

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

श्री० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर (बिहार) :
श्रीमान् सभापति जी, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ :
“१८ अप्रैल १९६२ को संसद् की दोनों सभाओं की सम्मिलित बैठक में राष्ट्रपति ने कृपया जो अभिभाषण दिया है उसके लिये राज्य सभा के सदस्य जो सभा के वर्तमान सत्र में उपस्थित हैं, राष्ट्रपति के प्रति अपनी हार्दिक कृतज्ञता ज्ञापित करते हैं।”

श्रीमान्, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर प्रत्येक वर्ष हम दो दृष्टियों से विचार करते आए हैं। एक दृष्टि यह है कि साल भर में सरकार ने ऐसे कौन कौन से काम किये हैं जिनका उल्लेख राष्ट्रपति ने आवश्यक समझा है। दूसरी दृष्टि यह है कि वे समस्याएं कौन हैं, वे नीतियां कौन हैं जिनकी ओर राष्ट्रपति देश का ध्यान आकृष्ट करते हैं। जहां तक पहली बात का सवाल है देश के कार्यकलाप की रिपोर्ट राष्ट्रपति के पिछले अभिभाषण में आ चुकी थी। फिर भी मैं दूसरी दृष्टि से राष्ट्रपति के इस अभिभाषण का बड़ा ही महत्व मानता हूँ। यह उस राष्ट्रपति का अंतिम भाषण है जो बारह वर्षों के बाद अब अवकाश ग्रहण करने जा रहे हैं। इन बारह वर्षों में देश में बहुत बड़े बड़े काम हुए। मेरा खयाल है इतिहास में ये वर्ष बहुत ही उल्लेखनीय माने जायेंगे। इन बारह वर्षों में देश की जो प्रगति हुई, उसके आंकड़े रिपोर्टों में मौजूद हैं। जो भी व्यक्ति न्यायी और निष्पक्ष हैं वे इन रिपोर्टों को देख कर इस बात का अंदाजा कर सकते हैं कि भारत की प्रगति किस रूप में हो रही है। लेकिन जिन लोगों को उन आंकड़ों पर कुछ कम विश्वास हो वे अगर गांवों और शहरों की ओर जायें तो प्रगति का एक हल्का उल्लासपूर्ण रंग उन्हें वहां भी दिखायी पड़ेगा।

श्रीमान्, संसद के इस सत्र में यह बात कही जा रही है कि योजनाओं के परिणामस्वरूप इस देश में अमीरों की अमीरी में वृद्धि हो रही है और गरीबों की गरीबी बढ़ रही है।

मैं इसमें तरमीम चाहूंगा। मेरा संबंध गांवों से है और भारत की गरीबी का गढ़ भारत के शहरों में नहीं गांवों में खड़ा है। अमीरों की अमीरी बढ़ रही है, यह बात शायद सच है।

श्री ए० वी० बाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
शायद ?

श्री० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर : लेकिन गरीबों की गरीबी का रूप कुछ बदल रहा है। उसका रूप यह है कि जिन जगहों पर विकास के चरण पहुंचे हैं, उद्योग के चरण पहुंचे हैं, वहां गरीबी निश्चित रूप से घट रही है। इसके बहुत प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण हैं। लेकिन जहां विकास के चरण अभी पहुंचे नहीं हैं, जहां उद्योग किसी प्रकार के शुरू नहीं हुए हैं, वहां शायद गरीबी जैसी की तैसी मौजूद है, मगर वहां भी आशा की किरण अब दिखायी देने लगी है और लोग परिवर्तन की मांग करने लगे हैं। यह अपने आप में बहुत बड़ी चीज है। मेरा खयाल है कि यह देश निश्चित रूप से प्रगति की राह पर आ गया है और तीसरा विश्व युद्ध नहीं छिड़ा तो भारत को समृद्ध होने से अब कोई भी रोक नहीं सकता है। इसलिये जो संसद् के सदस्य हैं, जो देशभक्त हैं, जो जनता के हितकारी हैं, उनकी नजर अब इस बात पर जानी चाहिये कि देश की जो माली हालत बढ़ रही है, उसका फायदा गरीबों को कहां तक पहुंच रहा है। इस दृष्टि से मैं श्री मुर हरि के उस संशोधन को महत्व देता हूँ जिसमें उन्होंने यह प्रश्न उठाया है कि सरकार जिस समाजवाद की स्थापना कर रही है उसकी रूपरेखा क्या है। और इसी दृष्टि से मैं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के सत्रहवें संदर्भ को महत्व देता हूँ जिसमें अपने अंतिम भाषण में उन्होंने राष्ट्र को सलाह दी है कि प्रजा सत्ता और समाजवाद, दोनों पर आरुढ़ रही।

समाजवाद की स्थापना संसार में दो रूपों में हुई है। इसका एक रूप तो वह है जो रूस और चीन में दिखायी पड़ा है। उसका दूसरा रूप इंग्लैंड और स्कैंडिनेवियन देशों में है। रूस और चीन में जो समाजवाद कायम

[श्री० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर]

हुआ है उसे मैं किताबी समाजवाद कहता हूँ किताबी इसलिए कि उन देशों ने समाजवाद की स्थापना मार्क्स एंजल्स और लेनिन के सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार की है, उनकी लिखी पुस्तकों को सामने रख कर की है। लेकिन इंग्लैंड और स्कैंडिनेवियन देशों ने समाजवाद की रचना करते समय कोई किताब विशेषतः मार्क्स, लेनिन या एंजल्स की किताब सामने नहीं रखी। उन्होंने अपनी परम्परा को देखा, उन्होंने अपनी ज़रूरतों को देखा उन्होंने समानता की आवश्यकता को देखा और ये सारी बातें देख कर अपना तौर तरीका बदल डाला और उस परिवर्तन से उन देशों में समाजवाद उत्पन्न हो गया।

समाजवाद का सबसे बड़ा दुर्गुण यह समझा जाता है कि उससे रेजीमेशन पैदा होता है, उससे मनुष्य की वैयक्तिक स्वतंत्रता का हास होता है और आदमी आर्थिक व्यवस्था का गुलाम हो जाता है। लेकिन ये बुराइयां उन्हीं देशों में देखी गईं जिन देशों में समाजवाद की स्थापना किसी ग्रंथ के अनुसार की गई है। जिन देशों ने कागजी किताबों के बदले ज़िदगी की किताबों का ज्यादा ख्याल रखा, उन देशों में समाजवाद तो कायम हुआ, मगर मनुष्य की वैयक्तिक स्वतंत्रता पर कोई आंच नहीं आई। हिन्दुस्तान का कदम आज जिस राह पर है वह यही ज़िदगी की किताबों वाली राह है। हम समाजवाद के उस रूप की तलाश में हैं जिसके जरिये इस देश की गरीबी मिटायी जा सके, विषमता दूर की जा सके, अमीरों और गरीबों के बीच जो खाई है वह कम चौड़ी बनायी जा सके, संभव हो तो पुरो तरह से पाटी जा सके और उन सारे कार्यों को करते हुए हम भारत की परम्परा को बचा लें, मनुष्य की वैयक्तिक स्वतंत्रता को बचा लें, समाजवाद कायम हो जाये और किसी भी भारतवासी की वैयक्तिक स्वतंत्रता का हास नहीं हो, यही हमारा ध्येय है।

मेरा खयाल है कि हम लोग कहीं रूस और अमेरिका के बीच अपनी राह बना रहे हैं। इंग्लैंड और स्कैंडिनेवियन देश भी इसी रास्ते के आसपास पड़ते हैं। मगर, मेरा यह भी खयाल है, कि अंततोगत्वा, भारत की राह इंग्लैंड की भी राह नहीं रहेगी। इंग्लैंड और स्कैंडिनेवियन देशों में समाजवाद की नींव समृद्धि पर पड़ी थी। भारत में गरीबी बड़ी भयानक है, यह देश संसार का सबसे निर्धन देश है। धनी होकर विनम्र रहना संभव है, लेकिन गरीब होकर कटु और क्रुद्ध नहीं हो उठना, यह बड़ी ही दुस्वार बात है। मेरा खयाल है हिन्दुस्तान की गरीबी यहां की सरकार को बार बार ढकेल कर बीच की राह से बायें की ओर ले जायेगी। और जो स्थिति देश में पैदा हो रही है उसमें कोई भी ऐसी सरकार टिक नहीं सकेगी जो खुल कर दक्षिणी पंथी होना चाहती हो।

भारत में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना की जाये, यह प्रस्ताव संसद ने १९५४ ईसवी में पास किया था। तब से हमने समाजवाद की ओर थोड़ी बहुत प्रगति ज़रूर की है। गरचे मैं उसे केवल समारम्भ ही कहता हूँ। मगर इतनी प्रगति से भी दोनों प्रकार के लोग नाराज़ हैं। हमसे वे भी नाराज़ हैं जो अपने जीवन का ध्येय समाजवाद मानते हैं और हमसे वे भी नाराज़ हैं जो पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था को पूरे जोर से देश में कायम रखना चाहते हैं। जो समाजवादी हैं उनकी नाराजगी का कारण यह है कि समाजवाद की पोथियों में उस रास्ते का जिक्र नहीं है जिस पर हिन्दुस्तान चल रहा है। जो सेठवाद के पुजारी हैं वे खूल्लमखूल्ला कह रहे हैं कि कांग्रेस कम्युनिस्ट हो गई।

“ज़ाहिदे तंगे नज़र ने मुझे क़ाफ़िर समझा, और क़ाफ़िर ये समझता है कि मुसलमां हूँ मैं।”

"The Zahid considers me to be a Kafir and the Kafir considers me to be a Muslim"

जो आदमी बीच की राह पर चलता है उसे दायें-बायें दोनों के बपेड़े अेलने पड़ते हैं।

तब भी बुद्ध कह गये हैं कि "मध्य मार्ग ही श्रेष्ठ मार्ग है"। यही मत यह है कि सरकार के वामपंथी आलोचक गरचे यह तो कहते हैं कि समाजवाद की ओर जरा तेजी से चलो, मगर, भारत में वे भी यह कहने की हिम्मत नहीं कर सकते कि प्रजातंत्र की जो जंजीरें तुम्हारी गति को धीमी बनाये हुए हैं, उन जंजीरों को तोड़ दो। यह अच्छी बात है। लेकिन देश को निराशा और शायद जनता को खतरा सबसे अधिक उन लोगों से हो रहा है, विशेषतः उन विद्वानों से हो रहा है, जो पूँजीवादी तराजू पर बैठ कर समाजवाद का विरोध कर रहे हैं, जो गांधी जी का हवाला देकर हिन्दुस्तान को इस भ्रम में डाल रहे हैं कि गांधी जी पूँजीवादी मार्ग के समर्थक थे, वे समाजवादी नहीं थे।

जब मार्क्स मरे, उनके अनुयायी दो दलों में बंट गये। एक दल अपने को सोशलिस्ट कहने लगा, दूसरा अपने को कम्युनिस्ट बताने लगा। मेरा खयाल है, गांधी जी के मरने के बाद भी गांधी जी के अनुयायी मुख्यतः दो दलों में विभक्त हो गये हैं, जिनमें से एक दल के नेता आचार्य विनोबा भावे हैं और दूसरे दल के नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल। जवाहरलाल जी और विनोबा भावे में बाहरी फर्क काफी है क्योंकि एक शासक है और दूसरा संत। मगर जहाँ तक गांधी जी की शिक्षा का सवाल है उन दोनों में कोई भेद नहीं है। दोनों के दोनों यह मानते हैं कि जब तक भारत में समता स्थापित नहीं होती, जब तक भारत में समाजवाद का कोई निश्चित रूप स्थापित नहीं होता, तब तक गांधी जी की कल्पना का राम राज्य किसी भी तरह कायम नहीं हो सकेगा। इस मामले में फर्क केवल उन दोनों में भाषा का है। जिस ध्येय को जवाहरलाल जी समाजवादी समाज कहते हैं, उसी ध्येय को विनोबा जी ने साम्य योग का नाम दिया है। लेकिन अब देश में एक तीसरे प्रकार के गांधीवादी खड़े हो रहे हैं जो कहते हैं कि सच्चा गांधीवादी

वह है जो पूँजीवाद की रक्षा में विश्वास करता है और जो समाजवाद का विरोध करता है।

यह एक नयी दुरभिसंधि देश में खड़ी हुई है जिसका मुकाबला चितकों को करना चाहिये, जिसका मुकाबला देश के गरीबों को करना चाहिये। मार्क्सवाद के ओलों की बौछार से बचने के लिए लोगों ने गांधीवाद का उपयोग छाते के रूप में करना शुरू किया है लेकिन वे भ्रम में हैं। गांधी और मार्क्स में और चाहे जो भी भेद हो लेकिन, गरीबों को धोखा दोनों में से कोई भी नहीं देना चाहता है। गांधी जी दयालु हैं। संभव है, मार्क्स से डरे हुये लोग अपनी रक्षा के लिए गांधीजी के पास जायें। लेकिन, सम्पत्ति वचाने वाले को निराशा गांधी जी से भी होगी। मार्क्स का कहना है कि जिसके पास जरूरत से फाजिल है उसमें छीन लो। लेकिन ऐसा आदमी अगर गांधी के यहां जायेगा तो गांधी जी कहेंगे कि छिनने में हिंसा होती है और तेरे लिए भी यह अपमान की बात है कि तू किसी को छिनने के लिए प्रेरित करे। तेरा कर्तव्य है कि तू इसका त्याग कर दे।

मार्क्स की किताबों को सामने रख कर हम समाजवाद की रचना नहीं कर रहे हैं यह ठीक है। गांधी जी मार्क्सवादी नहीं थे। मार्क्स की शिक्षा भी गांधी की शिक्षा नहीं है। लेकिन, भारतवर्ष केवल भारतवर्ष ही नहीं है, वह संसार का अंग भी है और दुनिया में जो विचारधाराएं चल रही हैं उनका असर भारत पर भी पड़ता है। ऐसा लगता है कि हमने समाजवाद का ध्येय यूरोपीय या सार्वभौम विचारों के प्रभाव में आकर के चुना। लेकिन उसके लिए जो मार्ग हमने चुना है वह शुद्ध भारतीय है, इससे कोई इंकार नहीं कर सकता है।

गांधी जी को कुछ लोग पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था का संत समझते थे। यह गलत बात है। अनेक बार गांधी जी ने दावा किया था कि मैं भी अपने ढंग का सोशलिस्ट हूँ। सन् १९४७ में जब दिल्ली में राजनीतिक सम्मेलन हो रहा

[प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर]

था, बापू ने जयप्रकाश जी की ओर इशारा करते हुए कहा था : "He holds the reins of the Socialist Party but I too am a Socialist." उसके पहले या उसके बाद एक बार बापू ने यह भी कहा था कि "Truth and nonviolence must incarnate in Socialism." सत्य और अहिंसा के जिस मार्ग से भारत ने स्वाधीनता प्राप्त की, सत्य और अहिंसा के उसी मार्ग से हम समाजवाद की स्थापना करने जा रहे हैं।

लेकिन समाजवाद की यह अहिंसा राह है क्या ? कुर्जों उद्योगों पर कब्जा हम सरकार का चाहते हैं जिससे प्राइवेट सेक्टर जनता का स्वामी नहीं बने वह उसका सेवक बन कर रहे। छोटे उद्योगों का प्रसार करके हम गांवों और शहरों में रोजगार फैलाना चाहते हैं जिससे हर आदमी काम पा सके और टैक्सेशन के रोलर को चला कर हम समाज से विषमता को दूर करना चाहते हैं। समाज की जो जमीन ऊबड़ खाबड़ है वह इस रोलर से एक दिन समतल हो जाये।

किताबों का सही उपयोग करना कोई जाने तो किताबें कोई बुरी चीज नहीं हैं। मुश्किल यह है कि किताबें अपने जमाने को सामने रख कर लिखी जाती हैं और ऐसा होता है कि आने चल कर हर किताब की कुछ बातें झूठ हो जाती हैं। लेनिन ने कहा था :

"The roads to London and Paris lie through Peking and Calcutta." उनका आशय शायद यह था कि चीन और भारत से जब फ्रांस और इंग्लैंड निकल जायेंगे तब फ्रांस और इंग्लैंड के लोग इतने गरीब हो जायेंगे कि वे अपनी सरकारों के खिलाफ बगावत कर उठेंगे और वहां तब उन देशों में भी साम्यवाद की स्थापना हो जायेगी। लेकिन लेनिन की यह उक्ति पूरी नहीं हुई वह गलत निकल गई। फ्रांस और इंग्लैंड चीन और भारत को छोड़ कर चले गये। और गरचे कि यह ठीक है कि रूस और अमेरिका को तुलना में वे कमजोर हैं लेकिन

वे गरीब नहीं हुए। वे खाने पीने अच्छे देश हैं। और विद्रोह की तो बात ही क्या है इंग्लैंड में सोशलिस्टों को जब वह तरीका ही नहीं मिलता जिसमें वे इंग्लैंड के वोटों को समझा सकें कि तुम कंजर्वेटिव पार्टी को वोट मत दो।

किताबों की कुछ और बातें भी गलत निकली हैं। समाजवाद की पांथियों में लिखा है कि मैकेनाइज्ड कल्टीवेशन मशीन से की गई खेती से उपज ज्यादा होती है। लेकिन अनुभव यह बतलाता है कि हाथ का खेती से उपज कभी कभी मशीन की खेती से ज्यादा हो जाती है और खर्च उसमें बराबर कम पड़ता है। विशेषतः ऐंम देशों में जहां जमीन कम है और काम करने वाले हाथ ज्यादा हैं वहां यदि मशीन लाई जाये तो उसमें तुलना ज्यादा, लाभ कम होगा। यह भी हुआ है कि जिन देशों ने किताबों से समाजवाद कायम किया, सावन के महीने में वहां से यह खबर आई कि हमारे यहां उपज २०० प्रतिशत बढ़ गई है और भादों में यह खबर आई कि सारे देश में भयानक दुर्भिक्ष पड़ गया है।

