

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

you run the Government. You prove that money has been received. What is the use of this kind of irresponsible talk?

Now, Sir, there is another thing about which I would like to draw pointed attention. The Madras Government issued a Communique on the 23rd November, and it was published as a Government Order in the Fort St. George Gazette, which stated that in order to avoid any kind of doubt that official machinery was being used for the purpose of elections, Ministers would not participate in official functions such as opening of this or that. But immediately after that, even before the ink was dry on that Government Order, Mr. Kamaraja Nadar, the Chief Minister of our State, participated in such a function. He was the main actor in the function and he turned the first sod for the opening of a railway line. The railway line was not opened but the first sod was turned for the Virudhunagar-Manamadura rail link. Then Mr. Kamaraja Nadar turned the first sod in the Salem-Bangalore rail link. Mr. S. V. Ramaswamy, the Deputy Railway Minister, was also a participant in that function.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Ramamurti, you will continue after lunch.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT ON RAILWAYS FOR 1961-62

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN): Sir, on behalf of Shri Jagjivan Ram, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for grants for Expenditure of the Central Government on Railways in the year 1961-62.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS) 1962-63

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN): Sir, on behalf of Shri Jagjivan Ram, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the year 1962-63 in respect of Railways.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

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

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Ramamurti.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Before we start, where is the Minister? None is here. I am told that the President's Address, like the Government, has been returned. Where is it? Has it been returned to the lobby? I think we should adjourn. Shall I send a search squad?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Let us wait.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think the adjournment should be recorded. Not one from the Government is here, neither big, nor medium, nor small.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Now a Minister is coming.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now a Deputy has been discovered. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA): I am sorry, Sir.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I was just drawing the attention of the House to the fact that just on the eve of elections, despite the solemn declaration that the Government itself had made, we found important Ministers like the Chief Minister of our State and the Deputy Railway Minister going to participate and even playing the chief actors' roles in what is called the turning of the first sod for the new railway lines that are to be opened, I do not know when. And mind you, these two places are located exactly in the constituencies from which these two Ministers were contesting. Again there was Dr. Subbarayan. I do not think he would have normally attended any such function but I found him one day in Kulattur, an obscure village in his Parliamentary constituency, opening a public telephone call office. Anyway, these are the wonderful ways; this is the morality. After making a solemn declaration that they will not participate in such functions, after making a solemn declaration through a Government communique in the Official Gazette, this is how these things are carried out in practice. I can go on multiplying instance after instance. Even if these things cannot be brought under 'corrupt practices' listed in the Act, I think it would be worth-while if the Election Commission undertakes a probe into the amount of development works that have been carried out in particular constituencies, particularly in difficult constituencies in which the Chief Ministers of States were contesting, in which certain important Ministers of the State concerned were contesting. And I dare say the report of such a probe would be a very interesting document. I am certainly not opposed to carrying out development schemes but why should certain constituencies be singled out, constituencies which happen to be particularly difficult for the Congress party to win from?

320 RS-4.

Sir, these are the things we have to take note of if elections are to be run fairly and squarely.

There is another matter also to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. In 1960 our Prime Minister went to Kerala at a time when his own party, despite all constitutional proprieties, despite all the resolutions that they themselves had adopted, carried on a violent struggle against the legally elected Government there and the Prime Minister was good enough to go and advise the Kerala Ministry to resign on the alleged ground that they seemed to have lost the confidence of the electorate. Actually when elections were held some time later it was found that the party had not lost the confidence of the electorate but on the other hand the percentage of votes polled by the Communist party had increased.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Only the seats had decreased.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Percentage of votes, I said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And the number of votes.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Both quantitative as well as percentage. The percentage of votes had increased. Here now you were holding parliamentary elections and the issues involved are the same. What did the results of the elections show in Kerala? Out of the 126 Assembly constituencies which comprise the 18 parliamentary constituencies in that State, the results showed that the Congress—P.S.P. combine was able to get a majority only in 40 and the percentage of votes polled by the Communist Party and by those people whom it supported, whom it sponsored, had gone up to 49.5 per cent. The number of Assembly constituencies in which the Communist Party and its Independents had secured a majority amounted to 77. These are

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

the figures. Now, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is not proper on his part to advise the Kerala Ministry to resign and order fresh elections. Applying the same standard which he applied to another party, is it not the proper thing for him to do? The Deputy Chief Minister of Kerala, Mr. Shankar, had said the other day that constitutionally we were not bound to resign but there was also the question of morality involved. What exactly was the question of morality involved, he did not choose to expand. But today when actually it has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt—last time the Congress Party was able to get a majority by its unholy alliance with a communal party, only because of that and not by the strength of its own policies—that it no longer commands that majority because the Muslim League no longer supports it, why should not our Prime Minister come forward boldly and ask the Kerala Ministry to resign and face the electorate by holding fresh elections? Constitutional propriety apart, morality demands it. In Great Britain, even if a series of by-elections go against the ruling party, sometimes they go to the polls and they seek a fresh verdict of the people. Even if a series of county council by-elections go against the ruling party, the ruling party resigns and they hold fresh elections. This is what happens in that country. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he should not now advise the Kerala Ministry to resign and face the electorate. Whatever might be the verdict of the electorate in a fresh election, I am not bothered about it. But morality requires that they should do it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Did your group in the Lok Sabha resign when the verdict in the mid-term elections for the Kerala Assembly went against it?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If we had been in the Government then the

question would have arisen. We are not in the Government and therefore the question of resigning does not arise.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: So you prescribe different moral standards for the Government and the Opposition?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Absolutely not. In 1960 you sought the verdict of the people for the purpose of ruling the particular State. Today I tell you, you have lost the confidence of the electorate and you are not fit to rule the State. That is all I am concerned with. I am not concerned with who rules what.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is convinced.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I say, you are not fit to rule there. That is all.

I would only refer to one or two things more. The President has made a reference to the Code of Discipline and industrial relations and my friend, Mr. Arjun Arora, had been good enough to refer to the fact that the Code of Discipline is violated mostly by the employers. He was referring to the employers in the private sector but I would like to refer to the employers in the public sector industries. I am glad, Sir, that yesterday's newspapers carried a news item that the strike in the Heavy Electrical Company at Bhopal had been settled. But then why was it necessary for the workers in that particular industry to go on strike for nearly a month? This is something which has got to be gone into.

SHRI P. C. SETHI (Madhya Pradesh): Because you wanted to win that election.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: After all we had nothing to do with it. It is an independent union and because of the cussedness of the management

right from the beginning that this thing has been going on there, strike after strike. I would like to give the facts for the edification of my hon. friend. If my hon. friend, Mr. A. D. Mani, who comes from Bhopal and who edits a paper, had been here, he would have been able to throw a lot of light on this unfortunate strike. What has happened? Here is a case where right from the year 1960, ever since this factory went into production, I am not sure whether the management has been producing switchgears, transformers and things of that kind or whether they have been producing strikes. This is not the only strike. During the last one and a half years there have been five strikes. This is the fifth strike that has taken place. And on what grounds are these strikes taking place? Why is it necessary for the workers to go on strike on simple questions? In 1958, for example, there came an order from the Ministry asking them to constitute what is called a Staff Council and immediately a Staff Council was constituted, a puppet Staff Council was constituted by the management without reference to the workers. Then, afterwards again when they were forced to have an election, a Staff Council was elected. After the Staff Council was elected, in its very first meeting the Chairman and the Secretary were elected unanimously. The Secretary happened to be a worker and the Chairman happens to be the Resident Director, Mr. Sarangapani. They were elected unanimously. But in the very next meeting Mr. Sarangapani comes and says that the person who had been unanimously elected as the Secretary of the Staff Council was not acceptable to him and therefore he would have nothing to do with the Staff Council. Is this the way to behave? I would like to know whether any management can behave in this way? For example, is it open to the workers to go and say that they do not recognise the management? Here is a management which has the temerity to say that the Staff Council which has been elected by the workers, and

