

the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 393, dated the 24th March, 1962, publishing the Central Excise (Fifth Amendment) Rules, 1962, under section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-35/62.]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE (DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE) NOTIFICATIONS

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table:—

(a) A copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 388, dated the 31st March, 1962, publishing a corrigendum to Government Notification G.S.R. Nos. 288 and 289, dated the 19th March, 1962.

(b) A copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 392, dated the 31st March, 1962, publishing a corrigendum to Government Notification G.S.R. No. 86, dated the 20th January, 1962.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-33/62 for (a) and (b).]

THE EXPENDITURE-TAX (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 41 of the Expenditure-tax Act, 1957, a copy of the Central Board of Revenue (Expenditure Tax) Notification G.S.R. No. 444, dated the 29th March, 1962, publishing the Expenditure-tax (Amendment) Rules, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-34/62].

REFERENCE BY THE CHAIR TO ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON THE 1ST MAY, 1962

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon Shri Diwakar to speak, I should like to refer to something that hap-

pened yesterday. For the first time in the last ten years the House had to be adjourned for ten minutes. When grave matters were under discussion here, there was not a single representative of the Government. I hope that such a situation will not occur again and Government will be careful about its responsibility to the House.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued.

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I crave the indulgence of the House for saying a few words on the important debate and questions arising out of it. I am very grateful to you, Sir, for giving me some time on this occasion. I associate myself with the motion moved by Shri Dinkar, namely, that we are very grateful to the President for his Address. While associating myself with this motion, it is necessary for me also to say a few words about the President who is leaving us after a very glorious and important contribution to the working of the Parliament as well as to constitution-making in our country. He was the President of the Constituent Assembly. He piloted with great ability the whole of the Constitution and later was elected as the President of the Republic. His personal qualities have matched equally with his capacity as the Constitutional Head for the last 12 years of this great Republic of India. I associate myself with all the compliments that have been paid to him in this House by hon. Members. I do not think I should repeat the encomium because so many have paid him compliments in such highly poetic and beautiful language that I do not think I shall be able to improve upon them.

As regards the problems arising out of the President's Address, I do not think I can cover all the prob-

blems that arise naturally from such ■an Address. The" Address-is a ' comprehensive documentt dealing with numerous things and I think I should confine myself to a few important points. I do not think anybody can deny that India has progressed during the last 12 years in many fields and in a very remarkable- may. It is not merely the opinion • of- our own people or observers in this ' country but I think several eminent and critical visitors, journalists and people connected with the Monetary Bank and other big organisations "which have been helping us to develop our economy have appreciated the rapid progress that we have been, making. But I think it is not enough to make progress in some of these fields only, as there ar_e some other important fields in which progress has not been parallel and has not been adequate. I mean to point out" two or three illustrations as to how, though we have progressed in the material field, in certain sections Of our activities, in the field of education, in the field of emotional integration of the country, even in the promise which we had made regarding universal compulsory education, we have not made adequate progress. Of course, we have made some progress but the progress is not adequate. We have hardly reached 25 per cent or 26 per cent of literacy in our country. "While the number of universities is increasing there is a common complaint that the standards are falling. The final policy regarding the medium of education in universities does not still seem to have been laid down and there is ■ some confusion about it. So I think while in the material field we have been making better progress, in the educational and cultural fields and in what may be said to be the field of integration, we are far behind the mark Possibly far greater and more concentrated efforts are indicated along those lines. I need .not emphasise how very important this matter is. The very fact - that after twelve years of; independence and progress and 209 RS—5.

the working of our new Constitution, we had to summon a National Integration Conference is itself evidence of the fact. that we, have not progressed along that line very much. I may,recall here the speech which Dr. Ambedka/ gave while concluding the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly. He ,said to us—and I think they are words worth remembering—"We - are ,not still a nation. We have yet to be a nation." I think much effort is yet necessary in this matter.

Now,' generally looking at the situation outside our country, I think we cannot be very happy so long as , we have dangers on the Chinese border as well as the Pakistani border.

Another great and very important but very dangerous development is that of nuclear tests and the nuclear war that looms lajige on the horizon. I think that we are not possibly as conscious of the immediate dangers as we ought, tp .be.. In. fact, these, dangers were pointed out to us long, long ago by those who knew about them very intimately. Once it happened that I had an occasion to speak to Or. C. V. Raman, the Nobel Prize winner, the great physicist. I asked him if the experiments in space that wer_e being made were of a purely scientific type and if they had nothing to do. with military objects. He immediately "burst out on the spot and said that everything . that was being done was with a military view and that the results of those experiments would be used for military purposes. A detached observer like him and one who knew what was - being done held this opinion. Now, whatever th_e pretensions about exploration of space, of going to the Moon etc., these are related to the basic intention or motivation of using all this knowledge for purposes of dominance by on_e people on the other, by one nation on the other, by one group on the other, or whatever it might be. So, this arms race looks like the old *Mahabharata* story

[Shri R. R. Diwakar.]

of "Sund-Upsund". They were two brothers. They were righting with each other in competition and ultimately they destroyed themselves. But today it is not only the destruction of one nation or another nation or two nations who may fight against each other, but of the whole of humanity. I think, therefore, we in India must take interest in these nuclear tests. The nuclear war may come at any time, even by an accident. I think we should also take note of the fact that in the past even scientists have warned all against the use of nuclear devices. This was long before the Hiroshima disaster. If I can tell the House, the source where we can find documentary evidence about these matters, I can mention the name of the book "Brighter than thousand Suns". It is a book published by Penguins and is very easily available. Long before the actual bomb was thrown at Hiroshima as soon as it was known that such a bomb was a possibility, as soon as the first experiment was carried out at Nevada in New Mexico, 32 scientists wrote out a document saying that it was dangerous to use such a bomb in war. Mind you, they were not politicians. They were not statesmen. They were scientists. Yet the scientists could see through the political and other dangers to humanity better than the statesmen and politicians who were there and thinking in terms of using the bomb. They, the scientists, have clearly said that the authorities should only demonstrate it. That means, they should invite all the countries of the world and demonstrate what kind of weapon it was and what kind of weapons they could develop. That may be a sufficient deterrent for anybody to use it or in any way bring it into the field or practical warfare. The second thing that they mentioned was that they should never use it on non-military targets. The third warning that they gave was—and this is all in a document—that they should give a warning, even when

they were using it against military targets. As we all know, unfortunately, all these warnings by scientists were ignored. They have pointed out not merely the danger, not merely the disaster that may come; they have also pointed out that the use of these will lead to political and other consequences, over which they will have absolutely no control. How prophetic, that these scientists should have said it so long ago. And now all those consequences have followed. Therefore, I think it is right that the Government is doing its best to stop these. Our delegation is very alert about this matter and tries to gather together people of the same persuasion and put pressure on the Powers which are busy in this matter. At the same time, I think, as the President has pointed out in the second para of his Address, Members of Parliament, on account of the different opportunities that they have, have also by themselves to think about their responsibilities outside the House as well. And I think a very strong protest or a kind of combined protest from all thinkers in our country will have to be registered on an occasion like this.

The third important thing which I wanted to say was about national integration. One of my hon. friends here yesterday made a plea for an independent Dravidistan. He pointed out that the very fact of speaking about national integration is contradictory in terms. But I should say that what he put forth as his plea is exactly the reason for efforts at national integration. Now, whether it is Dravidistan or any other "stan", I think we have sufficient experience of one "stan", and we should not think in terms of repeating that kind of "stan" however high might be the objectives and however great might be the grievances. In the first place I would like to know what is this Dravidistan. We speak so many times about the South and the North. Is it a geographical expression or is Dravidistan a linguistic-

tic or ethnic or political term? I think we should be clear about the meaning of this term. Which is the line which divides India into North and South? Is it, for instance, the Cauveri or the Krishna or the Go-davari or the Narmada or the Vin-dhyas? As regards Dravidastan, its culture and all such things, I would call the present culture of ours as really Aryo-Dravidian or Dravido-Aryan. I have sometimes taken interest in the study of these cultures and as to how they have developed. I do not think we can call our present culture either exclusively Aryan or Dravidian as such. It is Aryo-Dravidian because very important elements from each of them have mixed together. So far as our blood is concerned, I do not think that anybody can stand up and say that ethnically he is a Dravidian or he is an Aryan. That being the case, to rake up those old ideas or old prejudices or whatever they might be and try to build political ambition on such flimsy grounds, I think, is not the wisest way, nor is it the right way nor the truthful way. Let us say that we have certain regional or political ambitions and from that point of view we want to do certain things. That is a different matter. I myself happen to be a Dravidian if at all that ethnic or linguistic meaning is given to that term. I speak the Kannada language. My mother tongue is Kannada, and Kannada is very akin to Tamil. I think that among the four southern languages which are of Dravidian origin, Kannada and Tamil are nearer to each other than even Telugu or Malaya-lam. Even so, I never thought in terms of myself being a Dravidian in any ethnic or any other sense. I do not think that this particular notion is in any way supported by the State from which I come. Possibly, when this movement is analysed, the Dravidian movement may have to be restricted to what may be called a part of Tamilnad and that too to a section of the people in Tamilnad. But since it is there, we should not

look very lightly upon it. This is democracy. Everybody has a right to preach what he wants to preach, and people who think that this helps them in their political ambitions or removing regional grievances and so on will naturally go on moving along that line. But what I would like to suggest and also to a certain extent clarify is that no other State except Tamilnad, and that too a particular party there, is very keen about this particular idea. In other parts, in Karnatak, for instance, we are strongly against any move of that kind. We might have grievances. In fact every State might have a grievance. All States are not equally developed. That is not possible. There are historical reasons for it. Not that the present Government does not want to develop all the States on a uniform basis, but there have been historical reasons. Take Orissa, for instance, or some other State. There are historical reasons, but today the establishment of what are called the Planning Boards for States will take us along the line of uniformity, because they will themselves think and try to see, having in view the general picture of planning for the whole of India, what they should emphasize as priorities. So, I think the Plan is for developing the whole of India and every bit of it, but at the same time on account of historical reasons there have been some lapses or there has been some lagging here and there. That has to be made up. But to make that the reason for secession, I think, is most disastrous not only from the point of view of India but from the point of view of those who are actually advocating it. I therefore wish to emphasize the fact that, while we may emphasize the regional grievances and all that, we should never think in terms of secession, because secession is not only disastrous to the whole of India but to the very State which wants to secede. Our strength lies in unity, it need not be repeated here.

[Shri R. R. Diwakar.]

One more thing is that we have to realise that our interests lie in being united. This has to be not only emotionally felt—no doubt emotionally we might feel that all India should be one and so on and so forth, but it is not enough—but we have to intellectually feel and also come to the conclusion by studying facts and figures that the interest of small regions lies in being one with the whole of big India. It is that alone which can be the basis of our real integration. For instance what was not common between the *kauravas* and the *pandavas*? The blood was the same, the *gurus* were the same, the race was the same, the language was the same, the script was the same, all these things were the same. Yet, when 'interests differed, they sought the worst battle in the world **and** decimated the whole manhood of India. Today, for instance, if we look at the Muslim world, there are ever so many Muslim countries which are not united, because their interests are divided. Therefore, we should base our national integration on the basis of interests, after studying the same. How can these interests be achieved, how can our goals be achieved? Only by remaining part and parcel of this great country, of this great Republic.

Sir, I think I have already taken more time than was necessary, but these were the two things which I wanted to emphasize, and I have placed before the august House the few thoughts that I had on these questions. Thank you

SHRI MOHAN LAI, SAKSENA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the Motion of Thanks to the President for his last Address to Members of Parliament. But at the very outset. I would like to offer my hearty felicitations to him on the completion of the tenure of his office. This may sound somewhat strange but I am one of those who believe that the proper time to offer

personal felicitations is the time when he leaves his office, after doing his job well and not when he assumes it. Six-, it was the country's good fortune that in the formative period of the Republic we had Dr. Rajendra Prasad as our President. Apart from the many qualities of head and heart with which he is endowed, his close association with Mahatma Gandhi as well as his prominent role in the struggle for freedom and in the framing of the Constitution, he was marked out as the most suited person for this august office, and the admirable manner in which he has carried on this great responsibility has not only justified the choice of the nation but also raised him in popular esteem.

Sir, repeated references have been made to his dedicated and saintly life, his simple habits and humility. But what is remarkable is that he has remained unaffected, his mode of life of simple living and high thinking has remained unaffected by the atmosphere of ease and comfort, of pomp and show prevailing in the Rashtra-pati Bhavan. Still more it is remarkable that there has not been any marked change in this atmosphere which is reminiscent of the feudal times and also is not keeping with the socialistic pattern of society. Sir, I should like to quote only one instance. The gaudy and costly costumes of the attendants continue practically unchanged. They should be changed as soon as possible for they are reminiscent of feudalism and not in keeping with socialist pattern of society. It may also be remembered that what used to be the garb of respectability, the apparel worn by princes and the noblemen and the courtiers and the elite was purposely made by the Britishers—the uniform or the divery of their *khansamas*, *khid-madgars*, *chaprasis* and *chopdars*. Sufficient time has elapsed since the Britishers left us and I hope necessary-steps will be taken in the near future to change the atmosphere.

This is supposed to be the last Address of the President but I may

assure him that we will continue to look to him for guidance and inspiration. For long before he came to occupy this august office, ' he was known as a devoted and selfless servant of the people. He had been acclaimed by the people as the country's jewel, *clesh ratna*, and he is one of the few leaders who inspires universal love and esteem. Though a man of few words, his words are weighty and have far-reaching influence because what he says he means and he practises what he preaches. Sir, I hope it will be given to him still to inspire and serve' the nation. Generally, parting is painful but I may frankly state that I do not have any such feelings and for very good reasons. Firstly, I do not have any sense of separation for he has been one of the shining lights of our political firmament and will remain so wherever he may be. So, I hope that it will be given to him to guide us even after he is free from the shackles of office. The second reason is, we are going to have another man of faith, a philosopher, a professor of humanities, one who has got broad sympathies and a wider outlook of the world, and if I may be permitted to say, more suited to place before the world our highest ideal of "*vasudhaiva kutumbakam*" "the whole universe is a family,"—than any other person today. And one thing more. You are not going to occupy this place by the favour of one party or person. Your nomination has been acclaimed by all the parties and it is a good augury and matter for joy and encouragement. I hope that things will improve and change for the better. The next five years are very fateful and especially in the coming two years, there may be developments which may determine the fate of the country for decades to come and I hope that under your guidance the country will be able to steer clear of all the dangers.

Sir, lastly, I feel a little glad that Rajendra Babu will be free from the shackles of office and he may yet be

able to render greater services to the country at a time when it is faced with fissiparous» forces at home and with perfidious aggression' • from abroad, when the foundations of freedom have not become very firm when the roots of democracy have not gone very deep, Indian unity or national unity needs to be strengthened, and the vision of Mahatma about panchayati raj or people's raj, about the working of parliamentary democracy remains unrealised. As he said, many parties and persons will woo the voters but only the very best will win. But to our sad experience, we know that the last general elections have revealed that the contrary has happened. Generally, the very best men have been scared away. And I may remind the House of one whom we all miss. For him everyone of us has great respect and many of us will even be prepared to make room for him. He fought the election to this House but he was found at the lowest rung of the election ladder. I need not say anything as to how others got through to this House. But I think there is sufficient reason for us to ponder. The elections have not achieved their primary purpose of providing the electorate with an opportunity to have a government of their choice, as well as an opportunity to the parties to educate the electorate about their policies and programmes, about their past achievements and their future aspirations. But they have certainly served one useful purpose. They have revealed the shortcomings, the lacunae, in the election law, how money has become a menace and defeat the very purpose of law. The guardians of law found themselves helpless. Under their very nose things which are defined as corrupt practices have taken place which they could not take cognizance of. For they can be enquired into only by an election petition. Sir, as you know, election petition is a tardy process, one of the election petitions relating to second general elections was decided only after the term of

[Shri Mohan Lai Saksena.]

the Member was over, after the third general elections were over.

So, taking all this into consideration I am of the view that this should have been referred to in the President's Address, and if for some reason or other it could not be taken up in the Address, it should have been discussed by means of a resolution. But I feel that a commission has to be appointed, a commission consisting of Members of the two Houses and presided over by a person in whom all parties and people have general faith, which might go into the existing election law and make recommendations so that the recurrence of the deplorable happenings in the last elections can be prevented in future. I am not interested in whether money played a part or corrupt practices were followed in a particular constituency or not, but I know for certain that there is scope for that. Money has played its part and has proved as the biggest menace to democracy, and if it is not stopped I am afraid it does not bid good for democracy in this country, and the dream of Mahatma Gandhi that many parties and persons will woo the voters but only the very best will win, will remain unrealized, and so I would like the President, when he leaves his office, to think of what is known as the last will and testament of Mahatma Gandhi, of his idea that the Congress should convert itself into Lok Sevak Sangh. It was not possible to do so and we did not accept it. But now cannot we start some such organisation, of having an all-party basis which might do the same work on the lines suggested by Mahatma Gandhi and which might ensure that all parties and persons may woo the voters but the very best will win them? I have written something about this and I have got a number of suggestions, but it will take much time to refer to them. I believe that, at a time when we are faced with many dangers and pressing problems and when the old

generals of Mahatma Gandhi's nonviolent army are not only ageing but are arrayed in different and opposing camps, it would be possible for only one person, and that is Dr. Rajendra Prasad, to bring them together, to make them sit together and make them talk to one another and to find as to what they are fighting for, as to where they are drifting to. Is it not possible to arrive at the greatest common measure of agreement among them and reduce their differences to the minimum? Is it not possible to map out an area of agreed activities to the largest extent possible and on which they can concentrate their attention and, above all, to have an effective machinery, and a law to ensure free and fair elections and to avoid waste of time, energy and resources as the last elections have entailed. As you know, passions more than principles have swayed the last elections. Election campaign was purely directed to somehow or other collecting people, through film stars or artistes, propaganda through loudspeakers and other means, and then raising slogans on behalf of or against a party candidate; that is all, nothing else; there was no talk of principles.

These are some of my expectations of Rajen Babu and therefore I feel a little glad that he would be free from office. But I am a little nervous because of his health. He is not in very good health and I am afraid at the Sadaqat Ashram he may not have the same medical facilities, and care as in Rashtrapati Bhavan. Doctors who were asked to come here recently are there. Even in Delhi I believe it was the prayers of millions of people which enabled him to tide over the crisis ten months back, when the doctors were passing anxious days and nights and when all of us were living in a state of suspense, and at long last by God's grace he recovered. I have every hope that the prayers of millions of his countrymen who love him as well as ever, and who have still faith in him, I hope will give

him the necessary strength to do what we have failed to do so far. Not only that I also take this opportunity to express my thanks to the doctors who had attended on him during his last illness, and through whose efforts he has been able to recoup and attain his present strength, poor though it is, and I hope I am voicing the feelings of every Member of this House in this regard.

Sir, I now come to the next question which was raised by my friend, the D.M.K. leader, Shir Annadurai; I am sorry I have not been able to pronounce his name correctly just now, but I will get used to it. Sir, I listened to his speech with attention and I may congratulate him on his maiden speech and for the forceful exposition of his case for Dravidistan or Dravida Nad. I am glad that he is here and I am not telling him that "you have sworn your allegiance to the Constitution and you have no place here since you say something against the Constitution; you should not speak of secession." It may be constitutional; it may be unconstitutional, but that is another thing. I am glad he is here, and I hope he will be able to ... ■

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): He is not here.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA: I am sorry; I thought he was here. Anyway I hope he will take a long-range view of things and look to the other side of the picture. There was a time when Bulkanisation of Europe was favoured but after the bitter experience of last two World Wars the position has completely changed. Even big nations are trying to come together, to form unions and other arrangements. So Dravida Nad can never serve his purpose. It would create tremendous problems and difficulties. He may have his grievances; he pointed out about planning, about location of industries and other matters. But Balkanisation of the

country is not the remedy as will be evident if he looks to Africa, to what is happening there. There are two Power blocks in the world and they are trying to jump upon each and every small nation and that is what will happen in India if there is secession of part of the Union of India. When the Britishers left India there were 500 odd native States left behind as entities separate from the rest of India and the Britishers had hoped that the native States would create sufficient trouble for us and would not enable India to come together as a composite whole for a long time to come, and I am glad to recall to mind that through the far-sighted statesmanship of Sardar Val-labhbhai Patel they were all integrated in a very short time with the rest of India, and I hope we will not witness such a scene again and that we will not add to the present number of States. On the other hand I would come back to my old suggestion, of having zonal councils with actual executive power. In 1956 I had suggested that the zonal councils should not be merely advisory bodies. As a matter of fact, it was Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant who had accepted them as advisory bodies and I had pointed out even then, that as advisory bodies they were not likely to serve much useful purpose. On the other hand, I had suggested that the zonal councils should be armed with powers and if the States are not prepared to delegate them some powers, the Centre should, to begin with, delegate certain powers. They could be entrusted with planning in their zones, the transport and communications could also be placed under their control, and even the railways in their zones—once they got started, other things could be included. Not only that; I had wanted that there should be only five or six zones, each having a common Governor, a common High Court and Public Service Commission for the zone—I do not want to go into details—and I would like my friend to think on these lines and to see whether his difficulties cannot be solved or his doubts cannot be resolved that way.

[Shri Mohan Lai Saksena.]

Then, Sir, about planning something has been said; -much has been said. There was some reference about the enquiry by committee, as to why the "' committed' had taken so • long „ to report, and it was asked as to where the increased national income had gone and how the rich were becoming richer and the poor poorer. I may point out that it does not require much enquiry. Mahatma Gandhi had ■told us, - father warned us, that ,any plan that exploits only the -natural resources and ignores the human power was a lopsided plan, that it would never bring about equality amongst the people. But we have gone to the contrary path and so ! that is what has happened. -I for one believe in planning, I am for co-operatives and yet I confess that I am not enthused. Many of the difficulties about the Second Plan have come true, because there was¹ no proper control exercised over the projects, and nothing has been done to take steps to prevent the recurrence of past mistakes, to check the soaring prices, the rich becoming richer and the poor poorer. We have taken to planning as we want to go ahead, but the obstacles -we have come across, we have not taken steps to overcome them or to profit from our past mistakes. To my mind the greatest challenge to the planners, to the administrators, to the public men and to the statesmen is the unemployed person in the village or in the town, who is prepared to do even manual labour but to whom you cannot give any work. It is suggested that after the Third Plan or the Fourth Plan they will be provided with some work. I was reading a speech by one of the Chief Ministers the day before yesterday the gist of which was: "If you require two pieces of bread and you have only one, even then I want you to spare one-eighth or one-tenth for national development and the well-being of the future generations". Is it reasonable for a Chief Minister to talk like that—if you have one bread, share it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have exceeded your time. Please wind up.

SHRI MOHAN ~LAL SAKSENA: Mr. Krishnamachari is here and I hope he TvTTI bear rrte out. In 1954, as far back as that, I had given him a definite -scheme for villages where co-operatives could be started whereby we would be able to guarantee work to a villager for five days in a week. He will have to contribute only one day's labour to the oofcooperative. That scheme was not accepted. It required only Rs. 2,500 by way of grant and Rs. 3,000 by way of loan. We wanted to guarantee work. Have we got any other scheme? Sir, we are concerned with big things only. We seem to be suffering from neurosis of planning for big things only. I am sorry to say that these small things that count go „by default. We should take note of that. I know, Sir, that many things are decided by the Planning Commission, but even the Planning Commission Members do not know whether their schemes have been implemented by .the States or not.

I would remind my friend, ■ Mr. Krishnamachari, about the scheme of having State Housing Corporations. Schemes were devised but not a single State has set up a Housing Corporation. Money has been spent. It has been given to capitalists for providing employment and they have just spent the money but there is hardly any improvement. The scheme of having Housing Corporations has remained unimplemented. I have repeatedly reminded the persons concerned but with no results.

There is another suggestion. Sir, the President will be retiring in a.few-days' time, and as I told you, so far as he is concerned, his guidance and his advice would be available. But there should be some provision in the Constitution itself by which the benefit of his advice, experience and mature judgment could be made available to the Government. But the question is:.

How can it be done? After all, you are having ■ ex-Chief Justices in this House. You have an ex-Governor-General outside. Can we not have some provision, by whatever means...

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (Punjab): Shri Rajagopalachari, the ex-Governor-General, is already giving advice.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA: Yes, he had to give that way and that is the greatest justification for what I am saying. My submission is this that there must be an agency through which either the Head of the State or the Prime Minister should be able to call them and consult them or get their opinion, or if they feel concerned about any question, they should have the right to write to the Prime Minister or the Head of the State and that should be considered by the Cabinet. After all, the final decision will rest with the Government. But their views will provide an opportunity to the Government for second thoughts. I know under the existing conditions people dare not say "no" to anything which is said by the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister. It is not only in the interest of the nation alone, but if it is in the interest of the Government also. You cannot always expect Rajaji to go on writing to you. On the other hand, there should be some provision by which they are kept in the picture, so that we can get the benefit of their advice. To begin with, I would include the Prime Minister, ex-Chief Justice of India, the ex-Governor-General and the President for this purpose.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): We have only one ex-Governor-General and that is enough.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA: Sir, these are the suggestions that I had to make. I am grateful to you for having given me the time and for having sat through my speech. I hope the suggestions that I have made will be considered.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI (West Bengal): Mr.*Chairman, Sir, our President's present Address should be read together with his earlier one delivered at the last Session of the second Parliament. Sir, both the Addresses deal with many aspects, social, political and economic, but I would make my observations confining myself to only a few salient points.

Sir, in the international arena, we deplore the nuclear tests for they stare grimly at the face of humanity. It raises the vital question in the mind 'of the average individual whether man has any future.

Closely connected with this is the problem of disarmament. Peace cannot be guaranteed by mounting war-preparedness. The cold war may develop into, a shooting war by its own inexorable law, and if and when it does, the future of human speeches becomes only a matter of speculation. Hence it is the major duty of the major powers to guarantee the future of mankind. Sir, we are proud that we have been playing no inconsistent and no mean role in this regard.

Sir, during the year under review, we were constrained to march into and liberate Goa, Daman and Diu, the last vestige of Portuguese colonialism in our country. The British had parted, the French had made the *de facto* transfer of their colonies but the intransigence of the autocratic Portuguese regime would not follow suit. They refused to recognise the changed context, the changed attitude all over the globe.

As for ourselves we were committed to strive towards securing the unity of our nation. This unity, Sir, was incomplete till the foreign pockets were not liquidated from our soil. We have undertaken to honour international obligations and to promote international law, but first and foremost, we have to maintain our territorial integrity. We would have been dishonest to the national honour if I we would have allowed the Portu-

[Shri Parmalal Saraogi.] guese regime, the Portuguese colonialism, to stay in our country specially when it was reported that Portugal was about to enter into a pact with Pakistan that it would hand over Daman and Diu to the latter in return of an assurance of military assistance in the case of an attack on Goa. We are glad that our Government has been able to avoid a major world conflagration on this issue and in the words of our President, "Conducted practically a bloodless operation" to clear the job.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Madam, good neighbourliness has not been prevailing with our neighbours. Our relations have not improved in any way during the year under review. Committed as we are, we shall strive to solve all our disputes by peaceful means including direct and indirect negotiations. But flat despair should not be allowed to be the final hope. We may have to take recourse to other methods or devices, if forced. Arbitration, however, should be ruled out in settling any dispute involving a claim upon our territory.

Sir, in the last general elections, the people have reiterated and proclaimed their renewed faith in the present Government which stand for the valued principles of neutrality, co-existence, peace, prosperity and progress. Even in a place like Calcutta and Greater Calcutta, which was considered as a stronghold of the Reds in the 1957 elections, the Congress has come out with a thumping majority this time. This should, at least now, silence the right-thinking critics . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat):
What about the Reds inside the Congress?

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: . . . They should start appreciating the role of the Government.

