to be made. I know there are differences between Congressmen and ourselves but then the choice is not that you are having a liberal party. Here we and our allies together constitute the Opposition. If these other forces were to grow as Opposition, it will be ruin for the country. As you know, Madam, Mr. G. D. Birla in his address at the Annual General Meeting of the United Commercial Bank expressed satisfaction that the Swatantra Party had become the major Opposition today. I say, with all respect to Mr. Birla, that we are here to see that the Swatantra Party does not become the main Opposition in the country, no matter what happens. And we have seen to it this time. No wonder, Mr. Tata gives, for example, Rs. 75 lakhs to the Congress Party— openly of course; secretly it may toe

more—and Rs. 25 lakhs to the Swatantra Party. He says, "You in the Congress are my friends and you in the Opposition are also my friends". He will tell the Congress Minister "Do this thing for me" and he will tell the Swatantra Party, "If Mr. Swaran Singh will not help me, if the Minister of Commerce and Industry will not help me, put pressure on these Ministers so that you can take them in a reactionary direction". This is a wonderful thing. The monopolists have thus developed an interesting strategy in the country—feed the Congress and maintain its monopoly of power and in order to see that pressure is put from the Opposition, put the Swatantra Party and the Jana Sangh in the Opposition so that democracy gets distorted, so that democracy is vulgarised, broken up, humiliated and humbled and the entire State machinery works in favour of Big Money and the monopolist. I would ask Mr. Sapru, would he like that?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I won't.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No; he would not like it and therefore I need not dwell upon it very much. So this is the poser before the nation today.

As far as our P.S.P. friends are concerned, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha says "extremists". I do not know what he means. But if he has us in mind, as a colleague I would tell him that the P.S.P. which was trying to thrive on the banner of anti-communism in the third General Elections has miserably failed. Mr. Asoka Mehta declared from the top of the house almost at every public meeting that in the third General Elections the P.S.P. was going to be the first Opposition Party. I am very sorry for Mr. Asoka Mehta, but I am happy for myself. Therefore, this anti-communism does not work. The P.S.P.'s anti-communism has been rejected by the democratically-minded people. That is why there has been a demotion. In every State the P.S.P. has lost its

position, has been demoted to a lower position. Where it was the first Opposition, it has become the fourth. And I regret to say that even in Parliament they have gone down from the second to the fourth place. I am not happy. I would like the P.S.P. to sit in the place of Swatantra rather than Swatantra in the place of P.S.P. That is how we, Communists, view this matter. We are not anti-P.S.P. and all that. We have certainly our hatred against the exploiting classes represented by the Swatantra Party. Our hatred against oommunalism is like the consuming fire. There will not be any compromise on it, but friends of the democratic Opposition should take note of the development and see how we oan stand in the present situation. Therefore, I do not want to say much on this subject.

Before I finish I would only like to touch on another thing, namely, the release of long-term political prisoners. I again thank the hon. Members of this House who supported the cause of the release of long-term political prisoners. We have appreciated the action of the Madras Government in releasing twelve such long-term political prisoners in their State. Four are still there and we hope they will be released; also Comrade Balan, who is now in jail in Kerala, but was convicted in a Coimbatore case. I would appeal from this forum to the Chief Ministers of West Bengal, UP., Bihar and Punjab to release all the long-term political prisoners. Let the inauguration of the new President be marked by this aot of justice and compassion. I know, if Dr. Rajendra Prasad had power under the Constitution to commute the sentences and release the prisoners, he would have done so.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But he has no power. I would ask the Prime Minister, therefore, to impress upon the State Governments to release these prisoners when the new President takes office. I may mention in

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] this connection that one of them was Mr. Kansari Haider, a Member of the Second Lok Sabha, and about whom I spoke. You will be glad to hear that though I could not get him released 'by the Government of West Bengal, the High Court acquitted him. All the charges against him failed and the sentence of life imprisonment has been set aside. He is a free man today. Finally, I hope this will be done.

As far as the D.M.K. is concerned, I wish to tell Mr Annadurai that we shall not allow the forum of Parliament to be used in order to spread this dangerous and dismal idea of separatism in the country. From this side of the House we shall counter it every time Mr. Annadurai and his D.M.K. friends speak of separatism, because that is the philosophy not of goodness, not of democracy. That is one of the most deadliest thoughts that one can have after independence. As free citizens of the country we unite all the States. There everyone stays. We shall fight for the redress of the grievances of the working people. I have no doubt in my mind that should it come to that, should it come to fighting this idea of separatism, it shall be fought, I tell you. I tell Mr. Pathak that.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): May I know from the hon. Member whether the Communist Party in Madras has decided by a majority vote to support and cooperate with the D.M.K.?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Take it from me that no Communist in India supports separatism and our Party is quite clear on it. Separatism has to be countered, fought and eliminated as a political ideology.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): May I ask a question? Has the Communist Party agreed to cooperate with the D.M.K.? There is no question of separatism. Please answer that question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that question? You know very well that we are two. If we had been opportunists in politics as some hon. Members here are, then we would have been in the Assembly not two Members with ten lakhs of votes. Today in the Madras Assembly we have paid the price of fighting the D.M.K., in not aligning with them. Just because we fought the Congress, we did not ally with the D.M.K. Our seats in the second General Elections had come down from 12 to 4. Now, it is two. We are prepared for that. That is the answer. I do not wish to say very much. I have spoken at length, but I think the D.M.K.'s separatism is the most dangerous, disruptive idea that one can have. I would appeal to the Members, all those who have supported the D.M.K., to disabuse themselves of this horrible, dangerous idea and seek redress of their grievances within the framework of the unity of India which we all want not only to cherish but to strengthen by the common and combined efforts of all progressive and patriotic forces in the country. If India is united, we all live; if India is broken up then we all perish. This is quite clear. History has made it abundantly clear time and again. Must we fly in the face of history and begin the dangerous, tragic process of dismemberment, or must we traverse the path of unity and national integration and make our national unity more secure, unbreakable, indissoluble, beautiful and majestic in every sphere of life and activity?

Thank you.

SHRI ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am uncomfortably conscious of the fact that it is not very easy to follow Mr. Gupta. It is not a very happy sequence because it is virtually impossible to match him or emulate him either in the intensity of his feelings or eloquence. At any rate, I welcome this opportunity of participating in this debate and I shall deal first with three

or four topics that have been frequently referred to. One is regarding elections. A great deal has been said. I would like to add one or two things which I believe have not been fully appreciated. We, on this side of the House, feel gratified that we have come back in a majority. The Communist Party also feels that they have gained in strength. I was appointed by the Punjab Pradesh Congress as the chief observer of the State elections and my task was to assess the prospects of the Congress candidates in most of the constituencies. What I observed there does not constitute a very happy picture, either from the long range perspective of democracy or for the integrity and the political philosophy of the various parties here.

Let me first begin by confessing that the Congress Party, some of its members, showed a lack of discipline. If they were not given tickets, some of them openly, but many of them surreptitiously, tried to undermine the chances of the Congress candidate. It is not a very happy aspect for the rank and file of the Congress Party, which is the ruling party. Having said this, permit me to say that the parties of the Opposition did not come out with any commendable prospects. Mr. Gupta has been very eloquent about the rise of communalism and he has rightly denounced the parties of reaction. But I am sure he knows that in the Punjab at least—I cannot speak for other States—the Communists helped the victory of the Jana Sangh people. They supported the communal Akalis and the Akalis, in turn, supported the Communists.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no

4 P.M.

SHRI ANUP SINGH: The single object in their whole political strategy was to defeat the Congress. All other

objectives and political ideologies were deliberately relegated to the background with only one object which unfortunately they have not been able to fulfil. So, let us not be over-enthusiastic about the recent elections so far as the solidarity and the respective political programmes of the various parties are concerned.

Madam, a great deal has been said both in this House and outside in the press that democracy has taken a stronghold and a very firm foothold in India. But it is a very vast subject and I do not want to enter into the various aspects, but I think it will be highly dangerous for us to be very complacent about it. So far as I am concerned, I speak from a bit of experience during the recent elections. The party candidates in most cases did not present clear-cut programme either of the party or of the problems of the country before the electorate. They tried to exploit the religious sentiments, the group loyalties, caste, State, personalities, etc. This is certainly not a very happy beginning because we are just beginning. The voters who were loaded in trucks were taken to the polls and I regret to say that the vast majority of them did not know what the real issues were. Of course, the Congress emerged as the most powerful party because its programme was, comparatively speaking, known to the people. But I make a very broad generalisation that we—when I say we, I mean all the political parties—have not made any effort so far to educate the people politically, and I think the sooner we begin this the better for all of us.

The second problem that has been referred to here and one of the most vital and, perhaps, the paramount issue in the country today is that of integration. Here again one cannot make any new or concrete contribution except to express one's own uppermost feelings. When the hon.

[Shri Amup Singh.] Member over there from the D.M.K. was speaking, I was rather disturbed. At the same time, I am glad he spoke the way he did. I for one would not like to discourage such speeches. They are dangerous, and I know all

the political philosophy that supports the idea that this Union is indivisible, unbreakable, eternal, everlasting, and so on. Perfectly true, constitutionally and politically we are a united nation and nobody, no individual and no political party or combinations thereof will be allowed so far as the Constitution is concerned to break up this Union. But this political integration and this constitutional integration, Madam Deputy Chairman, is not enough. What we should be primarily concerned about is the spiritual, the mental and the emotional integration. When you have the spectacle of a responsible Member, a representative of how many people I do not know, voicing here the sentiments, statesmanship requires that we take note of them and do all that is humanly possible to see that such sentiments do not flourish. One of the things which is highly resented in the South—and I had some opportunity of going there—is what they feel to be the imposition of the Hindi language. My friend over there also made a reference to that. Nothing will be accomplished by imposition, and I am quite sure that in due course of time people will line up to accept Hindi as the national language. But I would suggest that we in the North deliberately and consciously try to learn at least one of the languages of the South as they j

are learning Hindi, I think it is understanding, goodwill, reciprocity, give and take and above all tolerance that will cement this union. No amount of constitutional paraphernalia has ever prevailed. Reference was made to America, how the unity was preserved, but at what cost? Bloodshed. But later on everything possible was done to win over the south, and some of the lingering remnants of that hate still persist. You go to the south, and they still do not want to hear the names of some of the military generals that were on the side of the north, and even Abraham Lincoln, the undisputed leader of the times and for all times so far as America is concerned is looked down upon by some of the people in the south simply because they were locked up in a deadly struggle. We certainly do not want anything of that kind to happen in this country. What I am suggesting is that interruptions on this side and trying to shout down somebody because he is voicing a sentiment with which we do not sympathise will not work. It will simply alienate people. We are a democratic people, and the most elementary requisite of that is tolerance and willingness to hear all points of view, and I would suggest that we try to follow this.

Two or three remarks have been made by a representative of the Opposition. Mr. Ramamurti yesterday in a very delightful Srony said that the Congress people had been groping for a definition of socialism. One of the newspapers today has said that he pooh-pooed the idea of socialism. I do not think the lack of any precise

definition of socialism is anything that one can gloat over. I will be pardoned for asking Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the Communist leader, and his Party as to whether they are sure what socialism means.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Absolutely. One hundred per cent. I will give you just now the definition. Socialism means the power in the hands of the working people and in a society where exploitation of man by man is ended, means of production and distribution and exchange are nationalised, where one man is not allowed to exploit the other, and the proletarian stayed.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: What about the disparity in income?