whose Secretary has been elected unanimously by the Staff Council, is not acceptable to the Chairman and, therefore, he will have nothing to do with the Staff Council. Here is a machinery that has been set up by the Government after a good deal of discussion in the tripartite conferences and this Staff Council has been rendered absolutely ineffective. Then afterwards what happened? In 1959 again a new Staff Council is elected and there again the Staff Council is not acceptable to the management, to Mr. Sarangapani. He does not allow the Staff Council to function. A series of letters are written to the management asking them to convene a meeting of the Staff Council. I would like to ask the Ministry to go into the whole question and find out how many times the Staff Council that was elected in 1959 and 1960 met, how many letters had been written to the management to see that the Staff Council was functioning, and why was it that the Staff Council did not function? Then, again, what happens? What, then, is the machinery available when the management treats the elected Staff Council in this fashion? What is the machinery at all for conciliation at the bipartite level? Where is the machinery? Then, what happens? There is the Industrial Relations Act of the Madhya Pradesh State which came into force on 31st December, 1960, more than a year ago. Then, a particular union which had on its rolls a membership of over four thousand, comprising sixty per cent. of the total complement of workers, particularly embracing the entire artisan class, the engineers and the top skilled class of people, writes for recognition under that Act. That Act provides that if a union having a membership of the majority of the workers applies for recognition, that question has to be gone into. It has to be enquired into by giving notice to the parties concerned. Was any such thing done? No such thing was done because it did not suit the Madhya Pradesh Labour Minister, Mr. Dravid, that an independent union should

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

command the confidence of the majority of the workers and be recognised. And he asked the management to recognise an INTUC union because it is his stooge, as if recognition is some favour to be conferred on the workers and not something which the workers have a right to get. Therefore, he asked them to recognise the INTUC union. Then, what happens? Even the normal method of settling a dispute is not open to the workers. During the last one and a half years how many strikes have taken place? First a strike took place in 1960. On what grounds? Here were the trainees who were trained for years and they were sent to production work as fullfledged workers. But when they were engaged on production work they were not given the salary of fullfledged workers. The management continued to pay them the salary of trainees and they had to go through a strike in order to impress on the management that it was committing a serious mistake. Later on they had to give them that salary. Then, again, within a few months another strike took place. It is on account of the England-returned engineers, all those engineers who returned from England, who had been sent by the management to England, who had been trained for nearly two years in England. When they came back after their training, the management refused to give them the emoluments which were due to them. These sixty engineers had to go on strike. They had to go on strike in order to see that their terms were accepted. Then again immediately afterwards there was another strike. And what was this strike for? This was the strike of the watch and ward staff, the security staff. Two of the security staff were killed in a jeep accident. The jeep belonged to the factory. The jeep was going on the factory's work. Two workers were killed. And here was a cussed, wooden, heartless management that refused even to help the workers' families to have a proper burial and funeral. It is again on

account of their cussed attitude that the workers went on strike. The entire staff, the entire workers joined in the strike. Afterwards the Commissioner of Police intervened in the whole question. What was the attitude of the management as a result of that? After that they dismissed six of these people. Again, this inhuman attitude of the management resulted in a strike. Then, later on another strike by six hundred 'A' class artisans took place. What was the reason for that? After having been trained, after having undergone a test, the management said; "You have to undergo a test again." The artisans refused to do so. They said, "We have already undergone a test. You publish the results of the test." The management refused to do that. Then, they went on strike and Mr. S. N. Banerji, a Member of the Lok Sabha, ran up there. Discussions took place and the management said no tests had been held. The workers produced the papers that were given to them by the management in writing in that test. The question papers were produced. The management's game was up and they had to admit that the test had been held. Then the management agreed that they would hold tests only for those workers who did not attend the previous test due to sickness or otherwise. This is the way the management has behaved right from the beginning. And my friend comes and says, 'Because the Communist Party has had to win an election'. We have been contesting elections throughout the country. We have contested so many seats. In industrial areas we have contested and we are not manufacturing strikes in every place in order to win an election. Here is what the Prime Minister, who went there, said:—

"The employees should get justice, more than justice. If the officials are bad, they should be transferred. The demands are not such that a strike should be resorted to."

It is easy for the Prime Minister to say that the demands are not such

ever which there should be a strike. But unfortunately the attitude that the management has adopted in this particular factory is such that the workers have no other go, no other weapon, except to resort to strike. Even on such simple questions as the allocation of quarters, they have to go on strike. The rules are there. The minutes of meetings are there as to how the quarters are to be allotted to the workers. But all that is violated. Then, what course is left to the workers, except to assert their right? Appeals to the Prime Minister, appeals to the Minister concerned, appeals to the Home Minister had not got any result. The Prime Minister certainly says a very good thing when he says that if the officials are bad they should be transferred. But of what use are such utterances when the practice is different? I would like to ask, in a public undertaking of this type, if we have got such a wooden-headed, bureaucratic officials who do not understand what industrial relations today mean, what should we do?

They do not today carry out even the law of the land. When the law of the land says, for example, that a particular union has got to be recognised on the basis of the strength of its real membership, the union is not recognised. The management refuses to let even the Staff Council function which is today a statutory obligation. Here is a management which thinks that it can do whatever it likes and the workers are there to submit themselves as slaves. There is something rotten in this public sector undertaking. It is a serious matter. I am not talking of all undertakings in the public sector. Here is a particular undertaking which is a very important undertaking for our future electricity development. We have got to depend upon it for the manufacture of turbines, for the manufacture of transformers, for the manufacture of switch gears, and so on, on which we are spending so much of foreign exchange today. In this particular factory hundreds and thou-

sands of people have been trained, and they are to be the nucleus for building up the future transformer and heavy electrical equipment factories in other parts of the country. Therefore, it becomes particularly important that the person or persons who are put in charge of an undertaking like that behave properly, that they show proper understanding of what exactly are the rights of the workers, that they do not try to behave as some Nawabs, and if they behave as Nawabs, they should go out. We cannot keep them. They are unfit to be there. Parliament has got a right to see what exactly is going on in these undertakings. Therefore, I would ask the Government to undertake a serious enquiry, not by some officials but a serious enquiry in which the Members of Parliament are effectively associated, because we have sanctioned hundreds of crores of rupees for many of these public sector undertakings, and we have got a right to know what is happening in these undertakings, what these officials who are put in charge of these public undertakings are doing. If they are people who are unfit to have proper relations with the workers, then they have to go. Here is a management which refuses to abide by the rules and regulations framed by the Government itself. What are we going to do about that? That is why I say that we have got to go into the whole question very seriously and take proper action against the officials concerned. Otherwise the future industrial development in this country is in jeopardy.

Lastly, the President has talked about so many developments that have taken place. When you were speaking, Sir, you also had spoken about many of the developments, and you quoted statistics of so much cycle production, this production and that production. All that is very good. What I would like to point out here is this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have taken thirty minutes already.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then that watch must be wrong.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Eight minutes he has taken before, and 22 minutes now.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I will just refer to one thing. In 1952 when our Prime Minister inaugurated the First Five Year Plan, that is, when the first Parliament was constituted, at that time our Prime Minister had drawn pointed attention to one fact. He said:—

“We have to develop industry in that major way, but always remembering that all the development of industry in that major way does not by itself solve the problem of the hundreds of millions of this country.”