अपने देश में आजकल कभी कभी यह बात भी सुनाई पड़ती है कि प्रजातन्त्र के कारण हमारी प्रगति कम हो रही है। हम कुछ दूसरी बात सोचें। और दूसरी बात डिक्टेटर की कल्पना पर जाकर चकती है। यह ठीक है कि डिक्टेटरशिप जरा तेजी से चलता है और प्रजातन्त्र की चाल कुछ मद्धिम होती है। बल्कि यह भी कहना चाहिये कि डिक्टेटर अगर बयालु हुआ तो जनता का वह कल्याण भी कर सकता है। लेकिन मुश्किल सबसे बड़ी यह है कि डिक्टेटर जब गलती करने लगता है तब उस गलती को रोकने का डिक्टेटरशिप के अन्दर कोई औजार नहीं होता। प्रजातन्त्र की महत्ता केवल यह ही नहीं है कि प्रजातन्त्र हमें कोई सास चीज देता है बल्कि यह भी है कि वह हमें अनेक मुसीबतों से बचा सकता है। एका-साथी तो पूरी ठीक नहीं बैठती है, लेकिन

डिक्टेटर की तुलना में खरहे से करता हूँ। खरहा बड़े जोर से दौड़ता है। प्रजातंत्र कछुआ है। वह धीरे धीरे चलता है। मगर जो तेज चलता है वह कभी झाड़ी में भी फंस जाता है, कभी खड्ड में भी गिर जाता है। इसलिये लोक कथा में जो यह बात कही गई है कि खरहे और कछुए की होड़ में जोन बराबर कछुए की होती है, वह ठीक बात है।

अभी भारत के दो तरफ दो राष्ट्रों में डिक्टेटरशिप कायम है। एक देश में जब डिक्टेटर ने कार्यभार संभाला तब वहाँ से खबर यह आने लगी कि इस देश में अब कोई दूध में पानी नहीं मिलता है। फिर थोड़े दिनों के बाद यह खबर भी आने लगी कि अब वहाँ दूध ही नहीं मिलता है।

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी : पानी में दूध मिलना है।

श्री० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर : अब तो खबर यह है कि दूध ही नहीं मिलता है। दूसरे देश में जब डिक्टेटर ने राज्य संभाला तो वहाँ से हिन्दुस्तान में खबर पहुंची कि देखो, इस शहर में पान की पीक कोई सड़क पर नहीं थूकता है। ऐसे ही जब मुंबालिनी ने राज्य संभाला था तब सारे संभार में खबर आई थी कि इटली में ट्रेनें अब ठीक समय पर आया जाया करती हैं। ट्रेनें तो समय पर आने जाने लगीं, लेकिन हुआ यह कि खरहे को उन्माद चढ़ गया और वह पूरे मुल्क को लेकर खड्ड में कूद गया।

डिक्टेटरशिप से यही खतरा है। अपनी गलतियों में सुधार करने का रास्ता प्रजातंत्र में है क्योंकि प्रजातंत्र में विरोधी दल काम करता है, विरोधी दल सरकार पर अंकुश लगाता है, विरोधी दल सरकार को गलत रास्ते पर जाने से रोकता है। लेकिन डिक्टेटर अगर गलती करने लगे तो उसे कोई नहीं रोक सकता। इसलिए राष्ट्रपति को ये विशेष रूप से धन्यवाद देना हूँ कि जाते

जाने उन्होंने देश को यह सालह दी है कि तुम प्रजातंत्र पर आरूढ़ रहो। तेजी की इच्छा बहुत अच्छी चीज है। तेज चलने की कोई बात करे तो उसका विरोध नहीं किया जा सकता। हम सिर्फ इतना ही चाहते हैं कि हमारी सारी तेजी प्रजातंत्र के नियमों के वृत्त में होनी चाहिये। हमें ऐसी तेजी नहीं लानी चाहिये जिससे कि प्रजातंत्र का वृत्त ही टूट जाये।

मेरा समय हो रहा है। श्रीमन्, आपकी आज्ञा में अवकाश ग्रहण करने वाले राष्ट्रपति के सम्बन्ध में कुछ विचार प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। बारह वर्ष के बाद देश-रत्न डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद अब अपना कार्यकाल समाप्त कर रहे हैं। यह बहुत अच्छी बात हुई कि जब भारत में प्रजातंत्र का आरम्भ हुआ, जब यहाँ नई परम्पराओं की नींव पड़ने लगी, तब इस देश के राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद हुए, जिनकी विनम्रता और निश्चलता तथा जिनके त्याग और कुर्बानी के किस्से इस देश के गांव गांव में फैले हुए हैं। संघर्ष के दिनों में सरदार पटेल जिस कांग्रेस की बीर भुजा समझे जाने थे, मौलाना आज़ाद जिसके दिमाग समझे जाने थे, राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी उस कांग्रेस के हृदय थे। गांधी जी ने उन्हें, देश-रत्न कहा था। इसी कारण वह पदवी राजेन्द्र बाबू के नाम के साथ चल पड़ी। जिसकी बड़ाई स्वयं गांधी जी ने की, उसकी बड़ाई और कोई क्या करेगा।

प्रणवीं महावीर हनुमाना,
राम जामु जस आपु बखाना ।

लेकिन केवल गांधी जी ने ही नहीं, राजेन्द्र बाबू के अनेक साथी हमेशा से उनके गुणों के लिए उनकी प्रशंसा करते आये हैं। सन् १९३४ में जब राजेन्द्र बाबू बिहार भूकम्प के काम में लगे हुए थे, तब पंडित जवाहरलाल जी ने एक वाक्य कहा था :

"You will find truth itself peeping through those eyes."

[श्री० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर]

सन् १९४६ में जब राजेन्द्र बाबू दूसरी बार कांग्रेस के सभापति होने लगे तो भारत कोकिला सरोजिनी नायडू ने लिखा था :

"One has need of a golden pen dipped in honey to write about Prasad's unique personality."

और जब राजेन्द्र बाबू राष्ट्रपति के पद पर आसीन हुए तब डा० सच्चिदानन्द सिन्हा ने उनके बारे में जो कुछ लिखा था वह बड़ा ही अर्थपूर्ण वाक्य है :

"Here is a man who, in all the heated controversies of party strife and mortal conflicts of political warfare, has not caused or received a single bruise."

मैं जब १९५५ में जनेवा गया था तब मैं विश्व पार्लियामेंटरी असोसियेशन के सेक्रेटरी, मिस्टर आन्द्रे बोन से मिलने गया। मिस्टर बोन उन्हीं दिनों भारत से लौटे थे और भारत की प्रशंसा से वे भरे हुए थे लेकिन एक बात उन्होंने यह कही कि तुम्हारे राष्ट्रपति से जब मैंने हाथ मिलाया तब मुझे लगा कि उनके भीतर से कोई बहुत बड़ी चीज मुझको देख रही है और मैं इस हाथ मिलाने की घटना को कभी नहीं भूलूंगा।

श्रीमन्, भारतवर्ष पिछले सौ वर्षों से उस राह की तलाश में है जिसके जरिये वह पश्चिम के सर्वश्रेष्ठ गुणों को अपनी परम्पराओं से एकाकार कर सके। यही वह स्वप्न है जिसका आख्यान राम मोहन राय से लेकर गांधी जी और जवाहरलाल जी तक सभी नेताओं ने किया है, यही वह कल्पना है जिसकी कविता रवीन्द्रनाथ जी ने लिखी और यही वह विचार है जिसका दर्शन स्वयं आपने सारे जीवन में तैयार किया है। देश का सौभाग्य था कि जब देश का शासन

राजेन्द्र और जवाहर की जोड़ी के हाथ आया, भारत को यह रास्ता आपसे आप मिल गया। वैसे राजेन्द्र बाबू भी परिवर्तन के लिये बड़े उत्साही हैं और पंडित जी में भी परम्परा का पूरा जोर है। लेकिन फिर भी यह बात कही जा सकती है कि इस युग में जो बेचैनियां हैं, परिवर्तन के लिये जो उतावलापन है और दूर के भविष्य को खींच कर निकट ले आने की जो उमंग है, उसका प्रतिनिधित्व पंडित जी ने किया। और इन बारह वर्षों में भारत की परम्परा को प्रश्रय राष्ट्रपति भवन से मिलता रहा है। परिवर्तन का उतावलापन और जमाने की बेचैनियां पंडित जी में आज भी काफ़ी जोर पर हैं। लेकिन भगवान को श्रद्धा कि आगे भी भारत की परम्परा को प्रश्रय राष्ट्रपति भवन में ही मिलेगा क्योंकि हमारे अगले राष्ट्रपति वे हैं जो भारतीय विद्याओं में निष्णत हैं और जो सारे संसार में विद्या शिरोमणि के रूप में पूजे जाते हैं तथा जो भारतीय संस्कृति के जाग्रत पहरेदार हैं। जिस दिन राजेन्द्र बाबू अपना अन्तिम भाषण दे रहे थे हममें से बहुतों का हृदय भर आया था कि अब यह दृश्य देखने को फिर नहीं मिलेगा। भगवान से हमारा प्रार्थना है कि वे जहां भी रहें, स्वस्थ रहें क्योंकि ऐसे लोगों के जीवित रहने मात्र से देश को प्रेरणा मिलती है। मैं भारत के इस अभिनव भरत को प्रणाम करके अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, before I begin my speech, may I add my words of praise to Dr. Prasad, our President, who will be shortly leaving the high office which he is occupying? He began his political life when he met Gandhiji in the year 1917 or 1918 and took part in the Champaran Satyagraha. He has been holding the highest positions in the Congress, in the nation and in the Government. He is a man of ability, character, dignity and humility. The years that he has been at the head

of the Government of India have been the most active years in many centuries in this country. A new India is being forged and is born, and it was fortunate that one of his standing could be the President of India in these years. We have great pleasure in paying him our tributes and, as the previous speaker, said, we have great pleasure in wishing him long years of peace and happiness.

May I also add, Sir, just as the previous speaker said, it is only a few days, a few weeks, before the next President will be installed, and may I also, Sir, give him the welcome, to the future President yet to come? It is indeed a credit, a glory to any country, Sir, to have one of your learning, of your vision and of your scholarship and character as its President.

Having said these few words, may I proceed on to the President's Address? The President, Sir, has referred to the "pilot projects for the utilisation of the rural manpower." These are for tackling the unemployment problem in this country. Unemployment in this country is of two kinds. There has been tremendous unemployment in this country—one is unemployment, another is under-employment. No proper statistics have been taken about under-employment but some statistics have been taken about unemployment. Sir, it has been found that at the end of the Second Five Year Plan there would be a backlog of about 9 million people unemployed. We did not expect to have so much unemployed on our hands but various considerations have helped to swell these figures, and now it is expected that at the end of the Second Five Year Plan our unemployment would be somewhere about 9 million. Added to this, Sir, is the new labour force that is being daily added on in this country due to the coming in of greater population. The indication that was given at the end of the Second Five Year Plan was that in 1961 we would be 408 millions. We found later that our population was 202 RS—4.

increasing at a greater speed and the Central Statistical Organisation in 1959 said that it would be 431 millions. But, Sir, the Census operations have shown that we are still better and we are 438 millions. The result is that the increase in the labour force during this period, which was once thought to be 15 million, is now considered to be 17 million. To this must be added the 9 million which is the backlog left in the previous Plan. This is indeed a tremendous job.

Sir, the Plan has made calculations as to the amount of employment that it may provide. Another curious feature about these 17 million people is that two-thirds are from the rural areas and one-third is from the urban areas. All the jobs that we could provide in construction, irrigation and power, railways, social services, health, education and everything put together, the total amount of employment that we can provide would be 14 million of which two-thirds will be urban and one-third will be rural. While two-thirds of the unemployment is rural and one-third urban, what we can provide as employment out of these 14 million is two-thirds urban and one-third rural. Therefore, the necessity has arisen that earnest attempts must be made to provide greater employment facilities in the rural areas and this "project for the utilisation of the rural manpower" is one of the devices for providing that employment.

In this matter, I would like to narrate here a little experience of mine. Sir, the project being of such importance, Rs. 150 crores having been provided for it, I thought I must learn something about this project. I went to the Library and I asked the people in charge of the library, "Have you got something about this 'project for the utilisation of the rural manpower'?" The Librarian looked at me up and down and said, "No, Sir." Then I showed him the Third Five Year Plan in which it is said that a sum of Rs. 150 crores is provided for this. "It must be a sufficiently important project and you must have something about it." I

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

said. The man was resourceful. He phoned, up his counter-part in the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission man was surprised and said, "Nothing is available." Then, the Planning Commission man might have suggested, "This is in the Budget, isn't it? And, so ask the Budget man." Sir, I phoned the Finance Secretary. Straight came the reply saying, "Ask the Budget Section." I asked the Budget Section, Sir, and the Budget Section man said, "I do not know anything about this provision. You must ask the Planning Commission." He referred me to a number. I phoned the number which rang and rang and nobody replied. Then, I remembered the Additional Secretary of the Planning Commission, Shri Tarlok Singh, a friend of mine, and I thought that I could as well see him and talk to him. I talked to him. An efficient man that he was he at last was able to give me some reference. He was good enough to send me some references. This is just to say that the Plan must work but. the Plan does not work by passing on the baby.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Red-tapism.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I am not talking about red-tapism. Sir, I am talking of the first reaction that you get to your enquiry, "I do not know. Ask somebody else." Not even a reference is given. So, this is the pattern of administration. I do not want to make very much of this. But, Sir, our people must be a little more efficient, especially with a big Plan like this which involves thousands of crores of rupees. It must be worked and worked properly.

Now, I come to this pilot project. Sir, this project is good; and I think something good will come out of this project. The literature supplied to me shows that:

"In the early stages, only labour intensive works calculated to gene-

rate substantial direct employment and enhancing, at the same time, the employment potential indirectly by building up agricultural productivity and community assets should be taken up."

This is good; it is excellent. About this project my opinion is that this project, instead of having a separate organisation, must be entrusted to the panchajats because they know what work is needed. To create another organisation to work this may mean coming into conflict with the pancha-yats. The panchayats must be entrusted with this work, and as far as possible labour co-operatives must be entrusted with the actual doing of that work.

Sir, this matter has been considered at a meeting of the Planning Commission. Mr. Tarlok Singh was good enough to send me the proceedings of that Committee. They have pointed out two difficulties in this matter. All similar programmes—community contribution programmes—undertaken in areas whether under community development programme or for rural works, should be based on the common scheme of local community contribution.

They have referred to another matter, "Responsibility for Maintenance of Works". A couple of years back the Government of India appointed a committee to go into the rural works programme. You know, there was a programme for areas where National Extension Service was not spread. Certain amounts of money were given and by a matching contribution this rural works programme was conducted and you know, Sir, what the Committee recommended. The Committee made two recommendations which are worth nothing this connection. One of the recommendations was that the so-called contributions that were made in the locality were not real for two reasons. One was that the estimates were far bloated, and many times the contribution was met from the estimate itself. The people who have

experience of these projects said it because they knew. Secondly, many of these works were undertaken by panchayats. In that case who made the contributions? The Panchayats and not the public. These were the criticisms made. We must see that as far as possible, local contributions that are contemplated are real.

The second criticism which is more important, in my opinion, was that though many miles of roads were constructed under the scheme, yet, later on, there was no maintenance. The district boards to whom they were given did not have the money to maintain them. The result was that many of the roads were not maintained properly. Here also there will be the same difficulties. This is what they say:

"Responsibility for maintenance of works.—Before accepting a scheme under the rural works programme there should be a definite assurance that the asset created would be maintained in good condition by a responsible body of institution."

This is very important because nothing is so frustrating as to see that you build a thing and it goes off before your eyes in a few years so that the urge for building is discouraged. These are the criticisms or suggestions which I may offer and I hope that this programme of utilisation of rural manpower will yield results. It is expected that 2½ million people will be given employment but I do not know whether that expectation is high or low. Even if it gives proper employment to 1½ million people, I shall think we are amply rewarded by that programme.

Let me come to the second matter which I would like to mention. One of the great difficulties in our way to-day is our foreign exchange position. The Budget read was very bad indeed in regard to that position. The Economic Survey 1961-62 which makes a reference to that says as follows:

'Perhaps the most unsatisfactory aspect of the economic situation in 1961-62 has been the persistent attrition of our foreign exchange reserves. The foreign assets held by the Reserve Bank had declined from Rs. 746 crores at the beginning of the second plan period to Rs. 136 crores by the end of the plan period. During the current year, it became necessary to supplement these reserves by a net drawing on the International Monetary Fund of Rs. 58.3 crores. Even so, indications are that the year as a whole will reveal some decline in reserves from the level from which it started.'

If I may refer to external assistance, I completely agree with what has been said in this report:

"External assistance is undoubtedly valuable in the formative stages of development; and in the immediate period ahead, it would be necessary to negotiate additional assistance for financing developmental as well as maintenance imports if the implementation of the plan is to proceed at a satisfactory pace. But even with assurance of external assistance on an adequate scale, there would be little room for manoeuvre in steering the economy from year to year unless export earnings could be lifted progressively."

This matter has been referred to in the Budget speech but I am not happy about the way in which it has been tackled. On page 8 of the Budget Speech, para 20, it is said:

"I have already referred to the importance of increasing our export earnings. The promotion of sales abroad is a costly business. Apart from the expenditure on staff which Government employ, both at home and abroad, for this purpose and the money which they spend on participation in fairs and exhibitions abroad, industry itself must spend a great deal more for this purpose . . .".

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

When referring only to the cost of our foreign propaganda I am afraid that they have not appreciated the reasons for the lack of foreign exports. The reason is something more fundamental than lack of propaganda and that is dealt with in the Third Plan Report very vividly and if I may say so, very correctly. This is what they have said, if we want successful exports, what we must do is to reduce the cost of our production. Unless we are competitive in the foreign markets, we cannot export. Recently, I was surprised when I heard in one of our Committee meetings that the cost of our production of sugar is Rs. 700, the cost at which we sell in U.S.A. is Rs. 500 and the cost at which we will sell in other markets will be about Rs. 300 or Rs. 400. How do we stand? If we cannot get even half the price in a competitive way, how or we expect to export at all? In the cost structure, as I have said, and in productivity, the principal industries especially export industries, must become competitive as early as possible and a systematic beginning towards this end has to be made within each industry.

Then they say something about which I would like to have some information. For developing export, they say, it is essential that a considerable part of India's industry should become much more competitive than it is at present. Agreed but what is being done about it? They say:

"It is true that over a significant range of products Indian industry is capable of competing in export markets or at any rate, of becoming reasonably competitive. However, the range of these industries is not large enough at present. Study groups have been recently set up to consider ways of reducing costs in certain selected industries such as cement, jute, bicycles, electric motors

and transformers and rayon. It is proposed to review the more important cost studies undertaken for different industries in recent industries."