SHRI ANUP SINGH: I might say here that I am reasonably familiar with the book definition. The difference between the Communists and the Socialists is that the Communists want to bring about this millennium through force, if necessary. The Socialists are addicted to the idea of constitutional government. But as I said, I have in mind the ever-lasting controversy that has been going on in the ranks and among the leaders of the Communist Party, the revisionists, the deviationists, the Trotskyites, the Stalinists, the anti-Stalinists, and so on. Only a few years ago Mr. Stalin, no doubt a great man, was an authority, undisputed authority for the interpretation of Marxism or orthodox socialism. Today it is said that Mr. Stalin did not understand the A, B, C of socialism. What I am driving at is that the Congress has adopted a pragmatic, dynamic approach for the uplift of the masses through peaceful and constitutional means. I would rather be on this side than killing and fight-

ing with each other only over the definition. The socialists of today become renegades, reactionaries, tomorrow. So, let us not fling these generalisations at each other because they do not serve any purpose.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I say that many confirmed Congressmen become dissident Congressmen? Have you not seen that?

SHRI ANUP SINGH: Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the international situation. Obviously, the question of the resumption of nuclear tests has come as a shock to all of us. Here again, I am very sorry that I have to differ from Mr. Gupta in his approach. He was busy apportioning the blame—the Soviet Union was invariably right in his opinion; the American politicians were emitting warfare all the time. They both have been right; sometimes they both have been wrong. It is a very controversial subject. I think, that when the Russians resumed the tests, they were rightly, appropriately, criticised by many people including our own Prime Minister. He was not very happy over it. Now, the Americans have done the same thing. Two wrongs do not make one right. And I think we will be serving the cause of peace much better if we continued to make earnest appeals to both sides to come to some understanding, to bury the hatchet, rather than blame this party or that party. In this connection, Madam, I would refer to the suggestion that Lord Bertrand Russel made, namely, that India should send a warship to the testing site. Our Prime Minister said—and here I am very unhappy to differ with him, not fully appreciating the strength of his argument—that he did not see what purpose it could serve. Maybe, it is a silly suggestion; maybe, it is purely symbolic. But I think it would have been a very great moral gesture. I for one would have accepted this and

[Shri An up Singh.] lent a warship there. Let it be blown to pieces. Who knew at the time when Mahatmaji started his protest against the British, that that would prove to be his victory? He said that he was going to protest.

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR (Nominated) : It was not a warship but a freighter or a ship with civilians which Bertrand Russel wanted to be sent by our Prime Minister to the Pacific.

SHRI ANUP SINGH: I am sorry. I stand corrected. These things have a long-range impact which cannot be easily ignored.

Finally, I wish that both America and Russia would respond to the fervent appeals not only of the Prime Minister, not only of the Parliament of this country, but of the anguished humanity at large that not war, but co-existence has become inevitable.

Thank you.

श्री गोड़ेमुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति महोदया, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के बारे में जी प्रस्ताव आपके सामने है उसको प्रस्तावित करते हुए श्री दिनकर जो ने मेरे एक मंशोधन का भी जिक्र किया था। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में यह कहा था कि यह मंशोधन बड़ा महत्व रखता है क्योंकि उसमें यह कहा गया है कि हमारे देश में समाजवाद की रूपरेखा क्या होगी? मैं इस विषय पर वाद में बोलूंगा। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में जिक्र किया है, इसलिए मैं उस पर पहले बोलना चाहता हूँ। इस समय जेनेवा में जो डिसआर्मामेंट कांफ्रेंस हो रही है उसमें भारत ने अपना प्रतिनिधि भेजा है और उसने एक फार्मुला पेश किया है।

मेरा ऐसा अनुमान है कि हिन्द सरकार ने जो फार्मुला वहाँ पर पेश किया है उसके बारे में वह यह सोचती है कि उसने दुनिया के सामने एक बहुत ही अहम फार्मुला पेश किया है। लेकिन जिस देश के पास शस्त्र नहीं है, जिस के पास शस्त्र की शक्ति नहीं है, अगर वह दुनिया को यह सलाह देता है कि शस्त्र का कैसे उपयोग किया जाना चाहिये या शस्त्र का उपयोग कैसे बन्द किया जाना चाहिये तो एक अजीब बात मालूम देती है। असल में भारत सरकार की यह नीति होनी चाहिये कि वह दुनिया के सामने डिसआर्मामेंट के बारे में कोई नया आइडिया या नया विचार रखे। यह नया विचार इस तरह का होना चाहिये जिससे दुनिया के लोगों को यह मालूम हो जाय कि अगर शस्त्र का इस्तेमाल किया जायेगा तो क्या खराबी होने वाली है। आगामी दुनिया का जो इतिहास है उसमें ये तमाम शस्त्र खत्म हो जायेंगे या दुनिया खुद ही खत्म हो जायेगी। क्योंकि शस्त्र आजकल इतने खतरनाक हो गये हैं कि उनका इस्तेमाल करना ही मुश्किल है। अगर इन शस्त्रों का इस्तेमाल होता है तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि दुनिया ही खत्म हो जायेगी। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को, न सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की, बल्कि जो भी ऐसे एशिया और अफ्रीका के देश हैं, जिनके पास शस्त्र नहीं हैं, जो शस्त्र की शक्ति के साथ बात नहीं कर सकते हैं, उनकी एक विचारधारा निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में होनी चाहिये थी कि यह कार्य किस तरह से होना चाहिये और इसका दुनिया की जनता के लिए क्या महत्व है।

हमारी सरकार ने इन १५ सालों के अन्दर इस तरह की कोई बात नहीं की बल्कि उसकी विदेश नीति का मूल उद्देश्य दुनिया के जो दो शस्त्र वाले देश हैं यानी रूस और अमरीका उन के बीच दलाली करने की रही है। उसकी नीति यह रही है कि कभी एक के पास से एक सुझाव लेकर दूसरे के पास ले जाना और कभी दूसरे के पास से एक सुझाव लेकर पहले के

पास ले जाना। इस तरह से भारत ने एक "ब्रोकर" की नीति अपनाई है। उसकी विदेश नीति का परिणाम यह निकला है कि दुनिया में और एशिया और अफ्रीका में जो उसके दोस्त थे वे भी छूटते चले जा रहे हैं। मैं आपके सामने एक मिसाल अल्जीरिया की रखना चाहता हूँ। अल्जीरिया की प्रोविजनल गवर्नमेंट भारत सरकार से यह मांग कर रही है कि वह उसको मान्यता दे दे। अभी तक दुनिया के ३४ देशों ने उसको मान्यता दे दी है लेकिन भारत सरकार ने अभी तक उसको मान्यता नहीं दी है, यह क्या बात है? जब हम दुनिया से कालोनियलिज्म को खत्म करने के बारे में बड़ी लम्बी-चौड़ी बातें करते हैं, जो आजाद पसन्द लोग हैं उनका समर्थन करते हैं, तो क्यों नहीं अल्जीरिया की सरकार को मान्यता देते? जब हमारे सामने एक ऐसा मसला आ जाता है जिसके बारे में हम इतनी लम्बी-चौड़ी बातें करते हैं, इतनी लम्बी-चौड़ी दलीलें देते हैं, जब उस दिशा में काम करने का वक्त आता है तब उसको क्यों नहीं करते? शायद आप यह सोचते होंगे कि अगर हम अल्जीरिया की सरकार को मान्यता दे देंगे तो डीगौल नाराज हो जायेंगे या कोई दूसरा नाराज हो जायेगा। इस तरह से भारत सरकार के सामने कोई पोजिटिव पालिसी नहीं है। दुनिया में जो आजादी की लड़ाई चल रही है उसकी हम पोजिटिव रूप से हिमायत कर रहे हैं, तो फिर क्यों नहीं अल्जीरिया की सरकार को मान्यता देते हैं। अगर हम उनकी सरकार को मान्यता देते हैं तो हम दुनिया की आजादी की लड़ाई में ज्यादा मदद दे सकेंगे। लेकिन हमारी सरकार तो लम्बी-चौड़ी बात करती है और जब काम करने का अवसर होता है तब कुछ नहीं करती। भाषण देने से और लम्बी-चौड़ी बातें करने से कालोनियलिज्म खत्म होने वाला नहीं है। आजाद-पसन्द लोगों का अगर साथ देना है तो उसके लिए कोई ठोस कदम उठाना चाहिये और अल्जीरिया की सरकार को मान्यता देनी चाहिये।

जो हमारे अगल-बगल के देश हैं जैसे नेपाल है, उनके साथ हमारे कैसे संबंध हैं और वे कहां तक ठीक ढंग से चल रहे हैं, इसकी मुझे कुछ आलोचना करनी होगी। करीब दो हफ्ते हुए जब नेपाल के राजा यहां आये थे और उन्होंने हवाई अड्डे पर जो भाषण दिया उसमें उन्होंने युनाइटेड नेशन्स के पांच प्रिंसिपल की भी बात कही। लेकिन बाद में जब हम उनके भाषण को जो उन्होंने दूसरी जगह पर दिया था पढ़ते हैं तो उससे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि उनके मन में हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में कोई शंका रह गई है। इस तरह से यह बात साफ हो गई है कि हमारे और उनके बीच जो संबंध हैं वे गड़बड़ हैं। इसलिए मैं यह समझता हूँ कि अगर भारत सरकार इसी तरह की नीति अपनाती रहेगी तो इससे न तो हमको फायदा पहुंचने वाला है और न ही दुनिया को फायदा पहुंचेगा।

हमने निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में जो फार्मुला पेश किया है अगर उसके बजाय खुश्चेव और कैंनेडी से यह कहते कि तुम निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में खूब बहस करो लेकिन सबसे पहले दुनिया की गरीबी को खत्म करने के बारे में उपाय करो तो मेरे ख्याल में यह सबसे श्रेयस्कर होता। हमारा मुल्क जो गरीब है, जो दुनिया के सब देशों से गरीब है, उसको इस तरह का सुझाव अवश्य रखना चाहिये। दुनिया में जो सबसे बड़े ताकतवर मुल्क हैं, जिनके पास सब तरह के शस्त्र हैं, जिनके पास दुनिया की दौलत है, वे आपस में सम्मिट कांफ्रेंस करें। उनके सामने सबसे पहला मसला यह होना चाहिये कि दुनिया की गरीबी खत्म हो। मेरा ख्याल है कि इस तरह का सुझाव खुश्चेव और कैंनेडी को देना चाहिये और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि निःशस्त्रीकरण भी होगा क्योंकि जब दुनिया की गरीबी मिटेगी, तो फिर शस्त्र का कोई उपयोग नहीं रह जायेगा। इस तरह की एक विचारधारा हम लोगों को विदेश नीति में

[श्री गोड़े मुरारी]