Further on, he says:—

“We have seen in other countries that economic growth does not necessarily mean national growth. We should not think that growth of the nation comes merely from the shouting that takes place in the market places and stock exchanges of the country.”

Expanding it he said:—

“Political democracy, if it is to have any meaning must gradually, or if you like, rapidly lead to economic democracy. Without that, if there is great inequality in the country all the political democracy and all the adult suffrage in the world does not bring about the essence of democracy.”

I underline that—

“Therefore, your objective has to be the bringing about of more equality and a more unitary society.”

Sir, when you are quoting these statistics, or when the President is quoting many of these statistics, I wish that they remembered this fact and also quoted the other side of the

statistics and found out how this increased national income, increased national wealth has been distributed in this country. I am not going into the whole question, because there is not much time for that, we had a Committee to go into that question, what happened to that Committee? Whenever we are discussing the development on the economic front in our country, is it not necessary for us also to think in terms of the distribution of national income and national wealth? What is taking place in the name of socialist pattern of society? Are our activities today directed in order to reduce these inequalities or are they actually accentuating these inequalities? This is the prime question which I would like the Government to answer, which I would like the Ministers to answer. Otherwise all these declarations are so much verbiage. They are very brave words, socialist pattern of society, democratic socialism, and so on. All these things are very brave words, but when it comes to a question of actual practice, what do we find today in our country? We find growing concentration of wealth in the hands of a few families. Financial institutions, like banks, are in the hands of a few families. Similarly, industrial concerns are in the hands of the same few families. This is what is happening in our country. This is not something which is very desirable, and the projection of this has also taken place in the newspaper industry. The latest report of the Press Registrar says that nearly 61 percent of the total circulation of daily newspapers in this country is concentrated in the hands of ten big families, who also happen to be industrial tycoons, who happen to be also banking tycoons. We know what the result of that has been in the Bombay election. The Prime Minister also complained about that. Let us, therefore, not talk very much of democracy when on the other hand we are continuing to allow this sort of concentration of wealth to take place. Therefore, it is high time that all of us in this House think very

deeply about the measures that have got to be taken in order to prevent this growth of concentration of wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer families.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to express my deep appreciation and sincere thanks to the Address of the President delivered on the 12th March. Within a brief span of eight pages the President has given us a kaleidoscopic picture of the activities that transpired within a year since he addressed us last. This, Sir, is a fine resume of the activities that took place in the various fields, industrial, agricultural, technological and also cultural.

One thing that has arrested my attention in his Address and on which I would like to lay particular stress is his emphasis on the expansion of Sanskrit learning. It is very rarely that we come across such remarks in Government addresses. But here I was very happy to see that the President was pleased to remark that the study of Sanskrit is expected to make considerable advance in the next few years by the establishment of a Central Sanskrit Institute at Tirupati which will also conduct research in specialised branches of Sanskrit learning. During the course of my travel abroad I have come across various scholars of Sanskrit and Indology, and I can bear testimony to the fact that we have the best people in foreign lands as our sympathisers, those who are conversant with Sanskrit learning. They understand our minds in the context of our background, and it gives us pleasure now to think that here if we make a sincere effort to find a real university to impart Sanskrit learning and disseminate Sanskrit learning in a liberal fashion, the day is not far-off when on the basis of this language we may have proper national and emotional integration in this country and also

we may have scholars abroad who will understand us better.

Sir, the major part of my observations would be limited to the foreign affairs which the President was pleased to deal with. The first question that naturally agitates our mind is the question of disarmament. This is a long-term process, and we find that there is no end to it though it is a happy news that shortly a conference of 18 nations is going to be convened at Geneva, and we hope that there would be fruitful discussions and that they would arrive at some concrete solution. So far the atmosphere had been extremely vitiated, I had been going through some of the proceedings of these conferences and the wordy duals between these two blocs represented by the Soviet Union and the United States of America. It is really painful. The other day the Defence Secretary of the United States made some most incriminating remarks and in reply to them, the Defence Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malinovsky declared:—

“With one nuclear rocket blow we could raze off the face of the earth any targets, all the industrial and administrative political centres of the U.S. and destroy whole countries which have lent their territories for American military bases.”

This is a painful expression. This is a most devastating expression, I should say. Now comes another appraisal of this catastrophic situation by Lt. Gen Arthur G. Trudeau. He says:—

“Today a single missile can equal in destructive power all the devastation created during World War II.”

If this is exactly the position, we do not know where we stand. Earlier, Sir, I cautioned the House that we were moving towards a catastrophic age. We had a complete civilisation, we had a glorious past and we had,

[Shri Satyacharan.]

of course, everything that humanity could give us in so many centuries. But today we are treading on the path of devastation. Sir, I have to make a suggestion in this connection. The disarmament conference is going to be held tomorrow. India has always been in favour of complete disarmament, not piecemeal, because the time has come when we cannot make suggestions for any piecemeal disarmament. It has to be whole and complete. But probably this suggestion of ours has not made any impression on these two blocs. Now India has to watch at Geneva what exactly is the attitude of these two Powers since it is these two Powers which mean, not the others which function as only auxiliary powers. We who are non-aligned, we who do not possess nuclear arms—and even if we have them, it does not merit the attention of the big nuclear powers . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Does the hon. Member know that as far as the socialist countries are concerned, they have accepted the suggestion of the Government of India and other friends saying that the Western countries accept complete and general disarmament? They are prepared to accept any control.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: I know that, and I know that it is for the United States of America also to reciprocate in the same fashion.

Now, Sir, about disarmament I have to conclude with these remarks that the time has come when in the context of the horrors of these nuclear weapons, it must now impinge on the conscience of people with terrifying immediacy, otherwise there is no way out.

The second thing to which I would like to draw attention is the Indo-Pakistan relations. Now, as far as Indo-Pakistan relations are concerned, unfortunately in spite of Government of India's best efforts, relations could not be improved. Only the other day

in the course of the Canal Water Treaty the Government of India allocated a huge sum of Rs. 83 crores to Pakistan. It was with a view not to appease, but to win the friendship of our great neighbour which had been always propagating, rather launching, a campaign of hatred and calumny against India. I was pained to see some of the most incriminating remarks that could have been ever made by a head of a State were being made by President Ayub Khan during his recent visit to the United States of America, especially his attack on India on the television. He said that since the birth of Pakistan it had been living in moral fear of India, and the something was simultaneously published in The Dawn, the mouth-piece of President Ayub Khan, that India was 'our' potential enemy, not China or Russia or for that matter, any other country. These are the remarks which have to be reckoned with because they are not the remarks of those people who do not matter. It comes from the President who is holding a high office of trust and responsibility Sir, I do not wish to use any offensive language which may reflect or in any way cast aspersions on the high office of the President of Pakistan. In my own moderate fashion, I would say this much that a head of the State should learn to speak in a language of diplomacy which must give a feeling that here is an expression which is born of a decent political tradition. Sir, we learn that very soon we are going to have a conference, or I should say a meeting, between the Prime Minister of India and President Ayub Khan. Probably it will be in connection with Kashmir. Well, we hope that this time it may yield some results. We are doubtful because so far during the last fourteen years we have not been satisfied with the contents of the deliberations and the results. Let us hope, Sir, that this time things will take a different turn.