Our President has spoken about the Third Five Year Plan envisaging as a large-scale effort to build up our national economy, to increase productivity and employment and to ensure the development of society on the basis of justice, social, economic and political as enjoined by our Constitution. He has given a call that the I P.M. Plan must increasingly bring within its scope of implementation a larger number of our people as participants in production with both skills and understanding of the national objective. This is a stirring call and I do hope that the leaders of all shades of public opinion would do their best not only to see that the Third Plan is a success, but that we are able to launch upon bigger and bigger Fourth and Fifth Five Year Plans with renewed vigour and confidence. Even an independent person like Dr. C. D. Deshmukh, while speaking only three days back, gave a glimpse of India in 1961—a brighter, healthier and happier country. He observed that electricity would have reached every village by then. The people would have more food to eat and more milk to drink. There would be no serious unemployment. The per capita income would have doubled. He further said the per *capita* consumption of foodgrains would increase from 14 oz. to 18 oz., milk production would be doubled, and an average individual would have 36 yards of cloth as against 16 at present. The present per capita income is Rs. 331. It would reach Rs. 792 during the next two decades and would be above subsistence level. Every second man would have a bicycle. Dr. Deshmukh prophesied that India would advance very much industrially during the next two decades. One-third of the national income would be from industries and another one-third from agriculture—a welcome feature.

Today over 50 per cent, of our national income is derived from agriculture and about 70 per cent, of the

population is dependent on it. And this is the main ingredient in an underdeveloped country. There are other ingredients and requisites of planned development such as the formation of social capital, stepping up of the rate of investment, creation of social enthusiasm, strong and stable government, control on population and so on. All the above requisites can be fulfilled only when there is planning. Planning alone is capable of making an integrated approach to the task of development or growth, in any country. Those who are opposed to planning and those who believe in the *laissez faire* policy should take serious note of this.

A review of the study of the economy of the nation during the year that has just passed discloses a mixed picture of light and shade. While on the one hand there was an increase in the over-all production of agriculture and industry, on the other, there were serious imbalances in important sectors of our economy, like power, transport, coal, special varieties of steel etc. As regards agriculture, specially cash crops, we have to guard against the phenomenon of satisfactory output in one year followed by scarcity in the other. There was a record output of raw cotton in the year 1960-61, but since the agriculturists did not get an economic price, there was a switchover of land from cotton to oilseeds, particularly to ground-nut resulting in serious scarcity in the current season. We had a bumper crop of jute this year, but I apprehend that a similar situation will develop in respect of jute also. The Indian Jute Mills Association is a very important and powerful body, but they have failed to rise to the occasion and to act in the national interest. The jute mills have been making satisfactory profits, but somehow or other the agriculturist did not get a fair and economic return for his fibre.

Kegarding sugarcane I would like to bring to the kind notice of the Food and Agriculture Minister that during the present sowing season, there has

been considerable diversion of land from sugarcane to other crops, specially in Uttar Pradesh and some parts of Bihar. The production of sugar in the year 1960-61 was about 3 million tons, to be exact, it was 29.86 lakh tons. From all indications available, the production this year should be near about 26 lakh tons and I think that the production will not be over 2.5 million tons next season. With the increasing consumption, which should not be less than 2.5 million tons next year and with exports of another 3 to 4 lakh tons which should be maintained, I feel that a situation may arise which may need our constant vigilance.

The over all balance of payments position continues to remain difficult during the first year of the Third Plan despite an increase in exports by Rs. 34 crores and a decline in imports by Rs. 127 crores. There was a further decline in the level of foreign exchange reserves even after taking into consideration a net drawing of Rs. 58.3 crores on the International Monetary Fund. The reserves declined from as much as Rs. 748 crores at the end of the First Plan to Rs. 136 crores at the beginning of the Third Plan. Today they are a little below even this level and are round about Rs. 120 crores. Basically the weakness in the balance of payments position reflects a structural deterioration in regard to invisible account. With the progressive decline in foreign exchange reserves and a sizable increase in external indebtedness the current invisible account in the balance of payments position emerges as a net source of drain whereas it yielded a net surplus of about Rs. 200 crores per annum only a few years ago. Again, the repayment obligations on foreign aid have been rising. Movement of private and banking capital during the year 1961-62 also tended to add to the pressure on reserves. In this context of a narrow margin of reserves and a sizeable gap even on maintenance account leaving aside capital account, there is little doubt that a vigorous promotion of exports has become a

[Shri Pannalal Saraogi.] major desideratum of our economic policy. The Report of the Ramaswami Mudaliar Committee is before the Government and it is high time that decisions are taken 'on its recommendations. The allocation of Rs. 1 crore for the purpose in the Budget seems to be rather meagre.

Madam, the maximum utilisation of productive resources can be assured only if the different sources of finance are harnessed to optimum efficiency. It is extremely necessary that the transfer of resources from the people to the Government must not result in a reduction in net investment. The money collected through taxation and loans should be invested to the maximum extent in productive projects. The administrative machinery must be streamlined at various levels in order to effect economy in expenditure, remove procedural difficulties, expedite decisions and co-ordinate policies.

Madam, our revered President, in a touching reference has mentioned that this was the last occasion on which he addressed as the President of our Republic. We on our part, wish to record our deepest appreciation of the tradition he would leave behind and our gratitude for all that he has done for the country during his tenure. We are fortunate that we possess a great man like Dr. Radhakrishnan as our next President. One need not dilate on the manifold qualities of his head and heart. They are so obvious to everyone. With these words, Madam, I support the Motion of Thanks whole heartedly.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Sudhir Ghose.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: Are we continuing during the lunch hour also?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are having no lunch hour today.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSE (West Bengal) : Madam Deputy Chairman, the

President in paragraph 12 of his Address to both Houses of Parliament has made a reference to the Disarmament Conference in Geneva and to the Disarmament Committee of the United Nations and India's role in it. That conference and the problem of war and peace today is uppermost in the minds of all peace-loving men and women all the world over, in spite of their domestic preoccupations. I wish to offer a few brief remarks on this subject and the purpose of my brief remarks is to make a specific suggestion to the Prime Minister.

The discussions that have gone on at these conferences in Geneva, the attempt each side has made to overturn the other instead of a sincere desire to reach a basis for an understanding has been a disheartening spectacle. On top of it all, the President of the United States has disappointed men and women all the world over who had pinned their faith in him by resuming nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, which has endangered the future of man. The explosion of nuclear bombs and the pollution of the earth's atmosphere, Madam Deputy Chairman, is a crime against mankind—whether it is committed, by a Communist Prime Minister or a democratic President. By their action and by their defiance of world opinion, Chairman Khrushchev and President Kennedy have earned the curse of every mother—black or white—who has a child.

Only last September, President Kennedy, while addressing the United Nations said:

"Today every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child is living under a nuclear sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness. The weapons of war—must be abolished before they abo-

lish us. For 15 years the United Nations has sought reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream. It is a practical matter of life and death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison with the risks of an unlimited arms race."

Madam Deputy Chairman, in spite of this very wise statement, it seems -that the President of the United States allowed himself to be misled by military doctrine applied to false intelligence. Only last autumn, when Chairman Khrushchev, brushing aside world opinion, exploded his 57-mega-ton bombs and polluted the earth's atmosphere he too said at that time, "We are carrying out experimental blasts and improving our weapons, so that mankind may never experience the horrors of nuclear war." Madam Deputy Chairman, it is hardly possible for any normal person to believe that such sentiments are sincere either on the Russian side or on the American side.

What are we going to do about it all? Our Russian friends and our American friends are not the only people living in this planet; apart from 180 million Americans and 160 million Russians there are more than 2000 million other human beings living on this earth, who are bystanders in this mortal competition of these two giants. The giants seem to have forgotten that Soviet Russia and the United States are not just two scorpions locked inside a bottle fighting with each other; there are hundreds of millions of others who are not insulated against the results of their action. And the time has come when these hundreds of millions have got to raise their voice in protest in Asia and Africa and all the world over.

Some days ago our Prime Minister said somewhere that while he admired the efforts of Bertrand Russell and his efforts for peace he did not quite understand what Lord Russell meant by his recent suggestion to him that the

neutral nations might send their to the area of nuclear explosions. I suppose what Lord Russell meant was a type of *satyagraha*. If the neutral nations of the world sent their navies to the site of these explosions, neither the American Government nor the British Government have the legal right to drive them away from there. These waters around the Pacific Christmas Islands are international waters and if the ships and men of neutral nations are present there in the vicinity of the site of explosion, well, those who are exploding the bombs could not do so without endangering the ships and men belonging to neutral nations and this they would not dare to do. This would perhaps be an effective way of preventing the Anglo-Americans from going ahead with their tests.

•

Now, Madam, apart from thinking of such protests we must not give up all hope because the Disarmament Conference in Geneva is deadlocked and the Foreign Ministers have all gone home. In spite of the surrounding gloom there seems to be some rays of hope which we can discern in the horizon. It appears that some encouraging progress has been made in the negotiations going on between the Americans and the Russians in Washington over the question of Berlin and the German problem. It appears that the Western Powers have made very substantial concessions and have offered to Russia, first of all, a declaration of non-aggression between the Warsaw powers and the Nato powers with a limited guarantee for existing national boundaries but without legal recognition of the Oder-Nisse line. In addition, they seem to have offered the creation of an international authority over access to West Berlin with East Germany and West Germany playing their role of advisers. They also seem to have offered a U.S.-Soviet agreement to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons and thus making it impossible for West Germany to develop a nuclear bomb and in addition joint committees of East Germany and West Germany on technical problems.

[Shri Sudhir Ghose.]

Now, a non-aggression pact between the Nato and Warsaw powers as well as an international authority over access to Berlin—these are very substantial concessions in favour of Mr. Khrushchev and here is something tangible that we can hang on to and build upon and perhaps the way to build upon it would be to bring about a gathering together of a summit conference at this stage. Last February, Mr. Khrushchev suggested to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan a summit meeting before the Geneva meeting. Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan themselves had suggested to Mr. Khrushchev, "We three accept a personal responsibility for directing the disarmament negotiations in Geneva". It is a great pity that in spite of Mr. Khrushchev's request to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan, instead of saying a resounding 'yes' and accepting the suggestion, they opposed the summit conference with the result that the discussions at Geneva have reduced themselves to a wrangle among people whom Mr. Khrushchev contemptuously described as "Bureaucrats". Mr. Khrushchev has made it plain that unless he personally meets Mr. Kennedy no other Russian—not even his Foreign Minister—will be permitted to make any concession.

Now, that there is something tangible to go by on this problem of Berlin and Germany, that can perhaps be the basis on which a summit conference can now be gathered together perhaps in June or July and once some concessions are made by both sides on Berlin and Germany, there would perhaps be an atmosphere in which Chairman Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy will find it possible to approach this thorny problem of disarmament, reduction and abolition of armaments in spite of the lack of co-operation from their colleagues Chancellor Adenauer and President De Gaulle. It is also encouraging to observe that Mr. Kennedy has recently withdrawn from West Berlin the American General, General Lucias Clay and Mr. Khrushchev has also withdrawn from East

Germany Marshall Koenig—the two people who followed the path of rigidity in the past.

Madam, at present the Western Powers possess about ten times the nuclear weapons of Russia and Russia possesses about double the conventional military power of the West and the problem has been how to reduce arms on both sides without upsetting this "balance of terror". We have also heard the lengthy debates on this question of a nuclear test ban. If it is true that detection devices have been so developed by both sides now that any kind of explosion that may take place in any country can be detected from outside that country, it seems a tragedy to allow these negotiations to be wrecked over the question of inspection. But the trouble is that each side insists on what it believes to be just. If a man like the Prime Minister of India was present at the next summit conference, perhaps he could persuade his American and Russian colleagues to see that the slogan—that peace to be peace must be enshrined in justice—is a worn out Western European liberal sentiment; because if there is to be peace between two lots of people, one lot has to accept something which is less than justice according to its own ideas. We all know that the idea of getting involved in a summit conference does not appeal to our Prime Minister. But, for the sake of all that is at stake, I venture to suggest to the Prime Minister, that he may perhaps feel persuaded to take up with Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Kennedy at this stage the idea of a summit conference. It may be more logical to take it up first with his colleagues at the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference to be held in September. But in view of the mushroom clouds that are rising in the South Pacific there is not perhaps much time to be lost. Military logic in the United States has proved to be exactly the same as military logic in Soviet Russia in spite of the deep differences in their political philosophies. A country that invests some-

thing like 45 million dollars a year on armaments naturally has a powerful armaments industry and a very powerful armaments lobby in Washington. And all these powerful men do not like their countrymen to see clearly that disarmament offers the only hope of restoring national security which the nations of the world used to have when armaments could defend and which the nations of the world lost when the armaments became able only to retaliate and not defend.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the American-Russian gesture over Berlin appears to be serious. Twice in the past Russia seemed interested in a test ban treaty and twice the opportunity was lost. The Western leaders may dawdle and delay once the pressure of negotiations and the pressure of world opinion is relaxed. I, therefore, respectfully suggest to the Prime Minister that in spite of the limited character of the influence of India in these matters perhaps the time to act is now.

श्रीमती अन्नपूर्णा देवी बिस्मारेड्डी (मैसूर) : उपसभापति महोदया, मैं राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी में भाषण करने को कोशिश करती हूँ। अगर मेरे भाषण में कुछ गलत हो जाय तो श्रीमती उपसभापति जी से और महोदय सदस्यों से मैं प्रार्थना करती हूँ क्षमा करने के लिये।

जैसे वानर समूह ने लंका प्रवेश के समय श्री राम जी को अपनी अपनी शक्ति के अनुसार स्वामी भक्ति प्रकट की थी, वैसे ही हम राष्ट्रपति जी की सेवा के बारे में स्वामिभक्ति प्रेम, विश्वास और गौरव प्रकट करना अपना कर्तव्य समझते हैं। हमारे राष्ट्रपति त्याग मूर्ति, निराडम्बर पुरुष, महान नेता और गांधी जी के प्रिय शिष्य राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी को अपने हार्दिक और कुतन्त्रतापूर्वक अभिनन्दन व्यक्त करने का मुझे यह जो मौका मिला है, इसकी मुझे बहुत खुशी है।

हमारे राष्ट्रपति राजेन्द्र बाबू ने महात्मा गांधी के आदेशानुसार बकालत छोड़कर चम्पारन के असहकार आन्दोलन में प्रथम बार भाग लिया था। तब से हमारे देश के स्वतंत्र होने तक उन्होंने क्या जेल में और क्या बाहर, नाना प्रकार के कष्ट झेले। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी का बारह वर्ष तक हमारे देश के राष्ट्रपति के पद पर रहना सारे भारत की जनता के लिए खुशनसीबी की बात है। दोनों सभाओं के सदस्यों के समक्ष उनका जो अभिभाषण हुआ वह बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने पहले यह कहा :

“अपनी मातृभूमि की सेवार्थ सामूहिक प्रयत्नों के लिये आपका स्वागत करता हूँ”

हमें अपने देश की उन्नति के लिए सामूहिक प्रयत्न करने चाहिये। जाति, धर्म, प्रान्त, भाषा आदि के आपस के झगड़े भुला कर हमें अपने पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों से उत्पन्न कठिनाइयों को सामूहिक रूप से हल करना होगा और उनका मुकाबला करना होगा। देश की रक्षा के लिए हमें अपनी सरकार के साथ सहयोग भी देना चाहिए। बड़ी बड़ी तकलीफों को झेलकर हमने जो स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त की, उसको आपस के झगड़ों में पड़ कर खोना नहीं चाहिए। परिस्थितियाँ और विषम हो जाय, तो हमें अपनी सरहदों की रक्षा के लिए अपने प्राणों की भी आहुति देने के लिए तैयार रहना होगा। राष्ट्रपति जी ने आगे कहा :

“संसद् की सदस्यता की अवधि में आप में से प्रत्येक को, संसद् के अन्दर अथवा अपने अपने चुनाव क्षेत्रों में अपने देश की सेवा के रचनात्मक कार्य के लिये अनिवार्य रूप से लगातार अनेक और व्यापक अवसर मिलेंगे।”

तो हरेक सदस्य को अपने अपने क्षेत्र की जनता के साथ मिलकर अच्छी तरह काम करना

[श्रीमती अन्नपूर्णा देवी थिम्मारेड्डी]

चाहिये। अगर कहीं पर लोग यह समझते हों कि सदस्य केवल चुनाव के समय पर ही उनके पास जाते हैं, बाकी समय में जनता का खयाल नहीं करते, तो इस भावना को जनता में काम के द्वारा सदस्यों को दूर करना चाहिये और अपने अपने क्षेत्र की अधिका, बेरोजगारी, स्वास्थ्य आदि समस्याओं के परिहार के लिए निरन्तर प्रयास करना चाहिए।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने आगे कहा :

“राष्ट्र निर्माण के कार्य की दिन प्रति दिन की और अंतिम जिम्मेदारी संसद् की है। इस कार्य के लिये आपकी पूर्ण विचारवृत्ति, विश्लेषण, रचनात्मक आलोचना, सावधानी और समर्पण की क्षमता अपेक्षित है।”

हम सदस्यों का यह कर्तव्य है कि हम राष्ट्रपति जी के इस पवित्र सन्देश का पालन करें। अपने देश की उन्नति करना ही हमारा लक्ष्य होना चाहिये। पिछली दो पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं से हमारा देश बहुत आगे बढ़ा है। तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में अधिक खाद्य उत्पादन का जो लक्ष्य रखा गया है, उस तक पहुंचने के लिए सरकार को पूरा प्रयास करना चाहिए। अधिक खाद्य उत्पादन करने के लिए किसान क्यों अपने को असमर्थ पा रहे हैं, इसके कारणों की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट होना चाहिए। खाद्य उत्पादन के लिए आवश्यक सिंचाई की सुविधाएँ, खाद, अच्छे बीज, खेती के उपकरण आसानी से किसानों को सस्ते मूल्य में मिलना चाहिए। यही नहीं, जो अनाज किसान पैदा करता है उसकी अच्छी व सही बिजली का इन्तजाम सरकार को करना चाहिए ताकि किसान भी खुशी खुशी से आगे बढ़ता रहे। किसान खुशी से अधिक खाद्य उत्पादन करने की हालत में जब तक नहीं होगा, तब तक हमारे देश में आहार की कमी की समस्या का परिष्कार नहीं होगा।

किसानों को भी चाहिये कि सरकार से और किसानों के लिए निर्मित सहकार समितियों के साथ सहयोग करें।

जैसा कि विदेशों में होता है, फसल का बीमा करने का प्रबन्ध भारत में भी जल्दी से जल्दी होना चाहिये ताकि किसान अपने साल भर की मेहनत के बारे में बेफिक्र हो सके। गांवों में बेरोजगारी और गरीबी को दूर करने के लिये कुटीर उद्योगों को प्रोत्साहन मिलना चाहिये। हर एक गांव में कम से कम एकाध कुटीर उद्योग की स्थापना के लिये सरकार को प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। बड़े बड़े कारखाने अपनी शक्ति के अनुसार उत्पादन करने में असमर्थ हो रहे हैं। उनके लिये आवश्यक बिजली कोयला और यातायात की सुविधाओं को यथाशीघ्र हमारी सरकार को बढ़ाना चाहिये।

उपसभापति महोदया, हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा है कि पंचायत-राज ने जनता का ध्यान आकृष्ट किया है। कई वर्ष पहले ही हमारे राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी ने हर एक गांव में पंचायत-राज की स्थापना का सपना देखा था और उस सपने को कार्य रूप देने की आज हमारी सरकार कोशिश कर रही है। गांवों के पुनर्निर्माण के कार्यक्रमों के द्वारा आदर्श ग्राम बनाने की कोशिश में स्थानीय पंचायतों को सरकार द्वारा आर्थिक सहायता मिलनी चाहिये।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने संसद् सदस्यों के प्रति अपना विश्वास प्रकट करते हुए राष्ट्रपति पद छोड़ कर जाते हुए जो सन्देश दिया है उसे कार्य रूप में परिणत करना हम सब का कर्तव्य है। हमें चाहिये कि अपने कर्तव्य की पूर्ति करते हुए देश की शान्ति व सुरक्षा के लिये यथाशक्ति प्रयत्न करें और आपसी मतभेदों को भुला कर देश-सेवा के लिये प्रयास करें।

[شری پیارے لال کرپل ددطالبہ] بڑھتی جا رہی ہے، چھڑوں کے دام بڑھتے جا رہے ہیں اور سرکار نے کوئی بھی ایسا قدم نہیں اٹھایا ہے کہ جس سے جو ایسیلشیل کمیونٹیز ہیں، ضروریات زندگی کی جو چیزیں ہیں، کھانے پینے کی جو چیزیں ہیں ان کے دام مقرر کئے جائیں تاکہ غریب جلتا کی دوتھیں دور ہوں اور غریب جلتا ان چھڑوں کو آسانی سے سستے داموں خرید سکے۔

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

ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ ہمارے چلانے پر اور یہاں پر شور مچانے پر بھی ایسا کوئی قدم اٹھانے کے لئے سرکار تیار نہیں ہوئی ہے۔ آپ دیکھتے کہ بڑے افسروں کی تلخواہوں میں اور کلرک کی تلخواہوں میں، اعلیٰ افسروں اور چھوٹے چھوٹے ملازموں کی تلخواہوں میں ایک بڑا بھاری فرق ہے۔ ان کی تلخواہوں میں یہ جو فرق ہے وہ جہتک کم سے کم نہیں ہوگا تب تک اس دیہ میں سوشلزم نہیں آ سکتا۔ زیادہ سے زیادہ ایک اور دس کے بیچ میں فرق ہونا چاہیئے۔ مگر اس وقت ایک طرف تین ہزار، چار ہزار پانچ ہزار کی تلخواہیں ہیں اور دوسری طرف ہمارے کلرکوں اور دوسرے چھوٹے ملازموں کی شروع میں پچاس یا

ساتھ روپیہ بھسک پڑے ہے۔ تو جہتک یہ سب فرق نہیں مٹیں گے تب تک اس دیہ کے اندر کسی قسم کا سماج واں آ نہیں سکتا ہے۔

اب میں کچھ اعداد و شمار اور کچھ آنکڑے آپ کے سامنے رکھوں گا جس سے پتہ چلے گا کہ ہماری سرکار کس حد تک اس دیہ کے اندر سماج واں لا رہی ہے۔ ہماری سہیلترل گورنمنٹ کا ٹوٹل ٹیکس ریونیو جو ہے وہ ۱۹۵۱-۵۰ میں ۷۳۹ کروڑ تھا اور ۱۹۶۰-۶۱ میں وہ ٹیکس ریونیو بڑھ کر ۷۳۹ کروڑ کی جگہ ۱۲۹۱ کروڑ روپیہ ہو گیا ہے اور ۱۹۶۱-۶۲ میں یہ ۱۳۹۱ کروڑ روپیہ رہے گا۔ یہ ٹوٹل ٹیکس ریونیو سہیلترل گورنمنٹ کا ہے۔ اب اس میں ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز جو ہیں وہ ۱۹۵۰-۵۱ میں ۱۳۰ کروڑ تھے لیکن ۱۹۶۰-۶۱ میں ۲۰۶ کروڑ ہو گئے ہیں۔ اب ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز کو لہجئے ۱۹۵۰-۵۱ میں یہ ۲۱۷ کروڑ تھا اور ۱۹۶۰-۶۱ میں ۵۶۲ کروڑ ہو گیا۔ آپ جانتے ہی ہیں، مجھے کہنے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے کہ ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز کا اثر چلند لوگوں پر پوتا ہے اور ان لوگوں پر پوتا ہے جو کہ خوشحال ہیں، چونکہ ٹیکسوں کو آسانی کے ساتھ ادا کر سکتے ہیں۔ لیکن ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسز کا زیادہ تر بوجھ غریب جلتا کے اوپر پوتا ہے تو یہ ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز مجائے کم ہونے کے دن بدن بڑھتے چلے

جا رہے ہیں۔ اس وقت جو بجٹ پروپوزلس ہیں ان میں بھی ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز کافی تعداد میں بڑھائے گئے ہیں۔ سنہ ۱۹۵۱ سے لیکر اب تک ۶۲-۱۹۶۱ تک ٹیکسوں سے جو آمدنی بڑھی ہے ان ڈائریکٹ اور انڈیرکٹ دونوں سے وہ ۲۱۱ کروڑ روپیہ ہے اور اس میں سے ۲۳۵ کروڑ روپیہ جو ہے وہ ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز سے وصول ہوا ہے اور صرف ۷۶ کروڑ روپیہ جو ہے وہ انڈیرکٹ ٹیکسیز سے وصول ہوا ہے۔ یعنی مطلب یہ ہے کہ ٹیکس کا زیادہ تر بوجھ ہماری غریب جنتا کے اوپر دن بدن بڑھتا چلا جا رہا ہے اور زیادہ سے زیادہ ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز لگتے چلے جا رہے ہیں۔ ان ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز جو بڑھے ہیں تو ۲۵ فیصدی سے بھی زیادہ بڑھے گئے ہیں اور انڈیرکٹ ٹیکسیز اس کے مقابلہ میں ۶ فیصدی کے قریب بڑھے ہیں اس سے زیادہ نہیں بڑھے ہیں۔ اب آپ دیکھ لیتے کہ امیر آدمیوں کو کیا کنسیشنز مل رہے ہیں۔ ۱۹۳۷-۳۸ سے لیکر ۶۲-۱۹۶۱ تک ڈائریکٹ ٹیکسیز کا یونین کے ٹیکس ریونیو میں جو پروپورشن تھا وہ میں بتا رہا ہوں۔ وہ ۶ فیصدی سے گزر کر اب ۲۷ فیصدی پر آ گیا ہے یعنی پہلے ۶ فیصدی ڈائریکٹ ٹیکس تھا اور اب وہ گرتے گرتے اس وقت ۲۷ فیصدی پر آ گیا ہے۔ آپ اسٹیٹ ڈیوٹی ٹیکس، ویلٹھ، ٹیکس، گفٹ

ٹیکس وغیرہ امیروں کے اوپر لگاتے ہیں۔ مگر حالت کیا ہے۔ آپ دیکھیں تو ٹیل کلیکشن جو ہرنے اسٹیٹ ڈیوٹی۔ ویلٹھ، ٹیکس اور گفٹ ٹیکس سے سنہ ۱۹۵۶ سے لیکر — کیونکہ سنہ ۱۹۵۶ کے بعد ہی یہ لگے گئے ہیں۔ سنہ ۱۹۶۱ تک ان پانچ سالوں میں ان سے جو آمدنی گورنمنٹ کو ہوئی ہے وہ ۲۷۰۲۷ کروڑ ہوئی ہے۔ یعنی ان سے زیادہ سے زیادہ ۱۱ کروڑ روپیہ کے قریب سالانہ آمدنی سرکار کو ہوئی۔ تو یہ معمولی ٹیکس ہے، زیادہ ٹیکس نہیں ہے۔ اگر گورنمنٹ کوشش کرے تو اسٹیٹ ڈیوٹی اور ویلٹھ، ٹیکس کے ذریعہ سے گورنمنٹ کی کافی آمدنی ہو سکتی ہے۔ وہ لوگ جن کی منکیت یا سرمایہ پچاس لاکھ یا اس سے زیادہ ہے ایسے لوگوں کی کل تعداد گورنمنٹ نے ۱۰۲ کے قریب بتلاتی ہے۔ سارے ہندوستان میں اس وقت ۱۰۲ کے قریب ہیں۔ میں تو دعویٰ سے کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ اگر دلی ہی میں ڈھونڈے جائیں گے تو ۱۰۲ آدمی یہیں ہر ایسے مل جائیں گے جن کے پاس پچاس لاکھ یا اس سے زیادہ سرمایہ ہے۔ بمبئی یا کلکتہ جیسے کاسمپولیٹن شہر کو لے لیتے تو میں یہاں تک کہوں گا کہ اگر آپ وہاں ایسے آدمی ڈھونڈیں گے تو وہ اور زیادہ میں ملیں گے۔

[شری پیارے لال کرپل : مدظلہ العالی]

اب اسٹیٹ فنانس میں آجائیں۔ ٹیکس ریونیو ۵۲-۱۹۵۱ میں ۲۸۱.۵ کروڑ تھا اور اب ۶۲-۱۹۹۱ میں ۶۷.۹۱۱ کروڑ ہے۔ یہ اس وقت ٹوٹل ٹیکس ریونیو ہے۔ اس میں سے انڈائنڈ ٹیکس ۱۳۲.۴۵ کروڑ ہے اور ۶۲-۱۹۹۱ میں یہ بڑھ کر ۲۴۲.۹۱ کروڑ ہو گیا ہے۔ انگریز جو ہوئی، بڑھتی جو ہوئی، وہ ۴۶+۱۱ کروڑ ہے یعنی ۱۸۳ پرسیینٹ کی انگریز ہوئی ہے۔ اب انڈائنڈ ٹیکس لے لیجئے - ۵۲-۱۹۵۱ میں ۱۴۸.۶ کروڑ تھا - ۶۲-۱۹۹۱ میں ۳۶۸.۶۵ کروڑ ہو گیا - انگریز جو ہوئی ۱۲+ کروڑ کی ہوئی یعنی ۱۴۸ پرسیینٹ اور بڑھی ہے۔ اسی طرح سے ہمارے ہندوستان میں کارپوریٹ ٹیکس لگتا ہے جو کہ اور ملکوں کی نسبت سب سے کم ہے۔ اس کارپوریٹ ٹیکس کو آپ بڑھا سکتے ہیں - ہم کہتے ہیں کہ اگر آپ کو دیس کے اندر سماج واد کو لانا ہے تو آپ پہلے انڈائنڈ ٹیکسز کو کم کیجئے کیونکہ انڈائنڈ ٹیکسز کے ذریعہ سے جتنا کو بہت بے چینی ہے اس لئے اس کے اوپر جو مصیبتیں ہیں اس کو کم کیجئے - گورنمنٹ کی جو اقتصادی پالیسی ہے، اکانامک پالیسی ہے اس کی وجہ سے ایسا ہو رہا ہے کہ غریب اور زیادہ غریب بن رہا ہے اور امیر اور زیادہ امیر بنتا جا رہا ہے - آپ دیکھیں گے

کہ لڑائی سے پہلے یا لڑائی کے وقت جو آدمی ایک مل کا مالک تھا وہ لڑائی کے بعد دو یا تین یا اس سے زیادہ ملوں کا مالک بنا ہوا ہے - لیکن غریب کی حالت پہلے سے بدتر ہے - اس کے تن پر کپڑا نہیں ہے، پدمت میں پوری روٹی بھی نہیں جانی ہے - (Time bell rings.)