रखनी चाहिये और इसमें हमारी सरकार बिल्कुल असफल रही है, यह मेरा आपसे कहना था।

देश के बारे में जब हम सोचते हैं, तो देश की गरीबी के बारे में भी हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि क्या हालत है। यह कहा गया है कि देश ने तरक्की की है। अगर देखा जाय तो एक बर्ग ने तरक्की की है, जिसमें ५० लाख लोग हैं और हर पंचवर्षीय योजना में पांच छः लाख लोग उसमें और मिल जाते हैं। इतना तो हम मानने के लिए तैयार हैं, लेकिन जो आम जनता है, जो गांवों की जनता है, क्या उसमें भी कोई तरक्की हुई है? अगर आप देखेंगे तो यह पायेंगे कि जो स्थिति उनकी १५ साल पहले थी, उससे भी खराब स्थिति उनकी आज हो गई है क्योंकि चाहे कुछ भी ज्यादा पैसा और ज्यादा आमदनी उनको मिली हो, लेकिन चीजों के दाम इतनी तेजी से बढ़े कि उसका कोई लाभ उनको नहीं मिला। जो तरक्की के बारे में सोचते हैं उनको इस चीज का भी ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा कि दस सालों में और मुल्कों ने हमारे कम्पेरिजन में कितनी तरक्की की है। हम लोगों को यही नहीं देखना होगा कि हमारे देश ने कितनी तरक्की की है बल्कि हम लोगों को यह भी देखना होगा कि हमारे अगर बगल के देशों में जो तरक्की हो रही है उसके साथ हमारी कम्पेरिटिवली क्या हालत है। अगर इसको देखा जाय तो यह सफ़ हो जायेगा कि तरक्की तो हो ही नहीं रही है। कुछ चन्द लोगों की, एक बर्ग की तरक्की हो रही है और वे ज्यादा पैसे बना रहे हैं और जो गरीब हैं वे जहाँ के तहाँ लह जाते हैं। इसका एक मूल कारण यह है कि हमारा जो प्लान है वही दूषित है। जो पंचवर्षीय योजना है, हिन्दुस्तान की बनाई गई है वही दूषित है, क्योंकि यह पूरा प्लान नकल किया हुआ है, कहीं रूस का नकल किया हुआ है और कहीं अमेरिका का नकल किया हुआ है। लेकिन हमारे देश की जो स्थिति है उसको देख करके और

उसके अनुसार यह नहीं बना है। हमारे देश की क्या स्थिति है? हमारे देश में लेबर ज्यादा है, कैपिटल नहीं है, लेकिन जो प्लान बना है वह उन देशों की नकल किया गया है जहाँ कैपिटल का कोई अभाव नहीं है और जहाँ लेबर की कमी है। पूरा दृष्टिकोण जो प्लान का है वही एकदम खराब है तो फिर होगा क्या? इस तरह के दूषित प्लान को ले करके हम आगे बढ़ें तो नतीजा उसका खराब निकलेगा उसके बाद हम उसमें चाहे जितनी तरमीम करें और उसमें जोड़ें, उससे कोई मतलब निकलने वाला नहीं है। अगर सारी जनता को उठाना है तो फिर प्लान भी उसी तरह का बनना चाहिये कि जो प्लान का नतीजा निकले वह सारे देश की जनता के लिए निकले। उससे चाहे जितना कम नतीजा निकले, उसकी कोई परवाह नहीं है। हो सकता है कि सारे देश में बहुत ही कम तरक्की दिखलाई पड़े, लेकिन आम जनता की और सब लोगों की तरक्की दिखलाई पड़े, यह प्लान का मतलब होना चाहिये। लेकिन अभी जो प्लान है वह बिल्कुल उल्टा प्लान है।

अभी जो चुनाव हुआ, उसके बारे में दो तीन शब्द कहना चाहूंगा। जितनी कांग्रेस पार्टी की ओर से इर्रेग्युलैरिटी होनी थी, वह हुई और सरकारी मशीनरी का जितना दुरुपयोग करना था वह सब कुछ किया गया। खासकर के एक संसदीय क्षेत्र में, जहाँ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री खुद खड़े थे, वहाँ पर उन्होंने कितनी सरकार की मशीनरी का दुरुपयोग किया और कैसे लोगों में ब्लैकट्स बांटे गये, वह मैं बतलाना चाहूंगा।

AN HON. MEMBER: On behalf of the Prime Minister?

श्री गोड़े मुरारि : एक तो हरीसनगंज पोलिंग सेंटर है। वहाँ पर इम्परसोनेशन हुआ और प्रैसाइडिंग आफिसर को भी पकड़ा गया पुलिस के जरिये और वहाँ इतना इम्परसोनेशन हुआ कि रोक लगा दी गई।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : The hon. Member should know that there is a way out. Has he or anybody else filed a petition?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: What about recent amendments to the Representation of the People Act which have made acts like spreading of communal propaganda, corruption, etc. punishable? We have made these amendments to the Representation of the People Act. Why should not the Government enforce the provisions of the Representation of the People Act and punish the offenders who have indulged in such communal propaganda and corrupt practice?

श्री गोड़े मुराहरि : इलाहाबाद कारपोरेशन की कुछ स्टेशन वैनस को ब्लैकटस डिस्ट्रिब्यूट करने के लिए इस्तेमाल किया गया। मुकुन्दपुर में रेडियो सैट डिस्ट्रिब्यूट किये गये और रोडवेज बसेज का बहुत बड़े स्केल में वहाँ पर इस्तेमाल हुआ।

रेल मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री शाहनवाज खाँ) : गलत है।

श्री गोड़े मुराहरि : होलागढ़ और गिरधरपुर पोलिंग स्टेशंस में सौ बैलेट पेपर्स ऐसे थे जिन पर किसी और पोलिंग स्टेशन का स्टाम्प था। इसी तरह सोलन और रायबरेली के बैलेट पेपर्स मुबारकपुर और फूलपुर में पाये गये। ऐसी बहुत सी बातें हैं जिन्हें मैं पढ़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : आप पेटिशन कीजिये।

श्री गोड़े मुराहरि : हम पेटिशन करना नहीं चाहते।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : क्यों नहीं करना चाहते ?

श्री गोड़े मुराहरि : पेटिशन के लिए आप लोगों ने ऐसे कानून बनाये हैं कि उसके लिए भी पैसे की जरूरत होती है और हमारे पास इतने पैसे नहीं हैं कि हम उस पर खर्च कर सकें।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : कलकत्ता के मारवाड़ी तो पैसे देते हैं और उसी से आपकी पार्टी चलती है।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: How can we believe you?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: If the hon. Member believes in democracy for this country, it is the responsibility of the Government to investigate all these complaints if there are any.

श्री गोड़ मुराहरि : यह शर्म की बात है कि प्रधान मंत्री की कांस्टिट्यूंसी में ऐसी चीजें हों। आप मारवाड़ियों की बात कहते हैं। मैं यहाँ आपके सामने बतला सकता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री के कुटुम्ब के लोगों ने मारवाड़ियों से कितना रुपया लिया है। लेकिन मैं इन सब चीजों को यहाँ पर लाना नहीं चाहता। बात यह है कि आप खयाल कीजिये कि इस तरह की बातों को सदन में लाने से उसका नतीजा क्या होगा ? ये सारी चीजें मैंने अपनी जानकारी से बताई हैं। मैं खुद चुनाव के समय उस क्षेत्र में था और मैं पर्सनली जानता हूँ कि ये सारी चीजें वहाँ चल रही थीं। जब प्रधान मंत्री के क्षेत्र में इस तरह की चीजें हों तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान में हर छोटे आदमी के साथ किस तरह का व्यवहार हुआ होगा उसकी तो कोई हैसियत ही नहीं है। बहुत से सदस्यों ने यहाँ पर आपके सामने बताया है कि इलेक्शन में कितनी इर्रैग्युलरिटीज हुईं और गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी का किस तरह से दुरुपयोग किया गया। यह सब आपके सामने मैं इसलिए लाना चाहता था कि अगर जनतंत्र को हिन्दुस्तान में ठीक तरीके से चलाना है तो फिर सरकारी पार्टी की भी एक जिम्मेदारी रहती है जो आम चुनाव कराती है। पांच साल के अन्दर तो उसका कोई इलाज ही नहीं है। पांच साल के बाद आप जनता को अपनी इच्छा प्रगट करने का मौका देते हैं। अगर उस वक्त भी हजार तरीके की इर्रैग्युलरिटीज होती हैं

[श्री गोड़े मुराहरि]

और गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी का इस्तेमाल होता है और जो जनता की सही इच्छा है उसको प्रगट नहीं होने दिया जाता है। तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान में जनतंत्र चलना ही बहुत मुश्किल है।

एक दूसरी बात है। कभी कभी सरकार के कुछ मंत्री लोग और कुछ नेता लोग अपने भाषणों में यह कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में तो एडल्ट फ्रेंचाइज नहीं रहनी चाहिये। इसके बारे में भी सरकार के लोगों को सावधान रहना पड़ेगा। अगर इस तरह के भाषण दिये गये तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि जनता के ऊपर यह असर पड़ेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में जनतंत्र नहीं रहने वाला है।

इसके बाद पहले दिन जो मैंने ओथ लेने के समय एक प्वाइंट उठाया था कि हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान को एडल्ट फ्रेंचाइज के जरिये मान्यता होनी चाहिये, वह मैं फिर दोहराना चाहूंगा। आज आपने अन्नादुराई साहब का भाषण सुना। वे सेपरेशन चाहते हैं और वे कांस्टिट्यूशन के खिलाफ बोले। जो वे बोले मैं उसके खिलाफ हूँ, लेकिन इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि जब तक आप संविधान को सैक्टिटी नहीं देंगे, जब तक एडल्ट फ्रेंचाइज के जरिये मान्यता प्राप्त कराके आप उसको सैक्टिटी नहीं देंगे, तब तक कोई आ करके यह कह सकता है कि यह जो संविधान आपका बना है, यह ठीक ढंग से नहीं बना है और हम इस संविधान को नहीं मानते हैं। इसलिए अभी भी सरकार को मौका है कि वह इस संविधान को जनता के सामने रख करके, और आम मत ले करके इसका समर्थन करा ले।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या संविधान जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों ने नहीं बनाया ?