I come to the Congo to which the President has referred. As far as the Congo is concerned, we are happy to note that a parliament has been

convened and parliamentary government is functioning in that country. Our wish was—and on the floor of Parliament we had advocated it—that the foreign powers which were interfering with Congo's affairs should get out and the Congolese should convene their own parliament and decide their own set-up. But then, unfortunately, Belgium and some of its sympathisers were impeding the democratic progress of the Congo. Now, the only impediment that lies in the way of the Congolese Government is the part known as Katanga. It has received wide publicity. Sir, it is rather painful but I am constrained to remark—the way Mr. Tshombe has behaved, he may be characterised as a Congolese quisling because he has sold his country to the imperialists and those people who had been gnawing at the very root of democracy and the progress of that land for which we had always ample fund of sympathy. We wanted that this part of Africa must forge ahead and the nascent Republic must receive our sympathetic attention. Sir, in this connection I would like to draw the attention of the House to some British diplomats' and also to some Americans' behaviour. They were not very congenial; they were not at all conducive to the advancement of that country. Unfortunately, though colonialism is dying, the advocates of colonialism, in this or that form, do raise their heads. But we must warn them that colonialism is dead and no power on earth can revive it. We are perfectly conscious of the saying of Rudyard Kipling when he talked about his great empire. But those days of great empires are now gone. I said the other day, Sir, that now colonialism is dead; it is just like a stuffed dodo which does not merit our attention, and the attempts of those powers that wish to revive it are doomed. India stands for the progress of the Congo—for that matter, of any other nascent republic—which has come into being, and we wish that this part of Africa should go ahead.

Now, Sir, there are some other observations which the President was pleased to make. One was about the Indo-Tibetan Agreement of 1954. This is a very important piece of agreement which affects our relationship with China. At this juncture I must say that, when this Agreement was effected, the conditions were quite different. At that time, as we know, we harboured the best brotherly and amicable feelings for the State of China. We had all love and appreciation for the Chinese people as we found them then. They constitute a part of our Asian peoples; they are more or less like us. But in spite of the fact that they are so near to us, unfortunately, the way they behaved after 1957 has given us a different picture of their nationhood, of their intentions and their designs. Sir, when I use these three words, I intentionally use them. I say, "their designs", because, today, we see that China is not merely herself misbehaving in this fashion towards us but is also instigating other border powers, especially Nepal, against us. I must observe that she has also instigated certain elements in Bhutan and Sikkim, and has tried to bolster them up against India. She has also, to a certain extent—I should say—been hobnobbing with Pakistan. That is how she has created a series of troubles for us. Now, when this Agreement is going to be revived or, rather, if this Agreement is going to be renewed, I beg to submit to the Government of India to be very cautious so that the new Agreement is concluded in the context of the new situation created by China herself.

With these observations, Sir, I again register my appreciation of the President's Address, and thank him for the same. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to pay my deep debt of gratitude to our revered and beloved President for the Address he delivered to the Joint Session of this House and the other—the Lok Sabha,

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

Sir, it was rather sad for us to have been told, in the very first instance, like this:

"This is the last occasion that I shall be addressing you in this Parliament."

We know, Sir, everyone in this country appreciates, not only appreciates but looks upon our revered President as the friend, philosopher and guide of this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is not the last occasion; there will be another occasion for the President.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Anyway that is what he says.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He says "this Parliament." Another is coming.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: So, Sir, this has created pangs, a sort of suffering in our minds; it made us conscious that our President was addressing us for the last time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Last but one.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: All the same, Sir, we know him and the country knows him and we owe a deep debt of gratitude to him not only for this Address but for the several ones that he delivered before, and also for his great service and sacrifice made in the cause of this country.

Now, Sir, coming to the Address proper, this country has kept its economic and social goals, and he has been kind enough to refer to our goal as:

'a self-sustaining economy capable of increasing and generating resources for larger and further development.'

It is certainly so, Sir. Your good soul was referring to the various achievements, in the agricultural

and industrial fields, in the development of railways, in the development of post offices, in the development of telegraphs, in the development of telephones, etc., etc. As a matter of fact, our developmental activities have covered every department of human activity and every human being, whether he be an agriculturist or a labourer or a worker in the field or in the factory, or an officer or an employee in a Government office, or otherwise. This all-comprehensive developmental work has touched everyone and every activity and has been responsible for raising the standard of every human being in this country. It is well known that developmental works, which were unheard of in the annals of the history of this country, have taken place in this decade after our independence.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN) in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, coming to agricultural activity, it has been claimed in the President's Address that both in the matter of food production as well as industrial production we have reached almost our targets as laid down in the Plan and that the increase in agricultural production has been 8.1 per cent. during the year under review. This is really a matter for gratification, Sir, and I am sure, given the goodwill and the tempo that is warranted, as prescribed in the Third Five Year Plan, we are sure to reach the entire targets laid down therein.

Now, Sir, I do not want to take the time of this House by going into the details of our production programmes, both industrial as well as agricultural, but one fact figures very prominently, and that is that our trade deficits have been declining, and they have declined from 364 crores to 218 crores. This, by itself, should show the way economic trends have been taking place in this country, and therefore I am very happy, and I associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed by our worthy and revered President.

Now, Sir, internationally, most outstanding achievements can be claimed and it has been the case during the last year. Sir, when I raised the question of Goa, it was said that Goa was a thorn in the flesh of India. It had remained so for 450 years, and all the persuasions and attempts made in these fourteen years of our independence were not appreciated by the Salazar regime in Portugal, and therefore our illustrious Prime Minister played the most important diplomatic role in removing this thorn out of the flesh of India.

Sir, I do not know if the diplomacy with regard to the timing of attack on Goa and driving away the Portuguese from there has been sufficiently appreciated. I should think, Sir, the highest standard of diplomacy, a mature type of diplomacy was adopted and I must congratulate our Prime Minister for all that he did. First of all, Sir, there was the Belgrade Conference, what was called the Neutral Summit, and there he was able, with the assistance of all the neutral nations, to proclaim to the world that colonialism should be wiped out from the face of this earth. Thus he created a climate in the whole world.

Not only that, Sir, after the Belgrade Conference—I do not want to recount here all the details—he made a trip to Russia. I do not know if in so many words he mentioned to Mr. Khrushchev that he was out to remove the Salazar regime from Goa. Whatever he did or did not do, he earned the sympathy of Russia, the great power today, in his proposed action to drive away the Portuguese from Goa. Not only that, he also went to America and enlisted the sympathy of Mr. Kennedy in the proposed action of his. And above all, the greatest diplomatic act was in getting a resolution passed in the U.N.O. asking all the colonial powers to give up their colonies immediately. Thus the entire world, whether it was of the West or the East, was prepared for the great diplomatic act of Mr. Nehru.

Then, Sir, after this preparation he made bold to announce—I should think on the 16th of August or so—in this House that force was not ruled out in eliminating this colonial power from Goa. Having made all these preparations, our Prime Minister, much against his will, though subjected himself, as has been stated here, to severe criticism from some of the Western powers, made bold to make an attack. And after all, that attack, though it was termed as an attack, was a bloodless attack and within 24 hours of the first attack, Goa was captured. And this is a golden history of our victory not only in the diplomatic field but also in the national field. This act of the Prime Minister of India singly by itself is worth anything, and I am sure this would be appreciated for all time to come. This glory of liberating Goa goes to this Government, and I congratulate Mr. Nehru, with the rest of the country, on this brave and diplomatic act.