May I know what has happened to these studies? Have these studies given any results? Have you been able to find out anything. It must have been some time since these studies have been initiated. I would like to know whether these studies have yielded any result, whether the costs have been reduced. The development of industries in our country is spectacular, there is no doubt about it but I say that to-day our industries are more spoon-fed; they do not stand on their own legs. Today the cost at which they produce is more. The cost of motor car is a standing example. You get a similar motor car for half the price in other countries. Refrigerators and a variety of other things which are being produced to-day are there and it is the consumer who is paying for them, not that the cost that we are paying for them is very proper I do not mind if I pay, but if we must have export, our cost must go down, and if our cost must go down, my point is, what is being done?

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Referring to committees or study groups are sometimes the ways in which you avoid problems. Knowing the Government as I do, knowing committee and the way in which things are happening there, I would like to have the results of the steps that have been taken and I would like to know what has been done about it and what has been achieved by it.

I would like to refer to one other point before I close and that is about the socialistic pattern of society. Undoubtedly, we want to be socialist, at least about the desire there is no doubt but how far are we progressing towards that? I also think that in a developmental economy, you cannot avoid capital accumulating in cer-

tain hands and to a certain extent till the transfer is made either by way of taxation or by other methods, the people who produce wealth, who organise this production of wealth, will always have an advantage. I concede that great industrialists grow richer and richer. But this is the inevitable first step in the production of wealth in the country, because socialism means production of wealth first. You do not want to divide poverty. We are not socialising poverty. We want to distribute wealth in the country and if we want to distribute wealth, the wealth has to be produced first. But enough wealth is not produced in the country. Wealth production must be organised and always the people who organise this production of wealth have the first share or chance of getting more money. So industrialists as the first step, will get richer. This is an inevitable first step. But what I really don't understand is this. For our taxation policy we must have an idea of how all this wealth is distributed. It is all right our saying that taxation should be broad-based. It should be broad-based and there is no doubt about it. Taxing a few people at the top will not yield results. Taxing millions at the bottom will have results. There is no doubt about that. But for any taxation policy we must know where we are. The Mahalanobis Committee has been appointed, as the House knows. Of course, the problem that that Committee has to deal with is a very difficult one. Nobody denies that it is difficult. But if you take too long a time over the problem, that would defeat the very purpose. The result of the Mahalanobis Committee was promised at the time of the last Budget Session but still it is sitting over the matter. I hope, Sir, that we will get something out of the Mahalanobis Committee soon so that it may help us in our taxation policy.

Another matter I would like to refer to is this. There is no doubt

that wealth has increased in the country. Go to any industrial area, you find more wealth. Go to industrial magnates, you find that people who had Rs. 10 lakhs now have Rs. 20 lakhs. Some have Rs. 50 lakhs or a crore of rupees. One test is, you float a company, all the shares are brought. You want Rs. 1 crore, you get Rs. 2 crores. So there is money in the country, and it is good. Capital formation is good. It will help our industries. But what I am disturbed about is this. You go to a place like Coimbatore, for instance, you see great wealth there. But you go to any of the villages in their interior, there you find tremendous poverty. I had occasion to go to one of the hill areas. The poverty I found was something tremendous. You cannot imagine the poverty. So if you wait for natural channels to take all this wealth to these people, I do not know how long it will take. Therefore, that aspect of the question has also to be considered. The more unfortunate sections of the community, the backward sections of our community, those who are in the out-of-the-way villages in our country, they have not very much of the impact of the Plans. While it is true that wealth has increased—and there is no doubt about it—while it is true that the national income has increased, it is also true that there are large areas of the country and large sections of our people whom the Plans have not reached. Socialist pattern of society will be there only when we guarantee at least a minimum to every individual, wherever he is, in whatever part of the country he is. This also is an aspect Madam, which the Government will have to consider.

Madam, I do not want to say anything more, except to convey my best wishes again to the retiring President and to welcome the incoming President and Vice-President of this country. Thank you.

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are 22 amendments proposed to the motion.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Karala): Madam, Deputy Chairman, I move:

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

'but regret to note that no effective steps have been outlined in the Address to stop the system of 'police verification' in government services as well as in the Government and semi-Government undertakings with regard to the recruitments which nullifies the constitutional rights of equality in employment opportunities of our citizens'."

2. "That at the end o'f the motion the following be added namely: —

'but regret that no mention has been made in the Address about the stoppage and slowdown of the construction works of the Second Ship Building Yard at Cochin'."

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

'but regret to note that no mention has been made in the Address about the stoppage of certain preliminary works of the Phyto Chemical Plant proposed to be set up in the public sector at Neriya Mangalam (Kerala State)'."

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

'but regret to note that the Address does not take into account the gravity of unemployment in the country'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not take into account the prolonged delay in the *de jure* transfer of French territory in India'."

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

'but regret that no mention has been made in the Address about the recent steps taken by the Government of Pakistan, to drag the Kashmir question again to the U.N.'."

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

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

'but regret that in the Address there is no mention regarding measures to be taken by Government to protect the real wages of workers both in the public and the private sectors'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not take notice of the failure of the Second Five Year Plan and fails to suggest the detailed study of the causes that led to its failure'."

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the steps that Government propose to take to check the rise in prices'."

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the bad planning with regard to transport, power and coal resulting in

sizable installed capacity remaining unused'."

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the growing hardships and indignities to which citizens of Indian origin are subjected in South Africa'."

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the failure of the Government in providing adequate machinery for ventilating the grievances of the Government employees and resolving disputes'."

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the Government's failure to regain Indian territories forcibly occupied by China'."

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of Government's failure to solve the interstate border issues such as the Maharashtra-Mysore border which tend to hamper national integration'."

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

'but regret that the Address takes no cognizance of the increase in provocative actions by Pakistan on Indian territory'."

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh):
Madam, Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not suggest any measure to eradicate poverty in the country'."

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address for abolishing inequalities and fixing the maximum and the minimum limits of income in the ratio of 10 : 1'."

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the nationalisation of foreign capital'."

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the appointment of a committee to enquire into the irregularities and misuse of government machinery by the ruling party during the last General Elections'."

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address for the scrapping of the current Five Year Plan and formulating a new plan which will be beneficial and suitable for a country like India'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not explain the pattern of socialism which Government want to adopt and which is constantly discussed'."

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

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

[Shri G. Murahari.]

steps for the solution of the border problems with neighbouring countries'."-

The questions were proposed.

श्री गंगाधर सिंह : डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहिबा, आम तौर से यह परम्परा नहीं है कि सदन में किसी विषय पर बहस करते समय राष्ट्रपति जी की चर्चा की जाय। लेकिन हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति का यह अन्तिम भाषण था और इसके बाद वे अवकाश ग्रहण करेंगे, इसलिए मैं आशा करता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ थोड़ी बहुत चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ, उसकी इजाजत आप देंगी।

महोदया, मेरे लिये वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति के सम्बन्ध में विशेष बात कहना कई दृष्टि से सम्भव नहीं है। मेरा यह सौभाग्य रहा है कि पिछले ४२ वर्षों से, अपने राजनीतिक जीवन के प्रारम्भ से ही, उनके सम्पर्क में रहा। सिर्फ मानसिक सम्पर्क में नहीं रहा, बल्कि वर्षों तक एक ही मकान में, जेल में और जेल के बाहर एक ही जगह रहने का, उनके रक्षण, उनके नेतृत्व और उनके मार्ग दर्शन में काम करने का अवसर मिला। आज जब मैं उनके सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ तो हृदय भर आता है और ऐसा लगता है जैसे स्वयं अपने पिता या बड़े भाई के सम्बन्ध में निवेदन करना पड़ रहा है। जैसा आप सब लोगों ने उनसे बहुत कुछ सीखा है, उसी तरह मुझे भी अपने जीवन में उनसे बहुत कुछ सीखने और जानने का मौका मिला है। उनमें जो बहुत सी विशेषताएँ हैं उनके बारे में आप सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं लेकिन कुछ विशेषताएँ ऐसी भी हैं जिनको जानने का मुझे विशेष अवसर मिला। आपको शायद पता हो कि जब हम लोगों ने सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का निर्माण किया था उस समय हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति विहार कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष थे और मैं उस समय पटना जिला कांग्रेस का अध्यक्ष था। वे सोशलिस्ट पार्टी

के निर्माण को उचित काम नहीं समझते थे। मैं सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का मंत्री था लेकिन फिर भी जब कोई जिम्मेदारी का पद आया, जब कोई जिम्मेदारी का काम आया, तो उनका विश्वास मुझे प्राप्त हुआ। जितने का मैं हकदार था उससे ज्यादा मिला। यह इस बात का द्योतक है कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने विचारों के विरोध के वावजूद, विचारों की भिन्नता के वावजूद, जिसका जो हक था उससे उसको अधिक ही दिया, कम नहीं दिया। मैंने भी उनसे अधिक ही प्राप्त किया। यह अत्यन्त ही व्यक्तिगत मामला है इसलिये इसमें आगे मैं बहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं सदन का ध्यान सिर्फ इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि विचारों के विरोध को सहन करने की जितनी शक्ति हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति में है उतनी शक्ति मने गांधी जी के बाद किसी दूसरे नेता में नहीं देखी। हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति कई तरह से एक कड़ी के रूप में रहे हैं और कई तरह की परम्पराओं के वे प्रतीक रहे हैं। एक ओर जहाँ उनके रहन सहन, आचरण, व्यवहार से—शहर से दूर, रेलवे स्टेशन से दूर, सड़कों से दूर, भारतवर्ष के गांवों से लेकर राष्ट्रपति भवन तक एक कड़ी पैदा हुई, दूसरी ओर उनका जीवन—भारत के प्राचीन इतिहास से लेकर आज तक के जीवन की एक कड़ी के रूप में आपको और हमको मिलता है।

तीसरी चीज यह भी है कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति को जो उपलब्धि हो गई वह अब फिर किसी को नहीं होगी। हमारे राष्ट्रीय संग्राम से लेकर स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति और उसके बाद के युग की भी कड़ी रहे हैं और यह सौभाग्य फिर किसी दूसरे राष्ट्रपति को प्राप्त नहीं होगा जो हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति को प्राप्त हुआ है। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन से लेकर स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद की जितनी कड़ियाँ हैं उन्हें बहुत अच्छी तरह निभाया है। उन्होंने हमारे देश में एक मजबूत परम्परा की नींव रख दी है। जिन्होंने अपना

सारा जीवन सरकार का विरोध करने में लगाया उनके हाथों में शासन आया। ऐसी अवस्था में शासन को चलाना या उसका प्रतीक बनना और साथ ही अपने भीतर सामंजस्य स्थापित करना यह कितना मुश्किल काम है। हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने यह साध्य साधन किया है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Debate will continue. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

श्री गंगाशरण सिंह : डिप्टी चियरमैन साहिबा मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति कई दृष्टियों से एक कड़ी का काम करते रहे हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जो परम्परा उन्होंने कायम की है और जो कड़ी उनके सामने कायम हुई है वह परम्परा और वह कड़ी आगे भी देश में कायम रहेगी और उसका उत्तरोत्तर विकास होता जायेगा। दिनकर जी ने ठीक ही कहा कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति भरत की तरह रहे हैं, लेकिन भरत में और राष्ट्रपति में थोड़ा अन्तर रहा है। भरत ने अपने चौदह वर्ष राम की प्रतीक्षा में गुजारे थे, लेकिन अपने राष्ट्रपति को जब देखता हूँ तो ऐसा लगता है कि राम ने स्वयं यहाँ भरत का रूप धारण कर लिया है और वे किसी की प्रतीक्षा में नहीं रहे। इस ऊँचे पद पर पहुँचने के बाद भी उनकी सादगी उनकी शालीनता और उनकी विनम्रता को देख कर बरबस यह याद आता है और हम गर्व के साथ कह सकते हैं कि :

“शुकाती है हमारी आजिजी सरकार की गर्दनको”
जब वे राष्ट्रपति भवन को छोड़ कर फिर सदाकत आश्रम की ओर मुँह मोड़ रहे हैं और फिर वहाँ जा रहे हैं, तो कम से कम जो मैंने

देखा है उसके आधार पर मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि सदाकत आश्रम में फिर जब वे जायेंगे, तो उनकी जो कल्पना मेरे हृदय में, मेरे दिमाग में उठती है, उसका वर्णन मुझे कबीर के इन शब्दों में मिलता है :

“दास कबीर जतन से ओढ़ी,
ज्यों की त्यों धरि दीनी चदरिया।”

अब मैं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर कुछ निवेदन करना चाहूँगा। हर चुनाव के वर्ष में एक तरह की परेशानी का हमें सामना करना पड़ता है। यह अच्छा होता कि दो अभिभाषणों के बदले राष्ट्रपति का एक ही अभिभाषण चुनाव के वर्ष में भी होता। पिछली बार मैंने देखा और इस बार भी कि चुनाव के वर्ष में राष्ट्रपति के दो अभिभाषण होते हैं, एक तो पुराने सदस्यों और पुराने सदन के सम्मुख और एक लोकसभा के नये सदस्यों और नये सदन के सम्मुख और राज्य सभा के भी नये चुने हुये जो मेम्बर आते हैं, उनके सम्मुख। इसमें परेशानी यह होती है कि दोनों अभिभाषण एक तरह से अंधरे रह जाते हैं। कुछ विषय जो राष्ट्रपति के पिछले अभिभाषण में आने चाहिये, वे पहले अभिभाषण में आ जाते हैं और जिन विषयों का उल्लेख पहले अभिभाषण में होना चाहिये, वह पिछले में होता है। मैं अधिक उदाहरण देकर आपका समय नहीं लेना चाहता, लेकिन एक विषय की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। आम चुनावों के बाद लोकसभा का जो नया सदन हो और राज्य सभा के जो नये चुने हुये सदस्य हों, उनके सामने राष्ट्रपति का जो अभिभाषण हो, उसमें आम चुनावों का उल्लेख होना चाहिये। यदि ऐसा हो सके तो ज्यादा अच्छा रहे क्योंकि जिन लोगों को चुनावों का सामना करना पड़े और जो तुरन्त चुन कर आये वे अपने अनुभव के आधार पर बातें यहाँ पार्लियामेंट में रख सकें। लेकिन चुनाव की चर्चा ज्यादातर उन लोगों के सामने हुई, जिनमें ज्यादातर रिटायर्ड मेम्बर थे। पिछले चुनावों में चुन कर जो सदस्य लोकसभा

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

में और राज्य सभा में आये और उनके सामने जो राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण हुआ उसमें चुनावों की कोई चर्चा नहीं है। इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव के समय में और दोनों सदन के सम्मुख उनके भाषण के समय में ऐसी तरमीम की जाय, ऐसा सामंजस्य किया जाय जिससे चुनाव के वर्ष में राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण नये चुने हुये सदस्यों के सम्मुख हो और ज्यादा अच्छा हो अगर नये राष्ट्रपति वह अभिभाषण करें। मेरा खयाल है कि समय का थोड़ा सा सामंजस्य किया जाय तो यह कोई मुश्किल नहीं है। अगर इसकी आवश्यकता समझी जाय कि पुराने राष्ट्रपति भी चुनाव के पहले पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों के सम्मुख अपने विचार रखें या कुछ बातें करें तो उसके लिए चुनाव के पहले दोनों सदनों की बैठक बुलाई जा सकती है। मैं तो यह भी चाहूंगा कि जो विदा लेने वाले राष्ट्रपति हों उनको ऐसा अभिभाषण करने का जब मौका आवे तब वह भाषण गवर्नमेंट की कुछ नीतियों रूप में नहीं हो बल्कि उसमें थोड़ी छूट उनको व्यक्तिगत रूप में भी रहनी चाहिये जिससे वे अपने विचारों को भी जाते समय व्यक्त कर सकें और उनके अनुभव से यह देश और पार्लियामेंट लाभ उठा सके।

आज एक बड़ी परेशानी मालूम होती है। ऐसे बहुत से विषय थे जिनका इस अभिभाषण में उल्लेख नहीं है। ऐसे विषयों का जिक्र मैंने अपने संशोधनों में किया है। चुनाव के प्रश्न का बहुत बड़ा महत्व है, किन्तु उसका जिक्र इस अभिभाषण में नहीं है। चुनाव के सम्बन्ध में जो चर्चा होनी चाहिये थी, वह इस मौके पर आज हम नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। पिछले अभिभाषण में चुनाव की चर्चा थी, फिर भी इस अभिभाषण में उसका उल्लेख करना चाहिये था जिससे नये सदस्यों को उसके बारे में बोलने का मौका मिल सके। इतना बड़ा चुनाव हमारे देश में हुआ जिस चुनाव के फलस्वरूप इन दोनों सदनों में और भिन्न

भिन्न प्रान्तीय विधान सभाओं और विधान परिषदों में लोग चुने गये हैं। वह सबसे बड़ी घटना रही है और उसका असर सिर्फ तात्कालिक नहीं रहा है बल्कि उसका असर आगे आने वाले समय पर भी पड़ेगा। हम सब को यह तजुर्बा हुआ है कि ये चुनाव धीरे धीरे ज्यादा खर्चीले होते जा रहे हैं जैसे जैसे ज्यादा खर्चीले होते जा रहे हैं और वैसे वैसे मेरा खयाल है कि जनता का और नीचे के तबकों के लोगों का सही प्रतिनिधित्व भी धीरे धीरे कम होता जा रहा है। पैसे का प्रभाव चुनाव पर अधिक हो गया है और जिनके पास पैसा है उनके लिये चुनाव लड़ना अधिक सरल है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि सन् १९५२ का चुनाव जिना खर्चीला था, आज दस वर्षों में चुनाव उससे ज्यादा खर्चीला हो गया है। दूसरी बात यह भी है कि चुनाव के खर्च के सम्बन्ध में हमने रोक लगा रखी है, सीमा बांध रखी है कि इससे अधिक खर्च न किया जाय। लेकिन वह सीमा महज उस ब्रह्म की तरह है जिसकी चर्चा होती है, लेकिन जिसके दर्शन करना मुश्किल होता है। बाज लोग ही जिसके दर्शन के लिये आवश्यक बतलाई गई तन्मयता और एकाग्रता प्राप्त कर पाते हैं। मुझे अफसोस और दुःख यह है कि खर्च की सीमा का निर्धारण हमने किया, लेकिन देश के जो बड़े बड़े लोग हैं वे भी उस सीमा की रक्षा नहीं कर सके हैं। उनके चुनाव में भी ज्यादा खर्च हुआ है। मैं किसी का नाम लेना नहीं चाहता और न किसी तरह की अभद्रता दिखाना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम अपने हृदय का मन्थन करें और सोचें कि हम में से जो बड़े से बड़े लोग हैं, उनके चुनाव में भी जो सीमा है उससे कितना गुना अधिक पैसे खर्च हुये हैं। कहां से यह पैसा आता है, कौन यह पैसा देता है, यह ऐसी बात है जिस पर हमको और आपको सोचना चाहिये। इस खर्च को देखते हुये मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि अप्रत्यक्ष चुनाव होने लगें। मैं समझता हूँ कि सीधा चुनाव जनतन्त्र के लिये सबसे ज्यादा आवश्यक है। लेकिन इस सीधे चुनाव में जो दिक्कतें