श्री गोड़े मुराहरि : नहीं, आपको शायद मालूम नहीं है कि संविधान कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली ने पास किया था और कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली गुलाम हिन्दुस्तान की उन असेम्बलीज के नुमाइंदों की थी जो रेस्ट्रिक्टेड फ्रेंचाइज से चुनी गई थी।

मैं एक और चीज आपके सामने लाना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो आज कल विदेशी पूंजीपतियों की लूट चल रही है उसको बन्द करने के लिए और हिन्दुस्तान में तरक्की के लिए जो धन की जरूरत है उसको सप्लीमेंट करने के लिए भी यह जरूरी है कि जो विदेशी पूंजी है उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाय। हम बहुत लम्बी-चौड़ी बात समाजवाद की करते हैं और सरकार की तरफ से भी बहुत कुछ कहा गया है कि हम भी इस देश में समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं और समाजवाद की रूपरेखा हम आवडी से बना रहे हैं लेकिन आवडी के बाद से अब तक कोई ऐसी रूपरेखा हमको नहीं दिखाई दी है जिसको समाजवाद कहा जा सके। जो विदेशी पूंजी है उसका आज तक राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया गया है और जो पब्लिक सेक्टर है वह बढ़ता नहीं है लेकिन प्राइवेट सेक्टर पब्लिक सेक्टर से ज्यादा जोरों से बढ़ रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान में सोशलिज्म की क्या रूपरेखा होगी उसका अब तक सरकार की तरफ से कोई नमूना पेश नहीं हुआ है। हिन्दुस्तान में जो पूंजीवादी ढांचा पहले था वही अभी भी चालू है, उसमें कोई तरमीम नहीं हुई है। सिर्फ भाषणों में, जब मौका मिल जाता है तब यह कहा जाता है कि हम भी समाजवादी हैं और यहां समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं। समाजवाद की बात तो सभी करते हैं, समाजवाद की बात श्री धनश्यामदास बिड़ला भी करते हैं, लेकिन समाजवाद की क्या रूपरेखा होगी वह आपकी करतूतों का जो नतीजा निकलेगा उस पर निर्भर करेगा। आप समाजवादी हों या न हों लेकिन आपकी जो करतूतें हैं वह समाजवाद लाने वाली

हैं या नहीं इस पर सब निर्भर करेगा। मेरा यह कहना है कि अभी तक जो भी प्लान हुए हैं, कांग्रेस की ओर से अभी तक जो भी योजनाएँ बनाई गई हैं उनका सिर्फ एक ही नतीजा निकला है और वह यह कि पहले से जो ढाँचा था उसी को अभी तक कायम रखा गया है। इसीलिये मेरा यह कहना है कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान को तरक्की करनी है तो फिर हम अपने समाजवाद के ढाँचे को भी साफ करें और उसे साफ करने के लिये तो एक ही रास्ता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो आमदनी है उसमें १ और १० का अन्तर रखा जाय यानी कम से कम १ और ज्यादा से ज्यादा १० हो। अगर इस तरह का अनुपात हो, सभी की आमदनी १ और १० के बीच में होनी हो तो हमें पता लगेगा कि किसकी इनकम १० से ज्यादा जाती है और तब हम एक प्लान बना सकते हैं, तब हम एक रूपरेखा दे सकते हैं कि समाजवाद का यह रूप होगा। लेकिन जब तक इस तरह का कोई मूल उद्देश्य हमारे सामने नहीं रहता है तब तक कोई भी समाजवाद का ढाँचा सामने नहीं आयेगा।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं आपके सामने एक और चीज रखना चाहूँगा। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कहा गया है कि देश की जो खाद्य स्थिति है वह बहुत सुधर गई है, लेकिन क्या सुधरी है? जो सिर्फ दो वक्त खाते हैं उन को अगर आप जा कर देखिये तो पता चलेगा कि वे वही दाल-भात, भात-दाल खाते रहते हैं। ठीक है, आप यह कहेंगे कि ये दोनों वक्त खाना खाते हैं लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि उसमें कोई तरक्की नहीं हुई है। वे जो दाल-भात, भात-दाल पहले खाते थे वही दाल-भात अब भी खाते हैं। आप यह कह दें कि हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत तरक्की हुई है, खाद्य स्थिति में बहुत प्रगति हुई है और सब को दोनों वक्त का खाना मिल जाता है लेकिन ऐसा वही कह सकते हैं जो कि बहुत खुशहाल हों और दोनों वक्त बहुत अच्छा खाना खाते हों और उनसे यह पता

नहीं चलेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान का गरीब किस तरह का जीवन बसर कर रहा है। आप गांवों में जा कर देखिये कि गांवों में जो लोग हैं वे क्या खा रहे हैं। अगर इस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान में आप जा कर गांवों को देखेंगे तो पता चलेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई प्रगति नहीं हुई है।

वक्त खत्म हो गया है इसलिये खत्म करूँगा लेकिन फिर भी मैं एक बार इस चीज को दुहराना चाहूँगा कि अल्जीरिया का जो मामला है उसके बारे में सरकार जल्द से जल्द सोचे और मामले के और खतरनाक होने से पहले उसके बारे में कोई निर्णय ले क्योंकि एक बार कांगो में भी हमें यह गलती की थी और अफ्रीका की नजरों में हम गिर गये थे जब कि लुमुम्बा की गवर्नमेंट को हम ने रिकग्नाइज नहीं किया। अल्जीरिया ने इतिहास में शायद सब से ज्यादा मुसीबतें उठाई हैं, उस देश में इतने लोग मारे गये हैं कि इतिहास में इसकी मिसाल नहीं मिलेगी और सीज़फ़ायर के बाद भी दो हज़ार से ज्यादा लोग मारे गये हैं। तो अब उस देश की सरकार को मान्यता दे कर के हमें उनकी सहायता करनी चाहिये, यही मेरा निवेदन है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House will sit till 5.30. Shrimati Maya Devi Chettyr.

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, we are grateful to our President for his nice speech delivered to the joint session of Parliament. It has been my great privilege to be a Member of this august House since 1952, for ten years, and as far as my memory goes, our President has always left out mention of certain minorities in his Address. Madam, during the freedom struggle of our country, every part of the country and every community shared their responsibilities and burden to free the country from foreign hands. Madam, in this freedom struggle, the Nepali community took a great part along with

[Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty.] their big brothers in India and cooperated in the movement to see the country, but they are now most neglected in this country. They number not less than 30 lakhs in India. These Gurkhas or rather their forefathers came from Nepal to join the army as army personnel or to work as common workers in the common field. Since then they have made India their homeland and they have been serving India in various fields and in various capacities. These brave Gurkhas of Nepal since then have forgotten their homeland and have become citizens of India. They have, as I said, made India their homeland. The bravery of the Gurkhas were well-known not only today but centuries back and known all over the world. Every Gurkha feels that it is better to die than be a coward, because they are a martial race and cowardice is not in their blood. They are working in the military and in other fields of activities. When in the military they are placed in the hottest place or in the snow-bound regions, they are happy and contented and they are prepared to die with a smile on their face without any complaint. These brave Gurkhas have been serving the motherland sincerely and even recently those who laid down their lives and shed their blood on the borders in Kashmir were the boys from Darjeeling district. But in my opinion, the Government has not given proper attention and recognition to them.

They are in the military where you would find many Gurkha regiments but they are not even given the rank of a Brigadier. They prefer either the military or the police but even in the police there is not a single Gurkha Superintendent of Police even though there are many qualified and capable officers. In this way they feel that they are neglected in every field. Being a martial race, they do not like the idea of joining* any other humdrum service but prefer joining the armed forces or the police force. Even here, it is very difficult for them to

get into these services. I would request the Government of India to give special facilities to this community to enter such services. They are brave and honest and their loyalties can always be counted upon. It is not that I am praising them because I happen to belong to that community. Other foreign writers too have praised the Gurkhas. Here I would like to quote the remarks of a few British officers. Brain Hutan Hugtison writes in his book "Origin and Classification of the Military Tribes of Nepal in 1833" that the "Gurkhas are by far the best soldiers in Asia". He had taken among other Indian troops these Gurkhas to France and he wrote this book after the War. He wrote many things praising the Gurkhas. Another officer, Francis Toker, in his "Gurkhas" writes:

"The Gurkha must, for his unusually fine qualities, be nearly unique in the modern world. Let any enquirer be assured that if he seeks to understand the meaning of courage and selfless devotion, then he should soldier with a Gurkha Regiment. He will return an enlightened and a better man from the experience".

Thus, so many British officers and other officers have praised Gurkhas but today, after independence, these brave Gurkhas whether in the civil or in the military when they have rendered services with so much of devotion and loyalties, are not recognised properly.

In the political field also. Madam, we are not given any importance. There are Indians in Nepal, so also there are Nepalese in India. These Indians in Nepal enjoy equal facilities with the Nepalese in every field. When the democratic government was there, the Indians who had settled there were given equal facilities and were appointed as Ministers in the Cabinet and Governors in the States as Bada Hakim. There are thirty lakhs of Nepalese in India who have their own culture, language and their own customs but even then the Government

does not think it proper to give any recognition to them. I have not expressed my feelings so far thinking that, "Talk is silver but silence is gold". Now, I find that even after the passage of so many years after independence if I would not express my feelings and remain silent, then it would be taken as cowardice. I am not communal and I have always differed from such communal bodies which are there in Darjeeling. My family has always been away from this communalism and even my husband also was jailed in the movement led by Gandhiji. We are against communal bodies but we have been seeing other communities talking of their rights and the safeguards. We now feel that if we remain silent, Government would not give proper attention to this community and this community would remain behind. This is a democratic country and we are going to have a socialistic pattern of society and every community and every person has got full right to demand from the Government their safeguards and rights.

I was talking of the Indians in Nepal. Our culture and religion are the same. We do not differ either in religion or in culture. Due to the birth of Lord Buddha in Nepal and the visit of Sankaracharya and Vikramaditya to Nepal, the relationship between these sister countries became closer than before. We do not now think that Nepal is a foreign country because we are so close to them. The Indians in Nepal are equally in good number as the Nepalese are here in India.

In the economic field also, Madam, it is a great pity that even in the district of Darjeeling which has a population of more than six lakhs, there is neither a heavy industry nor a small-scale industry to provide employment for them. There is not even proper land for agriculture.

Every year, students come out from the colleges and the universities and they have to go out to find some job in countries like Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim and other foreign countries. They

go out of their country in search of employment and they settle there also. In this way, there are a few offices in the district of Darjeeling but they are also filled by plains people neglecting the rights of the local people. It is not a happy thing to express here. I am not communal; I do not like to express my feeling that the plains people go there and fill all the offices neglecting the local people. We are always talking about national integration, peace and harmony but by our actions we are disintegrating ourselves. In this matter I think the Government should pay proper attention to the border area because it is not proper in the interest of the country that people in the border area should remain unhappy and frustrated. I would request the Government to pay more attention to this border area and try to win over the hearts of the people there by love and affection. Every community expects love and affection from their Government. That is the way by which we can become one. Without love and affection we will never be one because we are apt always to think in terms of our communities and of our States. It is not a healthy sign that we should always think of ourselves.