Now, Sir, with regard to China, there has been aggression and occupation of our territory. While I pay the greatest compliment to the diplomacy of our Prime Minister with regard to taking Goa and driving away the Salazar regime, I am rather doubtful as to what his intentions are with regard to the territories occupied by China. Sir, it was reported in the press that in an interview to the Washington Post our Prime Minister is reported to have said that he was prepared for the Chinese occupation of the Aksai Chin area, where a huge road is said to have been built, as a sort of compromise. I do not know if this is true but I have not read any reports to the contrary. At least it has not been denied. . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: On lease.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Even if this should be true, I should really feel very, very sorry indeed. Our territory cannot be broken away even on the basis of lease to the aggressor. Our first and foremost duty is to get the aggression vacated. This is the

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

word that has been given to the country and we must stand by it. Sir, it was also said that China was prepared, as a compromise, not to ask for territories on this side of MacMahon Line if their occupation of Ladakh was compromised with. I am sure both these positions are very derogatory to this country and it will not be accepted. In the President's Address, in so many words it has not been said very clearly and I only wish it had been made very clear, come what may, that a compromise on any basis would not be tolerated and would not be made.

Now, Sir, we are also given to understand that a huge amount of road-building is going on in the northern border and our borders are almost safe, that there shall be no more aggression and an assurance has been given in this House from time to time to this effect. Sir, I am very happy that such a bold step has been taken, that the Himalayas that were giving protection to this country are being protected today, though it is a very sorry spectacle if we have to do it and our Government has been courageous enough to undertake this great task though at enormous expense and inconvenience. I am sure, this having been done China will be shown its way back from the Himalayan regions where occupation has taken place. And we know, Sir, that the entire country will be with this Government in this great act of getting the aggression vacated.

Sir, I have not much to say but just one more thing. The General Elections were referred to by our Communist friend. The whole country knows about their capability of twisting any information at their disposal to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of the other parties in the country. My friend, Mr. Ramamurti, has quoted from some doubtful scripts but we know how to assess them. Having lost in the elections he now comes forward with the theory that ten crores of rupees

were collected and spent on the General Elections. Ten crores of rupees is not a small amount. It is an astounding figure.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): Why should the hon. Member forget that we have increased the percentage of votes polled?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: You may have increased your percentage or not but you have decreased in numbers and there it stands.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: In your own State we have increased. We are making inroads into your State too.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That is what you claim. Though vanquished you can argue still.

Now, Sir, all these facts are before the country. The whole world has acknowledged the conduct of the General Elections throughout the length and breadth of India in less than ten days as an astounding achievement. There has been absolutely no trouble. And there has been absolutely no trouble. It was the most well organized election and the people been given the freedom to vote and they have voted. The very fact that in two of the States the Congress has only a near majority or only a very small majority or no majority at all, should show that the elections were free and unfettered. If money could have purchased votes, in Rajasthan and other places also they could have been purchased. This gives the lie direct to those of the Communist Party who say that rupees purchased the votes. In any election money has got to be spent.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If you ask the Congress people in Rajasthan, they will tell you that other people purchased the votes better than you did.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Anyway, I am not bothered about that. The Congress did not do it.

Therefore, as I was saying, the entire world has acknowledged the general elections as a feat and an astounding feat at that. I am sure the Communist Party which swears by democracy will also come forward to acknowledge this as a fact, that it is an astounding feat and give the Government credit for the way in which they had run the general elections. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I associate myself, or rather I am happy to have the privilege of associating myself with the profound satisfaction expressed in the House on the liquidation of the foreign possessions in our land. After that I come to the much debated question of the general elections in the country. The President's Address says that it reveals the success that has been achieved by the ruling party. But there is another revelation that has not been made and that is about the methods adopted by the ruling party. India is the largest parliamentary democracy in the world and . . .

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA (Madhya Pradesh): No mention of it is there in the Address.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes. It has been mentioned in the President's Address where it has been stated that the ruling party has come back to power with a mandate from the masses or the people, that is to say, the voters or the electorate. That has been mentioned in the Address.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: What is wrong there?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: But the . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Hon. Members will please address the Chair. I may tell you that I am very jealous of the attention to be paid to the Chair. So every hon. Member should speak to the Chair.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The interruption came from that side, Sir, and I thought it necessary to reply.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASSAN): That is all right, but you should address the Chair and not another hon. Member.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I bow to your ruling, Sir.

As I was saying, India is the country with the largest parliamentary democracy in the world. The ruling party, however, should not become proud on account of the success at the elections, because I shall reveal some of the methods adopted, at least in my State. I do not know about other States. But from the speeches I hear, I gather that similar things took place even there. In my own State of Orissa particularly, the Chief Minister happens to be the chief of the Provincial Congress Committee and in a press statement he has publicly announced it that money has been spent by his party to the tune of Rs. 12 lakhs. Now, there are twenty constituencies in Orissa and out of them one was uncontested. Dr. Harekrishna Mahtab, the Congress candidate, has been returned from one seat uncontested. So there were only 19 seats contested in Orissa and the Chief Minister who is the Congress chief also, has himself said in a press statement that he had spent a sum of Rs. 12 lakhs for these 19 seats. So the money spent by his party comes to about Rs. 63,000 per constituency. And that is apart from the money spent by individual candidates. And to add to it, since there were no Assembly elections in Orissa as we had our Assembly elections earlier when we had the mid-term elections, the Chief Minister along with the other Ministers could go round on their election campaigns. We do not object to the Ministers going round, but the government machinery was also carried along with them during their election tours. The District collector and the subdivisional officer and the block development officers also went with them. At places where the

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]

Congress did not have good prospects the block development officers were asked at public meetings to go ahead with some project which had not been scheduled for that particular area. The flood reliefs had already been distributed, but in order to better the prospects at the elections in some areas, fresh lists were submitted, they were collected at the public meetings and in public the collector was asked or the S.D.O. was told, that supplementary relief should be immediately distributed before the Minister held another meeting on the second day or the third day. That is how public funds, money from the public exchequer, were also used by the Congress for bettering its prospects at the elections.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, may I ask whether it is fair to bring these things here? They should be brought to the notice of the authorities or parties in the Assembly, because we are not in a position here to contradict them. I am sure most of these may not be warranted.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: But, Sir, there are other Members here who come from Orissa and who belong to the ruling party and they can refute my statements, if they can. I have brought it to the notice of the people and I now bring it to the notice of hon. Members here that the Chief Minister had, on his own statement, spent Rs. 12 lakhs. Can any hon. Member refute that? He can do it if he wants. Why should I go to the Assembly? This, after all, is the sovereign House for the whole country and it is definitely within its jurisdiction to discuss these things. If these things are not discussed here, where else are they to be discussed? Not in the marketplace, I suppose.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I think these things which relate to the Assembly should be discussed in the Assembly.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: They have been amply discussed in the Assembly; but apart from being discussed in the Assembly, they have also to be discussed in Parliament, because these elections were for Parliament and not for the Assembly.

The Ministers went round promising a school within every three miles or so in Orissa, and that too a high English school.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That is a very good thing.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is a good thing, of course, if it materialises. They should have made the promise long before, not just before the elections were due to be held. If they really meant to do it, they should have taken it up much earlier, or immediately after the elections were over. It is the time and place we object to.

Sir, we in Orissa were expecting some land reforms in Orissa. There was a lot of hue and cry about these land reforms. But these have now been put in cold storage, because the party thought that introducing a land reform policy might go against its interests. Therefore, something which we were expecting for long, something which would certainly have come through had there not been these parliamentary elections, has now been put in cold storage.