आती है, जो परेशानियां होती हैं, जिनके कारण यह सोचा चुनाव सही चुनाव नहीं रह जाता है उनके लिये हमें उपाय करना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि सभी दलों के लोग इस बात से सहमत होंगे कि ऐसा कोई कदम उठाया जाय जिससे आगे चल कर ये चुनाव ज्यादा खर्चिले न होने पावें और इन चुनावों से जो तरह तरह की परेशानियां पैदा होती हैं वे भी न होने पावें।

एक और चीज है जिस का सम्बन्ध सिर्फ सरकारी मशीन से और सरकारी लोगों से है। मैं सिर्फ विरोधी दल का एक सदस्य होने के नाते यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ बल्कि हम सब को यह तजुर्बा हुआ है कि इस चुनाव में सरकारी मशीन का, सरकारी साधनों का और सरकारी आदमियों का उपयोग हुआ है जो कम से कम हमारे देश में जो जनतंत्र है उसके तो अनुकूल नहीं है। मैं नफ्मोल में सारी बातें देकर आपका अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता। लेकिन यह बिल्कुल मानी हुई बात है, भले ही कोई घुमा फिरा कर इससे इंकार कर दे, लेकिन इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि पिछले चुनावों में सरकारी मशीन का, सरकारी साधनों का और सरकारी आदमियों का उपयोग हुआ है और इसको रोकने की चेष्टा होनी चाहिये। स्वाम कर के सरकारी पक्ष के लोगों से मैं यह निवेदन करूँगा कि जो परम्परा वे कायम कर रहे हैं, जो पद्धति वे कायम कर रहे हैं, उससे आज उनको लाभ हो रहा है, लेकिन जरा वे अपनी दृष्टि को दूर तक ले जायें और देश में जनतंत्र की जड़ों को कमजोर न करें। इससे आज उनका लाभ भले ही हो जाय, लेकिन भविष्य में न यह उनके लाभ की बात है और न जनतंत्र के लाभ की बात है। मैं बड़े दुःख के साथ, यह बात कह रहा हूँ। किसी पर कोई आक्षेप लगाने की दृष्टि से यह बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। अपनी पार्टी के पार्लियामेंट्री बोर्ड का चेयरमैन होने की हैसियत से इस चुनाव में मुझे देश के भिन्न भिन्न

भागों में जाने का मौका मिला और जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ वह अपने व्यक्तिगत अनुभव के आधार पर कह रहा हूँ। कोई मुनी मुनाई वान नहीं कह रहा हूँ।

एक बात यह भी सोचने की है कि इन चुनावों के चलते क्या परिणाम हमारे सामने आये हैं। एक परिणाम हमारी नज़र में यह आया है कि इन चुनावों के चलते जिस नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन की हम चर्चा करते हैं, वह नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन सबल नहीं हुआ है बल्कि वह थोड़ा कमजोर ही पड़ा है। आमतौर से जो पिछले चुनाव लड़े गये, वे राष्ट्रीय एकता की नीति, राष्ट्रीय एकता की पालिसी और राष्ट्रीय एकता के प्रिंसिपल को दृष्टि में रख नहीं लड़े गये। इसलिए जिन कारणों के चलते, जिन विचारों के चलते इस चुनाव में लोगों की जीत या हार हुई है, वह मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की एकता के लिए बहुत ही घातक है और जनतंत्र के भविष्य के लिए भी घातक है। इसलिए हमें इस बात को भी सोचना चाहिये और मेरा ख्याल है कि सभी दलों को मिल कर इस चुनाव के सम्बन्ध में एक चुनाव संहिता, आचार संहिता का निर्माण करना चाहिये और यदि आवश्यकता पड़े तो उस आचार संहिता को सही तरीके पर चलाने के लिए एक मशीन का भी निर्माण करना चाहिये। नहीं तो मुझे यह लगता है कि जहाँ एक ओर ये चुनाव जनतंत्र के प्रतीक हैं, जनतंत्र की शक्ति हैं, वहाँ दूसरी ओर इन चुनावों के चलते देश में एक तरह का डिस्इंटिग्रेशन, एक तरह की विश्रुंखलता फैलेगी। जात पांत के नाम पर, धर्म के नाम पर, भाषा के नाम पर, भौगोलिक सीमाओं के नाम पर, मजहब के नाम पर और तरह

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

तरह की विश्व खलता फैलाने वाली जो विचार-धाराएं हैं उनके नाम पर पिछले चुनाव लड़े गये हैं। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि देश के सभी दलों का, विचारकों का ध्यान इस ओर जाना चाहिये।

अभी मुझे नन्दा जी का एक भाषण पढ़ने को मिला और उसमें मुझे प्रसन्नता हुई कि कम से कम नन्दा जी ने सफाई के साथ इस बात को कबूल किया है कि ऊपरी दृष्टि से ऐसा मालूम होने पर भी कि आज के जो मेहनतकश हैं उनकी मजदूरी में, उनके वेज में तरक्की हुई है उनका जो वास्तविक वेतन है, उनका जो रियल वेज है, उनकी जो असली मजदूरी है उसमें तरक्की नहीं हुई है। और मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस सफाई और ईमानदारी के साथ यह स्वीकार किया गया है उसी सफाई के साथ इस कमी को दूर करने की भी चेष्टा की जानी चाहिए। अगर विरोधी दलों में से कोई इस तरह की बात करता तो तरह तरह के आंकड़े ला कर हम लोगों को निरुत्तर करने की चेष्टा की जाती, लेकिन मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता है कि स्वयं सरकार के एक बड़े, एक मुख्य व्यक्ति ने सफाई से इस चीज को मंजूर किया है। मैं और कुछ नहीं कहता सिर्फ इस ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो खुद लेबर डिपार्टमेंट के चार्ज में हैं, प्लानिंग के चार्ज में है, मिनिस्टर हैं, कैबिनेट के पुराने और जिम्मेदार मिनिस्टर हैं उन्होंने जिस खामोशी की तरफ ध्यान दिलाया है उस खामोशी की तरफ सिर्फ ध्यान दिलाने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा बल्कि सरकार को उस खामोशी को दूर करने की भी कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

अभी जब बजट पेश किया गया तो उसके सिलसिले में कहा गया कि हम जो टैक्स लगा रहे हैं वह जो मुनाफा होता है, लाभ होता है, प्राफिट होता है उसमें से कुछ हिस्सा लेने के लिये लगाना चाहते हैं। लाभ में से

हिस्सा लेना चाहते हैं, मुनाफे में से हिस्सा लेना चाहते हैं इसलिये उस पर टैक्स लगाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन यह कहना इस सदन के या उस सदन के, इन दोनों के, घेरे तक ही सीमित रहता है या जिस कागज पर वह भाषण छपता है उस कागज तक ही सीमित रहता है। व्यवहार में यही होता है कि जो टैक्स आप लगाते हैं उसके लिये आप कहते तो यह है कि मुनाफे पर टैक्स लगा रहे हैं, मुनाफे में से हिस्सा लेना चाहते हैं लेकिन जो उपभोक्ता हैं, जो कंजुमर हैं उन्हीं पर अन्त में वह टैक्स जाकर पड़ता है। उन पर सिर्फ वह टैक्स ही नहीं पड़ता है बल्कि आप टैक्स तो थोड़ा सा लगाने हैं पर नीचे जाते जाते वह टैक्स उन पर कई गुना हो जाता है। वह रक्त बीज की तरह हो जाता है, एक बूंद से न मालूम कितना पैदा हो जाता है। आप एक पाई टैक्स किसी चीज पर लगाते हैं लेकिन वह नीचे जाते जाते न मालूम कितने पाई हो जाता है, रूपया हो जाता है। जब आप टैक्स लगाते हैं तब मूल में कल्पना यह करते हैं कि मुनाफा बांटेंगे लेकिन यह कल्पना तक ही सीमित रह जाता है। मुनाफा तो बंटता नहीं है, मुनाफा तो उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ता जाता है और कंजुमर पर उपभोक्ता पर बोझा भी उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ता जाता है। मुझे खुशी होती यदि जैसा हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि हम उपभोक्ता पर कर नहीं लगाना चाहते हैं और मुनाफा में से हिस्सा बंटाना चाहते हैं तब वह कुछ ऐसे उपाय भी बताते कि जो टैक्स वे मुनाफा करने वालों पर लगाना चाहते हैं वह उन्हीं से वसूल भी किया जाय और उसका बोझा उपभोक्ताओं पर न पड़े। यह बताने की इस सदन के सदस्यों को जरूरत नहीं है कि अभी जो बजट को घोषणा हुई है उसका क्या फल हुआ है। हर वर्ष जब बजट की घोषणा होती है तो जो टैक्स मुनाफे पर लगाया जाता है वह मुनाफा करने वालों ने कभी नहीं दिया है बल्कि बजट की घोषणा होने के दूसरे दिन से ही उपभोक्ताओं को उन चीजों पर टैक्स देना पड़ता है, उन

चीजों की कीमत बढ़ जाती है। यह कोई इस बार का ही तजुर्बा नहीं है, हर बार का तजुर्बा है और पता नहीं है कि सरकार इस चीज को ठोकने के लिये क्या कर रही है और इतने अनुभवों के बाद भी फिर उसी चीज को क्यों बार बार दुहराया जाता है ?

यहां प्लानिंग की बड़ी चर्चा हुई और प्लानिंग पर हमारी सरकार काफी खर्च कर रही है और देश का ध्यान भी उस तरफ गया है। किन्तु, स्वयं सरकार ने भी कबूल किया है कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो लक्ष्य हमारे सामने थे उन लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति नहीं हुई। अब हम तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के बीच में हैं तो हमारी सरकार को इस बात को समझने की भी कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में लक्ष्य की पूर्ति जो नहीं हुई वह किन कारणों से नहीं हुई, क्यों कमी रही, क्यों खामी रही और जो खामियां रहीं उनको दूर करने की भी चेष्टा करनी चाहिये। तभी हम आगे अपने लक्ष्य को प्राप्त कर सकेंगे। नहीं तो खतरा इस बात का है कि हम लक्ष्य हर बार बनायेंगे और वहां पहुँचने के पहले हम अनुभव करेंगे कि हम लक्ष्य से दूर हैं और जो लक्ष्य हमने अपने सामने रखे थे उनसे बहुत दूर हैं। किन कारणों से, किन खामियों से हम लक्ष्य तक नहीं पहुँच पाए, अगर उनका अनुसंधान हम नहीं करेंगे, उनके लिये उपाय नहीं निकालेंगे तो मुझे इस बात का खतरा लगता है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट की यह जो तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना है वह भी उसी तरह से पिछड़ जायेगी और पूरी नहीं हो पायेगी।

बार बार चर्चा होती है कि हमारा देश कृषि-प्रधान देश है, हमारे ज्यादातर लोग गांवों में रहने वाले हैं, भारतवर्ष गांवों का देश है। हर आदमी इसके सहमत होता है लेकिन खरा गांवों की तरफ आप देखिये। यह ठीक है कि आज जहां तहां कुछ काम हुए हैं लेकिन

काम से ज्यादा जरूरी चीज जो थी वह नहीं हुई है। आजादी के बाद जिस आंधार पर काम होने की जरूरत थी, वह चीज नहीं हो पाई है। जिस चीज की कमी है वह यह है कि आजादी के बाद वह प्रेरणा नहीं आई, वह अहसास नहीं हुआ, वह अनुभूति नहीं हुई जो कि देश की आजादी के बाद हम सब को होनी चाहिये थी। हमारे सामने एक नई तस्वीर नहीं आई, एक नया लक्ष्य नहीं आया। आजादी के बाद गांवों में परमुखापेक्षिता बढ़ गई है, परनिर्भरता, डिपेंडेंस बढ़ गई है। गांवों में जहां कि लोग अपना काम खुद करते थे वहां आज हालत यह है कि लोग कहते हैं कि यह तो सरकार का काम है, सरकार करेगी, सरकार से घांट मिले तब काम होगा, जब काम सरकार के बनाकर डेवलपमेंट डिपार्टमेंट से होगा तब होगा, जब कोआपरेटिविज्म से होगा तब होगा, नहीं तो नहीं होगा। थोड़ा बहुत जो काम किया गया उसका दृष्टिकोण ऐसा रहा जो बिल्कुल सरकारी है और ब्यूरोक्रेटिक है और उसका असर आज यह हुआ है कि लोगों में प्रेरणा आने के बजाय लोगों में परमुखापेक्षिता हो गई है और उसी का नतीजा यह है कि देश में आजादी के बाद जो एक उत्साह देश के निर्माण के लिये आना चाहिये था वह उत्साह देश में नहीं आया। कोई भी सरकार हो—इतने बड़े देश में क्या एक छोटे देश में भी—अपने देश के पुनर्निर्माण का काम नहीं कर सकती है जब तक कि देश की जनता उसके लिये अनुप्राणित न हो, जब तक कि सारा देश उसके लिये अनुप्राणित न हो और जब तक कि सारे देश में इस तरह की प्रेरणा न हो। तो सबसे बड़ी खामी जो आई है, सबसे खराब काम जो हुआ है, वह यह है कि राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के जमाने में जो प्रेरणा थी, राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के जमाने में हम जो अनुप्राणित थे, आजादी के बाद की हमारी कार्यवाहियों ने उस प्रेरणा को समाप्त कर दिया है, जो पहले अनुप्राणित थे वह आज अबमरे से, आलसी से मालूम होते हैं। इसका सारा दोष इस बात पर है कि किस तरह से हमने

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

काम किया है, जो कुछ काम किया है उससे ज्यादा दोष जिस तरह से काम किया गया है उस पर है। जिन लोगों के द्वारा, जिन व्यक्तियों के द्वारा किया गया, जिस तरह से किया गया और उसकी जो पद्धति रही उस पर इसका सारा दोष है, जिसकी वजह से आज देश में प्रेरणा-शक्ति के बदले एक तरह की पस्ती मालूम होती है। इसलिये मैं यह चाहूंगा कि आगे सरकार जो कुछ भी निर्माण का काम करती है उसमें इस बात का भी ख्याल रखा जाये कि देश के अधिक से अधिक लोगों का पार्टिसिपेशन हो, देश के अधिक से अधिक लोग उसमें शामिल हों और इस ढंग से कार्य हो कि लोगों का उसमें इनीशियेटिव बना रहे। वे अगर गलती भी करते हों तो गलती करने का भी मौका दिया जाये, डेमोक्रेसी में ऐसा होता ही है। आज चीजें पहले से ज्यादा दुरूह हो गई हैं। किसी गांव वाले के पास जाइये, किसी देहात वाले के पास जाइये—चुनावों में बहुतों को जाने का मौका मिला है—तो आप देखेंगे कि आज सिद्धान्तों के पीछे उन्हें परेशानी नहीं है, सिद्धान्तों को कोई नहीं पूछता है, नीति को कोई नहीं पूछता है। आज देहात की परेशानी सिर्फ गरीबी नहीं है, घूसखोरी है, बेईमानी भी है। पहले आसानी से बहुत से काम हो जाते थे लेकिन अब आसानी से कोई चीज नहीं हो पाती है। नीचे से लेकर ऊपर तक एक व्यूह बन गया है कि उसमें से बिना-पढ़ा लिखा, बिना पैसे वाला आदमी निकल नहीं पाता है। जो कुछ भी प्लानिंग से, एड-मिनिस्ट्रेशन से, करना चाहते हैं उसके लिये आवश्यक है कि हम अपनी मशीनरी को दुस्त करे और तब ही इम्प्लीमेंटेशन ठीक होगा। आज एक चक्रव्यूह बन गया है। आज साध्य का कोई अस्तित्व नहीं, साधन की ही प्रधानता हो गई है, लक्ष्य खो गया है, एण्ड का कहीं पता नहीं चलता है, मींस डाभिनेट कर रहा है। आज सरकारी दफ्तरों की वही हालत हो गई है जो पुराने जमाने

में जमींदारी-कचहरियों की थी, आज उससे भी बुरी हालत सरकारी दफ्तरों की हो गई है। देहात के लोगों की छोटी छोटी चीजें जो कि अंग्रेजी जमाने में आसानी से हो जाती थी उनके लिये आज घूस देनी पड़ती है, रिश्वत देनी पड़ती है, दौड़ना पड़ता है। कहा जाता है कि पावर का डीसेन्ट्रलाइजेशन कर रहे हैं, हम सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण कर रहे हैं, हम देहात के लोगों को ज्यादा शक्ति दे रहे हैं, ज्यादा अधिकार दे रहे हैं। लेकिन वहां जाकर देखिये तो छोटी छोटी बातों के लिये भी देहात के लोगों को दौड़ कर सदर तक जाना पड़ता है, जिले के सदर मुकाम तक जाना पड़ता है, प्रान्तीय राजधानी तक जाना पड़ता है, यहां तक कि दिल्ली तक दौड़ कर आना पड़ता है, अगर प्रान्त में भी काम नहीं बना। छोटी छोटी बातों के लिये उनको परेशानी उठानी पड़ती है। तो सबसे पहली चीज यह करनी है कि आज जो प्रोसीजियर की दिक्कतें हैं, ब्यूरोक्रेटिक सिस्टम की दिक्कतें हैं उन दिक्कतों को दूर करने के लिये सारे सिस्टम को, सरकारी मशीनरी को ओवरहाल करना चाहिये तभी जो कुछ अच्छी बातें हम कहते हैं उनका परिपालन, इम्प्लीमेंटेशन, अच्छी तरह से होगा और उनका प्रभाव भी होगा, अन्यथा सब कुछ करने के बाद भी नतीजा बहुत अच्छा नहीं होने वाला है।