Regarding language, the Government has not recognised the Nepali language so far though it is a rich language. As Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji has written in his book, Nepali should be in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, because it is a rich language; it is an Aryan language and so it should be in the Constitution. I would request the Government that Nepali should be treated as one of the country's major languages and proper attention should be given to recognise this language. Recently, the West Bengal Government has given recognition to the Nepali language in the hill areas only and for that I am very much thankful to our Prime Minister, Home Minister and the Chief Minister Dr. B. C. Roy. The language problem nowadays is a great problem and every community feels, 'It is my language, it is my culture' and

میں آسامی بھی بستے ہیں اور بنگالی بھی - اس میں کشمیری بھی بستے ہیں اور گجراتی بھی - یہاں ہندو بھی ہیں مسلمان بھی؟ سکھ بھی ہیں اور عیسائی بھی - یہاں کوئی اقلیت نہیں ہے کوئی ماٹنارتی نہیں ہے - اس ملک میں اگر کوئی ماٹنارتی ہے تو وہ ایک ماٹنارتی ہے اور وہ ماٹنارتی ہندوستانیوں کی ہے - اس ملک میں بہت سی قومیں بستے ہیں لیکن ہندوستانی کی کم بستے ہے - حکومت کے سامنے اس وقت صرف ایک ہی چیز ہے - اگر اس ملک میں خوشحالی کو قائم رکھنا چاہتے ہیں، اگر ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرنا ہے، اگر آپ ہندوستان کی انہوالی نسل کے لئے ایک خوشحال ہندوستان بنانا چاہتے ہیں تو اس بات کی سخت ضرورت ہے کہ ہم قومی یکجہتی کی طرف توجہ دیں - قومی یکجہتی کے یہ معنی نہیں ہیں کہ ہم اس کا نعروں لکائیں - قومی یکجہتی کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ ہم ایک دوسرے کو سمجھیں - ہم یہ جانیں کہ ہندوستان کی جو منگی ہے وہ ہر شخص کی ملکیت ہے اس پر ہندو کا بھی حق ہے مسلمان کا بھی؟ سکھ کا بھی اور عیسائی کا بھی - نہ اقلیت کا زیادہ ہے نہ اقلیت کا کم ہے - اس ملک کے اندر نہ گورکھوں کا کوئی زیادہ حق ہے نہ بنگالیوں کا زیادہ حق ہے - سب سے انتہائی افسوس ہے کہ ایک کانگریس ممبر نے اس ایوان

میں اگر کچھ اس طرح کی بات کہی اور ساتھ ہی یہ بھی کہا کہ ہم قومی یکجہتی چاہتے ہیں - اس ملک میں اگر کسی چیز کی کمی ہے تو ہمیں اس بات کو دیکھنا ہے کہ وہ کمی جو ہے وہ ایک دوسرے کو سمجھنے کی ہے - یہاں چھوٹی چھوٹی باتوں کو بڑے رنگ میں لا کر قومی یکجہتی کو اور پریشانی میں نہیں ڈالا جا سکتا ہے - ہندوستان کو اس بات کا فخر ہے کہ اس ملک میں اس عجیب ملک میں نازک جیسا آدمی، جو وحدت پرست تھا پیدا ہوا - اس میں کوتم پیدا ہوا جس کا مشن محبت تھا - اس میں چشتی پیدا ہوا جس کا مشن محبت تھا - لیکن آج ہم اپنی چلد خودغرضیوں کے لئے اپنی مطلب پرستی کے لئے ہندوستان کو تباہی کی طرف لیجانا چاہتے ہیں -

میں اس ایوان کے ممبروں سے یہ درخواست کروں گا - میں تمام جماعتوں سے یہ التجا کروں گا - چاہے وہ کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے ہوں؟ چاہے پی - ایمر - پی کے ہوں؟ چاہے کانگریس کے ہوں؟ چاہے مسلم لیگ کے ہوں؟ چاہے جن سنگھ کے ہوں یا کسی جماعت کے ہوں؟ سب کو اس بات کا حلف لینا چاہیئے کہ ہندوستان کو چھوڑنے کی بجائے صرف اپنی پارٹی کو فائدہ پہنچانے کی کوشش نہیں کریں گے اور ہم ملک میں مذہب کے نام پر ذات کے نام پر، رنگ اور نسل کے نام پر، کوئی فساد نہیں ہونے دیں گے -

[شہری اے - اے - طارق]

5 P.M.

سمجھو اس بات میں کوئی دیکھ نہیں ہے کہ کون کس جماعت میں ہے - وہ کمیونسٹ ہوں وہ سوشلسٹ ہوں وہ حتیٰ کہ چاہے وہ فاسسٹ بھی ہو لیکن اسے ایک بات کو پہلے اپنے سامنے رکھنا چاہیئے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ وہ صرف ہندوستانی ہے اور خالص ہندوستانی ہے اور اگر ہم اس چیز کو سمجھتے ہیں تو یقیناً ہم ترقی کی طرف جائیں گے۔ میرے دوست نے صبح جو نعرہ لگایا اس ملک کی تقسیم کا میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس ملک کے لوگ اس ملک کے رہنے والے اور اس ملک کی حفاظت کرنے والے کبھی اس بات کی اجازت نہیں دیں گے اور ہندوستان کبھی تقسیم نہیں ہو گا - نہ مدراس میں نہ گجرات میں نہ کشمیر میں اور نہ پنجاب میں - ہندوستان ہندوستان کا ہے اور ہندوستان پر ہر ہندوستانی کا مساوی حق ہے -

میں آپ کی توجہ اس بات کی طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج اقوام متحدہ میں جسے آپ یونائیٹڈ نیشنس کہتے ہیں ایک ایسے مسئلہ پر بحث ہو رہی ہے جو ہم سب کیلئے انتہائی ضروری ہے وہ مسئلہ ہے کشمیر کا - میں آپ کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہوں گا اور آپ کی ہی نہیں بلکہ آپ کے ذریعہ تمام دنیا کے لوگوں کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ کشمیر کا

مسئلہ ہندو مسلمان کا مسئلہ نہیں ہے کشمیر کا مسئلہ اکثریت اور اقلیت کا مسئلہ نہیں ہے یہ مسئلہ صرف ہندوستانیوں کا ہے اور ہم ہندوستانی اس بات سے بخوبی واقف ہیں کہ کشمیر کے پیچھے کیا کہا ہوتا ہے کشمیر کے پیچھے کیا کیا سازشیں کی گئی ہیں -

میں پاکستان میں رہنے والے لوگوں سے محبت رکھتا ہوں - آخر وہ بھی ہندوستانی ہیں - میں جانتا ہوں کہ پاکستان کے لوگ اس وقت سیاسی یتیم ہیں - ان کے سامنے کوئی سیاسی زندگی نہیں ہے - پاکستان میں ایک ڈکٹیٹر شپ پیدا کی گئی ہے - وہاں وہ پیدا نہیں ہوئی ہے بلکہ باہری طاقتوں نے کبھی انگریزوں نے کبھی امریکہ نے پاکستان کے رہنماؤں کو خرید کر پاکستان کے لوگوں پر ایک ڈکٹیٹر شپ توپ دی ہے - پاکستان کے عوام اور ہندوستان کے عوام دو مختلف چیزیں نہیں ہیں - پاکستان کے بنکالی اور ہندوستان کے بنکالی مختلف نہیں ہیں - ان کی سمجھ ایک ہے ان کا کلچر ایک ہے ان کی تواریخ ایک ہے - لیکن اس غلط سیاست دانی میں اور ملک کی افراطیوں میں جب بھی پاکستان میں کسی قسم کی سیاسی جاگرتی پیدا ہوتی ہے تو پاکستان کے نیتا، پاکستان کے وہ نام نہاد لوگ جو اگر آج ہندوستان میں ہوتے تو ان کی حیثیت شاید برگیڈیئر یا

- پیچھے جنرل سے زیادہ نہ ہوتی لیکن آج پاکستان میں صرف بین الاقوامی سازشوں کی وجہ سے پاکستان کے عوام پر ان کو ٹھونسنا گیا ہے، یہ نیتنا جب پاکستان کے اندر لوگوں میں سہاسی شعور پیدا ہوتا ہے تو اس وقت پاکستان کی جلتنا کی توجہ کشور کی طرف لگا دیتے ہیں۔ ہندوستان کے حملہ کی طرف لگا دیتے ہیں۔

ہندوستان کی تاریخ میں اس وقت بھی جیسا پاکستان نے ہندوستان کی سرحدوں پر حماہ کیا ہندوستان نے پاکستان کی طرف دوستی کا ہاتھ بڑھایا۔ ہم نے بار بار پاکستان سے یہ کہا کہ آئیے ہم اور آپ ملکر ایک ایسا معاہدہ کریں کہ ہم ایک دوسرے پر حملہ نہیں کریں گے لیکن ہمیشہ پاکستان نے ہماری اس تجویز کو اور ہماری اس دوستانہ دعوت کو ٹھکرا دیا۔ آج پاکستان کے عوام سے یہ کہا جا رہا ہے کہ ہندوستان کی طرف سے خطرہ ہے۔ ہندوستان کسی اور ملک پر حملہ کرنا نہیں چاہتا۔ ہندوستان خود خوشحال بننا چاہتا ہے۔ اس کے ساتھ ہندوستان کی یہ خواہش بھی ہے کہ اس کے ہمسایہ ملک بھی خوشحال ہوں۔ کوئی شریف آدمی یہ نہیں چاہتا کہ اس کا گھر تو خوشحال ہو لیکن اس کے دائیں اور بائیں فاقہ مستی، فاقہ پرستی اور

بدنظمی ہو۔ ہر شریف آدمی اپنے گھر کی اچھائی چاہتا ہے، اپنے محلے کی اچھائی چاہتا ہے، اپنے شہر کی اچھائی چاہتا ہے۔ یہی ہندوستان کا نصب العین ہے۔ جس طریقہ سے ابھی پاکستان کے ڈکٹیٹر جنرل ایوب خان نے یہ کہہ کر ہندوستان کو لٹکرا ہے کہ اقلیتوں پر اکثریت ظلم کر رہی ہے۔ اقلیت ظلم کر رہی ہے یا اکثریت ظلم کر رہی ہے یہ ایک دوسرا معاملہ ہے۔ لیکن میں اس ایوان کے ذریعہ دنیا کے تمام لوگوں کو یہ بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم ہندوستان کے مسلمان اور ہم ہندوستان کے رہنے والے شہری ہندوستان کے معاملات کو خود سنبھال لیں گے۔ ہندوستان میں جو حقوق ہمیں حاصل ہیں وہ صرف مسلمان کو ہی نہیں، ہندو کو بھی نہیں، سکھ کو بھی نہیں، عیسائی کو بھی نہیں بلکہ پاکستان میں کسی شہری کو بھی حاصل نہیں ہیں۔ اگر دنیا کے نقشہ پر کہیں مسلمان خطرہ میں ہے، اگر کچھ زمین پر کہیں مسلمان فاقہ مستی میں مبتلا ہے تو وہ صرف ایک پاکستانی ہے جہاں وہاں کے رہنے والوں کو چاہے وہ مسلمان ہوں، ہندو ہوں، سکھ ہوں۔ کسی بھی شخص کو سیاسی آزادی نہیں ہے۔ پاکستان کی سیاسی حالت اتنی خراب ہے کہ اس ملک میں خوشحالی کا سوال ہی پیدا نہیں ہوتا۔ پاکستان میں سیاسی حالت اس حد

تک پہنچ چکی ہے کہ اس ملک میں بغاوت ہوگی اور ضرور ہوگی - اس بغاوت میں کتنے ہی لوگ مارے جائیں گے، اس کا ہمیں انتہائی افسوس ہوگا - پاکستان کی موجودہ حکومت ان حالات میں پاکستان کی اس بغاوت کو روک نہیں سکتی -

میں آپ کی توجہ اس طرف بھی دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ اقوام متحدہ میں اگر کشمیر کی کوئی شکایت ہے، اگر ہندوستان کی کوئی شکایت ہے تو صرف اتنی ہے کہ ہندوستان کی سرحدوں پر ایک غیر ملک کی طاقت ہے اور ایک ہمسایہ ملک نے حملہ کیا ہے - ہم اقوام متحدہ سے جس پر انگریزی اور امریکن بلاک کا کافی اثر ہے صرف یہ پوچھنا چاہتے ہیں کہ اب تک کس باعث سے اقوام متحدہ کو یہ کہنے کی جرات نہیں ہوئی کہ پاکستان حملہ آور ہے تو پاکستان سے یہ کہیں نہیں کہا جاتا کہ وہ کشمیر کی سرحدوں سے نکل جائے؟