Then there is another thing to which I must refer. I do not think other hon. Members will know much about it. We have in Orissa what are called Kendu leaves from which smoking beedis are manufactured. Orissa is one of the largest producers of these Kendu leaves. Next comes probably Madhya Pradesh. Now, the term of contract of these Kendu leave contractors ceased immediately prior to the elections. But these contracts were not renewed. They were kept in abeyance till the 26th of February, that is to say, to a date after the elections

There was a press note to the effect that they were to be kept in abeyance till the 26th of February. That was because the ruling party expected as much collection of money from each individual as possible without renewing the contract. Naturally there was cut-throat competition because each man wanted to get nearer the ruling party by paying the maximum that he could. Immediately after polling was over, contracts have now been renewed.

I come now to another point. The mover of the motion said that we sincerely want national integration but the gesture has to come from the ruling party. In Orissa, after the election was over, after the election tempo had died down, the Chief Minister of Orissa said in the Assembly that he was not going to reply to the Leader of the Opposition. This thing also came in the papers. In a parliamentary democracy, if a Chief Minister goes as far as to say that he would refuse to reply to the Leader of the Opposition or was not going to pay heed to the Leader of the Opposition, I do not know what to do. That is how it is done and, in spite of that, we talk of national integration.

I would like to mention another, very small point of course. Two newspapers published about these activities of the ruling party in Orissa during election time and because of that Government advertisements have been suspended on the plea that they have a circulation of less than 5,000 papers. Even though these two papers exceed this figure of 5,000 so far as circulation is concerned, the Chief Minister or the Minister concerned says in the Assembly that the circulation figure of the papers is less than 5,000 as ascertained through their own source, namely, the Special Branch. Sir, the recommendation of the Press Commission is that the collection of information should not be through the

Special Branch and that Government should depend upon the certificate issued by a Chartered Accountant. Even after the Chartered Accountant's certificate has come and even after the recommendations of the Press Commission have been accepted both by the Central and the State Governments, if advertisements are discontinued or suspended in respect of those newspapers, does that show that we have developed a proper sense of parliamentary democracy?

Sir, I thank you, and with these words I resume my seat.

श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार):
उपसभापति जी, आपकी इजाजत से मैं बैठ कर बोलना चाहता हूँ।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नफीसुल हसन) :
कुछ हर्ज नहीं है। आपकी तबियत खराब है, इसलिये मुझे इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है।

श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, यह हमारे लिये बड़ी ही खुशी की बात है और गौरव की बात भी है कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी, जो महीनों से अस्वस्थ थे, उनका स्वास्थ्य इतना अच्छा हुआ और उनके पास इतना साहस हुआ और हमारे बीच आने का इतना प्रेम हुआ कि इस गिरे हुए स्वास्थ्य में भी वह हमारे बीच आ सके और उन्होंने अपने भाषण में जो कुछ कहा है उससे हमको आशा है कि केवल पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को ही नहीं, बल्कि देश को भी बल मिलेगा।

अब मैं उनके भाषण की ओर आता हूँ। उनके भाषण में सब से पहले खेती के उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में जिक्र आया है और इसके लिये बहुत प्रसन्नता है कि पिछले साल बहुत से सूबों में बाढ़ और अतिवृष्टि होने पर भी हमारी पैदावार में ८.१ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई और जब हम १९५५-५६ के हिसाब से देखते हैं, तो वह वृद्धि १९.१ प्रतिशत है। यह एक मामूली बात नहीं है। इसी

[श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह]

सिलसिले में, भाषण में बनावटी खाद के सम्बन्ध में कहा गया है कि बहुत से इसके कारखाने हैं, लेकिन वे उनी खाद पैदा नहीं कर पाते हैं, जितनी उसकी मांग है और इसलिये और भी कारखाने खोले जायेंगे। यह किसानों के लिये सबसे खुशी की बात है क्योंकि इस चुनाव के सिलसिले में मुझे जहां जहां जाने का मौका मिला वहां-वहां मैं इसका जिक्र करता था कि फर्टीलाइजर की बड़ी-बड़ी फैक्ट्री हैं, खुद बिहार में फैक्ट्री है, तो किसान मुझे बताते थे कि उन्होंने तो इस फर्टीलाइजर को देखा तक नहीं है। फूड और एग्री-कल्चर मिनिस्ट्री अगर इसका इंतजाम कर रही है कि और कारखाने खोले जायें ताकि बनावटी खाद मिले तो यह देहात के किसानों के लिये और जो लोग इस बात में दिलचस्पी रखते हैं कि पैदावार बढ़ाई जाय उनके लिये एक बहुत ही जरूरी कदम है और इसका हम स्वागत करते हैं। हम यह जरूर जानना चाहेंगे कि अब तक देश में कितने खाद के कारखाने हैं, उनसे कितना पैदा होता है और मोटे तौर पर किस दाम पर वह बिकती है और उसको किसान खरीद सकते हैं या नहीं यहां मेरे कहने का मतलब मध्य दर्जे के किसानों और छोटे किसानों से है। जो और फैक्ट्रियां खोलेंगे, उनसे कितनी पैदावार होगी और मोटे तौर पर उसकी कीमत क्या होगी, यह हम जानना चाहेंगे। इसके उत्तर में फूड और एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री हमें जानकारी दें।

हमारे देश में लोहे के कारखानों की कितनी जरूरत है—रक्षा के लिहाज से, कल-कारखाने इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन को बढ़ाने के लिहाज से, ट्रांसपोर्ट के लिये पुल वगैरह बनाने के लिहाज से या मकान वगैरह बनाने के लिहाज से—उस पर तो कोई बहस की बात नहीं है, सब कोई इसको मानते हैं। इसीलिये जब राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने

भाषण में इस बात का जिक्र किया है कि भिलाई, रूरकेला और दुर्गापुर में लोहे के कारखानों में विस्तार होगा तो इससे हमें बहुत खुशी हुई है और खास कर हम लोगों को जो कि बिहार से आते हैं, इस बात से खुशी हुई है कि बोकारो में लोहे का कारखाना होगा। यह हम दो-तीन वर्ष से सुन रहे थे और इस बारे में तरह तरह की अटकल-बाजियां अखबारों में चलती थीं। अब राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण के बाद यह निश्चित हो गया है कि बोकारो में कच्चा लोहा और स्पात का मिला-जुला कारखाना होगा। यह हमारे लिये, बिहार के लिये ही नहीं बल्कि देश के लिये बहुत खुशी की बात है। वह इसलिये है कि पास ही में जमशेदपुर है जहां कि इसका कारखाना है, वहां लोहा हमारे खानों से बहुत मिलता है और बोकारो के आसपास भी—इसकी विशेषज्ञों ने जांच की है कि लोहा खानों में भरा पड़ा है। तो इसका इस्तेमाल हो सकेगा, यह खुशी की बात है। केवल बिहार का ही नहीं देश का भी इससे धन बढ़ेगा और शक्ति बढ़ेगी।