प्लानिंग की सब चर्चा करते हैं। लेकिन मुझे यह लगता है कि प्लानिंग को लेकर अगर सबसे ज्यादा कन्फ्यूजन कहीं है तो हमारे केन्द्र में ही है। यहां किसी मामले के बारे में सवाल उठता है या अखबारों में या दूसरी जगह सवाल उठते हैं कि हमारे लक्ष्य पूरे क्यों नहीं हुए हैं, तो एक डिपार्टमेंट की तरफ से मिनिस्टर साहब कहेंगे, उसके लिये जो कच्चा माल, रा मंटीरियल चाहिये था वह नहीं मिला और दूसरे मिनिस्टर साहब कहेंगे कोयला नहीं मिला, तीसरे मिनिस्टर साहब कहेंगे ट्रांसपोर्ट नहीं मिला। कोई अपने

ऊपर जिम्मेदारी नहीं लेता और एक दूसरे के ऊपर टाल देता है। इसके क्या मानी हैं ? इसके मानी यह हैं कि आज हमारी जो सारी प्लानिंग है उसमें कोई तारतम्य नहीं है, सामन्जस्य नहीं है, कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है। एक तरफ लोग बिजली के लिये, पावर के लिये लालायित हैं दूसरी तरफ आपने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा, कि किस तरह से रिहांड डेम का जो पावर है उसका कोई यूटिलाइजेशन, उपयोग नहीं हो रहा है; क्योंकि अभी फ़ैक्टरी तैयार नहीं हुई है। क्यों नहीं हुई है ? फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज नहीं है। जैसे पुरानी कहानियों में एक के बाद एक लड़ी जुड़ी रहती थी उसी प्रकार जब यह पूछा जाता है कि यह क्यों नहीं हुआ है, तो अंधेर नगरी चौपट राजा की तरह एक के बाद एक कड़ी की तरह जुड़े हुए जवाब मिलते हैं—यह रिहांड डेम का पावर इसलिये काम में नहीं आया क्योंकि फ़ैक्टरी तैयार नहीं थी, फ़ैक्टरी क्यों नहीं तैयार हुई क्योंकि मशीनरी नहीं आई, मशीनरी क्यों नहीं आई क्योंकि फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज नहीं था। इस प्रकार के सिलसिले को देख कर ही हम कहते हैं कि कुछ सामन्जस्य कीजिए, कुछ तारतम्य कीजिए, कुछ कोऑर्डिनेशन कीजिए, हर आदमी से जिम्मेदारी के साथ काम लीजिए। डीसेन्ट्रलाइजेशन विकेन्द्रीकरण, तो मुझे यहां केन्द्र में सबसे ज्यादा लगता है जहां हर आदमी अलग अलग मालिक है। यह नहीं मालूम होता है कि यहां सभी एक ही सरकार के मन्त्री हैं। जब उनका जवाब सुनिये, उनका विवरण सुनिये तो आपको यह लगेगा जैसे कई देशों की सरकारों के प्रतिनिधि अलग अलग बैठे हुए हैं, कई देशों की सरकार हों, यूनाइटेड नेशन्स हो। वहां जैसी बातें करते हैं उसी तरह के जवाब हमारे मिनिस्टर्स से मिलते हैं। इसलिये मैं यह चाहूंगा कि यह कोऑर्डिनेशन थोड़ा ज्यादा होना चाहिये, नहीं तो सारी प्लानिंग के कोई मानी नहीं है। प्लानिंग पर लगातार बल देते हुए देहात के लोगों की बात सुनिये, उनसे प्रेम दिखाइये, तकाजा कीजिए

लेकिन यदि आप खुद केन्द्र में बैठ कर प्लान कर सम्मिलित रूप से काम नहीं करेंगे तो यह उदाहरण हो जायेगा जिसका अनुकरण दूसरे भी करेंगे।

आप चाहे कितनी ही प्लानिंग करें, लेकिन जब तक उपभोक्ताओं के काम की जो चीजें हैं, जो कन्ज्यूमर गुड्स हैं, उपयोग की चीजें हैं, और दूसरी चीजें हैं उनकी कीमत पर, आप कोई रोक नहीं लगायेंगे, जब तक उसकी कोई सीमा निर्धारित नहीं करेंगे और उसके सम्बन्ध में निर्णय नहीं करेंगे, तब तक मुझे इस बात का खतरा है कि कोरे कागज पर तो देश की आमदनी बढ़ती चली जायेगी लेकिन उस आमदनी से न तो शरीरों का फायदा होगा और न श्रमिक आमदनी में सही वृद्धि ही नजर आयेगी। आमदनी कागज पर मिलेगी, रुपयों पर मिलेगी लेकिन वस्तुओं के रूप में नहीं मिलेगी। इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि प्लानिंग का मुख्य रूप यह होना चाहिये कि जो प्राइसेज हैं उनमें स्टेबिलिटी हो, उनकी एक सीमा होनी चाहिये और यह सीमा अगर ठीक हो तो आपका कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन भी कम होगा और दूसरी जगहों में, इण्डस्ट्रीज में और लेबर में, जो श्रंखल उठ खड़े होते हैं वे सारे श्रंखल बहुत कुछ कम हो जायेंगे। सब के मूल में यह चीज होती है, प्राइसेज का फ्लकचुएशन, उनका दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ना। इसलिये किसी भी प्लानिंग के हित में यह जरूरी है कि आप प्राइसेज की स्टेबिलिटी के बारे में कदम उठाइये जिससे आपको दिक्कतों का सामना नहीं करना पड़े और बार बार प्लानिंग नहीं बदलना पड़े, बार बार एस्टीमेट नहीं बदलना पड़े, और न बार बार अपने लक्ष्यों से दूर रह जाना पड़े।

नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की बड़ी चर्चा हुई है। नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन कान्फ़ेंस की गयी। मुझे भी सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ उस कान्फ़ेंस में शामिल होने का। उस कान्फ़ेंस ने कुछ फैसले लिये।

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन का काम एक सर्वतोमुखी काम है। हर तरफ से जब तक काम नहीं करेंगे तब तक सिर्फ कुछ काम बुरा निकाल दें, कभी लेक्चर दे दें, या इस तरह के छोटे मोटे काम कर दें तो उनसे ही हमारा लक्ष्य पूरा नहीं हो जाने वाला है; क्योंकि जहां तक हमारे कांसोलिडेशन का सवाल है, जो हमारी एकता है उसके ऊपर आज जो प्रहार हो रहे हैं वे भिन्न भिन्न तरफ से हो रहे हैं। एक तरफ भौगोलिक सीमाओं के आधार पर हो रहे हैं, भाषा के आधार पर हो रहे हैं, जाति के आधार पर हो रहे हैं, सम्प्रदाय के आधार पर हो रहे हैं तो दूसरी तरफ आर्थिक आधार पर भी हो रहे हैं। उसमें अगर कोई एक ही आधार को लेकर उसको सुधारना चाहेगा तो वह नहीं सुधार सकता है। इसलिये नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन का काम अगर हमको करना है तो एक आल राउन्ड एफर्ट हमको करना पड़ेगा, एक सर्वतोमुखी चेष्टा हमको करनी पड़ेगी और सब चीजोंको एक लेविल पर लाना पड़ेगा; नहीं तो दो बातों का खतरा है— एक तरफ का विकास (डेवलपमेंट) अधिक हो जायेगा, दूसरी तरफ कम होगा और नतीजा यह होगा कि जो चीज हम चाहते हैं वह नहीं हो सकेगी। यदि कोई नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की चर्चा करे और कहे उसका आर्थिक ढांचे से कोई संबंध नहीं है तो यह मजाक होगा। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। उसका आर्थिक ढांचे से भी संबंध होगा। आज कोई नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की चर्चा करे और कहे उसका शिक्षा से कोई संबंध नहीं है तो वह भी सिर्फ मजाक ही नहीं होगा, एक अधूरी बात होगी। उससे देश का काम नहीं चलेगा। वह तो उन अर्थों की जैसी बात होगी जो हाथी की पूंछ या पैर पकड़ कर उसे ही हाथी समझते थे। उसी तरह से आज नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की हालत है। जो एक चीज को पकड़ता है वह कहता है यही नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन है। मैं कहता हूँ कि नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की जो लोग जोशो-खरोश के साथ सदन में चर्चा करते हैं उनको सही मानों में उसके ऊपर भ्रमल

करना चाहिये। और मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि चुनावों के बाद कुछ लोग तो खुशियां मना रहे हैं, कुछ लोग गम में हैं—सार्वजनिक रूप से भी, व्यक्तिगत रूप से भी। गम में ऐसे लोग हैं जो या तो व्यक्तिगत रूप से हार गये हैं या जिनके मित्र हार गये हैं, या जिनकी पार्टी के उम्मीदवार हार गये हैं। खुशियां वे मना रहे हैं जो खुद जीते हैं या जिनके मित्र जीते हैं, या जो आदमी सरकार में हैं और जीते हैं। लेकिन दूर दृष्टि से सारे चुनाव परिणामों पर गौर कीजिए तो दो ही पार्टियां हारी हैं, कांग्रेस और प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी। आम तौर से बाकी और पार्टियां या तो बड़ी हैं या ज्यों की त्यों करीब करीब रही हैं। लेकिन कांग्रेस की ताकत इतनी बड़ी है, केन्द्र में उसकी सरकार है और सूबों में उसकी सरकार है। इसलिये कांग्रेस वालों को भी शायद पता नहीं चलता कि कांग्रेस भी हारी है और देश को भी इसका पता नहीं चलता क्योंकि सरकार उनकी बनी हुई है। लेकिन जैसे बनी हुई है, उसमें जरा कांग्रेस के इतिहास को देखिए, उसकी पृष्ठभूमि को देखिये और आज के इलेक्शन रिजल्ट को देखिये। कांग्रेस के आंदोलन में बिहार, यू०पी०, मध्य प्रदेश, गुजरात आदि जगहें सर्वोपरि थीं। कांग्रेस के आंदोलन से मेरा मतलब हमारी आजादी के आंदोलन से है। राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन में पंजाब का, बंगाल का बड़ा हाथ था। इन कुछ सूबों का ही मैं नाम लूंगा, ज्यादा नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। बिहार में क्या हाल हुआ है? बिहार में १९५२ में जो कांग्रेस का बहुमत था क्या वह आज है, १९५७ में जो था क्या वह आज है? इसी प्रकार यू०पी० में पहले जो बहुमत था क्या वह आज भी है? गुजरात की क्या हालत है? इसलिये आज सोचना चाहिये कि किस तरह की पार्टियां जीत रहीं हैं, किस तरह की पार्टियां हार रहीं हैं। शायद प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के होने के नाते मुझे यह कहने का उतना हक नहीं था और बहुत से लोग शायद इसका हंसी मजाक उड़ाएं लेकिन यह पार्टी का प्रश्न नहीं है। देश का प्रश्न है, देश के रूख का प्रश्न है। आज देश की

बो राजनैतिक पार्टी एक्सट्रीम की तरफ जा रही हैं वे पार्टियां गत चुनाव में जीती हैं। जो एक्सट्रीम गैर-जिम्मेदारी की बातें करते हैं वही जीतते हैं और जो एक्सट्रीम की गैर-जिम्मेदारी की बातों की चर्चा नहीं करते वे नहीं जीतते। यह डिमोक्रेसी के लिये, जनतंत्र के लिये, भारतीय परम्परा के लिये काफी घातक चीज है। हमारी परम्परा, हमारी सांस्कृतिक राह सामंजस्य की रही है। हमारे यहां क्रांति भी हुई तो सामंजस्य के जरिये से। यदि कभी धामूल परिवर्तन भी हुआ है तो उसमें भी एक घंडरकरेण्ट बना हुआ है। हमारी प्राचीन परम्परा का आज इस चुनाव ने जो छल दिखलाया है वह इस सारी परम्परा के प्रतिकूल है। इसलिये मैं आज सारे देश का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं, सिर्फ कांग्रेस का, पी०एस०पी० का और दूसरी पार्टियों का नहीं, बल्कि सारे देश का कि सब इस बात पर विचार करें कि ये चुनावों के परिणाम किस बात के द्योतक हैं? जहां तक बाहर का सवाल है अगर हम अपने देश के इतिहास पर गौर करे तो बारबार हमें यह दिखाई देता है कि जब भी हमारे देश पर संकट आया वह हमारे आपसी फूट के कारण आया। "इस घर में आग लग गई, घर के चिराग से"। हम जब तक एक रहे तब तक हमारा कोई भी बाल बांका नहीं कर सका चाहे वे पार्टियां हों, चाहे देश हों, चाहे समाज हो। आज मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि हम आपस में एक एक इलाके के लिए, एक एक जगह के लिए लड़ रहे हैं और छोटी छोटी बातों के लिए कटुता पैदा कर रहे हैं। इस तरह की चीजें मुझे खराब मालूम देती हैं और घातक मालूम होती है बनिस्वत दूसरी चीजों के। हम सब लोग आज कटुता की सीमा पर पहुंच गये हैं, जहां एक भारतवासी दूसरे भारतवासी के प्रति, एक देशवाला अपने ही देश वाले के प्रति कटुता की भावना रखता है। इस तरह से हम सब लोग आज कटुता की चरम सीमा पर पहुंच गये हैं, जिसको देखकर मुझे इकबाल का यह शेर बारबार बाद आता है :—

“शिकवए अफाए बफानुभा जो
हरम को महले हरम से है,

किसी बुतकदे में बयां करू तो कहे
सनम भी हरी हरी।”

आज वही हालत हमारे देश की भी है और हम सबको इस पर गौर और विचार करना होगा। जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में निवेदन किया कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति में एक विशेषता यह भी रही है कि विचारों और मतभेदों के चलते उन्होंने किसी को दबाने और कुचलने की कोशिश नहीं की बल्कि उसको प्रोत्साहन दिया। इसलिए अपने विचारों पर दृढ़ रह कर हम सबका मुख्य कर्तव्य यह हो जाता है कि हम अपने देश में राष्ट्रीयता और जनतंत्र को मजबूत करें और इस और में सदन के सब लोगों का और सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। इन शब्दों के साथ जो संशोकन मेरे आपके सामने हैं, मैं उनको पेश करता हूं।
धन्यवाद।

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, it is a memorable occasion in many ways when this House discusses the message of the President this year. In the first place, the occasion for discussing message of the President to Parliament is itself important. That importance is enhanced on this occasion by the fact that the President who has presided over the destinies of this great country during the past decade is about to lay down his office. And again, it is during this period that the country has passed not only through a period of intensive development but also great trials and tribulations in its formative years. So, in discussing the Address of the President, we have to have this broad perspective before us—the perspective of our policies since independence, how far the policies have yielded results, how far the nation is progressing towards the goals it has set before

[Shri N. M. Lingam.]

itself. In doing so, we have also to take into account certain factors without which we will not be able to have a sober appraisal of the state of the Union. In the post-independence era, as the House knows, we were beset with many difficulties. There was the problem created by the partition of the country; there were shortages in food; there were internal troubles created by the hang-over of the past colonial rule and the period preceding it. In fact, as one Member, put it, India during the post independence era represented a picture of co-existence of centuries. We had the bullock cart and atomic energy; we had the highest affluence and the most abject poverty in the field of material prosperity and in the field of thought, we had the highest culture and the most degrading squalor and ignorance and in the field of religion, we had the highest absolutism at one end and the most horrible fetishism at the other. It was the task of the Government to pull the country out of this morass and pilot it towards the goal of democratic socialism. The task, by any standard, by any yardstick, was stupendous. But let us see how our Government and our people have faced these problems. In the first place, we have gone through three general elections since the year 1950 when our Republic came into being. General elections with adult franchise on such a gigantic scale cannot be thought of in a country whose inherent strength and vitality is not as strong as that in India. It would have created nothing short of an upheaval in a lesser democracy. But thanks to the soundness of the heart of the country, we have withstood successfully three general elections which are unprecedented in the history of the world. This is not exaggerating facts, Madam, this is a sober and objective appraisal of what has taken place in the country during the last decade, and the importance of such an experiment in democracy becomes all the greater when we think that demo-

cracy itself is at a discount in most parts of the globe except perhaps in some of the Western countries. Of course, you exclude the totalitarian countries. They are any way excluded from the picture. If you look at South East Asia, if you look at the Latin American countries, if you look around our neighbours, democracy is either tottering or those countries are having dictatorial regimes. In this enveloping darkness, we have, by our successful conduct of the general elections and making democracy felt by all, become the beacon light to the world at large. The faith of more than four hundred million people in the democratic way of life has been thrice reaffirmed and when the President says in his Address that democracy is no longer a sentiment, it has struck roots and, therefore, Parliament is respected by this country, it is a mere statement of fact. It is this matter, Madam, on which the country and this Parliament have to congratulate themselves, that we are firmly established in the democratic way of life.

And then, taking our economic objectives, we have laid down the socialist pattern of society as our goal. People sometimes wedded to other ideologies or because they are not able to see eye to eye with the ruling party, decry this goal. They say we have not defined socialism, "Where is our socialist pattern?", "How far are we from it?" and "It is no more than a slogan and a cliché." But Madam, we are clear in our mind that not only because of the compulsion of circumstances in our country but also because of the trends in world economy, there is no alternative to a socialist goal. And what exactly do we mean by a socialist goal? It is not a doctrinaire approach to this objective. It is deliberately so in our country, but broadly speaking, it is the raising of the masses of the land. We are convinced that unless the masses are raised, unless we preach to the masses the gospel of help, the gospel of salvation the gospel of social raising up, there

is no future for the country. Call it socialism or whatever name you give it, that is our goal, and this Government is wedded to that goal and it is with all its earnestness implementing its policies towards the attainment of this objective.