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

جناب والا - یہ بات میری سمجھ سے بالاتر ہے - ہو سکتا ہے کہ دنیا کے کچھ بڑے بڑے لوگ اس کو سمجھتے ہوں - ایک طرف امریکہ جیسی عظیم الشان طاقت اقوام متحدہ میں اپنا رعب جمائے ہوئے یہ کہے کہ پاکستان اور

ہندوستان کے درمیان ایک جھگڑا ہے اور وہ اس بات کا دعویٰ بھی کرے کہ ہندوستان بھی ہمارا دوست ہے، لیکن اس کے ساتھ ساتھ پاکستان کو اس طرح کے ہتھیار مہیا کئے جائیں جن سے اندیشہ ہوتا ہو کہ اس دوستی کے پیچھے کوئی اور چیز چھپی ہوئی ہے - آخر پاکستان یہ ہتھیار کہاں استعمال کریگا؟ ہم نے دیکھا ہے کہ جن ملکوں کو یہ ہتھیار دوسرے ملکوں کے خلاف استعمال کرنے کی جرات نہیں ہوئی ہے وہاں کی جڈتا نے خود اپنی ڈاکٹریٹرشپ کے خلاف ان کو استعمال کیا ہے - عراق کا مسئلہ ہمارے سامنے ہے، ترکی کا مسئلہ ہمارے سامنے ہے - آجکل ان تمام ملکوں میں جن کو اقتصادی حالت کی بجائے، جن کو تعلیم کی بجائے، جن کو صحت کی بجائے، جن کو اچھی انڈسٹری کے بجائے ہتھیار دئے گئے ہیں، ان ملکوں کی تباہی ہوئی ہے - مجھے اس بات کا خطرہ ہے کہ کہیں پاکستان میں بھی اس قسم کی تباہی نہ آجائے - ہم پاکستان کی بربادی نہیں چاہتے ہیں ہم پاکستان کی خوشحالی چاہتے ہیں کیونکہ ہم خود خوشحال ہونا چاہتے ہیں -

میں آپ کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب کشمیر پر حملہ ہوا اسوقت جو سب سے پہلے کمیشن کشمیر آیا اس میں چیکو سلاواکیہ کے ایک ممبر ڈاکٹر کمیلے تھے - انہوں نے

اس بات کو ظاہر کر دیا تھا کہ کشمیر پر جو حملہ ہوا ہے اس میں پاکستان کا ہی ہاتھ نہیں ہے بلکہ اور بھی بہت سے ملکوں کا ہے -

جناب والا - ابھی جب امریکہ کے ڈیپنٹس سیکریٹری نے ہندوستان کے بارے میں اپنی رائے دی تو انہوں نے ہمارے لیڈر کے خلاف ہمارے عظیم دھماکے خلاف ایسے لفظ استعمال کئے جو ہم ہندوستانی سلنا گوارا نہیں کرتے۔ میں امریکہ کے صدر کی عزت کرتا ہوں لیکن میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ سیاسی اہمیت سے امریکہ کے صدر کی حیثیت ہمارے وزیراعظم سے کم ہے - جواہر لال نہرو اس ملک کے وزیراعظم ہی نہیں ہیں بلکہ وہ اس ملک کے دہلے والوں کے دلوں کے بادشاہ ہیں اور وہ ہمارے دھماکے دیں - ان کی شخصیت پر حملہ کرنا ہندوستانیوں کی توہین ہے اور کوئی ہندوستانی اسے برداشت نہیں کریگا - ہمارے دھماکے خلاف ان ملکوں میں جس قسم کے حملے ہوتے ہیں ہم اس کے خلاف پورے تہمت کرتے ہیں -

میں حکومت ہندوستان کی توجہ اس طرف بھی دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ کشمیر ایک ایسی جگہ قائم ہے کہ اس کے چاروں طرف بہت سے ملکوں کی سرحدیں ہیں جہاں حملہ کا خطرہ ہو سکتا ہے - اس کے لئے بھی یہ ضروری ہے کہ ہم کشمیر میں کمیونیکیشن

وسائل سے سزکین، ہوائی جہاز اور ریل کے انتظامات جتنی جلدی ہو سکے مکمل کریں - آج بھی شاید اس بات کا آپ کو علم ہوگا کہ کشمیر میں ہوائی جہاز لے جانے میں کبھی کبھی پانچ پانچ اور چھ چھ دن لگتے ہیں - ریل کا سلسلہ تو بہت معمولی حد تک ہے اور سزکین انٹی خراب ہیں کہ ان پر دو تین سے زیادہ وزنی گاڑیاں نہیں جا سکتیں - کشمیر کی حفاظت کے خیال سے حکومت ہندوستان کے لئے یہ ضروری ہے کہ وہ اس کی طرف توجہ دے - میں آپ کی توجہ اس بات پر بھی دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایک معمولی سے ٹیلیفون کو بھی کشمیر جانے میں دس دس بارہ بارہ دن لگ جاتے ہیں کیونکہ وہاں اکثر لائن کٹ جاتی ہے - اس سے حکومت ہندوستان کو جو نقصان ہوتا ہے وہ اس سے دس گنا زیادہ ہے کہ اگر وہاں ریڈیو کمیونیکیشن قائم کیا جائے - جب یہاں سے کوئی جہاز کشمیر جاتا ہے اور موسم خراب ہوتا ہے تو اسے دن میں تین تین دفعہ واپس آنا ہوتا ہے اور اس طرح اس پر جتنا خرچ ہوتا ہے اس سے کم خرچہ وہاں راتوار لگانے پر ہوگا - لیکن حکومت اس کی طرف توجہ نہیں دیتی ہے - ان حالات کے پیش نظر جو اس ملک کو درپیش ہیں میں آپ کو یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ پاکستان جس دھمک سے اور جس طریقہ سے اپنی حکومت کو چلا رہا ہے

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]
اس کے لئے ایک دن یہ لازمی ہو جائیگا کہ وہ کشمیر پر حملہ کرے۔ اس حملہ کو روکنے کیلئے اور کشمیر کی خوشحالی کیلئے اور ہندوستان کی ترقی کیلئے یہ بیحد ضروری ہے کہ ہم ان باتوں کی طرف توجہ دیں۔

میں ایک بار پھر آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں اور اس بات پر انتہائی زور دیتا ہوں کہ صاحب قومی یکجہتی ہمارے ملک کے حق میں ایک کارآمد چیز ہے اور اس پر فوری عمل ہونا چاہیئے۔ ایک اور بات ہے جس کی طرف آپ کی توجہ دلا کر میں اپنی تقریر ختم کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ وہ یہ ہے کہ ہندوستان میں جو فرقہ دارانہ حالات جو کہیں مذہب کے نام پر، کہیں مسجد کے نام پر پیدا کئے جاتے ہیں اس کے لئے میں تمام جماعتوں سے درخواست کروں گا کہ وہ اس کی طرف توجہ دیں اور سوچیں کہ اس کے پیچھے کیا چیز ہے۔

ایک چیز اور ہے۔ جب ہم سوشلسٹک پیٹرن کی بات کرتے ہیں تب ہمیں یہ دیکھنا چاہیئے کہ آخر وہ لوگ جن پر اسکا اثر پوتا ہے وہ کس حد تک اس سے فائدہ اٹھا سکتے ہیں۔ سوشلسٹ پیٹرن کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں کہ ملک کی سیاسی جماعتوں پر بڑے بڑے دولتمند، بڑے بڑے راجہ اور نواب چور راستہ سے داخل ہو کر قبضہ

کریں۔ اگر اس سلسلہ کو روکا نہیں گیا تو مجھے یہ خطرہ ہے کہ تمام سیاسی جماعتوں دولت کی نذر ہو جائیں گی۔ میں آپکو یہی بتا دلاتا ہوں کہ آپ کے لئے اور میرے لئے اگلے پانچ سالوں میں اگر یہی حالت رہی تو کسی کمیٹی کا یا لوک سبھا کا الیکشن لونا مشکل ہو جائیگا۔ میں پھر آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں۔

† [श्री ए० एम० सारिक (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : मैं आपका शुकिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस ऐवान में पहली बार बोलने का मौका बरखा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह मौजूदा सदरे हिन्दुस्तान का आखिरी एड्रेस सदरे की हैसियत से था, जो उन्होंने इस ऐवान को दिया। मैं सदरे हिन्दुस्तान का, हिन्दुस्तानी शहरी की हैसियत से और इस लिहाज से भी कि मैं पिछले दूसरे हाउस में उनका नामजद मेम्बर था, शुकिया अदा करता हूँ। मैं इस हाउस में इलेक्शन लड़कर आया हूँ और अब मैं एक मुतखव मेम्बर हूँ गो मुझे कभी कभी दहशत हो जाती है बुजुर्गों में बैठ कर अपनी कोई बात करने में।

میں ان لوگوں کا، खासतीर पर नेशनल काफिस का, बेहद मशकूर हूँ जिन्होंने मुझे इस काबिल समझा है कि इस ऐवान में भेज दिया है। इंसान बुजुर्गों की मोहबत से और कुछ न सीखे लेकिन अदब और तहजीब तो सीख सकता है और मुझे उम्मीद है कि मेरे वह बुजुर्ग जो इस ऐवान में बैठे हैं, मुझे समझाने और सिखाने में मेरी मदद करेंगे।

मैं सदरे हिन्दुस्तान के खुतबा के वारे में दो-एक जरूरी बातें आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। आज मुबह से मैंने इस ऐवान में, इस सभा में, बहुत सी तकरीरें सुनीं। लेकिन

दो तकरीरें ऐसी थीं जिनको मैं हिन्दुस्तान की यकजेहती के लिये, हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की के लिये, और हिन्दुस्तान के मुस्तकबल के लिये खतरनाक समझता हूँ। उन में से एक तकरीर ऐसी थी जो हम आज से १४-१५ साल पहले, हिन्दुस्तान की तकसीम से पहले, मुस्लिम लीगियों के मुंह से सुनते थे। आज हमने ऐसी ही एक खतरनाक तकरीर डी० एम० के० के नुमायन्दे से सुनी, जिन्होंने इस ऐवान में फिर एक बार सेल्फ डिटरमिनेशन का नारा लगा कर मुल्क को तकसीम की तरफ ले जाना चाहा। मैं इस मुअज्जिज मैम्बर को यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान जिन हालात में आज से १५ साल पहले तकसीम हुआ अब हिन्दुस्तान को किसी सूरत में, किसी ताकत से, किसी साजिश से तकसीम नहीं किया जा सकता।

मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन, मैं आपकी तबज्जोह इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बड़ा मुल्क है। इसमें आसामी भी बसते हैं और बंगाली भी। इसमें काश्मीरी भी बसते हैं और गुजराती भी। यहां हिन्दू भी हैं, मुसलमान भी, सिख भी हैं और ईसाई भी। यहां कोई अकल्लियत नहीं है, कोई माइनारिटी नहीं है। इस मुल्क में अगर कोई माइनारिटी है तो वह एक माइनारिटी है और वह माइनारिटी हिन्दुस्तानियों की है। इस मुल्क में बहुत सी कौम बस्ती हैं, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तानी की कम बस्ती है। हुकूमत के सामने इस वक्त सिर्फ एक ही चीज है। अगर इस मुल्क में खुशहाली को कायम रखना चाहते हैं, अगर हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों की हिफाजत करना है, अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान की आने वाली नस्ल के लिये एक खुशहाल हिन्दुस्तान बनाना चाहते हैं तो इस बात की सख्त जरूरत है कि हम कौमी यकजेहती की तरफ तबज्जोह दें। कौमी यकजेहती के यह मायने नहीं हैं कि हम इसका नारा लगायें। कौमी यकजेहती के मायने यह है कि हम एक दूसरे को समझें, हम यह जानें कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो मिट्टी है वह हर इंसान