उप सभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आप का वक्त हो गया है।

[شری پیارے لال کرپل : مدظلہ العالی]

دو تین ملٹ اور - اب میں زیادہ کیا کہوں - بولنا بہت چاہتا تھا مگر ایک سبجیکٹ اور آپ کے سامنے رکھوں گا اور وہ خاص کر ان کے بارے میں ہے جو یہ ہمارے غریب آدمی لاکھوں کی تعداد میں جھگیوں میں، جھونپڑیوں میں رہنے والے ہیں - جنہوں نے دلی میں بڑی بڑی عمارتیں بنائی ہیں - جنہوں نے دلی کی شان کو بڑھایا ہے - اور اب بھی اس کی رونق دوبالا کر رہے ہیں - لیکن یہ ہمارے غریب بھائی ان جھگیوں اور جھونپڑیوں سے نکالے جا رہے ہیں، ہٹائے جا رہے ہیں - ہٹائے جائیں بیشک، آپ ہٹائیں، ہم نہیں چاہتے کہ آپ کی خوبصورتی پر یہ بدناما دھبہ قائم رہے - مگر جب آپ سماج واد دیس میں لا رہے ہیں تو ان کو ہٹانے سے پہلے کم سے کم ان کے رہنے کیلئے مکانات بنا دیجئے ان کو ذرا خوبصورت طریقہ سے اور ٹھیک جگہ پر بنائیں - دو کمرے کے مکان ہوں کراہے آپ بھلے ہی جو مناسب ہو

وہ لیں - لیکن جو آپ یہ کرتے ہیں کہ انہیں روزگار کی جگہ سے ۸-۱۰ مہل دور بھیج دیتے ہیں اس میں ان غریبوں کا ۳۰ - ۴۰ روپیہ ماہانہ کے قریب بس میں آنے جانے میں لگ جاتا ہے جبکہ ان کی روزانہ مزدوری روپیہ دو روپیہ ہے - اور اس میں بھی وقت خرچ ہوتا ہے - آپ جانتے ہیں کہ بستیوں کا کیا حال ہے - نہ ان کوئی ٹائم ہے نہ ان میں جگہ ملتی ہے - تو اس طرح سے آپ کو بھی نقصان ہوتا ہے اور کام کا بھی ہرج ہوتا ہے - اس لئے آپ ان کو ذرا بستی کے قریب ہی رہنے دیکھئے - جیسے گلاب کا پھول ہوتا ہے اس کے نیچے کانٹے بھی ہوتے ہیں لیکن کیا گلاب کا پھول لینے سے پہلے کانٹے کو نکال دیتے ہیں - تو کانٹے کو گلاب کے پھول میں رہنے دیکھئے مگر اس کو چھپائے رکھئے جس سے پھول ہی نظر آئے - آپ نزدیک ہی چھوٹی چھوٹی بستیاں ان کے لئے بنا دیکھئے جو آپ یہ کرتے ہیں کہ ان کو شہر کے باہر بھیجتے ہیں، دس بارہ میل کے فاصلہ پر اور کرایہ بھی دس بارہ روپیہ ماہوار لیں گے تو اس سے ان کی حالت کبھی بہتر نہیں بنے گی اور نہ کبھی ان کا گزارہ ہو سکتا ہے - اس سے مسئلہ اور بھی زیادہ پیچیدہ ہو جاتا ہے - وہ اور بھی زیادہ پریشان کن بن جائے گا - اس لئے یہ نہایت ضروری ہے کہ آپ اس مسئلہ کو حل کرنے کی کوشش کریں -

ابھی آپ نے کئی بستیاں بنائی ہیں - قدوائی نگر میں ۱ شری نواس پوری میں، اور دوسری جگہوں میں - مگر ذرا آپ ان کی موجودہ بستیوں میں جا کر دیکھیں کہ چھوٹے چھوٹے بچے کس قدر سینکڑوں کی تعداد میں، کھینچو میں کھیلتے ہیں - ان کی تعلیم کا کوئی بندوبست نہیں ہے - یہ بچے ملک کا سرمایہ ہیں اور ایسی حالت میں وہ کیسے ملک کو آگے لے جائیں گے - برسات میں، گرمی میں، سردی میں معمولی سا کپڑا پہنکر اور معمولی سی جھونپڑی کے چھپر کے نیچے ہمارے غریب بھائی پڑے رہتے ہیں اور وہاں بھی ان کو نہیں رہنے دیا جاتا - پولیس آتی ہے، زبردستی ان کے مکانوں کے اندر گھس جاتی ہے، پر دہ نشین عورتوں کی موجودگی میں پولیس گھس آتی ہے - ان کے سامان کو بکھیر دیتی ہے - ان کی جھونپڑی کو گرا دیا جاتا ہے اور گری ہوئی جھونپڑی کو وہ پھر سے بنا لیتے ہیں لیکن پھر بھی ان کو چھن نہیں لینے دیا جاتا اور دوبارہ گرا دیا جاتا ہے - غریب آدمی ہیں، ان کے پاس اور ٹوٹی چارہ ہے بھی تو نہیں - ہماری گورنمنٹ کا یہ فرض ہو جاتا ہے کہ ان کی مدد کرے - یہی وجہ ہے کہ میں چاہتا ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ ان کے لئے کوئی پابند کرے اور کم سے کم دو کمروں کے مکان بنائے جائیں - یہ جو

[شری پیارے لال کریل مدظلہ العالی]

قدوئی نگر میں دھتے ہیں ان کے لئے ایک کمرے کے مکان بنائے ہیں انہیں ایک کمرہ کی بجائے دو کمرے بنادیئے جائیں۔ میں نے خود دیکھا ہے کہ وہاں پر جو لیٹرن اور کچن بنائی ہے وہ بالکل ساتھ ساتھ ملی ہوئی ہیں۔ آخر یہ کیڑے مکوڑے نہیں ہیں، یہ بھی انسان ہیں، ان کو بھی احساس ہوتا ہے۔ آپ ایسا کر سکتے ہیں کچن کو الگ کر سکتے ہیں ہاتھ روم سے اور لیٹرن سے، اور دو کمرے بنا دیجئے۔ اسوقت جو رہائش ان کو دی جا رہی ہے وہ اس طریقہ کی ہے کہ ان کے دھتے کے قابل نہیں ہے۔ بجائے اس کے آپ ان سے ۱۶-۱۷ روپیہ کرایہ وصول کریں ان سے چار پانچ روپیہ کرایہ وصول کیا جائے۔ اس کے ساتھ ساتھ الاٹمنٹ کا طریقہ بھی غلط ہے اس کو بھی درست کیا جائے۔ ایک فیملی کے آدمی جو ساتھ ساتھ دھتے ہیں انہیں الگ کر کے ایک کو کہیں اور دوسرے کو کہیں مکان الاٹ کر دیا جاتا ہے۔ یہ سب غلط اور نامناسب ہے۔

میں کہنے کو تو بہت کچھ کہنا چاہتا تھا مگر ابھی آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے ادا قائم دیا بولنے کے لئے۔ میں سرکار سے پوروز گزراں کروں گا کہ اگر آپ کو ملک میں ساج واڈ لانا ہے تو پہلے ان غریبوں کی حالت سدھاریجے۔ اگر آپ ایسا نہ

کریں گے، ان کی غریبی کو ان کی بے روزگاری کو اور ان کی کس مپرسی کو کم نہیں کریں گے تو اس دیش کے اندر ایک انقلاب شروع ہوگا جسے کوئی روک نہیں سکتا۔ اور جس کا نتیجہ خطرناک ہوگا۔

خاکساران چہل را بہ حقارت ملگر
توجہ دانی کہ دریں خاک سوارے باشد

یہ چھوٹے چھوٹے آدمی جو ہیں ہو سکتا ہے ان میں ہی سے مہاتما گاندھی جیسا آدمی پیدا ہو جو ملک کو صحیح راستے پر لے جائے اور ملک کی خوشحالی کا باعث بنے۔ اس لئے میں گزارش کرتا ہوں کہ ملک میں صحیح معلوم میں ساج واڈ لایا جائے۔ شکریہ۔

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब"]

(उत्तर प्रदेश) : जनाबा, अभी हमारी एक महिला सदस्या ने हिन्दी में अपने विचार रखे हैं। यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है। अगर हमारी महिलाएं हिन्दी में बोलना शुरू करें तो शायद हमारे दूसरे लोग भी हिन्दी में बोलना शुरू कर दें। हिन्दी हमारी राष्ट्रीय भाषा है इसलिये हमें हिन्दी उर्दू में ही तकरीरें यहां पर करनी चाहियें। मुझे खुद हिन्दी नहीं आती है। बहुत मुद्दत से अंग्रेजी से ही भाषण देता रहा हूं मगर सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का नुमाइन्दा होने की हैसियत से और उसके उसूलों के मद्देनजर अब यही कोशिश करता हूं कि हिन्दी में तकरीर करूं। यह तो बड़ी खुशी है कि हमारी महिला सदस्या ने हिन्दी में तकरीर की।

†[] Hindi transliteration.

जनाबा, सरकार जो कुछ भी करे वो वह सब ठीक है, जायज है और अगर हम कुछ कहें या करें तो वह सब नाजायज है वह सब ठीक नहीं है ।

“हम आह भी करते हैं तो हो जाते हैं बदनाम । वो कल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा नहीं होता ॥”

कांग्रेस पार्टी ने और हमारी सरकार ने अपना नसबे-उल्-अइन् बनाया है कि इस देश के अन्दर हमें समाजवाद लाना है लेकिन महज कहने से ही तो समाजवाद इस देश के अन्दर आयेगा नहीं, जब तक कि हमारी सरकार कुछ ऐसे कदम नहीं उठाती, जिससे कि समाजवाद हकीकती मानों में इस देश के अन्दर आये । अभी तक हमारी गरीबी वैसी ही, अभी तक रिश्वतखोरी वैसी ही है, अभी तक भ्रष्टाचार वैसा ही है और बरोज़गारी भी अभी तक उसी तरह से है । और ये सब बातें आप खुद अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं । खेतिहर मजदूरों की हालत उसी तरह से है । हजारों बीघा जमीन बेकार पड़ी हुई है, मगर वह खेतिहर मजदूरों को नहीं मिलती है । इसी तरह से हमारे मजदूरों के जो वेजेज हैं उसमें किसी किस्म की बढ़ोतरी नहीं हुई है । उनके वेजेज नहीं बढ़े हैं । अगर मैं आपके सामने आंकड़े रखूँ, एदादोशुमार रखूँ, तो बहुत समय लगेगा । महंगाई दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ती जा रही है । बीजों के दाम दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और सरकार ने कोई भी ऐसा कदम नहीं उठाया है कि जिससे जो एसेन्शियल कॉमोडिटीज हैं, जरूरियाते जिन्दगी की जो चीजें हैं, खाने-पीने की जो चीजें हैं, उनके दाम मुकरर किये जायें, ताकि गरीब जनता की दिक्कतें दूर हों और गरीब जनता उन चीजों को आसानी से सस्ते दामों में खरीद सके ।

JTHE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.

हम देखते हैं कि हमारे चिल्लाने पर और यहां पर शोर मचाने पर भी ऐसा कोई कदम उठाने के लिये सरकार तैयार नहीं हुई है ।

आप देखिये कि बड़े अफसरों की तनख्वाहों में और क्लर्कों की तनख्वाहों में आला अफसरों और छोटे छोटे मुलाजिमों की तनख्वाहों में एक बड़ा भारी अन्तर है । उनकी तनख्वाहों में ये जो अन्तर है वह जब तक कम से कम नहीं होगा तब तक इस देश में सोशलज्म नहीं आ सकता । ज्यादा से ज्यादा १ और १० के बीच में अन्तर होना चाहिये । मगर इस वक्त एक तरफ तीन हजार, चार हजार, पांच हजार की तनख्वाहें हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमारे क्लर्कों और दूसरे छोटे मुलाजिमों की शुरू में पचास या साठ रुपया बेसिक पे है । तो जब तक ये सब फर्क नहीं मिटेंगे, तब तक इस देश के अन्दर किसी किस्म का समाजवाद आ नहीं सकता है ।

अब मैं कुछ एदादोशुमार और कुछ आंकड़े आपके सामने रखूंगा, जिससे कि पता चलेगा कि हमारी सरकार किस हद तक इस देश के अन्दर समाजवाद ला रही है । हमारी सेण्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट का टोटल टैक्स रेवेन्यू जो है वह १९५१-५२ में ७३९ करोड़ था और १९६०-६१ में वह टैक्स रेवेन्यू बढ़ कर ७३९ करोड़ की जगह १,२९१ करोड़ रुपया हो गया है और १९६१-६२ में ये १,३९१ करोड़ रुपया रहेगा । यह टोटल टैक्स रेवेन्यू सेण्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट का है । अब इसमें डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज जो हैं, वे १९५०-५१ में १३० करोड़ थे लेकिन १९६०-६१ में २०६ करोड़ हो गये हैं । अब इन डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज को लीजिये । १९५०-५१ में ये २२७ करोड़ थे और १९६०-६१ में ये ५६२ करोड़ हो गये । आप जानते ही हैं, मुझे कहने की जरूरत नहीं है कि डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज का असर चन्द लोगों पर पड़ता है और उन लोगों पर पड़ता है जो कि खुशहाल हैं जो कि इन टैक्सों को आसानी के साथ अदा कर सकते हैं ; लेकिन इन्डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज का बोझ गरीब जनता के ऊपर पड़ता है । तो ये इन्डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज बजाय कम होने के दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ते चले जा

[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब"]
 रहे हैं। इस वक्त जो बजट प्रपोजल्स हैं उनमें भी डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज काफी तादाद में बढ़ाये गये हैं। सन् १९५१ से लेकर अब तक १९६१-६२ तक टैक्सों से जो आमदनी बढ़ी है—इन्डायरेक्ट और डायरेक्ट दोनों से वह ४११ करोड़ रुपया है और उसमें से ३३५ करोड़ रुपया जो है वह इन्डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज से वसूल हुआ है और सिर्फ ७६ करोड़ रुपया जो है वह डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज से वसूल हुआ है। यानी मतलब यह है कि टैक्स का ज्यादातर बोझ हमारी गरीब जनता के ऊपर दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ता चला जा रहा है और ज्यादा से ज्यादा इन्डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज लगते चले जा रहे हैं। इन्डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज जो बढ़े हैं तो २५० फीसदी से भी ज्यादा बढ़ गये हैं और डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज उसके मुकाबले में ६० फीसदी के करीब बढ़े हैं, इससे ज्यादा नहीं बढ़े हैं। अब आप देख लीजिये कि अमीर आदमियों को क्या कन्सेशन मिल रहे हैं। १९४७-४८ से लेकर १९६१-६२ तक डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज का यूनियन के टैक्स रेवेन्यू में जो प्रोवोरशन था वह मैं बता रहा हूँ। वह ६० फीसदी से गिर कर अब २७ फीसदी पर आ गया है; यानी पहले ६० फीसदी डायरेक्ट टैक्स था और अब वह गिरते गिरते इस वक्त २७ फीसदी पर आ गया है। आप एस्टेट ड्यूटी टैक्स, वैल्यू टैक्स, गिफ्ट टैक्स वगैरा अमीरों के ऊपर लगाते हैं। मगर हालत क्या है? आप देखिये टोटल कलेक्शन जो हुए एस्टेट ड्यूटी, वैल्यू टैक्स और गिफ्ट टैक्स से सन् १९५६ से लेकर—क्योंकि सन् १९५६ के बाद ही ये लिये गये हैं—सन् १९६१ तक इन पाँच सालों में इतने जो आमदनी गवर्नमेंट को हुई वह ४४.२७ कोड़ हुई है। यानी उनसे ज्यादा से ज्यादा ११ करोड़ रुपये के करीब सालाना आमदनी सरकार को हुई। यह मामूली टैक्स है ज्यादा टैक्स नहीं है। अगर गवर्नमेंट कोशिश करे तो एस्टेट ड्यूटी और वैल्यू टैक्स के जरिये से गवर्नमेंट की काफी आमदनी हो सकती है। वे लोग जिनकी मिलकियत या सरमाया ५० लाख

या उससे ज्यादा है ऐसे लोगों की कुल तादाद गवर्नमेंट ने १०२ के करीब बतलाई है—सारे हिन्दुस्तान में इस वक्त १०२ के करीब हैं। मैं तो दावे से कह सकता हूँ कि अगर दिल्ली में ढूँढ़े जायें तो १०२ आदमी यहीं पर ऐसे मिल जायेंगे, जिनके पास ५० लाख या उससे ज्यादा सरमाया है। बम्बई या कलकत्ता जैसे कास्मोपोलिटन शहर को ले लीजिए, तो मैं यहां तक कहूँगा कि अगर आप वहां ऐसे आदमी ढूँढ़ेंगे तो वे और ज्यादा तादाद में मिलेंगे।

अब एस्टेट फाइनेंस में आ जाइये। टैक्स रेवेन्यू १९५१-५२ में २,८१०.५ करोड़ था और अब १९६१-६२ में ६११.६७ करोड़ है। यह इस वक्त टोटल टैक्स रेवेन्यू है। इसमें से इन्डायरेक्ट टैक्स १३२.४५ कोड़ है और १९६१-६२ में यह बढ़कर २४२.९१ करोड़ हो गया है। इन्क्रीज जो हुई, बढ़ोती जो हुई है, वह ११०.४६ करोड़ है, यानी १८३ परसेन्ट की इन्क्रीज हुई है। अब डायरेक्ट टैक्स ले लीजिये। यह १९५१-५२ में १४८.६० करोड़ था। १९६१-६२ में ३६८.६५ करोड़ हो गया। इन्क्रीज जो हुई १२० करोड़ की हुई यानी २४८ परसेन्ट और बढ़ी है। इसी तरह से हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में कारपोरेट टैक्स लगता है जो कि और मुल्कों की बनिस्बत सब से कम है। इस कारपोरेट टैक्स को आप बढ़ा सकते हैं। हम कहते हैं अगर आपको देश के अन्दर समाजवाद को लाना है तो आप पहले इन्डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज को कम कीजिये क्योंकि इन्डायरेक्ट टैक्सेज के जरिये से जनता को बहुत बेचैनी है, इसलिये उसके ऊपर जो मुर्बावतें हैं, उसको कम कीजिये। गवर्नमेंट की जो इत्तिसादी पोलिसी है, इकोनोमी पालिसी है, उसकी वजह से ऐसा हो रहा है कि गरीब और ज्यादा गरीब बन रहा है और अमीर और ज्यादा अमीर बनता जा रहा है। आप देखेंगे कि लड़ाई से पहले या लड़ाई के वक्त जो आदमी एक मिल का मालिक था, वह लड़ाई के बाद दो या तीन या उससे ज्यादा

मिलों का मालिक बना हुआ है। लेकिन गरीब की हालत पहले से बदतर है। उसके तन पर कपड़ा नहीं है, पेट में पूरी रोटी भी नहीं जाती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपका वक्त हो गया है।

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब" : दो तीन मिनट और। अब मैं ज्यादा क्या कहूं, बोलना बहुत चाहता था, मगर एक सबजेक्ट और आपके सामने रखूंगा और वह खासकर उनके बारे में जो ये हमारे गरीब आदमी लाखों की तादाद में, झुग्गियों में, झोंपड़ियों में, रहने वाले हैं; जिन्होंने देहली में, बड़ी इमारतें बनाई हैं, जिन्होंने देहली की शान को बढ़ाया है और अब भी उसकी रीनक दोबाला कर रहे हैं। लेकिन ये हमारे गरीब भाई उन झुग्गियों, झोंपड़ियों से निकाले जा रहे हैं, हटाये जा रहे हैं, हटाये जायें, बेशक आप हटाइये, हम नहीं चाहते कि आपकी खूबसूरती पे ये बदनुमा घब्बा कायम रहे, मगर जब आप समाजवाद देश में ला रहे हैं तो उनको हटाने से पहले कम से कम उनके रहने के लिये मकानात बना दीजिये। उनको जरा खूबसूरत तरीका से और ठीक जगह पर बनाइये। दो कमरे के मकान हों किराया आप भले ही जो मुनासिब हो वह लें। लेकिन जो आप ये करते हैं कि आप उन्हें रोजगार की जगह से ८-१० मील दूर उनको भेज देते हैं, इसमें उन गरीबों का ३०-४० रुपया महीना के करीब बस में आने-जाने में लग जाता है जब कि उनकी रोजाना मजदूरी पचा दो रुपया है और उसमें भी वक्त खर्च होता है। आप जानते हैं कि बसेज का क्या हाल है। न उनका कोई टाइम है न उनमें जगह मिलती है। तो इस तरह से आपको भी नुकसान होता है और काम का भी हर्ज होता है। इसलिये आप उनको जरा बस्ती के कीव ही रहने दीजिये। जैसे गुलाब का फूल होता है, उसके नीचे कांटे भी होते हैं, लेकिन क्या गुलाब

का फूल लेने से पहले कांटे को निकाल देते हैं। तो कांटे को गुलाब के फल में रहने दीजिये मगर उसको छायाये रखिये, जिससे फूल ही नजर आये। आप नजदीक ही छोटी छोटी बस्तियां उनके लिये बना दीजिये, जो आप यह करते हैं कि उनको शहर के बाहर भेजते हैं, १०-१२ मील के फासले पर और किराया भी १०-१२ रुपया माहवार लेंगे तो उससे उनकी हालत कभी बेहतर नहीं बनेगी और न कभी उनका गुजारा हो सकता है। इस से मसला और भी ज्यादा पेचीदा हो जाता है। वे और भी ज्यादा परेशान कुन बन जायेगा। इसलिये यह निहायत जरूरी है कि आप इस मसले को हल करने की कोशिश करें।

अभी आपने कई बस्तियां बनाई हैं। किदवईनगर में श्रीनिवासपुरी में और दूसरी जगहों में। मगर जरा आप उनकी मौजूदा बस्तियों में जाकर देखें कि छोटे छोटे बच्चे किस कदर सैकड़ों की तादाद में कीचड़ में खेलते हैं। उनकी तालीम का कोई बन्दोबस्त नहीं है। ये बच्चे मुल्क का सरमाया हैं और ऐसी हालत में वे कैसे मुल्क को आगे ले जायेंगे। बरसात में, गर्मी में, सर्दी में मामूली सा कपड़ा पहन कर और मामूली सी झोंपड़ी के छप्पर के नीचे हमारे गरीब भाई पड़े रहते हैं और वहां भी उनको नहीं रहने दिया जाता। पुलिस आती है, जबरदस्ती उनके मकानों के अन्दर घुस जाती है। पर्दानशीन औरतों की मौजूदगी में पुलिस घुस आती है। उनके सामान को बखेर देती है। उनकी झोंपड़ी को गिरा दिया जाता है और गिरी हुई झोंपड़ी को वे फिर से बना लेते हैं, लेकिन फिर भी उनको चैन नहीं लेने दिया जाता और दुबारा गिरा दिया जाता है। गरीब आदमी हैं, उनके पास और कोई चारा है भी तो नहीं। हमारी गवर्नमेंट का यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि उनकी मदद करे। यही वजह है कि मैं चाहता हूं, गवर्नमेंट उनके

[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब"]
 लिये कोई प्रबन्ध करे और कम से कम दो कमरों के मकान बनाये जायें। ये जो किदवाई नगर में रहते हैं उनके लिये एक कमरे के मकान बनाये हैं। आयन्दा एक कमरा के बजाय दो कमरे बना दिये जायें। मैंने खुद देखा है कि वहां पर जो लैट्रीन और किचन बनाई है, वह बिल्कुल साथ साथ मिली हुई है। आखिर ये कीड़े मकौड़े नहीं हैं। ये भी इन्सान हैं, इनको भी एहसास होता है। आप ऐसा कर सकते हैं—किचन को अलग कर सकते हैं, बाथ रूम से और लैट्रीन से और दो कमरे बना दीजिये। इस वक्त जो रिहाइश उनको दी जा रही है वह इस तरीके की है कि उनके रहने के काबिल नहीं है। (Time bell rings.) बजाय इसके कि आप उनसे सोलह सत्रह रुपया किराया वसूल करें, उनसे चार पांच रुपये किराया वसूल किया जाय। इसी के साथ साथ एलाटमेंट का तरीका भी गलत है, उसको भी दुरस्त किया जाय। एक फेमिली के आदमी जो साथ-साथ रहते हैं, उन्हें अलग करके एक को कहीं और दूसरे को कहीं मकान एलाट कर दिया जाता है। यह सब गलत और नामुनासिब है।

मैं कहने को बहुत कुछ कहना चाहता था; फिर भी आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इतना टाइम दिया बोलने के लिये। मैं सरकार से पुरजोर गुजारिश करूंगा कि अगर आपको मुल्क में समाजवाद लाना है तो पहले इन गरीबों की हालत सुधारिये। अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे, उनकी गरीबी को, उनकी बेरोजगारी को और उनकी कस्मपरसी कम नहीं करेंगे, तो इस देश के अन्दर एक इन्कलाब शुरू होगा जिसे कोई रोक नहीं सकता और जिसका नतीजा खतरनाक होगा।

खाकसाराने जहान रा बाहिकारत मा निगर,
 तू चे दानी के दरीन खाक सवारे वाशद।

ये छोटे छोटे आदमी जो हैं, हो सकता है उनमें से ही महात्मा गांधी जैसा आदमी पैदा हो, जो मुल्क को सही रास्ते पर ले जाये और मुल्क की खुशहाली का वायस बने। इसलिये मैं गुजारिश करता हूँ कि मुल्क में सही मानों में समाजवाद लाया जाये। शुक्रिया।]

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I join the other speakers who have spoken in the debate today in paying a warm tribute to our retiring President who would be laying down his office 'shortly, and I take this opportunity of expressing the wish that he will have many happy and useful years of activity in his retirement.