It may be true, Madam, that in the beginning we are not able to achieve this goal, to see that every individual in this vast country has the basic wants of life, has shelter, has adequate clothing, has education and everything that would constitute the beginning of a socialist society. It may be also that in the first two Plan periods the income generated by the implementation of the Five Year Plans goes more to the organised industries and to the sector which has already had the advantage of economic power. That does not mean that we are deflected from the goal. We are only finding out how far we are prevented from achieving our goal as speedily as possible. It is with this view, Madam, that a committee of experts has been appointed. This committee has, probably, taken more time than Parliament expected it to take, but it is better to wait for the findings of this committee because the House is more keen and the Government is more keen than the Opposition that the income generated by the implementation of the Plan does go to the largest number in the country.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: What does the hon. Member mean by, "The House is more keen than the Opposition"? I am unable to understand this as if the Opposition does not form part of the House.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I said the ruling party is keener than the Opposition itself. The House itself is keen. The ruling party, more than the opposition, is keen that we should {

have the earliest possible probe into the directions into which the benefits accruing from the implementation of our Plans go. But the point remains, Madam, that our goal of socialism is unalterable and whichever party comes into power, it has got to keep that goal in view . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Wishful thinking.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: . . . because no party can thrive for a day if it abandons that goal. Any intelligent student who studies the economic trends in the world and the compulsions of the economy in the country will find that any party which is not wedded to the uplift of the masses, which I call socialism, cannot face the masses for single day.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Even Swatantra Party?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: The Swatantra Party may imagine that it can rule the country with some other ideology but it will find when it comes to power—if at all it comes to power—that it cannot pursue any policy other than that of socialism.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : How would you distinguish this party from pink conservatism or liberalism?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: My friend, Mr. Sapru, has referred to conservatism.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have used this word with reference to British Conservatism.

SHBI N. M. LINGAM: I submit to the House that these words, "liberalism" and "pink Conservatism" have no relevance to the condition obtaining in our country. They may have meaning in relation to the economic state in which some of the Western democrats find themselves, but here in India, with four millions of people, stooped in the most abject poverty, there is no goal other than socialism. Any further explanation in this connection would be only academic and, therefore, Madam, I do not want to take the time of the House in elaborating my point. But as far as we are concerned, we have no alternative to socialism and democracy.

It is true, Madam, that the democratic content is sought to be deepened by other processes because in a vast country, for democracy to be successful, it is not enough if the people go to the polls once in five years. The people themselves have to be given a feeling, a sensation that they are partners in the governance of the country and in shaping their own destinies. It is with this view, Madam, that panchayati raj has been inaugurated all over the country. It is too soon to measure the success of this experiment, but its basic objective is to give a new dimension to democracy because no other country in the world has to cope with the problem of democratic governance wedded to planned economy. It is, therefore, that we have through this experiment of panchayati raj attempted to give the people a feeling that they are also partners in this grand adventure at building up a new India. It means that the real power has to develop upon the levels below. This is called democratic decentralisation. It may mean a mere slogan if the State Governments do not by legislation part with power to the lower levels. I believe this process is going on, in various degrees in all the States in

the country. In any event, that is the goal. The Government has set before it that the people below the district level should be masters of their destiny in most matters concerning their day to day government and that they should feel that they are taking part in the building up of the country. Unless this is done, Madam, democracy will function only at the top and people will not be affected by the policies that we frame here, however glorious or however good-intentioned they may be. So, Madam, during the last decade the foundations have been laid for socialism, for democracy and for economic development through which to attain this socialism. And this Government is firmly wedded to these three goals, and I do not think that any party here could seriously assail the Government on these policies. These policies have yielded results and to the extent that we mobilise our resources, moral and material, we will achieve the goals we have set before us.

In the international field, we have played no insignificant role. We were cavilled at in the beginning that we were sitting on the fence and that we had no clear policy with regard to our relations with other countries but now the world has realised that we pursue a clear policy and that we cannot be diverted from this policy by any development that is taking place internally or externally. The image of India in the world to-day is of a country which is wedded to peace, which is wedded to the cause of coexistence, which is wedded to the policy of friendship towards all countries. This image now has become so impressive or so indelible in all the countries of the world that our foreign policy is being increasingly understood. How do we propose to pursue this policy of peace and friendliness? It is through our untiring efforts to lessen tensions and through efforts to bring about disarmament in the world,

total and complete disarmament. We are wedded to it. It is true that our voice is not a major voice in shaping the policies in influencing the policies of the major powers in the world but we do claim that by our unswerving loyalty to this policy of peace and friendliness we have succeeded in influencing the thoughts of other nations and that already results are being seen towards the goal of lessening of tensions and disarmament in the world. However arduous the method, however long the goal, we mean to adhere to this policy of friendliness towards all nations, this policy of pursuing the path of peace through disarmament. This is largely the image of the country.

Externally we are wedded to peace and internally we have laid down the goals of democracy, socialism and national planning. The country has judged the Government by its policies in these matters and it has returned the party in power with a fresh mandate which means that the country stands by these goals and these policies which the Government has set before the country. So it is an occasion on which we have not only to look back but look forward¹. The future years are going to be the most challenging ones but we can weather those storms also and the only sanction for our strength to weather such storms is not the compulsion of the dictator, not the bludgeon that is wielded by the dictator or any other immediate advantage, material or otherwise, but only allegiance to common ideals, unswerving allegiance to ideals and the dedication of the nation towards the implementation of these ideals. These are the only sanctions behind you. It is not even military power. In other words, the co-ordination of the wills of the country, national integration, can be brought about only by the allegiance to common ideals and by the dedication of the nation to reach these ideals.

It is a historic occasion when we consider that our revered President

has presided over this most important period in the history of India and that he is laying down office at a time when not only the country but the world itself is at cross roads. It has to choose between total annihilation and an era of unprecedented plenty, peace and prosperity, for all. But the President, as the Head of the State of this great country, has spared no pains to do his best for the achievement of these objectives and it behoves us to thank him for all that he has done not only during the past year but during the past decade. I would seek your permission to quote a small tribute to the President with which, I am sure, the House will entirely agree.

"Gentle by nature, scholarly by bent, steeped in the traditions of the country, and utterly dedicated in his patriotism and devotion to national interests, President Prasad represents in a unique way, the best and finest manifestation of the Indian genius. The country will wish him good health and strength of spirit in the coming years which he proposes to devote to unostentatious service to people."

I am sure the House entirely endorses these sentiments and we are doubly proud that the distinguished Chairman of this august House is succeeding to this high office.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):
Provided you vote for him.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Provided we live to vote also. So we have occasion to rejoice because our President has successfully completed a decade or so and the new President is going to be the distinguished Chairman of this House who has guided the destinies of this House so ably.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have a submission to make. I think you will agree with me that when the Address of the President is debated in the Houses of Parliament, someone more than a junior Minister need be present. I am glad Mr. Naskar is here but not one Minister . . .

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY (SHRI P. S. NASKAR) : Madam . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I appreciate your being present but one Minister of the Cabinet rank should be present and I have been watching it. I understand that our Parliamentary Affairs Minister has been promoted to Cabinet rank and it seems that he has not yet cared to manage in a way that when the discussion on the president's Address takes place in the House, at least some Ministers of the Cabinet should be present to listen to hon. Members. In the interests of good conventions of the House, I would request you to take note of it and see that this kind of thing is not repeated.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: I associate myself with the suggestion made by my dear friend Comrade Bhupesh Gupta and I hope you will kindly see to it that we are not treated like this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister here will convey this. However, a Minister is here . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the point I raise. The Minister is present, I see and you are also good enough to draw our attention to it but are you satisfied that no Minister of the Cabinet, or Member of the Government, so to say, of Cabinet rank is present in the House when almost all the Ministries are supposed to be taken up in the course of the discussion on the President's Address? If it were a question of conveying what is said in this House, then the stenographer's reports are there. A copy could be sent to the Ministers and no Minister need be present. Therefore, I would ask you to consider this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I think you have tired me. I have told the Minister

here to convey it. In any case there is the junior Minister in the House for the present.

SHRI P. S. NASKAR: All the points raised by hon. Members here will be answered in the reply.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But it is better that another Minister is also here.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I also associate myself with the feelings expressed now by my hon. friends here about the presence of Ministers in this House during this debate. I think it is something *dum* to the dignity of this House, to the position and status of this House that a Minister of Cabinet rank is present here, particularly when there are so many of them. Madam, it is not as if we are short of Ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are so many of them.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, I am coming to that later.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the only thing that is in surplus.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But for this interruption by my hon. friend here—a necessary and timely interruption of course—I was going to begin my observations by taking this opportunity to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by hon. Members on both sides of the House about the retiring President, President Rajendra Prasad. Madam, it is not necessary for me to dilate on on this. Dr. Rajendra Prasad has been an old and devoted servant of the country and his life will be an example, an inspiring example, for future generations in our country to copy, in all walks of life, as a student, as a scholar, as a servant of the country, as a person who came forward to sacrifice his all when the country's call came. Madam on behalf of my group in this House, I fully associate myself with the sentiments expressed.

I think it is due to him that the Government do take note of the sentiments that he himself expressed a few months ago, I think, while he was speaking before the Law Society, as to what state the President has been reduced to under the present method in which the Constitution has been working. He has his views. But he cannot function. He cannot do anything. Is this right, this procedure or this interpretation of the Constitution as it has been going on steadily in the last twelve years, the reduction of the President to a total non-entity? Is it worthwhile?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Madam, on a point of order. It is not fair to the President to say this, because the President referred to it as an academic question. He did not refer to it as.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I think I am fully in order in referring to it and in asking the Government to take note of that remark. Mr. Akbar Ali Khan need not become so great a defender of everybody. You have no reason to interrupt me and I do not give way. Will you kindly take your seat? I do not give way. Madam Deputy Chairman. I do not want to give way to this uncalled for interruption.

Coming as I do from Gujarat, I have particularly another reason to be grateful to Dr. Rajendra Prasad. Two years ago, perhaps three, when Gujarat was very much agitated, when the Gujaratis were asking for a separate State of Gujarat, it was Dr. Rajendra Prasad who was good enough to show us the greatest sympathy when the Government took apparently a very adamant attitude.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I would also join in expressing our good wishes to our Chairman about the events that are about to take place and about which there is no doubt. So there is *no* impropriety in referring to them. I am sure every person in

this House will feel very happy and very much gratified at that.

Madam, the mover of this motion[^] as also the President's Address itself_l refers to the elections. I am in entire agreement with my hon. friend here on the point of procedure and of having two Addresses by the President within such a short time. I do not know whether we are able to do justice to the Address or whether he is himself able to do justice to it, in presenting two Addresses, one before a House that was on its last legs and then repeating it after reducing it to a smaller scale, before the new House.

AN HON. MEMBER: And omitting some things.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, omitting some portions referred to in the previous Address. I think one Address by the President indicative of the policy of the Government, of the policy that the Government proposed to pursue in the future, before the new House[^] would have been more appropriate.

Madam, the mover of the motion began by giving us also simultaneously a discourse On Gandhism. Madam, I wish he had kept the name of Gandhiji above politics. The Father of the Nation is revered and respected by all of us and it is better that we keep his name out of controversy His saying and his writings are before us for anyone who wants to understand him. They are very easy to understand. He has all his life been opposed to any type of regimentation to every type of stateism, and to the very last day of his life. I do not understand how friends on that side of the House can quote Gandhiji and say that we are progressing towards Gandhism. We may be progressing towards socialism as it is known in the modern sense of the term. But surely that is not Gandhism. Gandhi-ji's way of socialism was different from the way that is being followed by our Government here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope Gandhism has found its way into the Hawaii Mahal at Jaipur.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: My friend is far from Gandhism, for everything he looks to a different place, a place which is outside this country, as everybody in this House knows. So I do not want to join issue with him on that.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the general election; are just over. I wish inner counsels had prevailed and the advice given by many people to the present Government to give up office six months before the elections had been followed. If they had done so, then perhaps we would have had a cleaner and better type of elections.

We need not repeat all that was said on the President's Address on the previous occasion. I would only say that it is not possible to characterise the elections as completely free from pressure, from influence or the use of the Government machinery. Madam Deputy Chairman, you will remember in this House in the November session, I think, I drew attention to repeated abuses by Ministers of their office and the machinery of Government, how the machinery of Government was utilised for their personal elections and also Government planes. There was even the opening of small railway station just to project persons before the public. To these things I had drawn attention here. I had also drawn attention to how the Home Minister of Gujarat went about in a procession of seven jeeps, with the Collector and the Deputy Collector, the police and so on, following him. I am glad the Chief Minister of Gujarat issued an order against it, but I cannot say that that order of the Chief Minister was followed. I know it for a fact that it was more followed in the breach than in the way it should have been. Therefore, the advice that was given to the present Government to vacate office for six months before the elections would

have given us a better and cleaner type of elections.

Last year when we were discussing the Company Law, all sides of the House opposed to the Congress party, had requested that the making of gifts from company funds should not be allowed.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I want to ask a question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am afraid this is the one thing which has led to all this abuse and the steadily mounting cost of elections. You can get money from companies and you can spend it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Patel is so loud in his own voice that I cannot get my question across.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Have I to give way to an interruption?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): Not necessary.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am asking a question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Am I at liberty to take notice of a question, if I want or not to take notice of it if I don't want?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Patel can take any course he likes. I do not expect any standard in that respect.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam Deputy Chairman . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He is asking a simple question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If the present Government had accepted that advice, perhaps we would have had a better and cleaner election and the reflection on the Government system also would have been better. Onco

the use of official machinery for improper purposes is allowed or connived at, there is no end and in our State, in a growing democracy when we have yet to build up traditions, when we have yet to inspire sufficient confidence in the services that they would be protected even if they remain neutral and that they need not take the side of the Government,— before these traditions have been established in the country—it is all the more necessary that the ruling party should have taken the advice that was given to it.

SHRI ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Patel would be good enough to permit me a slight intervention.

Madam, Mr. Patel has made reference to good conventions. I would like to request him to bear in mind that when another hon. Member politely asks a question and wants to intervene, it is one of the well established conventions and practices all over the world to give way unless there are ! compelling reasons to the contrary, and I do not think that there were any reasons to object to answering the question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: My chief reason for not answering his question was this. My time is limited. I have so many things to say in the limited time that I have before me. Therefore, interruptions of the type and the questions which were not really serious or pertaining to this but were only of a type to interrupt my thought or argument, I believe, I am completely right in disregarding.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, on a point of order. I seriously object to the statement that the question was not well meant or that the question was only intended to disturb Mr. Patel's coherence or incoherence of thought, I seriously object and you must give a ruling on this point.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: May I submit that there is no point of order? I said

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair is on its feet. Will th^ Members please take their seats? There is no point of order. According to Parliamentary conventions, interruptions are permissible but in this case the hon. Member has explained that he wanted to be within his time-limit of fifteen minutes and as such he did not give way. Therefore, Mr. Patel will continue and finish within his time.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, with all respect to you, he went much further. He reflected on m, motives in asking him a question and this is not permissible.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam Deputy Chairman, I did not cast any aspersions and it was not intended to cast any aspersions. I said I was being disturbed without any sufficient reason. That is all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has explained the reasons very clearly.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: This is exactly what I feared. I have lost my chain of thought. He has proved exactly what I was trying to tell him. He has proved my case.

Madam, I was talking about the necessity of forming clean traditions, of laying down a clean way so that the services would feel confident that if they took up a neutral attitude in the elections there would not be anything for them to fear. I am afraid this is very clear from what has happened all over and I have given you the example of what happened in Gujarat, the Home Minister going about in his jeep in a procession with the Police Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner of Police and'all that. This thing did not stop even during the elections. This does not build up very happy traditions.

[Shri Dahyabhai Patel.]

There is reference to planning and the speaker from the opposite benches himself said that the Planning Minister, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, himself had admitted that even though we are planning and we are trying to give better income, we have not succeeded in giving a larger income to the ordinary wage-earner or worker because prices have kept on increasing as the average wage has gone on increasing, the average earning of the citizen has gone on increasing. What better proof do I need to say that this planning has not succeeded? Besides, look at the money that has been spent all over. How much of it is productive? Look at the large sums of money that are being spent on public undertakings. What is the return that the country is getting? It has been admitted that we are getting less than one per cent. We are borrowing money from all over the world on interest at 5 per cent., 6 per cent., 6½ per cent., 7 per cent., and I think it is going to be 8 per cent, very soon. What are we earning on that? One per cent. How can we praise this planning, Madam? I think what is wrong with planning is that we are not doing first things first. We have just got an idea of doing big things making big shows and whether they give return or not, we must put up a big scheme. Look at the Damodar Valley Project or the Bhakra Nangal Project. We must invest so much of money in them and whether the country gets return or benefit from them will be seen later. This is a very serious matter which needs to be investigated. Coming from Gujarat, Madam, we have had the example of two large schemes supposed to be hydro-electric schemes undertaken by the Government, the Tapti Scheme and the Mahe Scheme. They have been left half way and now the Nar-bada Scheme is coming up. Even last week the hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power was absolutely non-committal and he could give no information on the matter. I asked, "When is it going to come? What is the

plan of the scheme? What is the cost?" Well, the whole matter is under investigation. The foundation stone of this scheme was laid by the Prime Minister a few months back before the election and he made so many promises and said that this scheme would give so much and so much. I am inclined to think that it was only for the vote, and, therefore, I am pointing out that the whole planning is only to get the vote of the people. There is, therefore, this basic flaw in every scheme, everything that is put before the country and I suppose Mr. Hathi, my hon. friend sitting opposite, the hon. Minister who was dealing with Irrigation and Power and who has now been given Information and Broadcasting, will have to . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not in charge of Information and Broadcasting.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Your information is wrong.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He has gone to Planning and I hope he will take it and . . .

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Every steel mill, every project is for the vote ultimately, no doubt about that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I wish part of the benefit would also accrue with the vote.

I must also point out, since there is reference in the President's Address, something with regard to the progress of oil exploration in this country. This is another matter on which Gujarat is very sore. Deposits of oil have been found in Gujarat. Madam Deputy Chairman, you have been abroad and you know that all the South American countries have built up their economy on oil. Where-ever oil was found, within two years they had their refinery and they became exporting countries. What is

the state of affairs in this country? We are going on arguing about the opening of a refinery, site for the refinery and so on but nothing happens. Our Minister makes repeated trips to Europe, discusses this and discusses that but there is no progress. This is particularly tiring in a region like Gujarat where we have large industries but unfortunately no coal. Coal has to be hauled to Gujarat from a distance of a thousand miles. In the case of steel plants there is shortage of coal, and so every third day there is a threat of closure of the textile industry which is the largest industry but other industries are virtually shut down for half the period for want of coal. Gujarat has legitimately a grievance against the Government for not attending to this and I hope the new Government will pay attention to this. We want a speedy remedy to this. If there is oil, use it. Do not waste time on arguments and do not select the best agricultural, garden land for putting up your refinery. There is so much land in Gujarat very near the promising oilfields which is not so useful, which is not so rich, which is not so much inhabited. That could be utilised for putting up your refinery. After all, if you are going to put up a pipe-line in Gujarat when you have found two or three promising areas of oil in different areas, whether ultimately the refinery is at one place or another, the pipe-line from one end will have to be extended. So, it is not the cost of the pipe-line. It is consideration of what would be the best in the interests of the country. And particularly when there is so much shortage of coal, it is most advisable to see that the oil that is available is put promptly to use in place of coal when there is such a shortage of power. Gujarat suffers from an acute shortage of power and also from a high cost of power. In Bombay we have power at half an anna a unit for heavy industries. In Gujarat it is 2] annas. Why is this difference? Then, in some States, where there is plenty of coal available, they are having hydro-electric

schemes. In Gujarat there is no coal. There are prospects for setting up industries. The people are industry-minded, but industries cannot be built up because of the high cost of power. These are things to which the Government should apply its mind and attention and try to solve them early. Thank you very much.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, in less than a fortnight our President will retire from the exalted office which he has filled with dignity and distinction in our country. He is one of the builders of our national movement. His has been a life dedicated to the service of noble causes and we have *no* doubt that in his retirement he will continue to serve those noble causes. We wish him happiness and prosperity in his retirement.