की मिल्लियत है। इस पर हिन्दू का भी हक है, मुसलमान का भी, सिख का भी और ईसाई का भी—ना अकसरियत का ज्यादा है, ना अकल्लियत का कम है। इस मुल्क के अन्दर ना गोरखों का कोई ज्यादा हक है ना बंगालियों का ज्यादा हक है। मुझे इंतहाई अफसोस है कि एक कांग्रेस मैम्बर ने इस ऐवान में आकर कुछ इस तरह की बात कहीं और साथ ही यह भी कहा कि हम कौमी यकजेहती चाहते हैं। इस मुल्क में अगर किसी चीज की कमी है तो हमें इस बात को देखना है कि वह कमी जो है वह एक दूसरे को समझने की है। यहां छोटी-छोटी बातों को बड़े रंग में लाकर कौमी यकजेहती को और परेशानी में नहीं डाला जा सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान को इस बात का फ़ायदा है कि इस मुल्क में, इस अजीब मुल्क में, नानक जैसा आदमी, जो बहदतपरस्त था पैदा हुआ; इसमें गौतम पैदा हुआ जिसका मिशन मुहब्बत था; इसमें चिस्ती पैदा हुआ जिसका मिशन मुहब्बत था। लेकिन आज हम अपनी चंद खुदगजियों के लिये, अपनी मतलबपरस्ती के लिये, हिन्दुस्तान को तबाही की तरफ ले जाना चाहते हैं।

मैं इस ऐवान के मैम्बरों से यह दरखवास्त करूंगा, मैं तमाम जमातों से यह इल्तजा करूंगा, चाहे वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के हों, चाहे पी० एस० पी० के हों, चाहे कांग्रेस के हों, चाहे मुस्लिम लीग के हों, चाहे जनसंघ के हों, या किसी जमात के हों, सबको इस बात का हल्फ लेना चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान को बचाने के लिये, सिर्फ अपनी पार्टी को फायदा पहुंचाने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे और हम मुल्क में मजहब के नाम पर, जात के नाम पर, रंग और नस्ल के नाम पर कोई फ़साद नहीं होने देंगे। मुझे इस बात में कोई दुःख नहीं है कि कौन किस जमात में है। वह कम्युनिस्ट हो, वह सोशलिस्ट हो, हत्ता कि चाहे वह फ़ासिस्ट भी हो, लेकिन उसे एक बात को पहले अपने सामने रखना चाहिये, और वह यह है कि वह सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तानी है और खालिस हिन्दु-

[श्री ए० ए० तारिक]

स्तानी है। और अगर हम इस चीज को समझ लें तो यकीनन हम तरक्की की तरफ जायेंगे। मेरे दोस्त ने सुबह जो नारा लगाया इस मुल्क की तकसीम का, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मुल्क के लोग, इस मुल्क के रहने वाले, और इस मुल्क की हिफाजत करने वाले कभी इस बात की इजाजत नहीं देंगे और हिन्दुस्तान कहीं तकसीम नहीं होगा— न मद्रास में, न गुजरात में, न काश्मीर में और न पंजाब में। हिन्दुस्तान, हिन्दुस्तान है और हिन्दुस्तान पर हर हिन्दुस्तानी का मसावी हक है।

मैं आपकी तवज्जो इस बात की तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज अक्वाम मुत्तिहद्दा में जिसे आप यनाइटेड नेशन्स कहत हैं एक ऐसे मसले पर बहस हो रही है जो हम सब के लिये इंतहाई जरूरी है। वह मसला है काश्मीर का। मैं आपकी तवज्जो इस तरफ दिलाना चाहूंगा, और आपकी ही नहीं बल्कि आपके जरिये तमाम दुनिया के लोगों की तवज्जो इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर का मसला हिन्दू-मुसलमान का मसला नहीं है। काश्मीर का मसला अकसरियत और अकह्लियत का मसला नहीं है। यह मसला सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तानियों का है और हम हिन्दुस्तानी इस बात से बखूबी वाकिफ हैं कि काश्मीर के पीछे क्या-क्या होता है, काश्मीर के पीछे क्या-क्या साजिशें की गयी हैं।

मैं पाकिस्तान में रहने वाले लोगों से मुहब्बत रखता हूँ। आखिर वह भी हिन्दुस्तानी हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के लोग इस वक्त सियासी यकीम हैं। उनके सामने कोई सियासी जिन्दगी नहीं है। पाकिस्तान में एक डिक्टेटरशिप पैदा की गई है। वहां वह पैदा नहीं हुई है बल्कि बाहरी ताकतों ने, कभी अंग्रेजों ने और कभी अमरीका ने, पाकिस्तान के रहनुमाओं

को खरीद करके पाकिस्तान के लोगों पर एक डिक्टेटरशिप थोप दी है। पाकिस्तान के अक्वाम और हिन्दुस्तान के अक्वाम दो मुह्तलिफ चीजें नहीं हैं। पाकिस्तान के बंगाली और हिन्दुस्तान के बंगाली मुह्तलिफ नहीं हैं। उनकी समझ एक है, उनका कल्चर एक है, उनकी तवारीख एक है। लेकिन इस गलत सियासतदानी में और मुल्क की अफरातफरी में जब भी पाकिस्तान में किसी किस्म की सियासी जागृति पैदा होती है तो पाकिस्तान के नेता, पाकिस्तान के वह नामनिहाद लोग, जो अगर आज हिन्दुस्तान में होते तो उनकी हैसियत शायद ब्रिगेडियर या मेजर-जनरल से ज्यादा नहीं होती। लेकिन आज पाकिस्तान में सिर्फ बैनुल अक्वामी साजिशों की वजह से पाकिस्तान के अक्वाम पर उनको ठूसा गया है। ये नेता जब पाकिस्तान के अन्दर लोगों में सियासी शऊर पैदा होता है, तो उस वक्त पाकिस्तान की जनता की तवज्जो काश्मीर की तरफ लगा देते हैं; हिन्दुस्तान के हमला की तरफ लगा देते हैं।

हिन्दुस्तान की तारीख में इस वक्त भी जब पाकिस्तान ने हिन्दुस्तान की सहदों पर हमला किया हिन्दुस्तान ने पाकिस्तान की तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया। हमने बार-बार पाकिस्तान से यह कहा कि आइये, हम और आप मिलकर एक ऐसा मुद्दाहदा करें कि हम एक दूसरे पर हमला नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन हमेशा पाकिस्तान ने हमारी इस तजवीज को और हमारी इस दोस्ताना दावत को ठुकरा दिया। आज पाकिस्तान के अक्वाम से यह कहा जा रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से खतरा है। हिन्दुस्तान किसी और मुल्क पर हमला करना नहीं चाहता। हिन्दुस्तान खुद खुशहाल बनना चाहता है। उसके साथ हिन्दुस्तान की यह ख्वाहिश भी है कि उसके हमसाया मुल्क भी खुशहाल हों। कोई शरीफ आदमी यह नहीं चाहता कि उसका घर तो खुशहाल हो लेकिन उस

के दायें और बायें फाकामस्ती, फाकापरस्ती और बदनजमी हो। हर शरीफ आदमी अपने घर की अच्छाई चाहता है, अपने मौहल्ले की अच्छाई चाहता है, अपने शहर की अच्छाई चाहता है—यही हिन्दुस्तान का नस्बुलऐन है। जिस तरीके से अभी पाकिस्तान के डिक्टेटर जनरल अयूब खां ने यह कहकर हिन्दुस्तान को ललकारा है कि अकलियतों पर अकसीरियत जुल्म कर रही है—अकलियत जुल्म कर रही है या अकसीरियत जुल्म कर रही है—यह एक दूसरा मामला है, लेकिन मैं इस एंवान के जरिये दुनिया के तमाम लोगों को यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान और हिन्दुस्तान के रहने वाले शहरी हिन्दुस्तान के मामलात को खुद संभाल लेंगे। हिन्दुस्तान में जो हकूक हमें हासिल हैं वह सिर्फ मुसलमान को ही नहीं, हिन्दू को भी नहीं, सिख को भी नहीं, ईसाई को भी नहीं बल्कि पाकिस्तान में किसी शहरी को भी हासिल नहीं हैं। अगर दुनिया के नक्शे पर कहीं मुसलमान खतरे में हैं, अगर कूरए-जमीन पर कहीं फाकामस्ती में मुब्तला है, तो वह सिर्फ एक पाकिस्तान है, जहां वहां के रहने वालों को—चाहे वह मुसलमान हों, हिन्दू हों, सिख हों—किसी भी शक्स को सियासी आजादी नहीं है। पाकिस्तान की सियासी हालत इतनी खराब है कि उस मुल्क में खुशहाली का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। पाकिस्तान में सियासी हालत उस हद तक पहुंच चुकी है कि उस मुल्क में बगावत होगी और जरूर होगी। इस बगावत में कितने ही लोग मारे जायेंगे, उसका हमें इंतहाई अकसोस होगा। पाकिस्तान की मौजूदा हकूमत इन हालात में पाकिस्तान की इस बगावत को रोक नहीं सकती।

मैं आपकी तबज्जो इस तरफ भी दिलाता चाहता हूँ कि अक्वामे मुत्तिहदा में अगर

काश्मीर की कोई शिकायत है, अगर हिन्दुस्तान की कोई शिकायत है, तो सिर्फ इतनी है कि हिन्दुस्तान का सरहदों पर एक गैर मुल्क की ताकत है और एक हमसाये मुल्क ने हमला किया है। हम अक्वामे मुत्तिहदा से जिस पर अंग्रेजी और अमेरिकन ब्लाक का काफी असर है, सिर्फ यह पूछना चाहते हैं कि अब तक किस ब्राइस से अक्वामे मुत्तिहदा को यह कहने की जुरत नहीं हुई कि पाकिस्तान हमलावर है और अगर पाकिस्तान हमलावर है तो पाकिस्तान से यह क्यों नहीं कहा जाता कि वह काश्मीर की सरहदों से निकल जाये ?