Sir, I should like to refer to certain paragraphs in the President's Address namely paragraphs 15 and 16, where he has spoken about parliamentary life and duties and about the traditions of our parliamentary institutions. There are a large number of people in our country who do not believe in a parliamentary democracy of the British type, and there have been some persons who have been talking about partyless democracy. I am glad to find my hon. friend, Mr. Morarji Desai, here because he is quoted by Mr. Selig Harrison in his book "India through the dangerous Decades" as expressing the opinion that he does not understand how 51 per cent majority has got the right to rule over 19 per cent minority. I am not suggesting that he does not believe in democratic institutions. Sir, two general elections have passed and it is time for us to ask whether parliamentary traditions have been properly laid. I should like to mention here that some days ago we heard about a report of the Election Commission asking one of the Governors not to tour the area during the election to some bodies. The gentleman toured the area and issued statements about what he did. He entered into party controversies. Further, we have seen the spectacle—and it is a question of tradition of institutions that we are

talking about—of Governors of States applying for party tickets to the Congress Party. These persons are going to hold the scale even between members of the opposition and those of the ruling party in the States, and these gentlemen apply for tickets to the Congress Parliamentary Party for being sent either to the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha. I should like to ask the Government and the Prime Minister whether these are the proper traditions that we wish to lay during our development of democracy. I think, Sir, the time has come for Government to pass an Act giving every Governor who has retired from office a pension so that he does not hang on to the Supreme Court asking for briefs or arguing cases of the capitalists concerned. And I think that all the Members of the House will agree that the office of the Governor is on the same par as the office of the President in regard to the conventions which have got to be observed. And I would suggest therefore...

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): May I ask one question? Was my friend referring to retired Governors or whom?

•SHRI A. D. MANI: Retired Governors should be given a pension. They should be treated like the Auditor-General or the Election Commissioner who operate under certain limitations. We do not want ex-Governors to go round the ordinary courts of law and argue cases. It is really...

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: They, the Governors, would not like to lose their freedom like that by taking a pension, I think.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, Sir. But we wanted to discuss what that freedom was going to be—is it a freedom to apply for a party ticket when you are a Governor? I should like an answer for that question.

I should like to pass on to another point...

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI) : Sir, may I ask him a question? Does not a governor become an ordinary citizen after retirement? Why should he be debarred from getting any party ticket? I do not understand this kind of democracy. What is this democracy?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to mention that for being called 'His Excellency', for sitting at the Government House, for being clothed with all the paraphernalia of the authority of the State, a person must make sacrifices.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Oh!

SHRI A. D. MANI: We do not want Governors to set up a bad example of being the tools of the party in power. That is what I want to mention and I hope that Members of the Opposition and the Government would have an occasion some time in future to meet and discuss the matter at length.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Now, what about Governors being appointed from amongst partymen by the British Government and other governments while they were in office?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, my hon. friend is thinking in terms of colonial history. We are not a colony here.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: We...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Is there any Governor in the United Kingdom?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Not in the United Kingdom but in other countries they have Governors and Governors-General, from amongst their partymen.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to mention here that we are talking of convention. And yesterday my hon. friend, Mr. Annadurai, spoke about the incompatibility of the words 'national integration,' that this Constitu-

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

tion is federal in its content though there are unitary functions assigned to the Centre with regard to the economic development of our country. Sir, my State, Madhya Pradesh, has not been enthused by the way in which the Cabinet has been formed here. The Prime Minister addressing a Press Conference in Delhi said that in appointments made to the Cabinet the claim of the 'States and areas should be taken into account and though I am not interested in ministerial positions, I should like to read out for the benefit of the House the following break-up of Cabinet appointments.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: There are some more to come, there is hope still.

SHRI A. D. MANI :

Andhra Pradesh	43 M.Ps.—4 Ministers
Assam :	12 M.Ps.—Zero
Bihar :	53 M.Ps.—5 Ministers
Kerala :	18 M.Ps.—1 Deputy Minister
Madras :	41 M.Ps.—3 Ministers
Mysore :	26 M.Ps.—2 Ministers
Orissa :	20 M.Ps.—1 Minister of State
Punjab :	22 M.Ps.—1 Cabinet Minister
Rajasthan	22 M.Ps.—3 Ministers
Madhya Pradesh	gets nothing.

Sir, I am not suggesting that people should be appointed purely from a region because they represent it but if you expect the States to put their heart into the execution of the Plan, they must have the emotional satisfaction of finding that one of their men has been chosen for an important position in the Centre. We have got the Bhilai Steel Plant in Madhya Pradesh; some of the best coal fields are located in Madhya Pradesh, and because Madhya Pradesh has not returned a sufficient Congress majority, we should not be penalised by losing representation in this case.

Further, the Prime Minister said at the Press Conference in Delhi that the two Chambers, the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha, will be treated on the same footing. We have seen during the last two years that the Rajya

Sabha has been losing its powers and functions on *account* of decisions taken elsewhere. On the Income-tax Bill, many Members of this House would have been willing to give their suggestions in the Select Committee but it was decided that the Rajya Sabha shall not sit in the Select Committee. We are very happy that Mr. Morarji Desai is here to listen to the debate. The other day, we found that the Ministers were not even attending the session of this Chamber. Sir, if the Rajya Sabha is to function effectively, certain traditions have also got to be followed. And, Sir, there are many men in this House—the Prime Minister said that we are all on equal terms—who would be willing to serve the States in some suitable ministerial capacity. Look at the composition of the ministry. The Rajya Sabha has been completely ignored. I can say that with a certain amount of liberty because nobody would charge me with harbouring or nursing the ambition of getting a ministerial position. I am a sort of an *amicus curiae* 'speaking for the Opposition, for those very able men who should also be given adequate opportunities for taking part in ministerial positions.

I would like to mention that we should also evolve traditions regarding the conduct of elections. I think the Election Commission should be given very wide powers to conduct the elections. And after the way in which certain people behaved in Punjab, after the manner in which certain candidates disappeared at the time of the election, I have very grave doubts about the proper functioning of the election machinery in future. Now, is there any difficulty—I would like to ask the Government—for an amendment of the Constitution being inserted making it obligatory for all Ministers to resign on the day the Election Commission issues the notification calling for applications for candidature? That is to say, we think of an interregnum of about four weeks once in five years when the Ministers should leave office and the Governors should

carry on the administration. There will not be any break-down of the Constitution and I think that after the way in which allegations have been made about the conduct of elections and about candidates being persuaded or forced to withdraw, we should think in terms of this Constitutional limitation.

I would like to make a reference to my hon. friend, Mr. Annadurai—who is not here—about what he spoke on the Dravidian demand which his party has sponsored in the south of the country. I am surprised that Mr. Annadurai should come and tell us that he was very glad to find that people treated him kindly. A large number of South Indians have stayed away from South India; they hold important positions; they have merged themselves with the community in which they live, and it is incredible for a person to come and say that South Indians are not properly treated. What he has said comes from a sort of psychosis and from the fact that he is living in a sort of insulated compartment of his own. He made a demand here 'for Dravidistan. But the other day when the Communists were trying to create trouble on the border . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Were they?

SHRI A. D. MANI: When they were alleged to have created trouble on the border, the Government of India brought forward the Border Areas Bill. Now, I should like to ask the Home Minister, if he cares to reply to this point in the debate, whether he would not make an amendment of the Constitution that the raising of any demand for the secession of any unit "will be considered a reasonable activity. I think that we should take a very clear stand on this issue and we should make it clear that if any unit wants to secede from the Union, the *Union Government* is prepared for a civil war. Unless a statement is made

categorically, the demand of the kind that my friend made on that day on the floor of the House for the first time, in ten years of the parliamentary life of this institution will continue to be made in many forums.

Now, Sir, I would like to pass on to the problem of disarmament to which certain references were made by the previous speakers, particularly by my friend, Mr. Sudhir Ghosh. I am not satisfied with the way in which the Government of India has been reacting to these nuclear tests. Questions were asked of the Prime Minister whether any special protest was made to the Soviet Union about the nuclear fall-out of the Soviet explosion and according to my recollection, the answer that he gave was not satisfactory. Sir, I should like to read out a very revealing report from Washington wherein it is stated: —

"India, particularly the area below the Vindhya range, will be well within the fall-out pattern of the American test, which follows a path just above the Equator around the globe, west to east.

"This is due to the location of the British Christmas Island and the U. S. Johnston Island, both of which are close to the equator." 2 P.M.

Our scientists have revealed that after the Soviet tests there was radioactive fallout in Calcutta, and the latest American tests have shown that the area below the Vindhya range is going to be affected.

Now, Sir, I know that it is very difficult for us to mediate between two giants, but I should like to ask the Prime Minister: "Why should we not make a spirited and symbolic protest by walking out of the Disarmament Conference if both the parties are going to continue the nuclear weapon tests?" And our walking out from there is not going to weaken any of these two major powers. By virtue of an act of courtesy extended to us we have found a place in the disarmament body to take part in the delibe-

[Shri A. D. Mani.] rations there and in the negotiations connected therewith, thanks to the pressure exercised by the Soviet Union, and thanks to the advocacy of our case by Mr. Krishna Menon in the United Nations. Unless we make a their tests. There is one other fact, are going to continue we are not going to continue in the disarmament body, it will not make an impression on the two giant powers to desist from their tests. There is one other fact. Sir,—this is also revealed from Washington—namely, that the fall-out pattern graphs show that it is moving to the East and that both the U. S. and Russia will be outside the affected zone—the affected zone is in the Pacific, and I think we should build up a Pacific security zone asking for the co-operation of countries bordering the Pacific and the Indian Ocean area, so that no country, either the Soviet Union or the United States, can experiment with these weapons in the Pacific zone area.

If I may, Sir, I would like to refer to some problems of planning—I will take only two minutes. The other day we tried to put a question to the Minister for Labour and Planning asking him to give us an idea about the kind of planning bodies which he wants to put up in the States. If planning is to succeed, Sir, and if our agricultural production is to improve, it is necessary for a representative of the Central Government to be on each and every Planning Board in the States so that he keeps a watch on the performance of the States in the matter of production, and also serves as the co-ordinating link between the State and the Centre.

I do not want to encroach on other Members' time. I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
वाइस चेयरमैन जी, जितनी भी तारीफ हम अपने प्रेसिडेंट राजेन्द्र बाबू की करें, वह

थोड़ी है। राजेन्द्र बाबू को मैं शुरू से जानती हूँ, जब वे वकालत करते थे और वकालत के बाद वे महात्मा जी के आन्दोलन में शरीक हुये। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि राजेन्द्र बाबू में सादगी है, नम्रता है और वे त्याग की मूर्ति हैं। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि यहां से जब वे अपने आश्रम में जायेंगे वे उसी तरह मासेज में काम करेंगे, जिस तरह वे पहले किया करते थे और वे ऐसी शक्ति और ऐसी ताकत बढ़ायेंगे, जिस से देश को पूरा लाभ होगा।

कल से मैं यहां पर आनरेबिल मेम्बरों के व्याख्यान सुन रही हूँ। मेरा इरादा बिल्कुल नहीं था कि मैं इस पर बोलूँ। लेकिन जब मैंने अपने डी० एम० के० के भाई को सुना तो मुझे बहुत अफसोस हुआ और यह खयाल भी हुआ कि अगर मुझ में ताकत होती, तो मैं अपने भाई को समझाती कि भारत के अब टुकड़े नहीं हो सकते हैं। भारत के साथ साथ पाकिस्तान का बनना हमारे लिए बहुत दुखदाई चीज हुई, बहुत तकलीफदेह चीज हुई। अब भारत का कोई और हिस्सा नहीं हो सकता है। वह भाई आये नहीं हैं, वरना मैं उनसे कहती कि अगर यह नौबत आयेगी तो मैं उनको यकीन दिलाती हूँ कि हम में से जितने लोग हैं, हम सब अपनी जान पर खेल जायेंगे, लेकिन हम भारत के टुकड़े नहीं होने देंगे, हिस्से नहीं होने देंगे। हमारे भाई इस तरह से बात कर रहे थे, जैसे नायब और साउथ में कोई बहुत बड़ा युद्ध चल रहा हो। उन्होंने अपने व्याख्यान में नार्थ और साउथ का सवाल खड़ा किया, लेकिन वह चीज होने वाली नहीं है। ब्रिटिश हुकूमत की दूसरी बात थी। मेरे भाई जो अभी बोले, उन्होंने भी यह कहना शुरू किया और यह बताना शुरू किया कि कहां कौन कायदे चलते हैं और कहां कौन कायदे नहीं चलते हैं। मैं उन भाई को बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि हम निराले हैं, हमारा बरताव

निराला है। हमने जो सत्याग्रह की लड़ाई लड़ी, वह हमने बगैर हथियार के और बगैर खून बहाये लड़ी। यह भी मैं उनको बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि पहले लिटरेसी होती है, फिर डेमोक्रेसी होती है। हमारे बतन में डेमोक्रेसी आई पहले और लिटरेसी अब आ रही है। यह भी एक निराली चीज हमारे यहां हुई। इन सब चीजों को सामने रख करके इसान एक नक्शा बनाये और उस नक्शे को देखे।

तो कल हमारे उन भाई ने जो बातें यहां कहीं, वे बहुत तकलीफदेह थीं। उन्होंने हिन्दी की भी चर्चा की। लेकिन उनको यह मालूम नहीं है कि जब वे साउथ में कोई स्टेट बनाने वाले हैं और साउथ को नार्थ से अलग करने वाले हैं, तो उनको एक मुश्किल यह होगी कि उनको ज़बान की भी ज़रूरत होगी। कौन सी ज़बान वे वहां पर रखेंगे? यह दिक्कतें उनके सामने पैदा होंगी।

इस वक्त हालत यह है कि हमने खुद ही अपोजीशन पार्टीज कायम की है। जब हमने यह तय किया कि हम पार्लियामेंटरी तरीके से हुकूमत करेंगे, तो हमने खुद ही अपोजीशन पार्टीज कायम की। अपोजीशन पार्टीज किसको कहते हैं? डेली अपोजीशन करने वालों को ही अपोजीशन पार्टीज कह सकते हैं। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि न सिर, न पैर, और जो चाहा व कह दिया। उसके माने अपोजीशन नहीं है। इसको अपोजीशन नहीं कहते हैं। अगर आपको कांग्रेस का सिद्धान्त पसन्द नहीं है, तो आप उसको क्रिटिसाइज करें और उसमें जो कमियां और खामियां हों, उनको बतलायें। कल हमारे एक सोशलिस्ट भाई ने, जो शायद उत्तर प्रदेश के हैं, पहले इधर-उधर की बात की और फिर प्राइम मिनिस्टर और उनके परिवार की बात शुरू कर दी और यह कहने लगे कि बिड़ला ने उनको सोने का हार पहनाया। पहले मैंने सोनहरा हार सुना, लेकिन बाद में मालूम हुआ कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि

प्राइम मिनिस्टर के परिवार वालों को सोने का हार पहनाया गया। मैं सस्त दिल करने गुनती रही। इससे अच्छा यह है कि वे अबल को बात करे और समझ की बात करे। किसने कब किसको हार पहनाया? ये सब बिल्कुल बेकार की चीजें हैं। कल ही मेरा जी चाहता था कि उनको टोकू, लेकिन मैं खामोश हो गयी। इलेक्शन में मैंने भी बड़ा तमाशा देखा। प्राइम मिनिस्टर के इलेक्शन में मैंने खुद देखा कि क्या क्या चीजें हमारे सामने आईं। इसलिये इलेक्शन का तरीका भी हमें बदलना है। इलेक्शन के माने यह नहीं हैं कि हम अपनी सभ्यता से नीचे उतर आयें। इलेक्शन के माने यह हैं कि हम अपनी सभ्यता पर कायम रहें। हम एक दूसरे से मिलें और हम कोई ऐसी बात न कहें जिससे हमको शर्म आये। जब तक समाज में सभ्यता नहीं आयेगी, जब तक समाज में अबल नहीं आयेगी, तब तक इसको बदलना आसान नहीं है। पार्लियामेंट के जो मेम्बर होते हैं, वे श्रीम आफ दी सोसाइटी कहलाते हैं। पार्लियामेंट में आने के बाद जो मेम्बर ऐसी बातें कहते हैं, उनसे मैं इतना ही पूछना चाहती हूँ कि आपने आज़ादी की लड़ाई में कितना हिस्सा लिया है, कितनी शिकंठ की है और किस हिम्मत और किस दावे से आप उन लोगों के सम्बन्ध में ऐसी बातें कहते हैं जिन्होंने सब कुछ खोया और आज़ादी की लड़ाई में शरीक हो कर के मुल्क को आज़ाद कराया। आप तरह तरह की ऐसी बातें कहते हैं, जिनको सुन कर के इंसान को तकलीफ होती है। जहां तक मेरा सवाल है, आप मानें, चाहें न मानें, मुझे इसमें ज़रा डर नहीं है कि कम्युनिज्म क्या है। मैं चाहती हूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के भी अपने सिद्धान्त हैं और वह फले फूले। कांग्रेस के भी सिद्धान्त हैं और आदर्श हैं और वह भी फले फूले। इसी तरह से जितनी भी पार्टीज हैं, वे सब फलें फूलें। लेकिन मुझे सिर्फ इतना कहना है कि आप भारतीय सभ्यता को न भूलें, भारतीय सभ्यता से नीचे न उतरें, कितना भी

[श्रीमती उमा नैरू]

बुरा लगे या कुछ भी हो, लेकिन भारतीय सम्प्रदाय को न भूलें। अगर कुछ कहना भी है तो ज़न्त से कहें एक तरीके से कहें, गालियाँ देकर आप नहीं कहें। अगर आप समझते हैं कि गालियाँ देकर कहेंगे तो हमारे ऊपर असर होगा, तो हम गाली-प्रूफ हैं, कितनी भी आप गालियाँ दें, वे गालियाँ हमें लगती नहीं हैं। हम समझते हैं कि जितनी गालियाँ आप देते हैं उतने ही हम प्वाइंट्स गेन करते हैं। ब्रिटिश सरकार से हम लड़े तो जितनी दफा हम जेल गये उतनी दफा हमने भारत माता को जय कही। जब वह हमें पकड़ती नहीं थी तब हमारी हार होती थी। जितनी गालियाँ आप देंगे, उतना ही हम समझेंगे कि हम आगे बढ़ते हैं। तो मैं संजीदगी से एक बात कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमें नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के ऊपर ध्यान देना है। अब जबकि आप भारत का निर्माण कर रहे हैं तब सब को एक तरीके से उसे करना है, उस के लिये हम को और आप को मिलना है और जितनी भी पार्टीज हैं, सब को मिल कर के नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के सवाल को अपने हाथ में लेना है और नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के सवाल को हाथ में ले कर के आप इस चीज़ को समझें कि वाकई यह क्या चीज़ है। आप खाली बैठ कर के एक साथ मिल कर सोचें तो सही और तब आप देखेंगे कि कितना उम्दा भारत का नक्शा बनेगा। अगर आप इस तरीके पर चलें, तो कितना अच्छा हो, लेकिन यह न कर के कोई नार्थ और साउथ को अलग करने की बात करता है, तो कोई और दूसरे तरीके की बात करता है। यह सब अपने स्वार्थ की बात है। इस को भी आप एनालाइज करें तो आप देखेंगे कि इस चीज़ में देश का वास्ता कितना है और अपने स्वार्थ का वास्ता कितना है। आपको अपने स्वार्थ का ख्याल ज्यादा है, देश से भी ज्यादा है। आप गवर्नमेंट को कंडेम करें और उसको बतायें कि कहां कहां गलती है, लेकिन जो तर्ज आपका बताने का है, उससे आप बिटरनेस

क्रिएट करते हैं और यही बिटरनेस आपकी सम्प्रदाय को गिराती है। इसलिये मैं यह कहूंगी कि आप नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के ऊपर ध्यान दीजिये। जो मतभेद हैं, उनको कम कीजिये, जो कम्युनल बातें फैल रही हैं, एक दूसरे में जो तफरतें पैदा हो रही हैं, उनको सब को मिल कर खत्म करना है और उन को खत्म करना ज़रूरी है; क्योंकि अगर आप यह खत्म नहीं करेंगे तो आप जिन्दा नहीं रहेंगे। इधर हिन्दू-मुस्लिम रायट्स हो गये और उधर कुछ और कर दिया, तो फिर इंसान जिन्दा नहीं रह सकता है और फिर इसी तरह के तमाशे होंगे। आप अपने मन में यह अगर समझते हैं कि ये चीज़ें मुल्क में होंगी तो कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट कंडेम्ड होगी, तो यह गलत ख्याल है। कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट छोटी चीज़ है और आपका मुल्क बहुत बड़ा है और इस तरह से आप इस बड़े भारी मुल्क का सत्यानाश कर रहे हैं। तो अपने हाथ से यह चीज़ आप लोग नहीं करेंगे। यह जाति-पाति का झगड़ा खड़ा करना बिल्कुल गलत चीज़ है। तो मैं आप को एक सलाह देती हूँ और मेरी सलाह यह है कि आप इस बात पर गौर करें, अच्छी तरह से गौर करें और गौर कर के एक दूसरे से मिल कर आप बात करें। आपके सिद्धांत अगर मज़बूत हैं, तो आप ज़रूर दूसरे को कायल कर सकते हैं, आप अपने सिद्धांतों को, अपने प्रिंसिपल्स को, सामने रखकर हमें समझा सकते हैं, लेकिन आप कभी यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि आप हमारी बात को मानते नहीं हैं। तो हमारे पास एक ताकत है, आपको दबाने की ताकत है और हम आपको गाली देंगे या आपको मारेंगे, पीटेंगे; तो यह गलत तरीका है, यह चल नहीं सकता है। हमारी जो सरकार है, वह इस कदर डेमोक्रेसी में यकीन करती है कि वह बेचारी कहती है कि आशा है कि इनको खुद ही समझ में आयेगा। उस ने एक बहुत लम्बा रस्सा इन्हें दे रखा है, इन्हें बहुत ढील देर खी है, लेकिन कभी कभी ऐसा भी खयाल होता है कि जब सिर

से ऊंचा पानी है तो फिर क्या करना चाहिये। घर में ही, अपना गृहस्थी में ही, हम देखते हैं कि बच्चे कहने से मान जाते हैं, तो ठीक है, लेकिन जो कहने से नहीं मानते हैं, तो उनको दंड देते हैं। अगर उन की शरारत किसी तरह से छूटती नहीं है तो फिर क्या करना चाहिये, क्यों उनको यों ही छोड़ देना चाहिये या डंडे से दुस्त करना चाहिये, यह सवाल आता है। इसलिये मैं आपसे यही निवेदन करूंगी कि हमें आपसे कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, लेकिन हम यह जरूर चाहते हैं कि गलत चीज न हो। एलेक्शन के दौरान मैं हमने यह चीजें देखीं। एलेक्शन में खड़े होकर यह कहना कि हम अनाज को सस्ता कर देंगे, कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट सस्ता नहीं करती, है लेकिन हम इसका भाव कम करेंगे, इसको सुन कर मैंने कहा कि यह क्या शेख-चिल्ली की कहानी हुई, हम बगैर सोचे समझे यह सब कहते हैं। तो हमें यह सोचना चाहिये कि हम क्या कहते हैं। देश में किस तरह की करेंट्स चल रही हैं कैसे चीजे सस्ती होती हैं और कैसे महंगी होती हैं, इन सब बातों को पूरी तरह से समझ कर कहना चाहिये।

अभी एक मेम्बर उधर से बोले और एक ही पाठ पढ़ना शुरू कर दिया। ऐसा भालूम होता था कि वह मैदानेजंग में बोल रहे हैं, वह एलेक्शन की मीटिंग में बोल रहे हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि गरीब का यह हुआ, वह हुआ, ऐसा हुआ, वैसा हुआ और उन्होंने सिवाय गरीब का पाठ पढ़ने के और कुछ नहीं किया, जैसे कि हम कोई गरीबों के दुश्मन हैं। मेरा कहना है कि हम किसी के दुश्मन नहीं हैं, बल्कि हमने तो इस तरह से ढील पन छोड़ रखा है कि हम ने सब को अपने सिर पर ही चढ़ा लिया है हमारी हालत तो यह हो गई है। इसलिये मैं ज्यादा न कह कर इतना ही कहूंगी कि यह जो स्पीचेज आप देंगे, उसमें आप समय ही खोयेंगे।

आप नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन की तरफ ध्यान करिये और जब तक आप अपने सब नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन पर ध्यान नहीं देंगे, तब तक वह नहीं होगा। आप समझते हैं कि शहरों में यह करेंगे, वह करेंगे और हर तरह तरह की कम्युनल चीजें होंगी; लेकिन मैं आपको यह भी बता दू कि देश में ऐसी शक्तियां पैदा हो रही हैं, जो इस बात पर तुली हुई हैं कि जहां कम्युनल बात होगी, वहां पर खुद जाकर सैक्रीफाइस करेंगे और इसको होने नहीं देंगी। कम्युनल एक्टिविटीज को हम होने नहीं देंगे और कम्युनल पार्टिज को हम रहने नहीं देंगे। याद रखिये कि भारत के और टुकड़े हम नहीं होने देंगे और अगर कोई भी कम्युनल फोर्स हमारे रास्ते में आयेगी, तो हम मिट जायेंगे, लेकिन कम्युनल फोर्स को खत्म करके छोड़ेंगे, यह हमने निश्चय कर रखा है। हमारे वाजपेयीजी बहुत मुसकुरा कर मेरी तरफ देख कर सिर हिला रहे हैं लेकिन जो मैं कह रही हूँ . . .

श्री ए० वी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

. . . वह आप करके दिखायेंगी, जो एक नई फोर्स पैदा हो गई है उससे लड़ेंगी।

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू : मैं वाजपेयी जी को समझती हूँ, लेकिन अपने मुंह से जो कह रही हूँ, यह निश्चय है और यह होकर रहेगा, मैं आपको बता दूँ। मैं आपको यह भी बता दूँ कि वाजपेयी जी काफी अबल-मन्द हैं और मैं इसको खूब अच्छी तरह से जानती हूँ।

श्री ए० वी० वाजपेयी : शुक्रिया।

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू : मैं समझती हूँ कि वह जमाना जल्द आयेगा, जबकि वह उधर नहीं होंगे और जो बात मैं कह रही हूँ, उसी को दोहराते हुये वह दिखाई देंगे।

मैं ज्यादा न कह कर यही कहूंगी कि मेहरबानी करके नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के सवाल पर सब लोग विचार करें।

[श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

इसके साथ ही मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि हमारे जो चेयरमन साहब डा० राधाकृष्णम् हैं, ये हमारे प्रेसिडेंट होने वाले हैं। इनके बराबर योग्य आदमी बहुत कम संसार में दिखाई देते हैं। इनका व्याख्यान सुनकर—मेरी तो हालत यह है कि अगर इनका व्याख्यान हो और उसे न सुन सकूँ, तो अखबार में जरूर पढ़ती हूँ, क्योंकि इनका व्याख्यान सुनकर—बहुत अच्छा लगता है। उनका व्याख्यान क्या होता है, एक फूल-सा बरसता है। और मुझे यकीन है कि हमारे प्रेसिडेंट राजेन्द्र बाबू, जो हमसे अब अलग हो रहे हैं, वह अपनी ताकत से, अपनी शक्ति से हमारे देश को ताकत और शक्ति देंगे, वे हमेशा अच्छे रहेंगे और उनसे हमको बराबर मदद मिलती जायेगी।

SHRI P. A. SOLAMON (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I need not begin by paying my tributes to the President particularly because it has already been done by our party leader.

Sir, the President was pleased to state in his Address:

"...It is envisaged as a large-scale effort to build up our national economy, to increase productivity and employment and to ensure the development of society on the basis of justice, social, economic and political, as enjoined by our Constitution."

The expression of these noble thoughts by the President must be welcomed by everybody in this House and outside in the country. But it is our duty to examine whether the Government have put them into practice as its policies.

In this connection may I draw the attention of the House to the first amendment that I moved in which I tried to draw the attention of the

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

House to the system of "police verification"?

Madam, the system of police verification at the time of recruitment prevailed for a long time. I think it was started by the British imperialists themselves. But after independence our democratic Congress Government also implemented the same system throughout the country. About this particular thing so many questions have been put in this House and the other House and so many protests have been made by democratic parties throughout the country. I remember that a few months ago this question was raised in the West Bengal Legislature by a member of the Opposition through a non-official Resolution. It was discussed there and the Chief Minister of Bengal at least honestly admitted that this system existed there and it was defended by him. But in Kerala State when this question was raised by a member of our party, the Home Minister of Kerala was not able to admit the truth.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala) : What about the undesirable elements?

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: This particular system exists there and he was not able to admit that and also that this was necessary for them to conduct their government services as well as other government undertakings.