मैं अभी जिक्र कर रहा था कि इलेक्शन के सिलसिले में जहां मैं गया वहां फर्टीलाइजर के बारे में पता लगा। उसी तरह से राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में इसका जिक्र है कि देहात में पाने के पानी के इंतजाम के सिलसिले में ५० प्रतिशत अनुदान के रूप में लोगों को मिलेगा। हम जब इलेक्शन के सिलसिले में गांवों में जाते थे और खास कर हरिजनों के टोले में और छोटे किसानों के टोले में या खेतिहर मजदूरों के गांवों में जाते थे तो सवाल यह होता था कि ५० प्रतिशत जो है वह तो दे दिया, लेकिन और ५० प्रतिशत कहां से आये। बिहार सरकार की ओर से सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का दिया हुआ ६०० रुपए एक कुएं के लिये मिलता है और हमने यह देखा कि बकिया ६०० रुपया उनको लगाना है। अब कोई ऐसी संस्था हो, जो कि

रुपया लगा दे तो दूसरी बात है, लेकिन वह खुद ६ रुपया भी नहीं लगा सकते हैं। वे कहते थे कि हमें मजदूरी कर के ४ सेर अनाज मजदूरी में मिलता है और उसी में सारे बाल-बच्चों को खिलाना और रखना सब कुछ है। उनके घर ऐसे हैं कि उसमें जानवर भी मुश्किल से रह सकते हों। वे कहते थे कि ६०० रुपया लावें कहां से। इसीलिये जब राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में मैंने यह बात देखी कि ५० प्रतिशत अनुदान के रूप में मिलेगा, तो सुनने में तो मालूम हुआ कि बड़ी अच्छी चीज है, लेकिन इसका उपयोग देहात वाले गरीब कर नहीं सकते हैं; तो मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से यह अनुरोध करूंगा कि ऐसा नियम होना चाहिये कि हरिजनों की बस्तियों में या खेतिहर मजदूरों की बस्तियों में, चाहे वहां हरिजन हों या न हों, या छोटे छोटे किसान जिनके पास एक-एक बीघा जमीन खेती की हो, उनके चास्ते पीने का पानी देना सरकार का कर्तव्य है। मैं कहता हूं कि जब हम एक वेल्फेयर स्टेट है, हमारी कल्याणकारी सरकार है, तब तो हमें पूरा खर्चा देकर उनके लिये पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये और कुएं बनाने चाहिये। हां, इसकी जांच होनी चाहिये कि कौन रुपया दे सकता है, कौन नहीं और यह एक दफा जांच से तय हो जायेगा। सोलह आना पैसा देकर सरकार की तरफ से पीने के पानी का इंतजाम होना चाहिये। मैंने देखा इस सवाल को लेकर बहुत से लोग कांग्रेस से और सरकार से रंजीदा थे, क्योंकि उनको उम्मीदें थीं। मैंने उनसे कहा बाढ़ आयी तो सरकार ने तुम्हारी मदद की गल्ला दिया, मकान मरम्मत करा दिया, खिलाया पिलाया; तो वे कहते थे सब कुछ ठीक किया लेकिन पीने का पानी तो नहीं दिया और उसका नतीजा यह होता है कि इधर उधर से पानी लाकर पीते हैं, हमारे बच्चे मरते हैं, हम मरते हैं। तो इस चीज की व्यवस्था करना एक कल्याणकारी सरकार के लिये निहायत जरूरी है।

अनुदान सेन्ट परसेन्ट होना चाहिये, पूरा अनुदान होना चाहिये, पचास परसेन्ट नहीं। तो इसकी ओर सरकार का ध्यान खूब जोरों के साथ मैं दिलाता हूं।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने और भी बहुत सी बातों के ऊपर अपने इस अभिभाषण में ध्यान दिलाया है, जैसे पंचायती राज बगैरह के मुताल्लिक। और यह एक जरूरी चोज है। मुझे भी थोड़ा बहुत गांवों का तजुर्बा है, गांवों में किसानों के बीच में रह कर मैंने काम किया है और पंचायत के चुनाव में मैंने देखा कि ऊंच-नीच की बातें, जातिपात की बातें बहुत ज्यादा चलाई जाती हैं। एक अजीब सिलसिला है हमारे गांवों में, पार्लियामेंट के चुनाव में जातिपात की बातें उतनी ज्यादा नहीं निकलतीं जितनी कि असेम्बली के चुनाव में। और असेम्बली के चुनाव से भी ज्यादा बात तब आती है जब हम गांव की पंचायत का चुनाव करने लगते हैं और इसमें बहुत कुछ सच्चाई है। हमने देखा है कि बिहार में पंचायत बनाने के बारे में एक इलाका है, जिसमें अफसरों ने दस पंचायत के टुकड़े किये। हम कहते हैं कि इसमें बारह टुकड़े कर दो, पन्द्रह कर दो, क्योंकि पन्द्रह या बारह टुकड़े करने पर जो पंचायतें बनेंगी उनमें जातिपात का उतना सवाल नहीं आयेगा। बहुत कुछ मेरिट पर आदमी चुना जायेगा। लेकिन हमारी नौकरशाही के लोग इन बातों को देखते नहीं हैं और हमारे सूबे को जो चलाने वाले हैं, वे भी नहीं देखते हैं। यह एक सिद्धांत की बात है कि वह पंचायत चल नहीं सकती, जो जातिपात के नाम पर चुनी गई है। अगर पंचायतों की तादाद बढ़ गई और उसके कारण खर्चा बढ़ जाता है तो उसके लिये हमारी प्रान्तीय सरकार को तैयार होना चाहिये। मैं इस प्रश्न की ओर केन्द्रीय सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करता हूं कि जब हम और जगहों में पंचायती राज बढ़ाने लगे तो इस बात को

[श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह]

ध्यान में रखें कि पंचायतों की संख्या बढ़ाने से झगड़े और कलह कम होते हैं और इसी ख्याल से पंचायतों की संख्या हमें बढ़ानी चाहिये ।

अब दो-तीन सवाल और हैं । चीन के बारे में अभिभाषण में बहुत सुन्दर ढंग से थोड़े ही शब्दों में कहा गया है । और उस पर कोई देशभक्त अधिक क्या कह सकता है ? भारत-तिब्बत संधि जो १९५४ में हुई थी और जिसकी मिथाद २ जून १९६२ को पूरी हो रही है, उसके बारे में चीन से जो चिट्ठी आयी है, उसके जवाब में जो यह लिख दिया गया है कि आप अपनी आक्रामक नीतियां छोड़िये और पंचशील के आधार पर चलिये, यह सोलह आना वाजिब बात कही गई है । मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई भी भारतवासी, जिसके दिल में देशप्रेम है, चाहे वह अपनी कोई भी पार्टी बना कर चले, इस बात से किसी भी तरह का ऐतराज कर सकता हो और इस पर मुकम्मल तरह से कायम रहने के लिये तैयार न हो । मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में यह जो दो शर्तें रख दी हैं, जो कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने लिख कर भेजी हैं, उस पर हर भारतीय को गर्व होना चाहिये; वह चाहे किसी पार्टी का हो, किसी मजहब का हो और किसी पेशे का हो । मैं तो यहां तक जाऊंगा कि जो भारतीय इसको नहीं मानता है, मैं उसको सच्चे मानी में देशभक्त मानने को तैयार नहीं हूं, बल्कि भारतीय मानने को भी तैयार नहीं हूं ।

अब सवाल गोआ के बारे में हैं । आप जानते हैं, हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब कितने शांति के अग्रदूत हैं और यही वजह थी कि सारी दुनिया की शांति के लिये और भारत के लिये हम इतने दिनों तक, चौदह-पन्द्रह वर्ष तक, गोआ के मामले में बैस