May I say that the President's Address is divisible into two portions? It deals with domestic issues and it deals with some international issues. I propose to say something about international issues. Our domestic policy was explained very ably by my friend, Mr. Dinkar. Now, the first question to which I would like to make a reference is that of Nepal. We have very close relations with that country. We had the honour and privilege of a visit from the King and Queen of Nepal to our country. We are anxious that the people of Nepal should develop along their own lines. We have no desire to interfere with their way of life. There is, in my opinion, no question of conflict of interests between us and Nepal. We have, however, a common interest in safeguarding some human values. Now, we cannot hand over the men who sought asylum in our country to the Nepalese authorities. That is unthinkable. We are a democratic country and we are proud of our democratic traditions. There is a writing on the wall which kings and dictators would do well to remember. The British monarchy has been able to

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] survive all these centuries because it is based upon the people's will. The British monarch is a constitutional monarch.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Chairman, is it permissible to read a written speech without the permission of the Chair?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am not reading a written speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is a written speech.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU I am not reading. I can refer to notes. And if it comes to that, not even referring to notes, I can go on talking perhaps better than what Mr. Patel imagines he can.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have no doubt that the hon. Member can talk better than I do, but that is not the point. There is something more than that. Can I not retaliate sometimes?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You wanted time. I think you should give time to Mr. Sapru now.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I do not conceal my utter contempt for the party of which my friend is the leader, and I think it is permissible for a Member to say that the party is a contemptible party.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Have you heard the remarks of Mr. Sapru? I think, Madam Deputy Chairman, you will see that I have been completely justified in ignoring his interruptions now and in future.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The British monarch is a constitutional monarch and constitutional monarchy is in the interests of kings who claim to rule by some divine right or the right of heredity. It is to be hoped that the King of Nepal, who is a far-sighted

man, will read the signs of the time carefully. It is not easy for a small country to play off one country against the other. That is not the way to build up the foundations of a good State. Therefore, let me say, in all humility, that while we want our relations with Nepal to be improved, while we have every desire to respect the independence of the Nepalese people, there are certain principles which are dear to us and which we cannot sacrifice even for the sake of so-called friendship.

I will now refer to the more important question of China. I know that some people are very sensitive about this question of China, but the existence of a big neighbour cannot be ignored and I am unable to understand those who think that we can solve this border problem which we have with China overnight. I think that China's attitude is reprehensible. I think China's attitude is unreasonable. But international questions cannot be settled by a pettifogging attitude. On international questions, for an international settlement, it is necessary that China should be brought into the picture and it is, therefore, in my opinion, incumbent on those who are seeking disarmament and who want an atom-free zone in Asia to see that China gets her proper place in the United Nations.

Having said this about China, I shall go on to consider certain world issues. But let me say a word about Pakistan. We have at the moment a discussion going on about Kashmir. It is an eternal problem with Pakistan in the United Nations. General Ayub Khan has told us that Hindus have been an aggressive nation or aggressive people throughout the ages. They drove out Buddhism and they are going to drive out Islam. Well, we are going to do nothing of the kind. We have a responsibility for our forty million Muslims in this country and we cannot allow the problem of Kashmir to be discussed in a manner which will accentuate communal feelings in this country.

It is open to General Ayub Khan to appeal to the General Assembly, but I think the General Assembly is wise enough to know how to estimate things, his moves and counter-moves.

Let me now say a few words about the international situation. It is a matter of the deepest disappointment that there has been a resumption of nuclear tests. Now I am not going to fix the responsibility for this resumption of nuclear tests. As a matter of fact the pattern was set by the Soviet Union unfortunately, but I would say that both the Soviet Union and the United States have now a sufficient number of nuclear weapons to destroy the human race. What is then their objective in multiplying those weapons? Why do they want to perfect those weapons? The possibility of a nuclear war cannot be eliminated unless these nuclear tests disappear because any accident . . .

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Miscalculation.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: . . . miscalculation on the part of any mad man might lead to a world conflagration. Agreement on this is absolutely necessary. Personally, I look upon Mr. Bertrand Russell-- I prefer to call him Mr. Russell instead of Lord Russell—as the prophet of the new age, and our Prime Minister has very valiantly, even at the risk of being misunderstood by both the Powers, taken a definite stand against nuclear weapons. I wish some of us could make up our minds to sign the pledge which Mr. Bertrand Russell wants us to sign against these nuclear weapons. They are evil, they are morally reprehensible, they should be banned, and there should be no "ifs" and "buts" to our disapproval of nuclear weapons. It is a misfortune that the Conference did not start as a Summit Conference. This is not my view. This is the view of a liberal paper, the "Guardian". It has been writing consistently in that strain, and the reason for that is this.

The Soviet system of government is somewhat different from the British and the American systems. The British Foreign Secretary and the American Secretary of State, and even a British Minister of State, can speak with an authority which even Mr. Gromyko does not possess. The only person who can speak with authority—that is the Soviet way of looking at questions—is Mr. Khrushchev, and perhaps the wiser course would have been to start the Conference not with a preparatory meeting of the Foreign Ministers but with a Summit Meeting at which some questions could have been settled by the leaders of the nations taking part in it.

There are a few questions on which the peace of the world depends. The first of those great questions, big questions, is that of Germany and Berlin. We who knew what partition is sympathise with the desire of the people of Germany for a united Germany. But we have to recognise, existing fact, and the fact is that East Germany exists, find you cannot go back to the days of 1945 or 1946 when the Potsdam Agreement was arrived at. Much water has flowed down the—Ganges does not exist there—down the Danube since the days when the Potsdam Agreement was arrived at, and I think it is essential that there should be some recognition in some shape or form of the existence of East Germany.

The second question is that of Berlin. Here again, I do not think that a purely legalistic view should be taken of the rights of both the blocs regarding Berlin. Berlin, as the Prime Minister told us, raises a human problem. There should be free access between East Berlin and West Berlin, but whether the West's interests can be best guarded by the presence of a few American troops or the presence of NATO troops is a debatable matter. Indeed the presence of these troops may complicate matters. When you are dealing with big problems, you

[Shri P. N. Sapru..]

have to show a certain amount of trust, and therefore I would like this question of Berlin to be viewed from a new angle.

Connected with the question of Berlin is that of nuclear-free zones in Eastern Europe and disengagement. One used to hear until two or three years back a great deal about the Rapacki Plan. It was modified by Mr. Gaitskell, and he put forward a plan of his own. Now we hear very little about the Rapacki Plan or the Gaitskell Plan. I think it is necessary to have in Eastern Europe an area of disengagement. A nuclear-free zone in this area seems to be indicated. Without some such approach the problem of Germany cannot be solved. You cannot blame the Poles and you cannot blame the Russians if they cannot forget the fact that twice within one generation Germany for one reason or another has disturbed the peace of the world, and therefore a realistic view has to be taken on this matter. Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan must not act as if they are echoes of what Dr. Adenauer has to say. I have very great regard for Dr. Adenauer. He is a very great patriot, but patriots sometimes take a very narrow view of the immediate interests or even of the ultimate interests of their country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken more than fifteen minutes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Then, have I exceeded my time?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Well, Madam Deputy Chairman, the Geneva Conference is not concerned with China and it is not concerned with Laos and Viet Nam but if there is to be peace, these questions too have to be settled and it occasionally strikes me that perhaps one method of approach is to settle these issues one by one and

after these issues have been settled, to see whether disarmament can be effected and, if so, how. By disarmament we mean not only the banning of nuclear weapons but also the reduction of conventional weapons. The difficult question of verification also arises and suggestions or proposals have been put forward by neutral countries which deserve consideration by both the blocs. For example, it has been suggested that there should be neutral zones or neutral check-posts established in neutral countries, and if there is any reason to suspect that there has been any nuclear explosions, then the neutrals should have the right of requesting the country concerned to have an on-the-spot inspection. If the country so requested refuses to respond, the world will be able to draw its own inference. Another suggestion which has been put forward is of zonal sampling. In any case, the question of verification cannot be just bypassed and on this question, I think that it is necessary both for the Soviet Union and the United States of America to take a realistic view. Possibly, the Soviet Union feels that it is somewhat weaker than the United States of America in nuclear weapons. Possibly, it is haunted by the fear that any system of inspection will lead to espionage. But if we allow this fear to haunt us, we shall never be able to arrive at any agreement or solution. The real problem before the neutral statesmen who are attending the Geneva Conference is to take objective attitudes and to put forward solutions which would bring the two States together so that the world may be able to enter upon an era of peace and prosperity, peace and prosperity for the colonial peoples of the world or the under-privileged peoples of the world, for peoples who have never enjoyed the good things of life. I think that the new Algerian agreement has complicated matters a little because Algeria has yielded on the question of giving facilities to France for testing nuclear weapons in the Sahara. But if a solution is arrived at on the major question of the nuclear test ban, this.

agreement will not stand in the way because Fiance will be a party to this agreement.

Now, just one word. I have just indicated the way in which my mind is working on these international issues because the question before mankind is one of survival. Bertrand Russel has written a new book "Has Human Race A Future?" It is for us to answer that question, and I hope that the answer is that the human race has a future, has a much bigger, better and brighter future than the golden age of which *my* revivalist friends are so fond of. Madam Deputy Chairman, we have in our domestic policy to pursue the programmes of social justice, programmes which will enable the common man, the tiller of the soil, the worker in our factories, the clerk in our Ministries, to come unto his *own* inheritance. Under the system which we are working today, glaring inequalities may be inevitable but they are certainly not in accordance with my concept of the ethical life for which man has struggled through ages and which was taught to us by Gandhiji.

Thank you very much for the time that you have given to me.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Madam Deputy Chairman, first of all, I would associate myself with all the sentiments that had been expressed in this House on all sides about our retiring President. I had already referred to it even during the discussion on his Address last time and, therefore, I do not propose to dilate very much on that nor do I propose to refer to the question of foreign policy or of international affairs. I hope these subjects will be dealt with by other members of our party later. Just now I would like to refer to one or two questions which have been raised in the President's Address.

The President has once again focussed attention on the fact that this Government is wedded—or this

House is wedded—to the idea of socialism or "The socialistic pattern of society. And my friend, Shri Lingam—I take him to be a typical representative of the party which runs the Government and which has proclaimed its goal—was at great pains to define what that meant. Of course, many people ask what it is. Unfortunately, it is a subjective thing. These are his very words. When I was listening to him, I was just reminded of the great Upanishadic saying that somebody wanted to define *parabrahma*; they could not define it. "It is not this, it is not this"—"*Nethi, Nethi*". This is the general reply. Similarly, my friend, Shri Lingam, a typical representative of the Congress Party, when he was faced with the problem of defining what that socialistic pattern of society to which his party was wedded was, ultimately came to the conclusion that it was raising the level of the common people, the upliftment of the common man. This is all the definition that he has been able to give us.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you mean by 'typical'?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: That is, people like him more or less, on the average. So, from that you can understand what that goal is. Therefore, may I ask him this question? What is the difference between your goal which you defined in 1951—the Co-operative Commonwealth—and this socialism, this uplift of the masses? At that time, you did not have the goal of the uplift of the masses when you defined the Co-operative Commonwealth. May I know what your goal was later on when you defined your goal as a welfare State? Did it not mean uplifting the masses? What is the difference? In 1956 at the Avadi Session of your Congress, you proclaimed that your goal was from then onwards going to be the socialistic pattern of society. And when you are faced with the problem of defining what it is, all the answer you are capable of giving is uplifting thf

Shri P. Ramamurti.] masses. What is the difference? Please tell me, I would like to know what the difference is.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Madam . . .

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am not yielding to you. Later on you can take your chance.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I shall give an answer right now. There was not much difference between the two except that by socialism we mean that the masses must be uplifted in the earliest possible period.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: At that time you wanted to lift them slowly, but now you want to lift them with greater speed. I am glad, but I do not know if any other member of your party accepts this definition and I do not know if your Prime Minister accepts it. Anyway, later on my friend, talking about these policies and how these policies have been worked out, said, "Maybe, there are some difficulties today. A Committee of the House has been appointed to probe into the distribution of the wealth that has been produced. Maybe, that that Committee has taken a lot of time on account of certain difficulties but, none the less we have appointed a Committee." After all, what is the meaning of appointing this Committee? What is the purpose of appointing this Committee? It only means that we have got to find out what are the difficulties we are faced with so that later on we can adopt measures in order to overcome these difficulties. This is the answer. This is how he was speaking.

Now, what are the terms of reference of this Committee? What is it going to probe into? It is supposed to probe into the distribution of the national wealth. Now, may I ask whether the Government does not know this when you have proclaimed your objective in the First and the Second Plans that the objective of the Plan is to even out the distribution

of the national income? At the end of the Second Plan, when you are formulating your Third Plan, was it not incumbent on you to find out how exactly the national income has been distributed in this country? And does it require a big Committee to go into the whole question? I do admit that a Committee, perhaps, would be able to find out things more precisely. It is quite true. But are there no statistics with the Government of India? What has the Reserve Bank of India been doing all these years? Are there no reports of the Reserve Bank of India? Year after year, the bulletins of the Reserve Bank of India are published every quarterly. Are these not sufficient data before the Government to see that concentration of wealth has taken place during the last ten years, an amount of concentration the like of which has not been seen even during the 150 years of British rule in this country? Does it require a Committee to probe into this? I will give you some figures, figures taken from the Reserve Bank of India bulletin. In 1960, for example . . .

AN HON. MEMBER.- You have made a probe into it.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I have not. These are all Reserve Bank of India figures, an institution run by the Government. In 1960, for example, out of the 29,874 registered companies, or about 30,000 companies in this country, do you know how much were the assets of 100 companies? The total assets of all these companies were Rs. 1,652 crores whereas the assets of just a hundred companies amounted to Rs. 1,017 crores. Does it not show concentration? Does it require a Committee to probe into? This is the whole question. Here are the Reserve Bank figures. I will go still further. I will take about 14 companies and I will give you the names of the companies with their assets: —

(In	crores)
Rs.	
Tatas	290
Birlas	291
MafatJal's ...	23
Walchand ...	20
Mahindras	14
Dalmias ...	80
MartinBurns ...	88

All these together add to Rs. 776 crores. Out of the total assets of rupees sixteen hundred odd crores in this country, these 14 houses alone control nearly 50 per cent. Does it require a probe by a Committee?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: But how many shareholders are there in these companies? Have you gone into that?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Yes, yes. We know what these shareholders do. We know how the companies are able to control the interests. We know all that.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Please give the figures for the clarification of the House.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I have got to explain to my friend that despite the existence of shareholders, companies are controlled by certain interests who hold the controlling interest in the shares. This is a simple question of capitalism. I am sorry to have got to explain this simple thing.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I am sorry, Madam, that my hon. friend does not realise that benefits do go to a large number of shareholders out of these companies,

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I know what I am talking about and the House also knows what he is talking about. These shareholders control so much assets. The controlling interest of so much assets in this country is in the hands of these 14 houses. This is such a simple thing which anybody understands. Do you want to know about the profits? 202 RS—6.

Madam, just during the last four years, 1958 to 1961, what was the profit in that?

All-India Index of Variable Dividend, Industrial Securities

1957-58	.	.	.	1266
1958-59	.	.	.	148-8
1959-60	.	.	.	161-7
1960-61	.	.	.	182-6

From 126 the dividend index rises to 182. Very good for these industries, no doubt about that. Does it require a probing Committee? Probably this Committee is required to probe into how this money is being distributed. My friend talks of socialism. And do you know about dividends? I will give you the example: —

Lakshmi Mills, Coimbatore

1958	12%	1960	30%
1959	20%	1961	30%

TELCO Bengal Papers

1958	22%	1960	12j%
1959	32%	1961	32%

Within these four years they made more than their capital. I can give you companies in this country which have made 1% times their capital in the last four years by way of dividend. This is what has been happening.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: This is not a complete picture unless you give us the shareholding base of each company.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Well, even if I do not give you the shareholding base, here are the facts that within four years, the profits declared by these companies have been equal to 150 per cent, of the entire subscribed capital. What do you call them? Do you call them profiteering, or do you call them ordinary profits? This is what is happening in this country. And what are the policies that are now placed before us by the President to see that these things do not take place in future? Nothing whatsoever. The same thing will go on merrily.

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

Concentration takes place not only in industry but concentration takes place in banking also. I will just give you some figures. Here are the figures worked out. Total number of private companies in 1948-49 was 584. In 1960 they were reduced to 350. And at whose expense did this reduction take place? The number of private companies with deposits over Rs. 25 crores increased from 6 to 14 in this very period. Then, the aggregate deposits held by the banks holding more than Rs. 25 crores amounted to Rs. 889 crores. They increase from Rs. 284 crores to Rs. 889 crores. These 14 banks in this country control deposits amounting to nearly Rs. 889 crores. These were the figures in 1960. Now these figures have increased, nearly Rs. 900 crores of the total deposits out of just Rs. 1,200 odd crores in all the banks put together. And who are these people who control the banks? They are the very same people who are also controlling their interest. Does it require a probing committee to probe into this whole question? Are we to understand that our Ministers, sitting on the Treasury Benches, are just children who do not understand these things? Certainly, they do. And if they do not understand these things, certainly they are not fit to be in the Ministry. I certainly credit them with intelligence. I credit my hon. friend there, certainly, with intelligence. He understands it. He knows what is happening and he is just interested in these developments. That is my charge. He knows that. Therefore, it is just these things which are taking place in this country. And when it comes to the question of taxation, then of course, we know what it is. We will deal with this later on when we are dealing with that point.