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

जनाबेवाला, यह बात मेरी समझ से बालातर है—हो सकता है कि दुनिया के कुछ बड़े-बड़े लोग इसको समझते हैं—एक तरफ अमरीका जैसी अज्जोमुल्दान ताकत अक्वामे मुत्तिहदा में अपना रौब जमाते हुये यह कहे कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के दरमियान एक झगड़ा है और वह इस बात का दावा भी करे कि हिन्दुस्तान भी हमारा दोस्त है, लेकिन उस के साथ साथ पाकिस्तान को इस तरह के हथियार मुहैया किये जायें जिन से अदेशा होता हो कि इस दोस्ती के पीछे कोई और चीज छिपी हुई है। आखिर पाकिस्तान ये हथियार कहां इस्तेमाल करेगा ? हमने देखा है कि जिन मुल्कों को यह हथियार दूसरे मुल्कों के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल करने की जुरत नहीं हुई है वहां की जनता ने खुद अपनी डिक्टेटरशिप के खिलाफ उनको इस्तेमाल किया है। ईराक का मसला हमारे सामने है, तुर्की का मसला हमारे सामने है। आजकल उन तमाम मुल्कों में जिन को इक्तसादी हालत के बजाय, जिन को तालीम के बजाय, जिन को सेहत की बजाय, जिन को अच्छी इंडस्ट्रीज के बजाय,

[श्री एस० एम० तारिक]

हथियारदिये गये हैं, उन मुल्कों की तबाही हुई है। मुझे इस बात का खतरा है कि कहीं पाकिस्तान में भी इस तरह की तबाही न आ जाये। हम पाकिस्तान की बरबादी नहीं चाहते हैं। हम पाकिस्तान की खुशहाली चाहते हैं; क्योंकि हम खुद खुशहाल होना चाहते हैं।

मैं आपकी तवज्जो इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब काश्मीर पर हमला हुआ उस वक्त जो सब से पहले कमीशन काश्मीर आया उस में चौको-सलोवाकिया के एक मैम्बर डा० खेले थे। उन्होंने इस बात को जाहिर कर दिया था कि काश्मीर पर जो हमला हुआ है उस में पाकिस्तान का ही हाथ नहीं है बल्कि और भी बहुत से मुल्कों का है।

जनावेवाला, अभी जब अमरीका के डिफेंस सेक्रेटरी ने हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में अपनी राय दी तो उन्होंने हमारे लीडर के खिलाफ, हमारे अजीम रहनुमा के खिलाफ ऐसे लपज इस्तेमाल किये जो हम हिन्दुस्तानी मुनना गवारा नहीं करते। मैं अमरीका के सदर की इज्जत करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं यह जानता हूँ कि सियासी अहमियत से अमरीका के सदर की हैसियत हमारे वज्जोरेआजम से कम है। जवाहरलाल नेहरू इस मुल्क के वज्जोरेआजम ही नहीं हैं बल्कि वह इस मुल्क के रहने वालों के दिलों के बादशाह हैं और वह हमारे रहनुमा हैं। उनकी शखसियत पर हमला करना हिन्दुस्तानियों की तौहीन है और कोई हिन्दुस्तानी इसे बरदाश्त नहीं करेगा। हमारे रहनुमा के खिलाफ इन मुल्कों में जिस किस्म के हमले होते हैं हम उसके खिलाफ प्रोटेस्ट करते हैं।

मैं हुकूमते हिन्दुस्तान की तवज्जो से तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर

एक ऐसी जगह कायम है कि उसके चारों तरफ बहुत से मुल्कों की सरहदें हैं, वहां हमले का खतरा हो सकता है। उसके लिये भी यह जरूरी है कि हम काश्मीर में कम्यूनिकेशन—मरासलात—सड़कें, हवाई जहाज और रेल के इंतजामात जितनी जल्दी हो सके, मुकम्मिल करें। आज भी शायद इस बात का आपको इल्म होगा कि काश्मीर में हवाई जहाज के जाने में कभी-कभी ५-५ और ६-६ दिन लगते हैं और रेल का सिलसिला तो बहुत मामूली हद तक है और सड़कें इतनी खराब हैं कि उन पर दो टन से ज्यादा वजनी गाड़ियां नहीं जा सकतीं। काश्मीर की हिफाजत के खयाल से हुकूमते हिन्दुस्तान के लिये यह जरूरी है कि वह उसकी तरफ तवज्जो दे। मैं आपकी तवज्जो इस बात पर भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक मामूली से टेलीफोन को भी काश्मीर जाने में दस-दस बारह-बारह दिन लग जाते हैं; क्योंकि वहां अक्सर लाइन कट जाती है। इससे हुकूमते हिन्दुस्तान को जो नुकसान होता है वह उससे दस गुना ज्यादा है कि अगर वहां रेडियो कम्यूनिकेशन कायम किया जाये। जब यहां से कोई जहाज काश्मीर जाता है और मौसम खराब होता है तो उसे दिन में तीन-तीन दफा वापिस आना होता है। और इस तरह उस पर जितना खर्च होता है उससे कम खर्च वहां रडार लगाने पर होगा। लेकिन हुकूमत उसकी तरफ तवज्जो नहीं देती है। इन हालात के पेशे नजर जो इस मुल्क को दरपेश हैं, मैं आपको यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान जिस ढंग से और जिस तरीके से अपनी हुकूमत को चला रहा है उसके लिये एक दिन यह लाजमी हो जायेगा कि वह काश्मीर पर हमला करे। इस हमला को रोकने के लिये और काश्मीर की खुशहाली के लिये और हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की के लिये यह बेहद जरूरी है कि हम इन बातों की तरफ तवज्जो दें।

मैं एक बार फिर आपका शुक्रिया करता हूँ और इस बात पर इंतहाई जोर देता हूँ कि साहब कौमी यकजेहती हमारे मुल्क के हक में एक कारामद चीज है और उस पर फ़ौरी अमल होना चाहिये। एक और बात है जिस की तरफ आपकी तवज्जो दिला कर मैं अपनी तक़रीर ख़त्म करना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो फिरका-दाराना हालात, कभी मजहब के नाम पर, कभी मस्जिद के नाम पर, कभी मन्दिर के नाम पर, पैदा किये जाते हैं उसके लिये मैं तमाम जमातों से दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि वह उसकी तरफ तवज्जो दें और सोचें कि उसके पीछे क्या चीज है।

एक चीज और है। जब हम सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न की बात करते हैं तब हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि आखिर वह लोग जिन पर इसका असर पड़ता है वह किस हद तक इससे फ़ायदा उठा सकते हैं। सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न के मायने यह नहीं है कि मुल्क की सियासी जमातों पर बड़े-बड़े दौलतमन्द, बड़े-बड़े राजा और नवाब चोर-रास्ते से दाखिल हो कर कब्जा करें। अगर इस सिलसिले को रोका नहीं गया तो मुझे यह खतरा है कि तमाम सियासी जमातें दौलत की नज़र हो जायेंगी। मैं आपको यक़ीन दिलाता हूँ कि आपके लिये और मेरे लिये अगले पांच सालों में अगर यही हालत रही तो किसी कमेटी का या लोक-सभा का ईलेक्शन लड़ना मुश्किल हो जायेगा। मैं फिर आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ।]

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I join in the tributes paid in this House by all sections to our President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, at the time of his retirement. I respect him and I wish him many happy years of useful service. Sir, I will not dilate on his virtues because the time is so short and hon. friends have already spoken about his qualities. Sir, I may not be misunderstood if I say a word or two about his Address

I have gone very carefully through the Address delivered by him to both the Houses of Parliament last month, and I am sorry to say that it is most disappointing. The President's Address, as I understand it, is a Government statement, and if this is all the new Government could find to say, indeed it has not made a spectacular beginning. There is neither a new sense of purpose born of a searching evaluation of the past record nor of the tasks ahead. The dominant motif of the Address is one of tiredness and easy satisfaction over what has been accomplished or whatever is proposed to be done this year. There is the sameness all over again and again every year.

The President has said that the country has made progress in many fields, but there is no particular evidence of striking progress in any field. Whatever has been achieved has been achieved through the mere passage of time. The President has claimed that the Third Plan has made a good start. Here again it is difficult to agree. The recent increase in dearness allowance is a warning of the menace of rising prices. Industrial costs are steadily mounting. The coal-transport-power bottleneck has not been broken. The export target for the year is unlikely to be achieved. The country is not vet out of the woods with regard to foreign exchange requirements. Despite a succession of favourable seasons the overall agricultural production has not yet attained a level of minimum guaranteed production. The current cotton shortage is indicative of this weakness, and yet complacency is the keynote of the Address.

Sir, many things are left unsaid both with regard to domestic as well as foreign affairs. I may not be wrong if I say that the Address is an insult to the new Parliament.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): It is a bad word to use.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: There is no mention of either Chinese aggression or Pakistan's infiltration into our territory. Does not the Government owe an apology to the nation and to the Parliament in this matter? I would ventilate here the feelings of the common man, what the common man feels in this respect. He feels insulted and humiliated. He asks to himself whether our Army is so weak that it cannot protect our frontiers and whether the Government cannot do anything better than making meek and silent protests in this respect

Sir, if we analyse the President's Address what does it come to? There are 19 paragraphs in the Address. Four of them are devoted to a sweet nothingness of courtesies. The last five are the kindly and sad words from the mouth of a noble and retiring person. Out of the remaining ten, two are notice of the itinerary of the present session, and the remaining paragraphs tell us with the utmost brevity what the Government is doing. Is it in any way the record of a mighty Government? I do not think so.

Sir, regarding the proposed legislative business enumerated by the President in his Address, I seek this opportunity to invite the attention of the Government to the total absence of Statutes governing the conditions of service of civil servants at the Centre as well as in the States. The Constitution contemplates such statutes, but even after twelve years no such step has been taken to initiate this type of legislation in this country. The matter is entirely left to the departmental rules which do not come either before Parliament or before the State Assemblies. The civil servant is left to the cruel mercy of the boss so far as recruitment and conditions of service are concerned. The constitutional safeguards are very limited. They only provide for the removal, dismissal or degradation in rank when it is in the nature of a punishment. Therefore, the conditions of recruitment and service of

Government servants should be laid down by Statute and not by the departmental rules only. I hope, Sir, that Government will take notice of this suggestion and that legislation to this effect will soon come up before this House.

In this connection I will quote an instance from Madhya Pradesh. A Class I post was advertised and the Public Service Commission of that State selected one candidate out of ten. But instead of being appointed on probation, he was appointed temporarily until further orders. After serving for two years, one fine morning he was demoted and he sustained a loss of Rs. 200 per month apart from the humiliation etc. There was no alternative for him to go to the High Court, because the appointment was temporary. There are so many instances like this. The Supreme Court has also held in a recent case that temporary appointments cannot be questioned in a court of law. So, my request to this House and to the Government is that legislation should be brought as soon as possible regarding the conditions of service and recruitment of Government servants.

Sir, many things have been said, and I do not want to take the time of this House regarding the elections and the Five Year Plans. I will only put forth a few demands on behalf of my State. As I said when I spoke on the Railway Budget, the State of Madhya Pradesh is very big but at the same time it is neglected. Its problems are very acute and stupendous, and my submission is that more care should be taken regarding this State. I will not go into details now regarding those demands because, I will do so whenever suitable opportunities present themselves to me. But I will only refer slightly to the problem of dacoits, the problem of Cham-bal ravines, their consolidation and the opening of new railway lines, etc. These are some of the things.

Then, Sir, in Madhya Pradesh two heavy industries have been located but their working is

far from satisfactory. You must have known that recently in Bhopal there was a strike for a long time, and the Bhilai affairs are also not very encouraging. So, when the Government asks the private industrialists to introduce participation of the workers in management, why should not the Government take the initiative in its own undertakings and enable workers' participation? My submission is that there should be workers' participation in management as far as these heavy industries in the public sector are concerned. Then, looking to my State, there is need for more such industries and for more railway lines.

In conclusion, I will request that the President's Address should be in more detail because it is the image of the country. The problems before the country are shown in the Address. Therefore, it is better that it is as detailed as possible.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.

): The House stands Adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House *then* adjourned at twenty-one minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 2nd May 1962.