In this connection, I would also draw the attention of the House to the manner in which this system works and how this system affects the entire mass of the citizens of our country. Madam, this system, as you may perhaps be aware of, is working throughout the country, under the direct control of the Home Ministry and by this system so many people have been thrown out from employment and so many others have been thrown out of even Government jobs. Not only that, so many people who are entitled to get Government jobs as well as jobs in the Government undertakings, have been denied this opportunity and this facility of getting

such jobs. So it is a system of bureaucrats and it is against the very principle of our Constitution. I say this because, in our Constitution, article 16 very clearly states that equality of opportunities for employment will be maintained by the Constitution. How can you have this equality of opportunities for all citizens maintained if you adopt this system of police verification? How can this be exercised by all the citizens of India? That does not mean that I am pleading that every criminal should be taken into service. In Kerala, we had to face this situation and we have nullified this particular instruction and instead of that we had made certain other arrangements to check up the persons who had to be admitted into Government service. A statement of the then Chief Minister of Kerala is relevant in this connection which I would read with your kind permission. He says:

"I may in this context, point out that when the Communist Government of Kerala decided not to follow the secret instruction of the Central Home Ministry, it did not give up the process of verification. It only changed the method of the verification and the agency to conduct it. It decided—

(a) That the Public Service Commission itself is to verify whether the applicants have any record of prior conviction for criminal offences.

(b) That the vague term 'participation in subversive activities' and the secret instruction of the Central Home Ministry regarding its applicability to certain political elements, including the members of the Communist Party, was to be given up. In other words, the Public Service Commission was to satisfy itself not only regarding the particular qualifications necessary for the job but also the character and antecedents of the applicant as can be seen from records."

In a democratic set-up the criminal elements can be found out and they can be prevented from getting into Government and other employment. If that is the purpose, namely, to prevent offenders and criminals from service, I can appreciate it. But if it is used for the purpose of preventing people from employment and offices because of their political affiliations or membership of certain parties, it cannot be allowed in a democratic set-up and a democratic government. That is what I would like to point out.

In this connection, I shall bring out certain things which will throw light on the method and the mechanism by which this system is implemented in this country by the Congress Government. Here is a letter—it may perhaps be a secret letter—sent by the Home Ministry to the Government of Bombay. This is an old one, a copy of a letter written on 5th April, 1950. I found it in my office file. It might have been sent by some democratic-minded person in the Home Ministry either in Delhi or in Bombay. Here it listed certain organisations as organisations indulging in subversive activities. It runs thus: "The Ministry of Home Affairs will communicate to different Ministries and attached and subordinate offices under them a list of the organisations which are from time to time considered by Government to be engaged in subversive activities, and the membership of, or association with, and one of which will be considered a good ground for the issue on a Government servant of the notice referred to in instructions. The list may be varied from time to time by Executive Instructions. For the present it has been decided that the following organisations should be so listed:

1. The Communist Party,
2. The Revolutionary Communist Party of India.
3. The Revolutionary Socialist Party of India.

[Shri P. A. Solomon]

4. The Rashtriya Swyam Sewak Sangh,

5. The Muslim National Guards and

6. The Khaksars."

Afterwards, I understand that almost all those names have now been excluded from this list, but the name of the Communist Party of India still remains. That is something which must be considered by this House. The Communist Party of India which is now a major opposition in Parliament and in most of the States, this Party which is functioning as a democratic opposition, continues to remain in this list, in the list of organisations maintained by the Home Ministry of the Government of India as organisations indulging in subversive activities. And how are these activities to be found out? They are based on the report of a constable or head constable and on that report the machinery of the Centre, as is mentioned in this Circular, will act. In that way it is nothing but another form of Macarthyism. Of course, in the Home Ministry here we have the veteran fighter in our freedom struggle—Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri. And our Government is run under the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. So I would appeal to them and say that there must be some rethinking on this matter and they must reconsider this Macarthyism in our country. I hope they will consider it and this process will be withdrawn.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Please define Macarthyism.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: I hope they will take immediate steps in favour of the victims.

I would now like to draw your attention to another aspect of the above-mentioned paragraph of the President's Address itself. It deals with economic, social and political justice. Even after the implementation of Plans, the economic aspect of the country is a serious matter for our consideration. It was mentioned here

that most of the areas had been neglected and there was controversy also even inside the ruling party. I heard that in Bengal during the formulation of the Third Plan, the Bengal Government demanded more liberty and more independence to bring out its plans and certain Ministers exercised their pressure upon the Central Ministry and the Planning Commission to get some projects allotted to that State. So, pressure is the main criterion for getting projects. This is the danger in the implementation of the Plan. In this connection, Sir, I would like to state that my state has always lagged behind because of the political situation and the present form of Government which is there. I need not go into the details of all that. In the bargain, our Government is left far behind. Once the present Industries Minister of Kerala said that he hoped to bring pressure upon the Central Government to get projects for that State. He mentioned the Heavy Electrical Project and said that without exerting pressure we would never get that project. The Madras Government is exercising pressure upon the Central Government to get that project their claim being that they are entitled to get this project because they were promised the first which was later on shifted to Bhopal. At the same time, our Industries Minister said that it was not correct to say that because the Heavy Electrical Project which is now located in Bhopal was previously promised to Kerala and everybody expected that it would be erected there. I say this thing because pressure is the main thing, no other policy or principle, and this means that there would always be quarrels, bargaining and this way our national integration may be put to danger. The other day, the Dravida Kazhagam leader, Shri Annadurai, said about . . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:
(Madras): Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: Yes. I am sorry. It is the by-product of the other one.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Offshoot.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: He said that the entire South is neglected and he wanted Dravindastan. We do not support such a demand and this was stated clearly by the Leader of our Party. At the same time, I would like to draw your attention to the fact how these people can demand such a separation and how such ideas get support from the people, a section of the people at least. This is because planning is not done according to the accepted principles. If planning is done according to the accepted principles which means the bringing forward of underdeveloped areas then people will think that they will get their right and that they will also get a chance to improve their status. If we go into the details of the first two Plans, I can say that Kerala State was purposely neglected. In the First Plan, the expenditure was of the order of Rs. 2013 crores and Kerala's share, on the basis of population was Rs. 80 crores but the allotment was only Rs. 44 crores. In the Second Plan, the total expenditure was Rs. 4,800 crores and actual expenditure was Rs. 4,800 crores and Kerala share on the basis of population was Rs. 175 crores but here again the allotment was only Rs. 87 crores. For the Third Plan, the all-India expenditure estimated was Rs. 7,800 crores in the public sector and Kerala's share, on the basis of population was Rs. 300 crores but the allotment was only Rs. 170 crores. At the most, after giving¹ a few more industries, it might become Rs. 200 crores but even then it would be far far behind. Industries are going down and the land available is also not enough. Taking into account the peculiarity of the Kerala economic problem you must provide more funds and more amenities. In this connection I would like to draw your attention to the report submitted by Dr. P. S. Lokanathan, Director-General of the National Council of Applied Economic Research. He has said that at least one thousand crores of rupees

must be invested in industries alone in Kerala within the next ten years to bring up the per capita income on a par with that obtaining in other parts of the country. Such peculiarities must be taken into account and some way must be found out. I hope that Government, in the next three years, would do something to provide some public projects to Kerala and other parts of the country also which are backward and which are not considered equal with other parts.

SHRI SAWAI MAN SINGH (Rajasthan) : Madam, I would like to pay a warm tribute to our President for the guidance that he has given to our country during the early part of our independence. His task has not been a very easy one but one which he has carried out with dignity and determination. He carried out his duties even at the expense of his health and I would like to wish him peace and happiness in his retirement.

We have had a general picture of the various developments in our country and the progress that they have been making but nothing has been said on one subject which is perhaps foremost in our thoughts today, the encroachment on our border, and I hope adequate precautions have been taken and that troops have been posted in strategic positions so that no further encroachment will take place. This is completely a task for our Army and I hope the Army will be given a free hand without any interference from civil authority. It is only if the task is left entirely to the Army can the Army carry out its duties efficiently.

I would also like to stress the need for national integration. The idea that any portion of our country can leave the Union and form a separate unit is unthinkable. We must all oppose any such move that may take place, for today there can be no greater sacrifice than the sacrifice that one can do for our country.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairman, this being
1 the last Address to Parliament by

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.] Dr. Rajendra Prasad as the President of India, it has a special sentimental and emotional value. It is the 'swan song' of 'Rajendra' the Rashtrapati and indeed he is a 'Rajahansa' in a world where we seldom see anything but ducks and geese, and very often crows and vultures. But, Madam, we in India are fortunate in that we have still amidst us some 'jewels' who will shine through ages like stars inspiring ennobling and guiding humanity. The adoration and the prayers of the nation will be always with Raj en Babu and may he live long in peace and health to shed his lustre and serve humanity in a different capacity. Madam, there is no doubt that he gave to that 'earthy throne' of the President, a heavenly hue.

Madam, the speech of the President, as it has always been, shows a depth and sweep which reflect the greatness of his personality, the magnitude of the task undertaken and the confidence arising from achievements. The goal is still distant; we are aware of it. Faults and failures are many; we admit it; all the same our achievements are really magnificent; nobody can deny it. Madam, in this world of conflict, turmoil, chaos and disorder, if India is a heaven of peace, it is no small measure due to the all-pervading influence and personality of our President and of our Prime Minister. The Constitution by itself could not have held together this vast and varied land of ours, differing in tongue, race, faiths and a hundred other things, by the mere fine legal phrases woven into it but for the emotional and intellectual loyalty that these 'giants' inspired.

Madam, the President says that parliamentary institutions and democracy have taken roots in this land of ours. To a large extent that is true but we cannot be complacent about it. There are disruptive elements working in this country today. Yesterday we had the unique privilege of bearing Mr. Annadurai's very eloquent exposition of his much-cherished ideo-

logy of separatism and also Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's equally eloquent defence for the unity of India. I only wish that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta would keep his word at least till the next election. As for Mr. Anna-durai, I am sorry he is not here but constitutional experts have already answered him fully and still I wonder how he can appear in this House as the champion of 'Dravida-nism' in the shape of a Southern State. Madam, I do not know whether he enjoys the confidence of the Telugus, the Kannadigas and the Malayalees but I am sure that he does not enjoy the confidence of his own constituency in Madras. Of course, the House knows how the politically conscious and patriotic Tamils answered him effectively by defeating him in the general elections.

Madam, there is much news afloat how the D.M.K. leader supported Acharya Kripalani against Mr. Krishna Menon in North Bombay, who in his own eyes should be a Dravida. We know that the election in North Bombay was fought on the basis of policies and not on the basis of personalities but I still mention this just to show that these are bad trends, bad omens and they are the real danger to the unity of India. They are like a dormant disease which has affected the *rashtra sareera* and they will burst upon us the moment the prestige of the parliamentary institutions wanes. If the persons in power are not above suspicion, the prestige of democratic institutions cannot survive. They are sacred and high institutions conceived under the Constitution and if in actual practice they are not maintained at the highest elevation desired, the Constitution itself will become a mockery. These are matters about which we have to be vigilant. These are matters about which the people who exercise moral authority over provincial Governments have to be always alert. A tree will be judged by its fruits and not by the label it bears. Coming as I do from Kerala, I feel I have to stress this point.

Madam, there was a small minority of people who used to be excited by military coups but the disgust and reaction of the oppressed people of some of these countries which fell a prey to military dictatorship seem to have disillusioned them. The recent military coups have not created any friendly excitement anywhere. No rule but the democratic one can give expression to the people's will and desire. It is a matter of gratification that our army has a glorious tradition of non-political and dedicated service. They have accepted the civil rule as supreme. We must strive to make our democratic traditions abiding and unshakable. We have further to instil into the hearts of the people a passionate attachment to democracy. Our educational experts must spend their best thoughts and lend their best energies for achieving the same.

Madam, there has been a sense of achievement in the tone of the President's Address, when he spoke of the planned programme of development. Many sceptics, who scoffed at our Five Year Plans, have come round now. But still the Swatantra Party is unconvinced. Of course, the Swatantra Party has every right, has every "swatantrya" to shut their eyes and say that darkness reigns in the world. We could never have set our foot on the road of progress, if we had not planned and worked. The leisurely way in which the *laissez-faire* policy could work out prosperity or progress in America or Britain in the 18th and 19th centuries, is not available to us in India in this the latter part of the 20th century. Goaded and spurred by totalitarian regimes, the backward peoples of Russia and China are being taken to goals of prosperity set before them and at every step we hear how they blare out their 'achievements' most of them fictions, not facts. A backward nation's topmost urge is for development and they will be ready to barter away their democratic freedom for promises of prosperity. In this context, the easiest thing for our

leaders would have been to assume totalitarian power. It is their deep devotion to democracy, their deep attachment to democracy, that has put us forward on the civilised road of a democratic Government, instead of the short-cut of a totalitarian Government. It has been a tremendous task. To keep the nation on this road, economic development has to be achieved with spectacular speed. And to that end planning was inevitable. But for the planning, the country today could not have been pulsating with new life. Only a purblind man can deny the rapid change in the face of India today.

Madam, India has demonstrated to the world the efficacy of democracy in quickening the pace of developmental activity. China, which started out almost at the same time as India, in the adventure of economic development, seemed to be forging ahead of us. At least we were made to believe so. We were told by our own 'China-maniacs' on the opposite that that vast country on the other side of the Himalayas was producing paddy in a prodigious way; that iron and steel were pouring out in an immense measure from every hamlet; that a real marvel was happening there, beyond the Himalayas. We were told that what was a famine-ridden country, just two or three years back, was exporting rice, while we in India were suffering privation. It is rather interesting that the climate has changed now. We do not hear much of that mighty colossus marching towards prosperity. On the other hand, we know that India, which was only plodding her way along, has forged ahead of China. That is to say, the hare is still struggling in the swamp of coercive methods, while the tortoise slowly but steadily forges ahead.

Madam, if socialism is the finest flower that blossoms on the tree of history and if its fragrance is love, its nectar human happiness, its petals universal brotherhood, then its stalk

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.]

must be democracy. The so-called socialism of totalitarian regimes is the poisonous flowers on the cactus of violence, even if they are produced in hundreds, where there is no human freedom, where there is no love or compassion, where there is no brotherliness, where there is no socialism. The democratic socialism, which we have set as our goal, is an inspiring and ennobling one, and I thank our President for his Address which in prospect and retrospect, reveals that we are on the right path.

श्री ए०बी० वाजपेयी : महोदया, इस अभिभाषण के साथ राष्ट्रपति जी हमसे विदा ले रहे हैं। १२ वर्ष तक—और १२ वर्ष का एक युग होता है—भारतीय गणराज्य के सर्वोच्च अधिकारी के नाते उन्होंने अपने महान् उत्तरदायित्व को भली भांति निभाया, लेकिन राष्ट्रपति भवन में उनका निवास जन-सेवा के पुण्य-पथ पर एक पड़ाव मात्र था, कभी भी उन्होंने उसके साथ किसी मोह का सम्बन्ध स्थापित नहीं किया। १ जनवरी, १९५१ को राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपनी डायरी में लिखा—जो प्रकाशित हो चुकी है—जिसकी कुछ पंक्तियाँ मैं आपके सामने उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने लिखा : “संसार में सभी चीजें अस्थिर हैं, हम लोगों का दिल्ली में रहना भी अस्थिर है, न मालूम कब और किस तरह यहाँ से हट जाना पड़े, इसलिये जो समय मिले उसका ठीक उपयोग होना चाहिये। मैं इसको एक पड़ाव मानता हूँ जहाँ थोड़े समय तक रह कर फिर एक रास्ते पर जाना है।” और हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी उस पड़ाव को छोड़ कर जन-सेवा की मंजिल पर फिर से आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। उस डायरी को पढ़ने से कभी कभी यह भी अनुभव होता है कि राष्ट्रपति भवन में उन्हें जितनी शांति, जितना संतोष

मिलना चाहिये था शायद वह नहीं मिल सका। कभी कभी यह भी विचार आता है कि यदि डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी राष्ट्रपति-पद स्वीकार न करते, शासन से पृथक् रह कर जन-सेवा का एक दूसरा केन्द्र स्थापित करके बैठ जाते तो क्या हमारे राष्ट्र की दिशा में कोई परिवर्तन होता। लेकिन बीती हुई बात को लौटाया नहीं जा सकता। हम परमात्मा से प्रार्थना करें कि राष्ट्रपति जी जहाँ भी रहें स्वस्थ रहें और उनकी शान्त और गम्भीर आवाज़ हमारा मार्ग-दर्शन करती रहे।

आज जब पुराने राष्ट्रपति जा रहे हैं और नये राष्ट्रपति अधिकार ग्रहण करने वाले हैं तो एक प्रश्न स्वाभाविक रूप से हमारे सामने उठता है कि क्या भारतीय गणराज्य का राष्ट्रपति केवल गणराज्य की शोभा है? क्या

वह हमारे संविधान का शृंगारमात्र है? क्या इससे बड़कर संविधान के निर्माता उससे किसी उत्तरदायित्व की आशा नहीं करते थे? ऐसे प्रसंग उपस्थित हुए हैं कि जिनमें राज्य के सम्बन्ध में नीतियाँ निर्धारित करते समय राष्ट्रपति जी से विचार विनिमय तक नहीं किया गया। ऐसे प्रसंग उस डायरी में उद्धृत हैं जिनसे ज्ञात होता है कि राष्ट्रपति भवन में कौन अतिथि बन कर रहें, कौन अतिथि बन कर नहीं रहें इस पर भी आपत्ति की गई। एक बड़े पत्रकार ने लिखा है—मैं चाहता हूँ कि शासन की ओर से इतका खंडन किया जाये—कि जब गोआ की मुक्ति के लिये फौजें भेजने का निर्णय किया गया तो उसकी पूर्व सूचना हमारे राष्ट्रपति को नहीं दी गई। मैं संवैधानिक आवश्यकताओं में नहीं पड़ना चाहता। लेकिन क्या यह आवश्यक है कि हम संविधान के अक्षरों के ही अनुसार चलें या भारत की परिस्थिति के अनुरूप हम

अपनी परम्पराओं का विकास करें ? क्या नई दिल्ली केवल एक घुरी पर घूमती रहे ? क्या हमारा ढांचा केवल एक स्तम्भ पर खड़ा रहे ? क्या भारतीय गणराज्य के अधिष्ठाता संविधान की शोभा बन कर रह जायें और संविधान के अन्तर्गत उसके जिन अधिकारों की व्याख्या की गई है, उन अधिकारों का उपयोग करते समय भी शासन उनसे परामर्श करने का सौजन्य भी न दिखाये ?

महोदया, स्वाभाविक है आज हमारा ध्यान पिछले पन्द्रह वर्षों में स्वतंत्रता की प्राप्ति के बाद हमने जो कुछ खोया है और जो कुछ पाया है उसकी ओर जाता है। एक भारतीय नागरिक के नाते हमें इस बात का अभिमान है—फिर हम किसी भी दल के हों, किसी भी विचारधारा के हों—कि पिछले पन्द्रह वर्षों में हमने न केवल अपनी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा की है, हमने उस स्वतंत्रता को सार्थक बनाने का भी प्रयत्न किया है—राजनीतिक, आर्थिक और सामाजिक क्षेत्रों में हम आगे बढ़े हैं। जब पड़ोसी देशों में लोकतंत्रीय शासन लड़खड़ा रहा है, हमने भारत में जनता की राय से जनता के लिये, जनता द्वारा चलने वाला शासन कायम रखने में सफलता प्राप्त की है। आर्थिक क्षेत्र में हमारी प्रगति उल्लेखनीय है। औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में, कृषि क्षेत्र में हम प्रगति के पथ पर आगे बढ़े हैं। किन्तु प्रश्न यह है कि क्या हमारी गति ठीक है और क्या हमारी दिशा सही है ? मैं दिशा की चर्चा बाद में करूंगा। जहां तक गति का सम्बन्ध है, कोई भी इस बात से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि जिस गति से हम चल रहे हैं वह संतोषजनक नहीं है। स्वतंत्रता की प्राप्ति ने, आर्थिक नियोजन ने जनसाधारण की अपेक्षाओं और आकांक्षाओं को बढ़ा दिया। लोगों में एक उतावलापन है। वे अपनी

स्थिति में बहुत क्षीघ्रता से परिवर्तन चाहते हैं और यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि लोगों की आशाओं और आकांक्षाओं में और हमारी उपलब्धियों में, हमारी प्राप्ति में, जो खाई है वह बढ़ती जा रही है। इसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि लोग अपने को असंतुष्ट अनुभव करते हैं ; इसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि हमने जो कुछ प्राप्त किया है उसका भी हम ठीक रूप से मूल्यांकन नहीं कर पाते, क्योंकि लोग चाहते ज्यादा हैं और हम दे कम सके हैं। सन् १९५०-५१ में हमने यह लक्ष्य रखा था कि हम पच्चीस वर्षों में प्रति व्यक्ति की आय को दुगुना करेंगे लेकिन १० वर्षों में केवल १७ फीसदी की वृद्धि हुई है। स्टील के, रासायनिक खाद के जो हमने लक्ष्य निर्धारित किये थे हम उन्हें भी प्राप्त नहीं कर सके। खाद्योत्पादन बढ़ा है मगर हमारी खाद्य-स्थिति चिन्ता मुक्त नहीं है। विदेशों से वत बड़ी मात्रा में हम अभी भी अन्न का आयात कर रहे हैं। योजना का उद्देश्य है, जनता को अच्छा जीवन बिताने का अवसर प्रदान करना लेकिन स्थिति यह है कि हम अपनी बहुसंख्या के जीवन की बुनियादी आवश्यकताओं को भी पूरा नहीं कर सके। राष्ट्रीय आय में जो वृद्धि हुई है उसका वितरण ठीक नहीं हुआ है। साधारण व्यक्ति की आय बढ़ी है लेकिन मूल्य इतने बढ़े हैं, जनसाधारण पर करों के भार इतने बढ़े हैं कि आमदनी में थोड़ी बहुत जो वृद्धि हुई है उसका जीवन के ऊपर परिणाम दिखाई नहीं देता।

श्रम मंत्री श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने स्वयं यह स्वीकार किया है कि औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले जो श्रमजीवी हैं बढ़े हुए मूल्यों के फलस्वरूप उनके जीवन-स्तर में वृद्धि नहीं हो सकी है। अन्य अर्थ-शास्त्री भी इस बात की ओर संकेत करते हैं कि यदि हम मूल्यों का बढ़ना नहीं

[श्री० ए० बी० बाजपयी]

रोक सकते, तो जिन्हें महीने में बंधी-बंधाई तन्स्वाह मिलती है, जो मजदूर हैं या कलम के मजदूर हैं, उनकी स्थिति हम नहीं सुधार सकते। मूल्य वृद्धि से किसानों को भी कोई खास फायदा नहीं हुआ क्योंकि अनुमान लगाया गया है कि ऐसे किसानों की संख्या जो बाजार में बेचने लायक अधिक अनाज पैदा कर सके २० फीसदी से ज्यादा नहीं है। बाकी जो खेतिहर मजदूर हैं, अनाथिक जोत वाले किसान हैं, आर्थिक नियोजन के परिणामस्वरूप मूल्य-वृद्धि के फलस्वरूप हम उन्हें कोई लाभ नहीं पहुंचा सके। खेतिहर मजदूरों की स्थिति तो बिगड़ी है, उनकी मजदूरी कम हुई है, उनके ऊपर कर्जा बढ़ा है। श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण के नेतृत्व में हमने जो अध्ययन दल स्थापित किया था अगर हम उसका प्रतिवेदन पढ़ें, तो ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे आर्थिक विकास का लाभ केवल २० फीसदी जनसंख्या को हुआ है और ८० फीसदी आदमी जो अनार्थिक जोत वाले किसान हैं, खेतिहर मजदूर हैं, जो पिछड़े हुए वर्ग में से आते हैं, परिगणित जाति से सम्बन्धित हैं, वनवासी हैं, आर्थिक विकास उनकी स्थिति को सुधार नहीं सका है।

केवल व्यक्ति और व्यक्ति के बीच में विषमता नहीं बढ़ी है, क्षेत्र और क्षेत्र के बीच में भी विषमता बढ़ी है, नगरों और गांवों के बीच में भी खाई बढ़ी है। आज ऐसी स्थिति है कि ८२ फीसदी गांव में रहने वाले व्यक्ति आर्थिक नियोजन से अपने को लाभान्वित अनुभव नहीं करते। उनमें जो बड़े हैं उन्हें थोड़ा बहुत फायदा हुआ है मगर उनकी संख्या नगण्य है। स्थिति यह है कि शहरी क्षेत्र और ग्रामीण क्षेत्र एक दूसरे को विभाक्त बना रहे हैं। शहरी क्षेत्र में

जहां बड़े पैमाने पर बड़े उद्योगों से पक्का माल तैयार होता है और जो यातायात के साधनों की सुविधाओं के कारण छोटे-छोटे गांवों तक सरलता से पहुंच जाता है वह वहां के परम्परागत उद्योगों को चौपट कर रहा है। दूसरी ओर गांवों में धन्वे नहीं हैं, रोजगार नहीं हैं। इसलिये बड़ी संख्या में गांवों को छोड़ कर लोग शहरों की तरफ पलायन कर रहे हैं, जहां उनके लिये निवास की और रोजगार की समस्या है। इस प्रकार शहरी और ग्रामीण क्षेत्र एक दूसरे के पूरक होने के बजाय एक दूसरे के संकट का कारण बन रहे हैं।

तीसरी ओर क्षेत्रों और क्षेत्रों के बीच विषमता बढ़ी है। अभी हमने माननीय सदस्यों के भाषण में सुना, कोई भी सदस्य ऐसा नहीं निकला जिसने कहा हो कि पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत उस के राज्य को जो कुछ धन-राशि मिली है वह संतोषजनक है और उसके लिये वह केन्द्र का आभारी है। प्रत्येक सदस्य ने शिकायत की है और शिकायत करने के लिये कारण भी हो सकता है। लेकिन हमें इस बात का विचार करना होगा कि यदि हम आर्थिक नियोजन कर रहे हैं तो क्या जो क्षेत्र अविकसित हैं, बहुत कम विकसित हैं उन्हें विकास के कार्यों में प्राथमिकता नहीं मिलनी चाहिये? मैंने कुछ आंकड़े इकट्ठे किये हैं जिनसे पता लगता है कि हमारा विकास असंतुलित है, एकांगी है; और जो विकसित क्षेत्र हैं, और जो अविकसित क्षेत्र हैं उनकी बीच की दूरी कम होने के बजाय बढ़ती जा रही है। यदि हम प्राथमिक शिक्षा को लें, तो ६ साल से ११ साल तक के बच्चों के लिए शिक्षा की सुविधा के लिए भारतीय संविधान के अन्तर्गत हम बंधे हुए हैं। ६० और ६१ की

स्थिति यह है कि केरल में इस प्रकार की शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध १०० फीसदी है, मद्रास में ७० फीसदी है। यद्यपि मद्रास के एक माननीय सदस्य ने इस बात की शिकायत की है कि उनके साथ न्याय नहीं किया जा रहा है। बम्बई में यह सुविधा ७५ फीसदी है, जब कि उड़ीसा में ४२ फीसदी है। उत्तर प्रदेश में ४० फीसदी, राजस्थान में ३६ फीसदी, जम्मू और काश्मीर में केवल ३५ फीसदी। शिक्षा के प्रसार में भी हम संतुलन से काम नहीं ले सके।

जहां तक बिजली के उपयोग का संबंध है, सन् १९५६-६० ई० में हमने १२,३०० मिलियन किलोवाट बिजली बेची जिसका ६० फीसदी बम्बई, पश्चिमी बंगाल, मद्रास तथा उत्तर प्रदेश में खप गया। बम्बई को ३,३७३ मिलियन किलोवाट बिजली मिली, मद्रास को १,४३० मिलियन किलोवाट बिजली, लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश को केवल २६४ मिलियन किलोवाट बिजली मिली और राजस्थान को ८० मिलियन किलोवाट, जम्मू और काश्मीर को ५० मिलियन किलोवाट और आसाम को केवल २५ मिलियन किलोवाट बिजली मिली। यदि प्रति व्यक्ति हम बिजली की खपत का हिसाब लगायें तो दिल्ली में एक व्यक्ति के हिस्से में १७७ किलोवाट बिजली आती है। मद्रास में एक व्यक्ति के हिस्से में ४३ किलोवाट बिजली आती है जबकि उत्तर प्रदेश में १३ किलोवाट, जम्मू और काश्मीर में १० किलोवाट और राजस्थान में केवल ५ किलोवाट बिजली आती है। इस प्रकार के और भी आंकड़े उपलब्ध किये जा सकते हैं। किन्तु समयाभाव से मैं उन्हें सदन के सम्मुख नहीं रखूंगा। स्पष्ट है कि यदि संतुलित विकास करना है तो हमारे आर्थिक नियोजन में परिवर्तन होना चाहिये।