Now, Sir, I would like to point out one thing. For example, I would like to bring the excise duty on cloth to the notice of the Minister now itself because the matter is very urgent. I have received a telegram two days

back that in Madurai all the power loom factories have closed down. Why? For the simple reason that when you impose excise duty on cloth, on the textile mills—there are textile mills and textile mills—there are the textile mills of Bombay which are composite mills, where yarn is produced right in that very mill and it is transferred to the weaving department. They do not go through the process of paying the profit to another concern. But here are the small factories, power loom factories where they buy the yarn from the spinning mills. They have got to pay the profits there. And do you know the fluctuating prices of the yarn in the market? Now, these people have got to pay this excise duty. I am not going into the question of desirability or undesirability of the excise duty on cloth itself. That is a different question. But I want to point out that the immediate result of this is that the small people who have to buy the yarn from somebody else are not therefore able to stand the competition with the big millowners today. They find themselves in the lurch and they have to close down their mills. Today they are in a bad condition. Therefore, something has to be done immediately with regard to these small power loom factories. It came in the papers also.

Another point in this connection is, when this is the type of development that is taking place, how do you expect the other objective of the Plan namely that there should be evenness in the development of our country and that the unevenness in the economic development that is there, the disparities as between regions and regions should be overcome as quickly as possible? How do you expect that objective to be realised at all? After all we know that despite all that the Government might say—my friend was waxing eloquent about the public sector industries but after all we know—the public sector industries are confined to a few heavy industries. The bulk of the industries of our country, the manufacturing industries and all

the other industries are in the hands of private industrialists and it is they that control them. The banks control them and all these people control them. Where do they have these industries? My friend knows, for example—if he goes through the number of licences he has given during the last year—where the licences were given most. I have the figures but I cannot go through them. His own Ministry has published a book which says that up to 1957 so many licences were given in the various States, according to the States. If he just goes through the book—till 1957 and later on up to 1960—he will find that the number of licences given to Bombay, West Bengal and some other States—mostly these two States—is the greatest. Uttar Pradesh suffers, Orissa suffers, Madhya Pradesh suffers and a number of others . . .

AN HON MEMBER: Andhra.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Andhra suffers, Kerala suffers and all these States suffer. Why? It is for the simple reason that these things are not in the hands of the Government. After all the capital resources are held by certain people. They will start industries where they like and they start industries precisely in those places which they think are of the greatest advantage to them. No wonder therefore, that industries are developing or concentration of industries is taking place around certain areas. Just go from Bombay to Surat and see the number of factories that have come up there. I am not envious of Bombay. I want Bombay also to build up but at the same time what is happening? Money has a tendency, capital has a tendency to invest that capital precisely in those areas where advantages have already been established. Therefore, what happens is, when these private industrialists go and develop industries in certain areas, disparities, far from disappearing, go on day by day increasing. This is what has been happening during the last 10

years. Naturally, how can you fight, for example, tendencies which do not feed] that the country should be united as a result of this? It is from that point of view that these have to be looked into and to long as you pursue this policy of greater and greater concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people, you will not, under any circumstances, be able to see that this disparity in the distribution of our industries is removed as quickly as possible. You may have the licensing authorities but I also know that the very people who have got the power of wealth, will be able to control the authorities who are actually licensing. Despite the Minister, they will be able to control the authorities. They will be able to buy up those people also. We know that. That is why I say that unless there is some fundamental solution, unless this problem is fundamentally attacked, attacked at the very base, it is not possible to get round all these difficulties that we are faced with inevitably. These are bound to be there and as a result of it all sorts of lop-sided developments in the country take place, all sorts of movements develop. You talk of unity of the country, this and that. They will just become *mantras*. I want to particularly point out that these are grave problems which we have to tackle and tackle very quickly. It is from this point of view that I want our Government also to think of the problems facing us, not only the industrial problem but also the other problems of an emotional nature, with a better understanding. My complaint is, they do not understand this. For example, take a simple question. Here is the State of Madras. Many people in Madras desire that this State should not be called by that name which has been given to it by the Britisher. Certainly Madras is not a Tamil name. Nobody understands what that name Madras is. It was given by a foreigner, by the Britisher and they want that State to be called by the name of the people who inhabit that State. They want it to be called the Tamil Nad. Why should this Government stand

[Shri P. Ramamurti.] in the way? They will say that we are trying to blame the Madras Government. Your party Government there is so cussed that it cannot understand the feelings of the people. Here are the people. It is not only the people of a particular trend that demand it. The people of various political trends are demanding it but despite that, ultimately the Government of Madras, the Government of that State was compelled to say—it took them about 3 to 4 years—"Hereafter when we refer to our State in the Tamil language, we shall call it Tamil Nad tout in the English language we will call it Madras." What is this?

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose demand is this?

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: This is a demand which has been put forward by everyone of us and I am demanding this very thing. Here is the Government that refuses to accept even this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is a Bill pending in our name.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Comrade Bhupesh Gupta has given that Bill long ago and the Bill has been pending for a long time.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: How does it advance the cause of socialism which has been so dear to you?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: When I am talking on the President's Address, I am not talking of only socialism, I am talking of the entire approach of the Government to the problem of socialism, to the problem of democracy, to the problem of national integration and I am talking of everyone of these and that it is from that point of view that I want to point out that even an understanding of the emotional urges of the common people of the various States concerned becomes absolutely essential and here is a Government

that refuses to understand these simple things.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: You do not realise that you are stealing the thunder from the speech of Mr. Anna-durai tomorrow.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I do not think that Mr. Annadurai will want words. He will talk about it. You need not bother about him.

There is another question which I would like to mention in this particular connection. In the other House I was told, questions were raised and there was an answer but in this House there was no reference to it. Now, on the 10th of this month, there was a firing in the An damans. Now, the Anda-mans is a territory which is directly administered under the Central Government by a Chief Commissioner. I want to ask the Government this. Do they not owe a duty to the House, do they not owe a duty to the people that when a firing has taken place in a territory which is being administered directly by the Government of India, which has no Legislative Assembly—there the people cannot go and ventilate their grievances—is it not the elementary duty and the first duty of the Government to come forward before the Houses and place before them and give them whatever information they possess and tell them what has happened? Here is a Government that has refused to do all this. Somebody in the other House raised a question and later on I find that the Minister concerned first said that they would have an enquiry by the Chief Commissioner of the Andamans. I am referring to the attitude or mentality of the Minister. Here is a territory which is directly under the Central Government administration and the Chief Commissioner is a person who was also responsible for the firing, who was present there and that is the officer who has to go and enquire. That is the first attitude. Of course, later on I know that the Home Minister had agreed that he would send a

judicial officer from the Maharashtra State to enquire into the whole question but it required shouting from all sides of the House, it required prodding. That shows a certain mentality or outlook towards the common people of the country. Here is a case where nearly 7 or 8 people have been killed and it is a brutal that took place. About 500 people had gathered there. What was their demand? It is not a question of constituting an enquiry to find out why this firing had taken place. That is not the only question. The justification or other-wise of the firing alone should not be the terms of references. What were the causes that led to the whole episode? We do not know. Nobody has told us what exactly happened in that place. This is an island far removed from here. There are no daily communications between India and the Andamans, no newspapers and no newspaper correspondents are there. Therefore, all the more it is incumbent on the Government of India to tell us what the facts are. As far as we know—we got letters—we learn that out of about 40,000 people in this area, about 15,000 are workers. There are workers working in the forest department and there are also workers working in the Public Works Department. About 5,000 workers working in the Public Works Department are being paid—you know what? Rs. 17/- as basic wage there. They came directly under the service of the Government of India. All these years, was it not necessary, was it not incumbent or correct or reasonable, to implement the recommendation of the First Pay Commission in their case? The First Pay Commission wanted a basic wage of Rs. 30/-. But as far as these Public Works Department workers are concerned, even today they get only this sum of Rs. 17 as their basic wage. The First Pay Commission had *come* and gone. The Second Pay Commission had also recommended and their recommendations have been implemented in other parts of the country. Even in the Andamans, I am told as

far as the forest department is concerned, the Second Pay Commission's recommendations have been implemented.

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

But as far as these 5,000 P.W.D. workers are concerned, no rise in wages has been implemented and they are still getting Rs. 17/- as their basic wage. From last year January they have been making attempts to see that the Pay Commission's recommendations are accepted in their case also. But they were being told that the matter was under correspondence with the Government of India. One year has gone, but there is no decision. Last January there was a demonstration before the Chief Commissioner's Office. They said they would immediately wire to the Central Government and find out whether they could implement rates immediately. January, February and March have passed and now April.

AN HON. MEMBER: The whole year will go.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: In February and March, these people refused their wages as a protest. On the 9th April they went, we understand, before the Chief Commissioner's Office to demonstrate. They sat there quietly for twelve hours. At 4 o'clock the office closed and they also dispersed. Next day some other people were sought to be brought to work, an attempt to get black legs. On the 9th there was a strike. Afterwards when the black legs were brought, there was a sort of picketing. The black legs also refused to work and on the 10th some 500 people squatted and all refused to work. Then in the presence of these 100 blacklegs who did not work they decided to disperse the people. Tear gas was used and then lathi charge and ultimately firing took place. The means of communications are scarce. It is very difficult to get information. But the letters we got

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

from there show—I don't know but the allegation is—that the shooting was to kill and not shooting in order to see that this crowd dispersed. We are not told whether any government official received a single injury. But, on about 500 people the firing took place and about five persons died, three more died the next day in hospital, and about 50 were wounded and all the injuries are on the head. So this brutal firing took place. We do not know what else happened in this far-off place. But from what little information that comes, it seems about 150 or 200 policemen were brought from another place into the Andamans and they were let loose on the people there. Persons speaking a particular language were taken there and it is said that were told to go and beat those people. I do not want to name the language they were speaking, for I do not want anyone to think that I am trying to incite anyone. But the fact is there. Now, it behoves this House to look into this and to have a proper enquiry. That enquiry cannot be by a judicial officer only. He will find whether the actual firing on that particular date was justified or not. I want to urge upon the House and to urge upon the Government to have a full enquiry, particularly since we are dealing with an island which is about 700 or 800 miles away. Communications are so poor and rumours will be set afloat. Rumours will be there in Madras. Rumours will be let afloat in Kerala and in Andhra Pradesh, and no amount of denial by the Government of India will wash them off. Therefore, I want to urge upon the Government, in order to allay all apprehensions it is absolutely essential that they should associate Members of Parliament belonging to all sides of the House with this enquiry. At least we should know when this enquiring officer goes there. After all, they are workers absolutely under the thumb of the officers there. They can threaten the workers, intimidate them. No lawyers are avail-

able there. Under these conditions any enquiry even by a judicial officer, conducted there without the assistance of other people from outside will be absolutely a farce. Therefore, it becomes absolutely essential that in order to allay misapprehensions that are likely to be created in the minds of the common people of Madras, in the minds of the common people in other parts of the country, that Members of Parliament are also intimated before this judicial officer goes there so that people who are interested at least, may go there. And what is more, the Chief Commissioner and the Deputy Chief Commissioner who gave the order to fire, should be forthwith transferred from there, for any enquiry that is conducted there, under conditions of intimidation that they are capable of practising there, is going to be a farce and it is not going to satisfy the people. I want to warn the Government of this. This is a very important matter, because if you do not conduct the enquiry in the proper way, feelings are going to be roused in certain parts of the country and you alone will be responsible for that. It is the duty of this House, it is the duty of the entire people of this country to satisfy this feeling. That is why I say that it has become essential and this must be taken seriously and with that enquiry must be associated Members of Parliament. That has become absolutely essential. I am not stating this for any propaganda purpose. I am saying this because if you do not do it, you will rue the consequences later on. Therefore, I urge upon the Government to take steps for this and also to immediately transfer the officers concerned and to see that a proper enquiry is conducted.

I think I have taken the time allotted to me and I leave other things to others of my party who will follow.

Thank you.

SHRI S. C. DEB (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman, first of all I will express

my gratitude to the President for delivering the Address to both Houses of Parliament. I also support the motion of thanks that was proposed by my esteemed friend over there.

The President in his Address has mentioned some very important issues and one of them he refers to in paragraph 4 where he says:

"Our planned economy is the basis of our material development and of the maintenance of a dynamic, social and economic equilibrium."

This is the crux and the whole essence of the Address he has delivered. This is the deep idea in 'our country's Plan on which our future development depends. There are persons who say that the Plan has not been carried out. The criticisms are there. But I would say that there has been thoughtful planning now and every party is joining in the formulation of the Plans and so this kind of abstract criticism is not worth much and it does not help anyone.

For our development, we must go forward in a planned way. Maybe, there may be some discrepancies here and there; there may be some weaknesses here and there. That may happen. There are weaknesses, human weaknesses also. They are in the Government also, in some machinery also. There are weaknesses somewhere and they may fail somewhere. We cannot foresee everything fifty years or one hundred years hence. And in industrial development, technology is the most important thing that requires the best attention from the Government, and we are gradually acquiring knowledge about technology and science. But our goal is there—a planned economy and the socialistic pattern of society. With that objective we are going forward. And our Industrial Policy Resolution also has clearly enunciated this principle and there is no room for criticism there. So, with that objective, policy and principle, we

must proceed. Now, here in his Address also our President has been pleased to mention about village and small industries. How the big schemes, the big industries, are to be developed and where they are to be developed, these things will be the concern of the Central Government, and the public sector is there for that purpose. But there is one thing. If we are to employ our people in a planned way and also the educated youths who are coming out every year in larger numbers—we must have small industries and village industries and they should be developed for serving the nation as a whole, and that is the most important thing that we ought to face and solve. There, our Prime Minister always stresses on one point; that is, the generation of power. In whatever area you go, you should have power. We must plan for it for five years, ten years, fifteen years. Not only big projects for the generation of power, but also small units for power generation—all kinds of projects for the generation of power, thermal and other things—should be there, and that is the most important thing for the village and small industries to be developed. When we ask that question, we find that there are many drawbacks. There are many things lagging behind. I would like to bring to the attention of the Government one thing. They say that there is a scheme to develop small industries. But where is your power generation programme? That has to be seen. I come from a backward area. There you cannot develop any big industries. One party came to start the paper industry, that programme was there. They went back, they failed. Other parties were there. It is because there are so many difficulties and the difficulty of power also is there. But for small industries, small units of power generation can be developed and that should solve the problem of that particular area—Cachar, Manipur, Tripura. This is my headache. I always beseech our Government and beg of them to draw up an economic plan for the development

[Shri S. C. Deb.] , of that area. The suggestion is there. Educated youths are moving about here and there, creating noise, going this way or that way, because they do not find opportunities in life, better avenues in life. They do not find any employment. Therefore, I beseech our Government most humbly again and again: you draw up an economic plan to develop that area. If there are difficulties there, bring that matter under your first consideration. Develop power resources there. Draw up a plan for that area and develop the whole of the area. And the most important thing is to develop the small industries and the village industries. Whether the State Government comes forward or not, it is the duty of the Central Government. Because of partition that area is neglected. It should not be neglected for all time to come. That area must be developed. Frustration cannot be there always. That being so, I beseech our Government to consider the question and chalk out a plan for the economic development of the whole of that area.

Then, our President has mentioned about the oil refinery at Barauni, at Nunmati and all that. Our Prime Minister went to Nunmati in the early part of January and the refinery was commissioned. But because of the difficulty of laying pipe-lines, oil was to be moved by railway and there was great difficulty. Now, we hear that that difficulty is over. And there is also a proposal for the laying of a pipe-line from Nunmati to Siliguri and also from Calcutta to Delhi via Barauni. It is a great project. This is a heartening matter of course. But, the difficulty is there for construction of pipelines and for my part, I would like to impress upon the Government that from Siliguri to Nunmati, a separate broad gauge line should be there. I think that a plan is there for it. Our State Government also finds difficulty and is pressing that another broad gauge line, from Siliguri to Nunmati should be

constructed. It should be taken at the highest level. It is not only the Railway Ministry that can do it; a decision should be taken at the highest level on that matter also.

Now, our minds are always worried by the Naga trouble. A separate Administration is there. Still the Naga trouble is going on. The other day there was looting; people were killed.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI (Madras): On a point of order. There are four clocks which show different timings. By which clock are we to be guided?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Well, it is already 5.00; I thought that I would allow him to speak for five minutes more so that he could wind up his speech.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: By which clock are you going? Are they for show—these four clocks?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Two minutes more, Mr. Deb.

SHRI S. C. DEB: As you announced, please give me five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Try to finish the speech quickly.

5 P.M.

SHRI S. C. DEB: Now, because of the Naga trouble, we are hearing many things. There was looting. People were killed. Trains cannot move. The other day one truck and one jeep were attacked. People were taken away by the Naga hostiles. Today we find from the papers that they have been released. Also, we hear that these Nagas are going to Pakistan to contact Phizo. I asked a question the other day whether there was any effort on the part of these hostile Nagas to move out of our country. The Government say that they are not aware of it. Though

they are not aware of it, things happen. Phizo, who was there before, escaped from that territory where trouble is going on. They must take note of it. The Naga problem should be solved here and now.

People cannot wait for long. It is not also a good thing for the Government, seeing that for ten years or twelve years now the trouble has been going on. We cannot comb out that particular area. A large concentration of forces is there and for so many years we have been spending money. We cannot comb out the particular locality where these people are creating trouble. It must be localised and that trouble should be put an end to.

Now, one thing more I want to say before I finish. In our part the only economically important industry is the tea industry, and that is deteriorating every year. A few days back I heard that there was a drought there. Last year also because of drought the crops failed. There was loss. It is a loss to our national economy. It is not only a loss to that part. It is earning foreign exchange. If you neglect it, it will suffer.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore):
The crop estimates show that there is an increase of 7 per cent in that area.

SHRI S. C. DEB: Last year the crops failed and there was a loss in that particular area. The tea industry is deteriorating there. Our Minister, Mr- Shah, knows it well. He went there. He is in charge of the exports department now. Exports are very important for our country. The whole country is interested in export promotion. So, I beseech our Government most humbly to see that this particular industry is developed properly there. Development programmes and other things are necessary for this. The reports are there. The Plantation Enquiry Committee's Report and many other reports are there. The Tea Board cannot do everything. What is our Government for? There should be a programme for actual development, where deterioration is going on, where we are losing money. That is the main thing. Our Central Government must see to it and solve it

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past five of the clock on Tuesday, the 1st May 1962.