व्यक्ति व्यक्ति के बीच की, नगरों और गांवों के बीच की, क्षेत्र और क्षेत्र के बीच की विषमता मिटनी चाहिये। आज वातावरण ऐसा है कि इन विषमताओं को विघटन का कारण बनाया जा रहा है। कल हमने इस सदन में एक खतरे की घंटी सुनी। स्वतंत्रता की प्राप्ति और देश के विभाजन के १५ वर्ष बाद फिर से भारत को बांटने की एक आवाज उठी है। विघटन का यह स्वर भारत के विनाश का स्वर है। भारत से अलग होने के और भारत के टुकड़े करने के कारण क्या दिये गये कि मद्रास के साथ न्याय नहीं होता? हम किसी भी राज्य में जायें तो यह शिकायत हमको मिलेगी। केवल राज्यों ही में नहीं, तो एक राज्य के जो भिन्न-भिन्न हिस्से हैं उनमें भी इस तरह की शिकायत है। पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग शिकायत करते हैं कि पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश वाले उनके साथ न्याय नहीं करते। कुल मिला कर उत्तर प्रदेश शिकायत करता है कि नई दिल्ली उसके साथ न्याय नहीं करती। इन शिकायतों में कुछ सच्चाई हो सकती है, लेकिन ये शिकायतें हमें इस बात के लिए प्रेरित नहीं कर सकती कि हम राष्ट्र के अस्तित्व को चुनौती दें और यह कि हम अपनी स्वतंत्रता की समृद्धि की पहली शर्त को समाप्त कर दें और हम यह मांग करें कि भारत टुकड़ों में बंट जाना चाहिये, भारत का बॉलकेनाइजेशन हो जाना चाहिये। मुझे बड़ा खेद है कि विघटन की यह आवाज आत्मनिर्णय के आवरण को ओढ़ कर आई है। उसे सैद्धांतिक

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

स्वरूप प्रदान करने का प्रयत्न किया गया है और पृथक्तावादी मांग को एक ऊँचे धरातल पर रखने की कोशिश की गई है और कहा गया है कि भारत एक राष्ट्र नहीं है, राष्ट्रों का समूह है और दक्षिण को छूट होनी चाहिये इस बात की कि वह उत्तर से अलग हो जाये। मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई भी देश इस प्रकार की मनोवृत्ति के साथ समझौता कर सकता है। मुस्लिम लीग ने दो राष्ट्रों के सिद्धान्त की बात कही थी और हम उसके खिलाफ लड़े। हमने कभी भी दो राष्ट्र के सिद्धान्त को नहीं माना।

श्री बी० डी० खोबरागड़े (महाराष्ट्र):
फिर भी हो कर रहा।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : होकर रहा, क्योंकि उस समय मुस्लिम लीग को बढ़ावा देने के लिए तीसरी ताकत थी और जो आज देश के विभाजन की मांग कर रहे हैं वे याद रखें कि अब अंग्रेज उनकी मदद के लिए नहीं हैं। सारी देश की जनता उनकी विघटनकारी मनोवृत्ति से लड़ेगी। अब विभाजन के इतिहास को दोहराया नहीं जा सकता। सन् १९४७ के स्वतंत्रित इतिहास की पुनरावृत्ति नहीं की जा सकती। हम किसी भी कीमत पर राष्ट्र की एकता की बलि चढ़ाना स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन यदि आज इस प्रकार की आवाजें सुनाई देती हैं तो उसका एक ही कारण है कि राष्ट्रीय एकीकरण के संबंध में हमें जितना ध्यान से काम लेना चाहिये था हमने उतना नहीं लिया। देश का बंटवारा हो गया, हम समझे कि सब बात ठीक हो गई। मगर जो जहर था वह मिटा नहीं, दब गया। उसका रूप बदल गया, उसकी अभिव्यक्ति के साधन बदल गये। मगर सम्पूर्ण देश में, एक-एक जन में एक

राष्ट्रीयता के भाव को प्रबल करने के लिए शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में, राजनीति के क्षेत्र में, संस्कृति के क्षेत्र में, हमें जो कदम उठाने चाहिये थे, हमने नहीं उठाये और उसका ही दुष्परिणाम आज हमें दिखाई देता है।

श्री अन्नादुराई ने कल बड़ी विचित्र बातें कहीं। उन्होंने कहा कि मद्रास को एक भी स्टील प्लांट नहीं मिला है, इसलिए मद्रास के लोग नाराज हैं। स्टील प्लांट तो बहुत से प्रान्तों को नहीं मिला है। सब प्रान्तों में स्टील प्लांट स्थापित कर दिये जायें, यह सम्भव नहीं है। कच्चा माल कहां मिल सकता है, इसका हमें विचार करना होगा। लेकिन क्या उन्हें स्टील प्लांट दे दिया जाये तो वे भारत से पृथक् होने की मांग छोड़ देंगे? क्या नई दिल्ली की सड़कों के नामों को बदल कर सभी मद्रास के नेताओं के नाम रख दिये जायें तो क्या वे पृथक्तावादी मांग का परित्याग कर देंगे? लेकिन यह तो सौदेबाजी होगी और देशभक्ति में सौदे के लिए स्थान नहीं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् को केन्द्र का मंत्री बना दिया गया है और इस पर उन्हें आपत्ति है कि कांग्रेस शासन "डिवाइड एंड रूल" की पॉलिसी पर चलता है। अगर हम मद्रास का कोई मंत्री नहीं बनाते तो यह आपत्ति होती कि यहां मद्रास का कोई मंत्री नहीं है और इसे लेकर फिर विघटन की मांग को बल प्रदान किया जाता। यदि मंत्री बना दिया गया है तो यह कहा जाता है कि वह इसलिए मंत्री बनाये गये हैं कि वे मद्रास के लोगों को दबायें, उनको समझायें। यह तर्क केवल एक ही बात की ओर संकेत करता है कि अभी हमारे राष्ट्रीय जीवन में राष्ट्रीयता की जैसी अनुभूति होनी चाहिये वह नहीं है। और इसलिए जहां हम कोई निरोधक कार्यवाही करें, मैं श्री ए० डी० मणि के इस सुझाव

का समर्थन करता हूँ कि हमें एक "ला आफ ट्रीजन" बनाना चाहिये, आवश्यकता हो तो हमें संविधान में परिवर्तन करना चाहिये। कोई भी दल, कोई भी व्यक्ति भारत से प्रलग होने की बात करे तो वह चीज गैर-कानूनी हो और हम कानून के स्तर पर उसका मुकाबला करें। लेकिन आर्थिक, शैक्षणिक और सांस्कृतिक क्षेत्र में भी हमें अपनी नीतियाँ ऐसी बनानी चाहियें जिससे भारत के कौन-कौने में निवास करने वाले इस बात को समझें कि यह देश हमारा है, और इस देश की रक्षा में हमारी रक्षा है, इस देश को समृद्धि में हमारी समृद्धि है। कभी कभी मुझे लगता है कि स्वतंत्रता की प्राप्ति के बाद हमने अर्थ पर जितना बल दिया है उससे जीवन को बांधे रखने के जो अन्य सूत्र हैं वे दुर्बल हो गए। आज आर्थिक प्रगति को एक दौड़ लगे हैं और उसमें हमारे सांस्कृतिक जीवन मल्य पिछड़ गये हैं।

श्री अन्नादुराई को मद्रास में स्टील प्लान्ट नहीं मिला यह तो दिखाई देता है मगर भारतीय एकता के साक्षात्कार के रूप में पर्वतराज हिमालय की पुत्री पार्वती नहीं दिखाई देती जो सुदूर दक्षिण में समुद्र के किनारे आराधना कर रही है, कैलाश पर निवास करने वाले भगवान शंकर की। मद्रास में मोतीलाल नेहरू सड़क और कमला नेहरू अस्पताल तो उन्होंने देखे, किन्तु क्या उन्होंने यह नहीं देखा कि केरला का एक नम्बूदरी ब्राह्मण ३२ वर्ष की अवस्था में सारे भारत में घूमा और उसने देश के कौन-कौने में मठों की स्थापना कर एकता को साकार रूप दिया। क्या उस नम्बूदरी ब्राह्मण के जो जगद्गुरु के रूप में विख्यात हुआ, अन्तःकरण में उठने वाली भावनाओं की अनुभूति उन्हें नहीं होती? स्नान के लिए छोटे में भरे हुए जल में सात नदियों के जल का आह्वान करने का श्लोक उन्हें सुनाई नहीं देता? क्या सप्तपुरियों में सम्पूर्ण

भारत का चित्र उन्हें दिखाई नहीं देता? यदि नहीं दिखाई देता तो यह उनका दुर्भाग्य है और उनके साथ देश का भी दुर्भाग्य है।

आखिर स्वतंत्रता की लड़ाई हम लड़े, किसी प्रान्त के लिए नहीं लड़े। आज हम गरीबी, बेकारी और भुखमरी के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं तो किसी एक प्रांत के लिए नहीं लड़ रहे हैं। हम सब एक नाव में सवार हैं और अगर यह नाव डूबेगी तो कोई बचने वाला नहीं है। वे दक्षिण को दूर ले जाना चाहते हैं। कहां ले जाना चाहते हैं? मुझे तो यही पता नहीं है कि दक्षिण कहां से शुरू होता है। क्या महाराष्ट्र दक्षिण में नहीं है? उत्तर वालों के लिए तो महाराष्ट्र भी दक्षिण में है और महाराष्ट्र वालों के लिए कर्नाटक दक्षिण में है और कर्नाटक वालों के लिए तमिलनाडु दक्षिण में है। फिर यह लक्ष्मण रेखा कहां खींची जायेगी कि यहां तक उत्तर है और इसके बाद अगर आप चले गये तो फिर आपको विघटन का रावण उठाकर ले जायेगा। हमारे देश में पहले ही भेद बहुत हैं, संप्रदायवाद है, जातिवाद है, भाषावाद है और अब उत्तर-दक्षिण का एक झगड़ा खड़ा किया जा रहा है, लेकिन हमें इसे समझना होगा और इसके मल में जाना पड़ेगा। हमें राष्ट्रीयता की भावना को बढ्दमूल करना पड़ेगा और शिक्षा में, इतिहास में ऐसा परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा जिससे एकता की भावना बाल्यावस्था से आरम्भ हो। मैं उनको इस शिकायत को मानता हूँ कि जो भी आज इतिहास पढ़ाया जाता है वह केवल उत्तर भारत का इतिहास है और उसमें दक्षिण के महापुरुषों का जितना वर्णन चाहिये उतना नहीं है। सन् १८५७ की लड़ाई में कट्टोबोमन लड़े थे। किन्तु उनका परिचय तब हुआ जब उनपर बने हुये एक फिल्म को पुरस्कृत किया गया। आसाम के, उड़ीसा के जो महापुरुष हैं उनका हमें जितना परिचय होना चाहिये, उतना परिचय नहीं है। उनके महापुरुषों के नामों पर सड़कें बनें, इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं हो सकती है।

[श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी]

इस दृष्टि से हमारे इतिहास में संशोधन करने की आवश्यकता है। इतिहास केवल उत्तर भारत का नहीं, सम्पूर्ण भारत का होना चाहिये। भारत के कण-कण के प्रति भारत के जन-जन के प्रति हम आत्मीयता का अनुभव करें, इस तरह का परिवर्तन शिक्षा में होना चाहिये, इस तरह का परिवर्तन संस्कार पद्धतियों में होना चाहिये। अब संस्कारों की पुरानी पद्धति ज्यों की त्यों नहीं चलती। नये युग के नये तकाजे हमारे सामने हैं। संचार के, यातायात के साधन त्वरित हो गये हैं और कोई कारण नहीं है कि हम देश के सुदूरवर्ती भागों को भी उस भावात्मक एकता की अनुभूति न करा सकें जिसके बिना हम अपने अस्तित्व की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते, स्वतंत्रता का संरक्षण नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन जो भी कमियाँ हैं, जो भी खामियाँ हैं, वे एक राष्ट्र के रूप में हमारी सबकी हैं और इसके लिए हम यह कहें कि हम देश से अलग हो जायेंगे, हम एक अलग राष्ट्र बनायेंगे, यह भाषा मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। मुझे खुशी है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता ने श्री अन्ना-दुराई की मांग का विरोध किया है, बड़े जोरदार शब्दों में विरोध किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने पाकिस्तान का समर्थन जिस आधार पर किया था कि वे आत्मनिर्णय की मांग थी, उस आधार को आज कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने छोड़ दिया है और इस बात को वे समझ गये हैं कि भारत राष्ट्रों का समूह नहीं है, यह "मल्टी नेशनल स्टेट" नहीं है, यह एक राष्ट्र है और इस एक राष्ट्र की एकता हमको रखनी और इस एकता में ही हमारी समृद्धि का मूलमंत्र है। मैं यह भी आशा करता हूँ कि स्वतंत्र पार्टी के नेता द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कडवम के आन्दोलन से अपने को पृथक् घोषित करेंगे और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरह यह कहेंगे कि अगर आपको कोई शिकायतें हैं तो उन शिकायतों के लिए

हम लड़ सकते हैं, हम नई दिल्ली से भी संघर्ष कर सकते हैं, मगर किसी भी कीमत पर हम भारत से अलग होने की मांग को बल प्रदान नहीं करेंगे।

चुनाव में इस प्रकार की विघटनात्मक प्रवृत्तियाँ दिखाई दी थीं। आज जब चुनाव समाप्त हो गये, तो चुनाव में जो जहर निकला है, जो विष निकला है, उसे भगवान शंकर की तरह से हमें कंठ में धारण करना होगा और जो रत्न निकले हैं उन्हें ले करके राष्ट्र जीवन का श्रृंगार करना होगा। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि वह जब हमारे भीतर चला जाये, जिसके जाने का संकेत दिखाई देता है। आने वाले कल की चुनौतियाँ हमको पुकार रही हैं। वक्त का तकाजा है कि हम आने वाले संकटों का सफलता के साथ सामना करने के लिए तैयार हों और उसके लिए आवश्यक है कि इस प्रकार की जो भी विघटनकारी, विभेदकारी मांगें हैं उनसे हम अपने को अलग करें। राजनैतिक, आर्थिक और सामाजिक प्रश्नों पर मतभेद हो सकते हैं। लेकिन जहाँ तक देश की स्वतंत्रता का, राष्ट्रीय एकता का सवाल है, उस पर मतभेद बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जा सकता। प्राचीन काल से भारत में उदारवादी रहे हैं, अनुदारवादी रहे हैं, क्रांतिकारी रहे हैं। हम आर्थिक और सामाजिक क्षेत्र में मतभेद रख सकते हैं, मगर एक बात पर हमको मिल कर खड़ा होना होगा कि यह देश हमारा है और जो देश को बांटना चाहते हैं या विदेशियों के साथ मिल कर जो भारत की भूमि को पदाक्रांत करना चाहते हैं, उनके साथ हमारा कोई समझौता नहीं होगा।

महोदया, आज हमारी सीमाएं संकटापन्न हैं। भारत पर चीन का आक्रमण हुआ है और पाकिस्तान में

आक्रमण की फिर से तैयारियां हो रही हैं। हम इन संकटों की ओर से आंखें नहीं बन्द कर सकते। जब ये संकट सामने खड़े हों, हम दक्षिण में एक पृथक्तावादी नारा लगायें, तो यह सीमा पर खड़े हुये शत्रुओं का हाथ मजबूत करना होगा। आवश्यकता तो इस बात की है कि हम मिल करके आने वाले संकटों का सामना करें। इसके लिए जहां जनता के स्तर पर हमें अपनी नीतियों में परिवर्तन करना होगा, वहां शासन के स्तर पर भी नीतियों में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता आज प्रतीत होती है। अभी तक शासन की ओर से यह स्पष्ट नहीं किया गया है कि आज चीन की ओर से समझौते के सभी दरवाजे बन्द कर दिये गये हैं तब चीन के कब्जे में जो भारत भूमि है उसको वापस कैसे लिया जायेगा। कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है कि हमारी क्या नीति है। जब कभी प्रश्न किये जाते हैं कि क्या चीन ने कोई नया आक्रमण किया है, तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री सदन में आ करके उत्तर देते हैं कि हां, चीन ने एक नई चौकी बना ली है। ये चौकियां कब तक बनती रहेंगी? कब तक हमारी तैयारी होगी कि हम चीन को आगे बढ़ने से रोक सकें? कब हम अपनी सीमाओं को सुरक्षित अनुभव करेंगे?

आज पाकिस्तान की ओर से जो धमकियां मिल रही हैं, उनको भी अनसुना नहीं किया जा सकता। काश्मीर का सवाल पाकिस्तान के लिए अपनी जनता का ध्यान बंटाने का सवाल हो सकता है। मगर हमारे लिए काश्मीर का सवाल हमारी राष्ट्रियता का, हमारी असांप्रदायिकता का, हमारे अस्तित्व का सवाल है। हम मजहब के आधार पर भेदभाव नहीं मान सकते। हम काश्मीर को पाकिस्तान के इस लिए हवाले नहीं कर

सकते कि काश्मीर में एक विशेष मजहब के मानने वाले लोग रहते हैं। भारत में अनेक मजहब हैं, भारत में अनेक भाषाएं हैं, भारत में अनेक प्रकार की भूषाएं हैं, हमारे भोजन के अनेक तरीके हैं। मगर इस विविधता में एकता है और उस एकता का हमें साक्षात्कार करना होगा। इस एकता की जड़ पर पहली चोट पड़ी जब हमने देश के विभाजन को स्वीकार कर लिया। मगर उस समय भड़काने के लिए अंग्रेज थे और हम स्वतंत्रता की प्राप्ति के लिए लालायित थे। आज कोई दूसरी ताकत हमको बांटने वाली नहीं है। इस लिए हम मजहब के आधार पर, भाषा के आधार पर, जाति के आधार पर देश के बंटवारे की मांग नहीं मान सकते। काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में हमारी एक ही नीति हो सकती है कि हम पाकिस्तान पर इस बात के लिए दबाव डालें कि जो काश्मीर पर कब्जा पाकिस्तान का है, उस कब्जे से हटकर पाकिस्तान काश्मीर खाली कर के चला जाय। सीमा रेखा पर विभाजन के प्रस्ताव को हम कभी स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे। सीमा रेखा कोई स्थायी रेखा नहीं है। यह नहीं हो सकता कि हम पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण के सामने झुक जायें और एक तिहाई काश्मीर पाकिस्तान को पेश कर दें और फिर हम चीन के बारे में यह कहें कि हम तब तक बात नहीं करेंगे जब तक कि वह अपना आक्रमण नहीं हटाता। इन दोनों बातों में कोई तर्कसंगति नहीं दिखाई देती है। आज अगर अमेरिका कह रहा है कि हम पाकिस्तान को एक तिहाई काश्मीर देकर पाकिस्तान से समझौता कर लें, तो कल चीन के दोस्त भी हम से कह सकते कि आज जो कुछ चीन के कब्जे में है चला गया है, उसे चीन के कब्जे में छोड़ कर हम चीन के साथ समझौता कर लें। मगर सार्वभौमत्व के

[श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी]

प्रश्न पर समझौता नहीं हो सकता और हम आक्रमण के सामने नहीं झुक सकते। इस लिए जो भी भारत की भूमि आक्रमणकारियों के कब्जे में है, वह खाली होनी चाहिये।

इस के साथ ही हम इस बात का प्रयत्न करें कि काश्मीर में पाकिस्तान के जो कुचक चलते हैं, आसाम में जो पाकिस्तानियों का अवैध प्रवेश हो रहा है और देश के भिन्न भिन्न भागों में साम्प्रदायिकता उभारने के जो इस समय विशेष प्रयत्न चल रहे हैं, उन प्रयत्नों का सामना किया जाय।

मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि काश्मीर की एक विशेष स्थिति क्यों रखी गई है। क्यों नहीं काश्मीर को भारतीय संविधान के अन्तर्गत उसी प्रकार हम ले आते, जिस प्रकार हम बम्बई को रखते हैं, मद्रास को रखते हैं? क्यों नहीं हम काश्मीर की जनता को लोक-सभा के लिए और राज्य सभा के लिये अपने प्रतिनिधि चुनने का अधिकार देते हैं? मुझे दुःख होता है कि मेरे लोक-सभा में साथी, श्री तारिक किसी चुनाव में हारे नहीं, मगर वे राज्य सभा में आ गये उनको भेज दिया गया। काश्मीर में जो सत्ता-खूद दल है, नेशनल काँग्रेस, और उस में जो एक गुट है वह मनमानी करता है और अपने हिसाब से अपने व्यक्तियों को कहां जाना चाहिये, कहां ले जाना चाहिये, इस प्रकार को ज्यादाती करता है। कोई कारण नहीं है कि काश्मीर के नागरिकों को उन मूलभूत अधिकारों से वंचित किया जाय जो अधिकार शेष भारत के सभी नागरिकों को प्रदान कर दिये गये हैं। हमें अनुच्छेद ३७० को समाप्त कर देना चाहिये और काश्मीर को भारत के साथ पूरी तरह मिलाना चाहिये। और काश्मीर में जो

पाकिस्तानी कार्यवाहियां चल रही हैं उन के प्रति हमें सावधान रहना चाहिये। काश्मीर में अनेक ऊंचे पदों पर ऐसे लोग मौजूद हैं जिनकी निष्ठाएं ढावांडोल हैं। तथाकथित आजाद काश्मीर के जो प्रेसिडेंट हैं उन के एक सगे भाई काश्मीर में एक बड़े ऊंचे पद पर हैं। मैं ऐसा नहीं कहता कि सगे भाई अलग अलग राज्यों में नहीं रह सकते, अलग अलग राज्यों के साथ निष्ठाएं नहीं रख सकते। मगर काश्मीर की एक विशेष स्थिति है। उस में तोड़ फोड़ के लिए काफी गुंजाइश है। और मैं समझता हूं कि इस प्रकार के जो भी अफसर सीमावर्ती इलाकों में हैं उन्हें इस बात की छट नहीं होनी चाहिये कि वे लोगों के साथ, लोगों की निष्ठाओं के साथ खिलवाड़ कर सकें।

मैं यह भी सुझाव देना चाहूंगा कि आसाम में जो पाकिस्तानी प्रवेश कर रहे हैं इन के रोकने के लिये कड़ी कार्यवाही की जाय। पता नहीं कि भारत का गृह-मंत्रालय क्या करता है? महीनों से जांच हो रही है, किस बात की जांच हो रही है? कितनी बड़ी संख्या में पाकिस्तान से लोग आ रहे हैं, वह आसाम को कौनसा रूप देना चाहते हैं, उनका इरादा क्या है, उनका मतव्य क्या है, क्या यह गृह-मंत्री जी से झिंझा हुआ रह सकता है। कौन सी बाधा है जो हमें रोकती है कि हम पाकिस्तानियों के आसाम में अवैध प्रवेश को रोकें? क्या हम रोक नहीं सकते हैं? जब प्रश्न किया जाता है इस सदन में या उस सदन में तो गृह-मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि जांच हो रही है। अब तो जनसंख्या के आंकड़े आ गये हैं उन से पता चलेगा कि किसकी संख्या कितनी बड़ी है। कोई कारण नहीं है कि एक मजहब के मानने वाले लोगों की तादाद इतनी बढ़ जाय? वे कहां से आये हैं, किस के इशारे पर आये हैं?

यह कोई हिन्दू-मुसलमान का प्रश्न नहीं है, यह आसाम को भारत के साथ रखने का प्रश्न है, हमारा राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा का प्रश्न है। जब कहा गया है कि क्या हम सोमा पर सेनायें नहीं लगा सकते, क्या हम पाकिस्तानियों के अवैध प्रवेश को नहीं रोक सकते तो गृह-मंत्रों जो कहते हैं कि यह व्यावहारिक नहीं है। तो जो व्यावहारिक है, वह कदम उठाइये लेकिन आसाम को कुचकों का एक ऐसा प्रदेश बनने से बचाइये जो कालांतर में जा कर भारत से बाहर हो जाय।

ये समस्याएँ हैं जो आज अपने समाधान की मांग करती हैं लेकिन एक पार्टी—चाहे वह कितनी भी बड़ी हो—इन समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं कर सकती। हमारे स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद के १५ वर्षों की अगर सब से बड़ी कोई कमजोरी है तो वह एक ही है कि राष्ट्रनिर्माण के जिस यज्ञ में हम लगे हैं उस यज्ञ में अपनी अहुति देने के लिये हम भारत को ४४ करोड़ जनता को प्रेरित नहीं कर सके। हम गांवों में जा कर देखें, हम किसी भी भाग में किसी भी व्यक्ति से बात करें, प्रगति हम ने की है, हम रुखा खर्व कर रहे हैं, लेकिन इस समृद्धि की जो अनुभूति होनी चाहिये, भविष्य के प्रति जो आस्था होनी चाहिये, वह अनुभूति, वह आस्था दिखाई नहीं देती है, लोगों की आंखों में आने वाले कन का सपना साकार होता हुआ दिखाई नहीं देता है, करोड़ों हाथ राष्ट्र के निर्माण में लग जायें ऐसी स्थिति दिखाई नहीं देती है। कभी कभी आशंका होती है कि क्या हम अपने निर्माण के प्रयत्नों के लिये जनता के उत्साह को जगा नहीं सकते और यदि हम उसे जगा नहीं सकते तो क्या नीकरशाही के भरोसे पर किसी देश में आर्थिक और

सामाजिक शान्ति आ सकती है? नहीं आ सकती है। कांग्रेस पार्टी आने वाले कल के तकाजे को पूरा नहीं कर पा रही है। भारत का भविष्य जिस नेतृत्व की मांग कर रहा है वह नेतृत्व कांग्रेस पार्टी नहीं दे पा रही है और इसलिये १५ वर्षों में हमने जो प्रगति की है वह प्रगति बड़ी उल्लेखनीय है मगर समाधानकारक नहीं है। कितनी बड़ा पूंजी था हमारे पास? देश स्वतंत्र हुआ था, स्वतंत्रता-प्राप्ति का एक महान राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन था, हमें प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू का नेतृत्व प्राप्त था, मगर इस पूंजी के बदले में हमने जो कुछ पाया है, जो कुछ हमारी प्राप्तियाँ हैं, उपलब्धियाँ हैं, वह किसी को संतोष नहीं दे सकती और आगे आने वाले काल में खतरे के संकेत दिखाई देते हैं। इन संकेतों को समझ कर आने वाले कल की चुनौतियों का हम सामना कर सकें, एक ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करना होगा। इसके लिये देश में सहयोग की, विभिन्न राजनैतिक दलों के होते हुए भी निर्माण के कार्यों में कंधा से कंधा लगा कर काम करने के संकल्प की आवश्यकता है, मगर इस के लिये पहल सब से बड़े दल की ओर से होनी चाहिये, इस के लिये उपयुक्त वातावरण बनना चाहिये। मैं नहीं समझता कि हमारे बीच में कोई आधारभूत मतभेद है और अगर मतभेद हैं तो कम किये जा सकते हैं लेकिन उस के लिये हम एक वातावरण पैदा करें जिसमें सब लोग राष्ट्र के निर्माण के लिये प्रयत्न कर सकें। अगले पांच वर्ष महत्व के हैं, ये राष्ट्र के जीवन में निर्णायक होंगे, ये भारत के भाग्य को तय करेंगे, ये लोकतंत्र की सफलता पर आज जो संदेह उठ रहे हैं उनका निराकरण करेंगे अथवा ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा करेंगे जिसका हम

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

सामना नहीं कर सकेंगे । इस चुनौती को
हम समझें और उस के अनुरूप अपनी
नीति बनायें यही मेरा निवेदन है ।

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL, (Kajastnan;: Madam, Deputy Chairman, at the outset I would like to associate myself with the tributes and homage that have been paid to the noble and distinguished personality of our retiring President. For the last twelve years he has adorned the highest office of the land with distinction. He has created traditions which the coming illustrious President will follow, which will uphold the traditions of democracy.

Madam, yesterday an extraordinary voice was raised in the House. It was a voice of treason, a voice of treason against the unity and integrity of our country. To that an effective answer has been given by various speakers. But, Madam, there is one point that I would like to refer to.

The Constitution was referred by our hon. friend, Mr. Pathak. What is the scheme of our Constitution? In various federal constitutions power has been transferred from the States to the Centre. But in our Constitution the position is different. In our Constitution power has been transferred from the Centre to the States. Therefore, in the nature of things it would be impossible for the Centre to give the right of secession to any State much less to a group of persons, as our distinguished friend, Mr. Pathak, has said. I hope, Madam, that after the effective answer that has been given to our worthy friend of the D.M.K. from Madras, he will forget about the idea of separation any more from the mother-land

Having said so, Madam, I will pass on to one or two other points. The question of disarmament is the burning topic of the day. It is a burning topic in many senses. In one sense it is a burning topic because the world

is on the verge of being burnt up to cinders and completely destroyed if disarmament is not achieved. We have seen that the disarmament talks have broken down and one or two countries have taken upon themselves the inglorious task of embarking upon nuclear weapon testing. Madam, this is a very unfortunate thing which has happened. I do not want to go into the question as to since how long these disarmament talks have been going on. They have been going on for a long time. There was a time when both the parties were about to come to agreement, but for reasons of their own, they decided to withdraw at the last minute from an agreement. And now that the talks have been continuing, both sides are taking up position one way or the other. Madam, a very distinguished person and a famous cosmonaut of Russia recently said that the world looks very beautiful and small from outer-space, and all the people who are interested in disarmament and peace should go to outerspace and see how small and beautiful this world is. I would like to add a rider that those who are interested in destroying the disarmament talks and who are engaged in armaments, they should also be sent up to outerspace to see how small but beautiful this world of ours is and what purpose it would serve to destroy this beautiful world.

Madam, I have to express my eratitude to the President for having mentioned in his Address that national progress should be synonymous with social justice. There can be no progress either here or anywhere else except on the basis of social justice. There can be no peace here or anywhere else except on the basis of social justice. What is social justice? It is not my task here to* define it. But it is obvious that it is* a prime condition and pre-requisite of a socialistic society. Articles 38 and 39 of our Constitution give us some indication of what social justice is. In the last ten years we have been

engaged in planned development. Let us examine how far we have progressed in the direction of social justice. It is quite true that in the last ten years great progress has been made. We have made great strides in economic development. Industrial output has gone up. We have almost reached the stage of self-sufficiency in food grains. The national income has gone up by 42 per cent, and by the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan the national income would be doubled. The *per capita* income also has gone up gradually. And here I would like to correct what the hon. Member Shri Vajpayee said just now that the income has increased only by 17 per cent. Actually it has gone up much more. He is calculating it with reference to the prices that were prevalent in 1948-49. That is not the correct method of assessing it, Madam Deputy Chairman. If he were to assess it on the basis of the prices that existed in 1950-51, he would find that actually the *per capita* income has gone up much more. On the whole we have progressed satisfactorily and altogether I can say that there is brighter and better outlook and we can look forward to a brighter horizon than ever before.

But then there is economic disparity. As so many hon. Members here and in the other House have said. These disparities continue to grow and stare us in the face. There is greater concentration of wealth in the hands of a few than before we embarked on our Plans. The privileges of the privileged continue unabated and unabashed. What was the aim of our planned development? I will read a little from page 5 of the book entitled "The Third Five Year Plan". It runs thus:

"The benefits of the economic development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of society and there should be progressive reduction of the concentration of incomes, wealth and economic power."

This is being recognised on all hands, but that is not happening. Concentration of wealth and concentration of economic power continue to grow in the hands of a few. There is conspicuous consumption and ostentatious living staring us in the face and even the semblance of restraint that was there has been removed with the abolition of the Expenditure-Tax.

Among other things there is disparity between regions. There is no doubt that we have not succeeded up to now in removing these regional disparities.

Let me now go to another matter, namely, to the social side. When I come to deal with the social side of the matter, let me not be misunderstood, for the social and economic sides are inter-dependent and closely related. They are closely inter-linked. Great things have been done in the social field and there is no doubt about it. Untouchability was abolished by our Constitution and has been made punishable by the Removal of Untouchability Act. Many other things have been done for the uplift of the backward classes. In fact, there is a whole chapter devoted to the uplift of the backward classes. I have no doubt that there has been some improvement in their condition. But still, Madam Deputy Chairman, there is room for complaints and our economic development has not touched even the fringe of their problem.

What is it that we have done or achieved in the matter of social equality? Have we succeeded in creating that climate in which social equality is generally recognised? Have we succeeded in changing social values, where the Harijan is no longer recognised a Harijan or a Bhil a Bhil? In that respect I am afraid we have not done our duty. Only if we do our duty in that respect can we be said to be honouring the Father

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal.] of the Nation who staked his very life in order that the Harijan may live with dignity and equality with his fellow-man. But it is an unfortunate fact that we have not made much headway so far as social equality is concerned. We have been told that there will be social mobility if incomes rise. But what has happened? The upper income groups keep to themselves and the lower income groups keep to themselves and associate among themselves. That is what has been going on and social mobility is found only in very little percentage in our society today. Madam, economic takeoff will come. There is no doubt about that. But social take-off is far-off and if there is any inordinate delay or lag between the economic take-off and the social take-off, that will be dangerous to our country and to our democracy. We have been told that if incomes continue to rise, it is possible that socially people will mix more and more. But that is not bound to follow and the history of various countries has shown that although economic improvement has taken place, social inequalities continue to remain.

Let me take up another matter, Madam Deputy Chairman, namely, this question of equality of opportunity. We have tried our best to give equality of opportunity to our people. But have we succeeded? I think we have not. One of the main purposes of social development is to give greater and greater equality of opportunity to all. But is it not a fact that there are public schools and other institutions which are exclusive in character, which deny admission to many and still get aid from public funds? I want to know how far that is the right thing to do. I am not going into the other questions of housing and other matters. But one thing I would like to say and it is this. Government must be more vigilant about the question of social equality which is the very sine qua

non of a socialistic pattern of society. If we have failed in this respect then I can only say that our democracy will be in danger and if our democracy is in danger then all the freedoms we have fought for, all these moral values we have stood for, will be swept away and thrown into cauldron of strife and turmoil.

Madam, with these words, I support the motion which has been presented to the House.

SHRI M. S. OBEROI (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am thankful that in spite of the fact that you are pressed for time you have given me a few minutes to speak and I will confine myself within that time. It is a matter of proud privilege for me to associate myself with hon. Members in this House who have in the past few days praised the services rendered to our country by our beloved President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, and during the past ten years that he has been the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad's services to the country and the people have been unique. As an elder statesman, Dr. Rajendra Prasad's advice was often sought by the Prime Minister and others who shape the domestic and foreign policies of this country. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who can be styled as a true son of the soil, never ceased to take interest in the teeming millions of peasants and labourers who constitute the vast majority of the Indian population and on the eve of his retirement I wish him good health and long life.

Madam, I have been sent to this House from the tribal area of Bihar and I would be failing in my duty if I did not refer to the deplorable conditions of the 39 lakhs of the tribal people living in that part of the country. I would like to take the House through the Constitution of India, article 339 which provides as follows:

"The executive power of the Union shall extend to the giving of

directions to a State as to the drawing up and execution of schemes specified in the direction to be essential for the welfare of the Scheduled Tribes in the State".

Having in view this article of the Constitution, the President appointed a Commission which was called the Scheduled Areas and Scheduled Tribes Commission under the Chairmanship of Shri U. N. Dhebar and this Commission submitted its Report last year. I would like to know the steps that have been taken so far to implement the suggestions made by the Commission because I am not aware of them. At the same time, the Third Plan also dealt with this problem but would the mere enunciation of a scheme do? I do not think so. It is most important that immediate steps be taken to give effect to such proposals in the Report. Here, I would like to mention what I myself have seen in that part of the country, how the people are crushed under indebtedness, the miserable conditions they have got to face and their plight. The present economic problem of the tribal areas is that these people, in the absence of any organised credit facilities by the Government, have got to go to the *banias* and the village money-lenders for loans to enable them to cultivate their lands and also provide livelihood for their families. I have known of instances where in the Santhal area, at the time of the harvest they have got to pledge their entire harvest to those *banias* and when they finish their harvest they have got to handover the entire crop to them. You can imagine the plight in which they are placed. In view of the fact that it is the special responsibility of the Union Government they should ensure the development of the tribal people by giving directions to the State Government to enact suitable legislation to save the tribal people from indebtedness and from the customs—customs in the sense that they are used to go to these *banias*: they cannot avoid it and they should be saved from the clutches of

these *banias* and money-lenders. I would suggest that an agency like a Scheduled Tribes Co-operative Finance and Development Corporation should be constituted in the various States wherever such conditions exist. The co-operative scheme should be adopted to the actual requirements of the Scheduled Tribes and the conditions prevailing in different areas.

Now, Madam, the next point which I would like to touch would be forests and agriculture. It is very important that the right of these people to forests and agriculture should be well safeguarded. I know that there is an act called the Chota-Nagpur Tenancy Act and the Santhal Parganas Tenancy Act, but the money-lenders and the *banias*, in spite of this, manage to appropriate the land belonging to the Tribal people. In case the land is to be acquired by the Government, they should be paid adequate compensation not in the form of cash because I know that these people cannot keep cash. They should be given land instead of money. Their living is on land. They are farmers and they spend all the time at their disposal on land. Unfortunately, they have only four to five months of work on the land and the rest of the time they idle away. They look for some occupation and they look for something to do but unfortunately they do not have anything to do. Some-4 P.M. thing must be done to keep them occupied. It is up to the Government to find out ways and means to keep them occupied. If you want my suggestion, I should say that the only way to keep them occupied is to have some sort of small industries for them. As far as I know, small-scale industries do not exist there. These small-scale industries can be found probably throughout India. Some sort of occupation has to be given to these people. I would, therefore, request the Government to look into this problem and see how it can be solved.

[Shri M. S. Oberoi.]

Then there is difficulty about irrigation. Very little has been done so far in the field of preserving the land by implementing irrigation schemes and the most important thing is distribution of good quality seeds and provision of good implements and these are absolutely missing. It is very important that they should be provided with all these facilities so that they can improve their lands—

Now, I want to be very brief and touch upon a few items like education, health etc. Education, especially technical education, has been neglected and very little has been done towards improving sanitation and health of these people. I remember an incident during my election campaign. About 300 people got together and there was only one boy there, 11 years of age, who came forward and said that he could read the voters' list which was in English. I was surprised that there was only one boy of 11 years who could read the voters' list. That is their plight; that is the condition of education in that part of the country.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention, Madam, that even the Planning Commission has admitted very clearly that the departments in the State set up for development programme among the tribal people are on the whole inefficiently equipped with personnel and do not enjoy the requisite support for undertaking the difficult task falling on their shoulders. Now, keeping in view the special responsibilities we have under the Constitution—I have already read **out** article 339—the Union and the State Government should form a special cadre of technical and other personnel for work in scheduled areas. This will provide a number of trained officers who will spend the entire period of their service among the tribal people so that their knowledge, their experience, would become a vital factor in assuring rapid development.

Thank you.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Madam, the President's Address, like the King or the Queen's Address in England, is intended to reveal the administrative and legislative intentions of the Government during the coming year. So, I shall restrict myself to what is mentioned in the President's Address and what is omitted from the President's Address in regard to the work of Government during the next year. I shall not be tempted to pursue the red herrings that were drawn across the debate, interesting as they were and charged, as some of those arguments were, with emotion. The President's Address is notable more for its omissions than for the commitments which it promises on behalf of the Government

I shall take first the commitments. With regard to agriculture, the Address is rather complacent when it says that the position of agriculture is satisfactory. How can it be satisfactory when in the year 1960-61 only 76 million tons of foodgrains were produced for a population of nearly 390 millions and when in 1965-66 a 100 million tons are promised—that is the target—for a population which will be about 460 millions? How can the agricultural position be satisfactory when, according to Mr. C. D. Deshmukh, a former Finance Minister of the Government of India, the people of India can get only 14 oz. of food-grains per day? They have to be satisfied with 1900 calories against Pakistan which can boast of 2,000 calories per head and Ireland which can boast of 3,400 calories per head.

We are promised in the Address rural development especially in regard to rural employment. Pilot projects, we are told, are to be undertaken, about 200 during the coming year. Employment, according to the Planning Commission's Report, is to be found for 2.5 million people in 1965-66. Although we all welcome these pilot projects, I am afraid they only **touch the fringe of the problem** because rural unemployment **runs to**

about 10 to 12 millions. In fact one difficulty about the passage about these pilot projects is that no specific proposals are made, whether financial or administrative, for the coming year.

Turning to labour, we find that a lot of research work has been promised on behalf of the Government of India. An Institute of Applied Manpower Research is to be set up in Delhi; a Central Institute of Labour Research is to be set up at Bombay. Is it to make up for the lack of research in our universities that the Government is organising all this kind of research on labour problems? And how will an this research help to solve the urgent problems of labour? We are promised in the Address a scheme for promoting workers' education but here again we find no concrete proposals. As regards industrial production, we are promised an atomic energy plant that will produce radio isotopes for use not only in industry but also in agriculture, biology and medicine.

We find an enthusiastic passage about panchayati raj. To introduce local self-government and to make it prosper is, indeed, one of the chief objectives of Indian statesmanship, but already it has been found that faction flourishes in most of these panchayats. And according to a recent observer, Mrs. Kusum Nair, there is not enough interest in the villages about the work of village administration. It seems to me that our villages are too small to be economically viable, to be politically useful and to be administratively managed. It is at the panchayat union level, at the samiti level, on account of their larger population, on account of their greater local resources and, therefore, *an* account of the better prospects of economic development that the line of future progress lies. Our villages are too small, they are too much caste-bound, they are too much driven by faction to be able to promote the progress of the country. But as I said, it is the omissions that are more notable.

Since the present Government came into power, there has been a very interesting development in the composition of the Cabinet. The Cabinet has expanded, and, together with the Cabinet, the Ministries also have expanded, so that by the time the formation of the Ministries is over, we shall have about thirty to thirty-five Ministers in the Central Government- It looks as if Parkinson's law has begun to be applied even to the Cabinet system. You know the law of Parkinson, that it is not work that creates officials but it is officials who create work; and officials are created, for other than administrative reasons, in order to satisfy certain groups, in order to satisfy certain regions, in order to keep the party in power, in order to keep the Government going, i.e., for any but purely administrative reasons. We, from the South, are no doubt glad that Mr. Subramaniam has been appointed a Cabinet Minister. He has steamed into the terminus of the parliamentary journey without halting at any intermediate stations. But it looks as if with the appointment of a Minister for Steel and Heavy Industries and with a Minister for Mines and Fuel and, in addition, the other Industries Ministers, we shall soon have an industrial State rather than a political State in India.

Then, Sir, there is no mention of the future settlement of Goa. Following Burke's advice that we should draw a veil over the origins of empire, I shall not touch upon the way in which we obtain Goa. But the future administrative set-up of Goa is important not only to the people of Goa, but also to the people of India. There is not a word mentioned in the President's Address as to how the administration of Goa in the future is to be organised.

Then, I come to a very important point, and to a point which is becoming rather urgent, and that is the defence of Kashmir. In view of certain utterances made by governmental spokesmen in Pakistan, it looks as if we are in for a show-down with Pakistan in the very near future. Now, can we be sure that the defences

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.J

of Kashmir have been organised on an efficient basis? Have we got in charge of the defences of Kashmir a man, a commander, who has had battle experience, who has had experience of fire in an actual battle? Have we got the best commander available in India posted to defend Kashmir? In view of the fact that Pakistan is receiving the most modern weapons from America, I think we should all be anxious about the defence of Kashmir. And that is why I should like to draw the attention of the Government, especially of the Defence Ministry, to the need for seeing that our defences are put on the most secure basis. Speaking about the defence of India, may I point out the curious fact that we have a Defence Minister, who is not only the Minister of Defence, but who is also a Minister for UNO affairs, so far as India is concerned. This pluralism of office may do credit to the ability, to the capacity for work, of the Defence Minister, but I think when we are faced with such anxious problems on our frontier, we must have a whole-time Defence Minister. I think the Army, the Defence Services are too important, too difficult and in too critical a position at the present moment to be satisfied with a Minister, who is both the Defence Minister and a Minister for UNO affairs for India. We should like him to be a whole-time, a twenty-four-hour Defence Minister, on account of the great problems by which the defence of India is surrounded. If he were able to devote the whole of his time, attention and energy to the defence problems, to defence administration, he would look to such small things as housing for military officers in Delhi. There are hundreds of officers who have been posted to Delhi from outside Delhi who are still going about without the security of permanent accommodation. They have to live in the rooms of friends. They have to wait for officers to go on leave, so that they can occupy their residences and for more than a year

hundreds of officers are without permanent accommodation. I think one of the first things that the Defence Minister should see to is the comfort of his officers, if he wants to get the best work out of them. He must see that they are well accommodated and that they are in decent comfort. And the Defence Minister would do these things if he were not a half-time Minister. So, I think in the interests of the defence of India, in the interests of the efficiency of the Defence Ministry and on account of the anxious problems with which the country is faced today, it is necessary that we should have a whole-time Defence Minister. Between the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister they should make their choice and if the Defence Minister wants to be a permanent resident-Minister in New York, we shall not be sorry. It is UNO's affair. It is their funeral. But so far as we are concerned in India, so far as the defence of India is concerned, we should like him to choose to be a permanent Defence Minister, a whole-time Defence Minister.

We have been promised something very positive. There are about 18 Bills that we are promised during the coming year. It looks as if Parliament is to be not merely a talking shop, as the original meaning of Parliament was, but that it should also be a legislative factory. That is why I suppose, on account of the large volume of legislative work that is thrown upon Parliament, we are forced to sit during these hot months of May and June. Madam, I come from a climate which is civilised, controlled, restrained, not rushing to such extremes as the climate of Delhi does. It is equable. But there is a northern sneer that the climate of Madras is hot, hotter and hottest, but it is equably hot throughout the year, and we do not suffer from these extremes, that we from the South suffer when we come to Delhi. So, in the interests of the comfort of Members from the South, in the interests **ever**

of legislative and parliamentary efficiency, I would like the Government and those that are concerned with the timing of our meetings to ban all parliamentary meetings during the months of May and June and during the months of December and January. Otherwise, to use an ultimate argument, the hands of Mr. Annadurai may be strengthened and more powder and shot will be given to him in his campaign against the north.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even otherwise he can.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Thpt is an irrelevancy which I shall deal with later.

Lastly, may I point out that in regard to economic development plans we have in plenty? These three volumes of the Five Year Plang tell us all what we have to do. There is no need for the continued existence of the Planning Commission. It has done its job by writing out these fat volumes and it would do well to retire. What Government has to do is to pick out from these Plans those projects which require the highest priority. It is the great defect of our planning system that we have no priorities. Of course Government says that this or that project has a priority. Everything has a priority. Each Minister claims to have priority for his own Ministry and for the development of his plans. What I would urge is that there should be a hierarchy of priorities. First things must come first. Foundations must come before superstructure. The foundations for planned development are not there. Look at literacy, for instance. It is 25 per cent, in the most advanced State like Madras and about 10 per cent in the most backward States like Bihar and U. P. from where the majority of the Central Government Ministers come. Priorities should be given therefore to the development of literacy, to the strengthening of foundations. Infrastructure is not there for the raising of your grandiose plans. The health

and strength of the villager, the economic holdings of the villager, roads for the villages, these have not been secured, and how can you have agricultural prosperity which is the foundation of all economic growth if you have literacy which is only 25 per cent, in the most advanced State and 10 per cent, in the most backward States? Literacy or the education of girls is in a deplorable condition. It is one of the worst blots on the administration of the Congress Government that it has neglected girls' education. How can you have economic and social progress in our villages if our women are not educated? The pursuit of plans and projects by the Congress Government reminds me of a humorous sketch by Stephen Leacock. He describes a rider on a horse which gallops in all directions, north, south, east and west. He comes back to the point from which he started. He gets no doubt a lot of exercise, he and the horse get a lot of exercise^ but they get nowhere. And that is the failing of all our Congress plans. They want to do heavy industries at the same time as small-scale industries, and higher technical education at the same time as primary education, all kinds of things at the same time so that nothing much is done. After all these developments, after all these plans, our economic growth is only at the rate of 3 per cent, per year, whereas in neighbouring countries like Ceylon, Indonesia and Burma the rate of economic growth is 5-7 per cent per year.

Madam, while there is controversy about most of the things that I have mentioned in the course of my speech, there can be no controversy about one point, and that is about unanimity of respect, regard and affection we have for the outgoing President. On this matter all parties are united, and I can join with them in wishing our President a life of peace and happiness. One thing was noted in regard to the character of our outgoing President, and that is that he was humble. Now, humility is no doubt a very good virtue in private life but

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.] it is rather out of place in public life. I wish our President had insisted during the term of his office on being consulted in regard to all matters of State. We have no definite information about the relations between the President and the Council of Ministers, but the cry almost of despair which went out from him when he called upon a Law Society to consider and report on the proper relations that are to exist between the President and the Council of Ministers shows that these relations have not been very happy. No doubt our President is the head of a constitutional Government, he is a constitutional head, and he has to respect and to follow the advice of his constitutional advisers, his Ministers. But even in England although the head of the Government, the Sovereign, he or she, has to follow the advice of his or her Ministers, there is previous consultation between the Council of Ministers as represented by the Prime Minister and the head of the State, the Sovereign. Not the consultation to which we have been made familiar in recent days when the Minister acting on behalf of the Congress Party consulted the Opposition in regard to the election of the Deputy Speaker; they first decide and then on the phone ask "Do you agree?"—that is not the kind of consultation that should operate between the Council of Ministers and the head of the State. Anyone reading the letters of Queen Victoria knows how she insisted on being consulted beforehand with regard to the appointment of ambassadors, with regard to the appointment of high officials and even with regard to the formulation of foreign policy. She had a great battle with that formidable Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston who used to send despatches to other Foreign Offices without showing them to the Queen, and she wrote a furious letter to the Prime Minister insisting on the Foreign Secretary consulting her beforehand.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Does the hon. Member

know that Queen Anne is dead and the Victorian times are over even in the United Kingdom?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Even in regard to modern times, I will quote an instance in the reign of King George VI, a passage at arms with Winston Churchill. He could not get a more formidable Prime Minister than Winston Churchill during the War. Winston Churchill wanted to accompany¹—of course in a private capacity—the invading army into Normandy on D-Day. The King felt that this journey of his Prime Minister would be fraught with great peril. If the enemy came to know of it, they would take a pot shot at him. Therefore, for days together King George VI spent his time and energy in prevailing upon Mr. Winston Churchill to refrain from this perilous journey and ultimately he succeeded. Therefore, Sir, let me conclude once again by wishing our President long years of peace and happiness, and I hope that in his retirement he will write his memoirs which may reveal the inner history of recent times.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I fully associate myself with the Motion of Thanks brought forward by Dr. Dinkar and supported by Mr. Chettiar. I join with all the Members of this House in paying my humble tribute to our respected President. His sacrifice in the freedom movement, his devotion to all noble causes and his high character will always be a source of guidance and inspiration to us. I wish him the very best of life and we are confident that whenever the nation needs his advice, his mature advice will always be available. We are fortunate that he hands over the reins of this high office to one who is a scholar, philosopher and statesman.

While expressing his thanks to the retiring President, Mr. Annadurai used an expression which at first sight looked like something innocent **but** it

struck me as something ungracious if not unparliamentary or discourteous. While expressing his thanks he said that they were not like the thanks of camp-followers. Well, Sir, here we were paying tributes to him; all the parties were paying tributes, and even if he referred to Congress people, I think that courtesy demands that when for the first time he had come to this august assembly, he should choose words which would add to his dignity and to the dignity of this House. I felt that there was a sort of bitterness, there was a sort of venom, there was a sort of hatred in that word—which I have ventured to advise him as one senior to him in age, and I do hope that he will give due consideration.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Please don't look at me all the time.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I know that you are above that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Better look at the Chair.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Now, Madam Chairman, I would, confine myself only to two or three points as I have very short time at my disposal. And the first thing that I would refer is to that thoughtful suggestion made by my esteemed friend, the leader of "the Praja Socialist Party who said that the one thing that progressive and democratic parties should take note of was that during the election, the P.S.P. and the Congress who were wedded to democracy, who were wedded to socialism, who were wedded to planned economy . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And in Kerala, they are wedded to each other.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: . . . lost their original position. Well, if we really want that our extremist friends on both sides have to be controlled in the future elections, we will have to do very serious heart-searching, we "will have to think over this problem and much **before the election comes,**

we have to be prepared for it. And I welcome that suggestion and I do hope—this is my personal request—that the P.S.P. people will join the Congress and make the Congress strong.

Madam, the other thing that I would just cursorily refer to is the question of disarmament. I was just reading the address of President Kennedy of 3rd March when he justified that the nuclear tests were for the sake of research and progress in atom bombs and that they were necessary. The same may be the argument on the part of Mr. Khrushchev. But I want them to realise that this is not a matter which is confined to their countries only, but it is a matter which affects the whole world and any mistake committed—no matter with whatever indifference or serious thought it may be—is bound to annihilate the human race. I do hope that the proposal submitted by the neutral countries will receive its due consideration and this most important problem of the world will receive due consideration from the two powerful countries, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

Now, Madam, I would refer to Mr. Annadurai's speech regarding national integration and also to the Kashmir problem. So far as Mr. Annadurai's speech is concerned, it pained me. I was really very much distressed because it brought before me the picture of the separatist movement that was started twenty years back, and being in Hyderabad, in India, particularly the Muslims, have suffered and they still feel for the mistake that was committed in partitioning the country. In fact, it is in that light that I would like to offer some suggestions to my friend, Mr. Annadurai, if he would care to listen, or through his friends I would like to convey to him my humble suggestions.

First of all, Madam, I want to make it clear—and I think that I am on very firm ground—that when he said that he was speaking on behalf of the South, that claim cannot be sustained.

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

Mr. Diwakar on behalf of Karnatak repudiated this claim. Mrs. Bharati on behalf of Kerala repudiated this claim and in my humble way I very strongly repudiate this claim on behalf of Andhra Pradesh.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Madras?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: So far as Andhra Pradesh is concerned, there is not a single person who could claim to be a representative of the D.M.K. Now, so far as Madras is concerned, I have heard that he was defeated when he was contesting for a seat in the Madras Assembly . . .

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): *On* this issue.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It assumes still more importance when he contested it on this issue.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: But many more members of the D.M.K.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: My dear friend, I know you belong to a similar group, but I am now trying to face Mr. Annadurai, and when you will say something, we will meet your arguments. The question is that so far as Madras is concerned he was defeated, and yet he gave the arguments and reasons which show how seriously he has given thought to this matter of secession. The first thing he said was that no names of Madras people were associated with Delhi roads. Well, I do not want to go into these trivial arguments but I am simply referring to that matter. He then said that there were no steel mills, no railway lines, nothing of the kind, in Madras. Let me tell you, Madam, so far as this question of stressing the needs of one's own State is concerned, I am second to none. I am interested in them and I am sure everybody coming from a State will be interested in bringing forward certain claims, certain grievances, with a view to getting redress. That

is one question he brought in and the other question he brought in along with it is: "Because these things are not being done I want to secede." I do not know how it can be said like that. Now, if this be the case, then I think even the private family life will be difficult to lead if we cannot put up with people expressing little differences of opinion and wanting a little more things for them. Now, Mr. Annadurai has put in this proposition because he has not got the steel mills. And he thinks the North is having it. Here I have got something to ask him and I very humbly throw a challenge to him. Now, take the biggest State of the North—U.P.—from where, as has just now been referred to, our Prime Minister and our present Home Minister and our previous Home Minister hailed, and so far as its industrial development and the contribution of the Centre to this State is concerned, let it be compared with Madras. If Andhra Pradesh says something I can understand, but so far as Madras is concerned I am sure it is not the case. I am prepared to sit with him, take out all the figures, compare then and show that so far as the financial help extended to Madras is concerned, for its educational advance, for industrial activities, for big plants, Madras has got a better share than U.P. In any case let us examine the position and if you agree that it is so, at least that main argument falls to the ground. What I am really perturbed is that when you, who have the advantage of addressing big gatherings, if you do not advise them, if you do not guide them properly, then you are bound to create difficulties, nay, disaster for the people for whom you speak.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): He will lose his leadership.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am sure he will lose his leadership. But what service he will have done, is the question. Whether he wants to do real and genuine service to the people or he wants to lose his leadership, is the question, and when the question of

election came, he knew the result, and he was not elected by the people. Now, so far as he is concerned, I would very respectfully say to him—when he has come to this Parliament—that it is for him to very seriously think that he has come here as a representative of 400 million people of India. Let him feel the responsibility and let him be proud of being an Indian. I am interested in my State but I am proud of being an Indian. Unless he feels like that, I think he has no business to sit here; he has no business to come and take the oath to the Constitution framed by the people of the country who gathered together and enacted it in the Constituent Assembly with the Preamble "We, the People of India" etc. In the interests of the people of India whose cause he has been advocating, in his own interests and in the interests of Tamil Nad and in the greater interest of the country I would request him, I would urge on him to take a very serious view of the stand which is injurious to the country as a whole. Let India be strong and he will see that every other part of India will be strong. Let India be united, and he will see that every part of the country will progress and prosper. In this changing world, when we see European countries going into further collaboration through the creation of a Common Market, when the smaller units are joining the bigger units, when there is the urge for human brotherhood, when countries of Asia and Africa and all other countries want to come together I think—he will pardon me—it is nothing but sheer madness to think of separation or secession from India; it will be greatly detrimental not only to Tamil Nad but to the whole of India.

Now, as I have no time I shall just refer to the question of Kashmir. I have been reading with some interest the speeches by Sir Zafarullah Khan and I only like to submit that so far as the legal, factual and constitutional position is concerned our Defence Minister—our friend is there—will deal with it and he will deal with it effectively.

tively, but what I want to present to the Members of the Security Council is that the Kashmir question has a human aspect in it. Now, they say that the partition of India was based on religion. I repudiate that; though it is branded like that, the whole thing was based on the vested interests who wanted to divide and rule—as has correctly been pointed out by Mr. Vajpayee. Now, I want to ask the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America in the Security Council, "Do they still want to follow the same policy?" That is one thing they have to answer. The other thing is, we know what followed the partition, how many lakhs of lives were destroyed, how many crores of rupees worth of property was destroyed. Let us face the question squarely. At that time passions were fanned and destruction followed. We are not feeling shy of having any sort of election or plebiscite there. We have already had two elections there. Besides, what they are contemplating has to be considered. What President Ayub Khan is contemplating is to rouse communal passion and to have again the same tragedy. The result is that Kashmir, which is considered a paradise, will be turned into a hell. I am saying this in the interests of the people. If the Security Council wants to satisfy itself as to the conditions prevailing in Kashmir, the economic condition, the educational condition and the general condition, I am prepared for it. Let the people come and examine the condition in the so-called Azad Kashmir and in our Kashmir and I have no doubt that they cannot but come to the conclusion that the standard of living and the prosperity in our Kashmir is much more than that in the so-called Azad Kashmir. I can even say that it is better than what obtains in Pakistan. That is one factor. The other factor is: I want the people sitting in the Security Council to think of the four crore Muslims living in India. We have a right to say something in this matter. With all the best efforts of the Government, when passions are aroused, nobody can control.

[Shri Afibar Ali Khan.] We have very recently seen what happened in Malda and what happened in Dacca and Rajshahi. We do not want to be like that. So, in the greater interest of the humanity at large I would respectfully demand of the Security Council Members, when they decide this matter, to have the whole background of the partition and to address themselves to the conditions and affairs existing at present in India, in Pakistan and in Kashmir and then decide the question.

Pakistan has got a sort of democracy—I do not know what kind of democracy—in which not a single minority community man has been returned, neither a Christian nor a Hindu. That is their democracy, and they want the Kashmir people to go and join that democracy. The fact remains that the Pakistan people do not have democracy. I would not like to go into that. It is a foreign Country and I do not want to say what is happening there. That is their lookout. But when the question of my country and my people comes, it is my duty to say frankly. I hope and pray wiser counsel will prevail.

Madam, one word more and I have finished. There has been a threat from the side of Pakistan that if this matter is not settled, Sir Zafarullah Khan said, tribal people will step in and then Pakistan also will come in. I hope discretion and wiser counsel will prevail.

Madam, one word more and I have finished. There has been a threat from the side of Pakistan that if this matter is not settled, Sir Zafarullah Khan said, tribal people will step in and then Pakistan also will come in. I hope discretion and wiser counsel will prevail with Pakistan. And if unfortunately they take that decision, then let me tell them that these four crores of Muslims will line up with their brethren and will lay down their lives for the honour of our country, for the

integrity of our country and for the prestige of our country. Let there be no mistake about that.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): It is not four crores, it is five crores of Muslims.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I accept your correction. I say that every Muslim will lay down his life, let there be no mistake. Therefore, it is in the best interests of Pakistan and India that wiser counsel prevails with them and they do not take any rash step which would mar the peace of the sub-continent and which will have a very disastrous effect on Pakistan. I thank you Madam, for giving me this time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are still a number of hon. Members who would like to speak. I think the House, therefore, will sit till 6 P.M. Even so, the hon. Members, I hope, will restrict their time-limit to ten minutes and in any case, never more than fifteen minutes.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, Deputy Chairman, the nation owes a deep debt of gratitude to Rashtrapati Rajendra Prasad for his life-long devoted service to the country.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. A. SUBBA RAO) in the Chair.]

His has been a life of suffering, sacrifice and dedication. For long his life will be a source of inspiration to the people of India. No man is better fitted than he to invite our attention to our duties as a democratic citizen, to educate us in democratic citizenship which is so necessary for the democratic growth of the nation. May we hope that our President, after retirement, will give us a proper lead in the matter and try to promote education in democratic citizenship through a non-party, voluntary, organisation?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I feel we have not paid sufficient attention to the need

of cultural orientation of our democracy. Nationalism, democracy, socialism, and humanism have been our ideals, but no attempt has so far been made to define these ideals and to permeate their norms and values in our thought and in our lives. The consequence has largely been very unhappy. Feudal culture continues to prevail in this country which is corroding democracy in various ways. We talk of nationalism but many of us fail to have true connotation of nationalism in our mind. Some talk of religious nationalism. Some think of linguistic nationalism. And a section of our people in the South have begun to stand for ethnic nationalism. Consequently, national spirit is not being developed the way it should develop, Caste loyalties, communal feelings, linguistic prejudices are having an upper hand over national spirit. Our general elections are fobbed off much of their democratic character. Democracy, if I may be permitted to say so, is converted into castocracy and pan-chayati raj is being captured by feudal forces trying to use the panchayati raj institutions for re-establishing their old feudal leadership in rural areas. In fact, feudal forces are trying even to capture parliamentary institutions. And here they have an alliance with powerful capitalist forces, Democracy is not only being corroded by casteism, communalism and by a culture of a feudal character, but also by ideologies of dictatorship. Socialism is ideologically challenged by the Swatantra Party and by certain other forces that try to identify parochialism with ancient Indian culture and with spiritual humanism. This problem, this cultural problem, I should say, requires to be tackled properly if democracy is to be strengthened in India and if democracy is to advance towards socialist democracy or a democratic socialist order.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I feel that our ideals will have to be given proper definition and they will have to be inculcated and cultivated in the people.

Much is talked of the Indian genius and under its garb on the one hand parochialism, and on the other hand muddle-headedness and confusion of thought are being fostered. All this is done in a way as if the Indian mind is muddle-headed, as if the Indian genius stands for confusion of thought. All those who have tried to study ancient Indian thought know very well that in ancient India our ancestors devoted sufficient time to the study of logic and they always insisted on the proper definition of concepts. I would even say that they devoted more time to the proper definition of concepts than even to their application to life. Therefore, in the name of Indian genius, we would hardly be entitled to be vague and to be indefinite in our concepts.

Sir, if we really wish that democracy should prosper, it is our duty to evolve democratic civic culture which may command the confidence of all sections of the people, of all parts of the country, and which may be suited to the needs of democracy and to the needs of our country. Every ideology, before application, has to be adjusted to the requirements of the country and in its application, the nation has to be pragmatic in its approach. But pragmatism does not mean confusion of thought. Adjustment in application does not require a nation to be vague in its concepts. Sir, I would submit that the evolution of a civic culture is very necessary for the building up of democracy in the country and for the building up of national spirit in this country. Sir, what a confusion we have made of socialism? Socialism today is faced with a powerful ideological challenge, the challenge of the Swatantra Party. Mere slogan of socialism will serve no purpose. Either the ruling party should pocket the ideology of socialism at the first challenge of the Swatantra Party, just as they pocketed the idea of co-operative farming at its first challenge, or it must define what socialism is and show how socialism can be advanced in the country, how socialist values

[Prof. M. B. Lai.] and socialist norms are better and more ethical than those advanced by its adversaries, and how socialist policies and programmes alone can solve the economic problems of a developing Country like India. Unless* you do that, socialism has no chance in India. The Indian community is tradition-ridden. It clings to tradition and it will not be prepared to accept a new ideology unless the Indian mind is convinced of the values and utility of that new ideology.

What has been done? I was hearing to various speeches during the last three days. What did they say? A large number of Congress Members identified socialism with the uplift of the masses. If the uplift of the masses alone means socialism, then every social ideology is socialist, because there is no social ideology in the modern world which does not stand for the uplift of the masses. If the uplift of the masses alone means socialism, then every political party in the world, at least every party in India, can claim or can be dubbed as socialist.

A great man of India went round the country during the elections and tried to identify the industrial growth that is going on in India with the industrial revolution and identified the industrial revolution with socialist revolution. Now, in Germany industrial development is going on and certain changes in the technology of production are also going on there. Nobody can say that Germany is going through in this mid-twentieth century, an industrial revolution. There was an industrial revolution in Great Britain in the 18th century and there has been industrial development in Japan before the war and after the war too. None could claim that the industrial revolution in England or the industrial development of Japan were socialist revolutions. The three concepts are very different. There can be industrial development as there was in Germany under Nazism, which is not industrial revolution. There can be industrial

revolution which is only capitalist revolution in character.

Then, it may be said that our industrial revolution is socialist revolution because of the development of the public sector. I think there can be a public sector in the capitalist economy. As Prof. Galbraith has pointed out, 30 per cent. of the market economy in the U.S.A. is constituted of the public sector. In India, we have a smaller public sector than the U.S.A. has. Can we call the economy of the U.S.A. socialist in character? None does so. No American economist says so. Sir, as Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, the Labour Minister and the Minister for Planning in one of his speeches in the Lok Sabha said, much must not be made of the public sector. We are doing nothing special with regard to the public sector which may entitle us to say that through the public sector we are advancing towards a socialist economy. The other day I was provided by Birla Brothers with a centenary brochure and I studied that brochure carefully and what did I notice? I noticed that in the post-independence period, the industrial products of Birla Brothers had increased by ten times. During this period the national industrial product has not increased even by 1½ times and the products of public sector enterprises have also not increased even by three times. From all this one gathers that in India, in matters of industrial production, the Birla sector is growing much more rapidly than the industrial sector as a whole or the public sector as such. We have in India a dualistic economy of oligopoly and public sector. I beg to submit, Sir, that the dualistic economy of oligopoly and the public sector can by no stretch of imagination, be called socialist economy. To build up socialist economy, oligopoly will have to be liquidated, large-scale means of production will have to be socialised, full employment will have to be provided to all, the standard of living of the working people will have to be raised and disparities in income will have to be considerably reduced.

in the Address, Government promises us to promote the building up of democratic and socialist society. I beg to submit that the scope of socialist society is bigger than that of socialist economy and I beg to submit further, Sir, that to build up socialist society it would also be necessary to combat and liquidate feudal culture, to reorient the entire social life on the basis principles of freedom and equality, to cultivate in the people democratic socialist principles and abiding faith in values of democracy and socialism. Is the Government prepared to undertake this task? If it is not prepared to undertake this task, the assertion is a profession which is not implemented in action. I say so, Sir, because I know that in the Second Five Year Plan as well as in the Third Five Year Plan, certain social objectives were said to be essential features of the socialist pattern of society but no attempt whatever has so far been made to implement any of these objectives. There is no liquidation of unemployment in India. Unemployment is mounting. Just after the Congress passed a resolution in favour of the socialist pattern of society, it promised that unemployment will be liquidated in ten years. But instead of being liquidated, unemployment is being doubled in ten years. The concentration of economic power is increasing and the disparities in income are also mounting. One important statesman of the Congress Party, Mr. U. N. Dhebar, has recently accepted in the Lok Sabha that in India the rich are becoming richer, the poor are becoming poorer, the lot of the industrial workers, the lot of the agricultural workers, the lot of the Scheduled Tribes and the Scheduled Castes has not improved. Their lots have rather deteriorated. While we are talking of socialism we are advancing in a different direction. We are promoting oligopoly in the country and I feel, Sir, it is our duty to be clear in our mind to say what we mean and what we say. That is all that I wish to say.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks very ably moved by Prof. Dinkar and seconded by Mr. Chettiar. On this occasion let me say that we all like, the whole of India likes and loves and reveres the retiring President and let me wish him many many years of happy and peaceful life in his retirement.

Now, let me open my remarks by alluding to one aspect of planning. Sir, the main objective of planning is to raise the standard of living of the people. In fact, raising the standard of living of the people is laid down in one of the articles of the Constitution in the Chapter on Directive Principles of State Policy. The standard of living of the people is dependent upon several variable factors. It depends upon the quantum of production, agricultural production, industrial production, quantum of services, etc. It depends also upon the growth of population in the country. In other words, the standard of living cannot be substantially improved unless we exercise control over all these variable factors. If I put it in mathematical language, standard of living is a function of several variable factors, that is, the quantum of production, industrial production, agricultural production, quantum of services and the growth of population for the time being. Now, we have got planning in various fields. We have got planning for agriculture, planning for industrial production, planning for education, and all that but we have not got planning for population. In other words, what we want is a policy in relation to the population of the country. Unless we have a definite policy towards which we can work in relation to population, there can be no substantial improvement in the standard of living of the people. Let me point out here that in western

[Shri S. C. Karayalar.]

countries like Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom the United States, etc., they have got a definite goal in relation to population towards which they are working. One of the factors that has emerged from demographic studies is that the population increase is the result either of a high rate of birth and a high rate of death or a low rate of birth and a low rate of death. Unfortunately, for us in India we have got a high rate of birth and a high rate of death with the result that the percentage of increase is comparable to the percentage of population increase in other countries but that is not a factor on which we can be very happy because, Sir, in our country we have got to consider the absolute numbers. That is, in India the growth of population is of the order of 4 millions per year. That is the thing which we have got to take into account and we have to make adequate provision for. In other words, what I want to emphasise is that we have got to adopt a certain policy. Whether it is a policy designed to secure an increase or designed to secure stabilisation, it is a matter to be studied by specialists in the field. All the same what I want to emphasise is that we ought to have a definite policy in relation to population and without a definite population policy it will be impossible to raise the standard of living of the people. As I said, several countries in the West have adopted policies towards which they are working. In the United Kingdom, for instance, a Royal Commission which went into the whole question has formulated certain proposals. They have said that it is necessary to plan for an increase of the population, that a married couple should have 2.4 children as against 2.2 children at the moment. That shows that there is a definite goal towards which they are proceeding but we have not got any such goal. It is true that we are doing something in the direction of family planning but that only touches the fringe of the problem. We have not got any plan

for any co-ordinated efforts in the direction of achieving a certain goal in regard to population. That is very very necessary and I think that is implicit in the article which lays down that the standard of living of the people shall be raised. That is to be regarded as one of the primary duties of the State.

Now, having said so much about this point, I want to touch upon certain aspects that emerge from the speech of the leader of the D.M.K. Party which he made yesterday in this House. He happens to come from the same State from which I come and so necessarily I have got to make some reference to what he said. I want to make particular reference to that part of the speech wherein he made a demand for a separate State or Dravi-dastan. He tried to make out a case firstly on ideological grounds. He had his own concept of democracy; he had his own concept of socialism and he developed his own theory of new nationalism and new national integration. He thought there was great need for rethinking on this subject, on this concept of nationalism and national integration. As a result of his rethinking he has come to the conclusion, that a separate State or self-determination should be given to South India. First he put it on ideological grounds. Later on he shifted his ground and said that the South had no steel plants, no railways, no irrigation schemes and all those things. When he tried to make out his case on this ground, I thought he gave up his case because, if other States also which are very deficiently equipped in regard to these matters and which are not developed like the South, then there would be a case for every State to secede from the Centre. In other words, instead of having one India we will have a series of States and that will be disrupting the whole concept of the unity of India. In that case where will India be? India will be divided into a number of States and all those States will become an easy prey to any aggressive

neighbour. Is that the consummation which he works for? Is it what he is thinking of? He said he was speaking on the claims of the South for separation and he said that he represented the resurgent spirit of South India. I should like to know what his credentials are to speak for the whole of South India. In the first place, he did not define what would be the territory of Dravidistan. I am inclined to think that he spoke for the whole of the area of Tamil Nad, Andhra Desh, Karnataka and all that. As a matter of fact one hon. Member this morning repudiated the claim of Mr. Annadurai to speak for the territory of Karnataka and the hon. lady Member from Kerala repudiated his claim to speak for Kerala. In fact, he will have first to establish his claim to speak for the area—which he claims to be Dravidistan. He himself has not defined what Dravidistan is. I should like to say that the claim that he put forward is very extravagant. It cannot be substantiated at all and he has no right to speak. Besides all these, I should like to say that the very basis of his demand is repugnant to the Constitution of India. It is preposterous in the extreme. On this very ground alone he is not competent to speak on the subject.

Now, Sir, having said so much, I should like to refer to the background of this move for a separate State. There is one article in our Constitution, which guarantees the right to freedom of speech and expression. Implicit in the freedom of speech and expression is the idea of freedom of thought. I should think the whole

basis of our democracy is freedom of thought. I want to refer to certain practices, particularly during the elections, prevailing in that part of the country, which are absolutely undemocratic and which tend absolutely to subvert all freedom of thought. I refer to certain slogans which actually, when placed before the ignorant people, uneducated people, were swallowed easily, without any thought being given to the content of the slogans. This idea of putting slogans and making false statements was exploited to the fullest extent possible by Hitler during the war time. Just, before the war, he created a war psychosis among the people by putting forward these slogans. His theory was that by putting forward slogans and making false statements a hundred times, false statements always catch on and they take the garb of true statements. That was the theory which he developed and that theory has been very successfully adopted by some of our friends in the South in order to create a 'demand for what is called Dravidistan, and that is really the basis of the demand for Dravidistan. It is absolutely undemocratic, because it cuts at the idea of freedom of thought, which is the basis of democracy. It is absolutely undemocratic, it is unconstitutional. I should like to say that this aspect of the matter has got to be studied very carefully. A new approach has got to be made to this question of using slogans for creating what is called public opinion and proper remedial measures must be applied with a view to preventing any disastrous results arising from such a concept and such a propaganda.

I thank you very much.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me, first of all,

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.] associate myself with, the sentiments expressed by a number of speakers regarding our President and pay my tributes to him on behalf of the Republican Party of India. With great devotion he has participated in every struggle and movement for independence and after this country achieved freedom, he dedicated his life to the progress and development of this country. His intention to work even after retirement in the Sadaqat Ashram and serve the people clearly proves that his life is a dedicated one. I wish him good health and long life.

Coming to the President's Address, I would only refer to one problem and that is the problem of national integration. After the speech of Mr. Annadurai, I think every Member has referred to his speech, almost every Member I should say, and it indicates the concern that every Member of the House has got regarding national integration. There is no doubt that every citizen of this country must cherish the high ideal that this country must be one and united and must be an integrated whole. And if there are any disruptionist tendencies forging ahead, then all of us must be united to defeat all such tendencies. Everybody has referred to this problem and to the speech of Mr. Annadurai, and the speeches were rather eloquent. Just now while speaking Mr. Vajpayee also used eloquent language and when he was speaking about the formation of Pakistan, I interrupted him by saying that even then Pakistan was created. He was a bit excited by my interruption. But I only wanted to emphasise, when I tried to interrupt him, that even after strong opposition by national leaders like Gandhiji and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Pakistan was carved out. Gandhiji had said that Pakistan would be created only over his dead body. Gandhiji survived but Pakistan was created. Should we forget the lessons of history? Everybody is opposing here the demand for Dravidastan. But this is not the first time when the demand for Dravidastan has been made in

Parliament. About four years back if I remember correctly, Mr. Sampath also had raised the same slogan, had advocated the same ideology, and wanted to have a separate State of Southern India. I want to know from all those people who are opposing today this demand, and particularly from the members of the Government, what they have done to check this tendency. Lately, the D.M.K. forces were divided. Mr. Sampath went out of that party. But in spite of the division in the rank and file, the D.M.K. increased its voting strength. The D.M.K. got more members elected to the Assembly and Parliament. What does this indicate? It indicates that even though this slogan was raised by Mr. Sampath four years back in the other House, our Government has done nothing to check these disruptive tendencies. And, therefore, I say that eloquent speeches and strong language will not solve the problem. In spite of opposition from Gandhiji, and Pandit Nehru, Pakistan was created. Even if all of us are united together against one Member, Mr. Annadurai, but only indulge in eloquent speeches, that will not solve the problem, and possibly Dravidastan may be created. So, we have to understand the causes of these disruptionist tendencies and remove those causes and make every citizen throughout the country feel that he is a citizen of this country first and last. He must have the interests of India in his heart and he must strive to further the development of the country. What do we find today? A lot of complaints are being made that the Southern people do not get their due share. Well, whether the complaint is genuine or not, it is for the Government to see. If the complaint is genuine then they must try to remove the causes and try to redress their grievances. I would only quote one instance. Only last week I was travelling along with two newly-elected Members from Tamil Nadu. They are Congress MPs. And do you know what their complaint was? All the Madras M.P.s have been relegated to the back bench

without any single exception. I do not know whether it is true or not. And one of these M.P.s said that he would go and have a talk with Shri Kamaraj Nadar. This is the treatment that Madras M.P.s are getting. This is a complaint not from any Opposition M.P., but from one Congress Member of Parliament. Well, if such treatment is to be given to those people, can we blame them if they try to have a separate State of their own? Sir, if we want to achieve national integration, then we must see that every State gets its due share, whether it is in regard to development programmes or development plans, railways or any other facilities, or even political facilities or political representation.

The second thing is that if there are any disputes between two States, they should be solved impartially without any injustice to any particular State. We know that there are a large number of disputes. There are disputes regarding the distribution of waters of many rivers between Maharashtra, Andhra, Madras and Mysore States. If there are such disputes, these disputes should be settled without partiality towards any particular State. But do we find that? When the Congress is dealing with such problems, do they adopt an objective attitude towards these problems? I may kindly be allowed to refer to certain problems of Maharashtra State.

Sir, the Maharashtra State has been claiming that the problem of border areas should be settled amicably. Some of the areas which are today in Mysore State must have been given back to the Maharashtra State. The Maharashtra Government has advocated that the basis which was helpful to solve the dispute between Madras and Mysore States should be adopted in solving this problem. So many years have passed, and nothing has been done in this respect. During the general elections in 1957 members of the Ekikaran Samity from Bham

district contested six seats, and out of the six they got five. On the same issue they resigned. Again they contested the elections and again they won those five seats. During the last general elections, in 1962, the same story was repeated, but even then this question is not being settled.

Sir, we have liberated Goa, and naturally all the people of Maharashtra claim that Goa should be a part of Maharashtra. These sentiments and feelings were voiced by no other person than the Governor of Maharashtra State. While addressing both the Houses of the Maharashtra Legislature the Governor had said that Goa belonged to Maharashtra and that it should be integrated with the Maharashtra State. Objection was raised to the speech of the Governor here. What reply do we get from the Government Benches? Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, says that Konkani is not the dialect of the Marathi language, that it is an entirely different language. Mr. Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister, said that even if Maharashtra claimed Goa, Maharashtra would not get Goa. Why should such strong language be used when particularly the Governor has expressed the feelings of all the people of Maharashtra and put forth the legitimate claim of Maharashtra?

Then, Sir, I will refer to another incident. One Goan citizen belonging not to the opposition party but to the Congress had requested the Military Governor that on the portrait of Chatrapati Shivaji should be placed in the Secretariat. This was accepted by the Military Governor, in a letter dated 8th January, 1962 from his Chief of Staff to Mr. Malkarnakar, a Goan citizen and a Congress worker:

"I am directed to say that the Military Governor will be pleased to accept the Statue of Chatrapati Shivaji for placing in the Secretariat. You may, therefore, strive early, by 15th January, 1962, for the presentation."

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

So, the Military Governor had accepted the request of one Congress worker in Goa to place the statue of Chatrapati Shivaji in the Secretariat, but after that what happened we do not know. On 12th February, again he writes:

"A reference has been made to the External Affairs Ministry, Government of India, who have advised us against accepting the offer of the statue of Shivaji. It is, therefore, regretted that your offer cannot be accepted."

The offer was accepted in the beginning, but later on on the advice of the External Affairs Ministry the offer was rejected. I want an explanation from the Government Benches as to what were the circumstances which compelled them to reject this offer. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has accepted Chatrapati Shivaji as a great national hero, and when he happened to be a great national hero, what objection can there be to place his statue in the Goa Secretariat?

I will now refer to another Question to show in what way Maharashtra State has been discriminated. My friend has been referring to inflated Cabinets everywhere. In the Central Government also we have got a Cabinet of 17 members. What about the representation of Maharashtra? There is only one Minister of Cabinet rank. There is no Minister of State, and there is only one Deputy Minister, Mr. Hajarnavis. Out of a large number of Members, about 35 or 40, we have got only one. Even if or Gujarat which is smaller than Maharashtra, there are two Members in the Cabinet. You will remember, Sir, that the Congress Party has scored a great victory over the opposition parties in Maharashtra. Out of 44 Members returned to the Lok Sabha, 41 were returned on Congress tickets, and only three opposition Members were returned to the Lok Sabha. Is *this* the reward for scoring a great victory by the Congress in Maharashtra? There is no other Member included in the Cabinet.

Sir, as I was speaking about the formation of the Cabinet, I would speak about the minorities also. What about the Scheduled Caste people? Here you increase the number of Cabinet Ministers. You have appointed more Ministers of State. But what is the position of the Scheduled Castes? Only one Cabinet Minister is there, Mr. Jagjivan Ram. There is no Minister of State. I do not know whether any Deputy Minister has been appointed recently. But what about Mr. Jagjivan Ram himself? When we study the composition of the Cabinet, we find that there is not any change in any other portfolio, but only the portfolio of Mr. Jagjivan Ram has been changed. He has been rather demoted. Why? Now, what about the Ministries in the States? Madhya Pradesh does not have a Minister of Cabinet rank from the Scheduled Castes; Gujarat does not have a Minister of Cabinet rank from the Scheduled Castes; Andhra Pradesh does not have a Minister of Cabinet rank from the Scheduled Castes. If you want to have integration of this country, you cannot ignore the claims of minorities in this country. You are always paying lip sympathy to the problems of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, but in actual practice what do we find? Are you doing anything to redress their grievances? Only a few months back Mr. Jagjivan Ram was being tipped as Deputy Prime Minister. Even Mr. Krishna Menon and his supporters and the supporters of the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, were canvassing in the lobby that Mr. Jagjivan Ram should be elected as the Deputy Prime Minister, as the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party. After a few months we find—I do not know what change has taken place in the past few months—that he is not allowed to retain his portfolio. He is demoted. The important portfolio of Railways has been taken away from him. Therefore, Sir, if we take into consideration all these factors, it is clear that the claims of minorities must be considered sympathetically, irrespec-

rive *ot whether they* are religion, communal, linguistic or regional minorities if we want to have integration of this country, if we want to defeat the ideology of Mr. Annadurai, it - will not be by eloquent speeches but only by removing the causes which are strengthening disruption ist forces. Instead of making eloquent speeches we must try to do something for them *to* achieve the integration of the coun-

try. Deeds but not words will achieve national integration. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. A. SUBBA RAO) : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 3rd May, 1962.