से काम लेते रहे और इस बीच में पुर्तगाली साम्राज्यवाद ने क्या क्या जुल्म नहीं किया और उसको हमने बर्दाश्त किया । सारी चीजें हुईं, हमारी तरफ से अगर कभी सत्याग्रह भी हुआ तो कौसी बर्बरता से उसको उन्होंने दबाया । तो गोआ सरकार ने जो कुछ किया उसको हम सब जानते हैं । जो विदेश के लोग पुर्तगाल के दोस्त थे, उन लोगों ने भी हमारी आलोचना की, लेकिन पुर्तगाल को अच्छे रास्ते पर चलने के लिये कभी राजी नहीं कराया । हमारी ओर से जो कदम उठाया गया, जिसका कि शलत नाम "मिलिटरी ऐक्शन" रखा जाता है, क्योंकि वह फौज के लोगों ने किया तो जरूर लेकिन वह पुलिस ऐक्शन से भी कमजोर चीज थी । हाथ की अंगुलियों पर गिना जा सकता है कि कितने फौज के लोग मरे थे और जो मरे वे भी धोका देकर । हमारी तरफ से आत्मरक्षा करते हुए लोग मारे गये । सिविल का कोई आदमी नहीं मरा । इतनी शांतिपूर्वक यह चीज हुई कि गोआ, दामन और ड्यू आसानी से मुक्त हो गये और शत-प्रतिशत आदमी इस बात को कबूल करते हैं और दिल से मानते हैं कि उनका लिबरेशन हुआ है, उनकी स्वाधीनता हुई है और जिस भारत माता की गोद में वे आना चाहते थे, वे आ गये हैं । मैं नहीं समझता कि किसी भी कसौटी से इसको शलत माना जा सकता है । चाहे वह अहिंसा की कसौटी हो या शांति की कसौटी हो, हर कसौटी से सोलह आना ठीक है । यूं तो स्वतंत्र होने के लिये अगर अहिंसा से काम नहीं चले तो इतिहास में इसके उदाहरण भरे पड़े हैं कि हिंसा से काम लिया गया है । लेकिन फिर भी गोआ के प्रश्न पर जो कार्य-वाही की गई वह बहुत अंशों में अहिंसात्मक हुई । मेरा ऐसा विश्वास है कि इस मामले में हमने जो कुछ किया वह हमारी नीति के अनुरूप ही हुआ है और यदि इस बारे में किसी को कोई शक हो तो वह गोआ में जाकर देख सकता है कि वहां के

बोग कितने खुश हैं, गद्गद हैं, कितने प्रसन्न हैं कि व भारत माता की गोद में आ गये।

अब जो सवाल सबसे अहम है वह चुनाव के बारे में है। अभी हमारा तीसरा जनरल इलेक्शन खत्म ही हुआ है, पहला जनरल इलेक्शन और दूसरा जनरल इलेक्शन खत्म होने के बाद। १९४७ में हमको स्वराज्य प्राप्त हुआ, १९५० तक हमने अपने संविधान को तयार किया और १९५२ से अब तक हम तीन इलेक्शन लड़ चुके हैं। अब इलेक्शन के परिणामों के बारे में विरोधी पक्ष के लोग केवल विरोध करने के लिये कहना चाहें तो दूसरी बात है, लेकिन मैं उनसे कहूंगा कि भारतवर्ष के चारों तरफ देखें, पूरे एशिया को देखें और इस गौरव को थोड़ा फील करें, महसूस करें कि क्या यह एक मामूली बात है कि २१ करोड़ जनता यहां वोट करती हो, जब कि चीन में जहां-जनसंख्या अधिक है, वहां जैसी गवर्नमेंट है उसमें आप जानते हैं कि कोई पार्लियामेन्टरी डिमोक्रेसी नहीं। मैं किसी दूसरे गवर्नमेंट को नहीं कहा चाहता और जगहों में आप देख ही रहे हैं कि फौजी हुकूमतें हो गई हैं या कहीं भी सही मानी में पार्लियामेन्टरी डिमोक्रेसी नहीं है, जैसी कि हमारे देश में है; बल्कि चारों तरफ अन्धकार ही फैल रहा है। जहां जनतंत्र चला भी था, वहां से भी खत्म किया जा रहा है। और हमारे जो विरोधी पार्टी के लोग हैं, अभी इलेक्शन में हमसे पूरी जुस्तजू कर के आये हैं, सारे देश में लड़े हैं। उसमें तो सभी बराबर थे, लेकिन उनको ज़रा इस शान को, गौरव को समझना चाहिये; उस थ्रिल को, स्पंदन को समझना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में डिमोक्रेसी है, लोकतंत्रवाद है, जिसमें भाग लेन का उन्हें मौका मिला १९५२ में, १९५७ में और अभी १९६२ में। कौन उसमें

शिकस्त हुआ, कौन जीता, यह दूसरी बात है। अपोजिशन के लोगों में काफी पढ़े-लिखे विचारवान लोग भी हैं। मैं उनसे कहूंगा कि यह कोई उनको शोभा नहीं देता कि चुनाव में जीत गये, तो कहा कि सब ठीक है और जब हार गये, तो कह दिया, ठीक नहीं है।

4 P.M.

जैसा कि हमारे भाई रेड्डी साहब ने कहा कि कांग्रेस मध्य प्रदेश और राजस्थान में बुरी तरह से हार गई, लेकिन क्या हमने कहा कि वहां पर किसी तरह की गड़बड़ हुई? यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है कि जहां पर हमारे विरोधी भाई जीते हैं वहां पर कुछ गड़बड़ नहीं हुई? यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है कि इलेक्शन के बाद इस तरह सरकार के ऊपर इल्जाम लगाया जाय। इलेक्शन के दमियान तो किसी ने भी एक लफ्ज नहीं कहा। जब रिजल्ट निकल गया, तब हमारे विरोधी पार्टी के लोग कहते हैं कि इलेक्शन में गड़बड़ की गई। मैं विरोधी पार्टियों को चैलेंज देकर कहता हूं कि वे इलेक्शन में जो गड़बड़ी की बात कह रहे हैं, वह उचित नहीं हैं। इस तरह से जो "आफ्टर थोट" बात कही जा रही है, वह तरीका ठीक नहीं है।

केरल के बारे में यहां पर जिक्र किया गया है और प्रेजिडेंट एड्रेस पर अमेंडमेंट भी आया है। केरल में इस बार कम्युनिस्ट छः सीट जीत गये हैं। वे लोग यह कहते हैं कि केरल में कांग्रेस और पी० एस० पी० की जो सरकार इस समय कायम है, उसके पीछे अब जनता नहीं रही; किन्तु मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बात गलत है। अगर आप आंकड़े देखेंगे, तो आपको पता चलेगा कि जिस समय मिड-टर्म इलेक्शन १९६० में हुए थे, उस समय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को ४२.९ परसेंट वोट

[श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह]

प्राप्त हुए, लेकिन इस बार उन्हें केवल ३५.४ परसेंट ही वोट प्राप्त हुए हैं। इससे यह साफ जाहिर है कि उन्हें इस समय पार्लियामेंट के इलैक्शन में पिछले इलैक्शन के मुकाबले में ८ या ९ परसेंट कम वोट प्राप्त हुए। पिछले इलैक्शन में हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों की जो हालत हुई वह आप सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, लेकिन आज के इलैक्शन में उससे भी बुरी हालत उनकी हुई। उन्हें चन्द पार्लियामेंट की सीटें मिल गईं और इस पर यह कहना कि जनता की सरकार पर आस्था नहीं रही, कोई तर्क-संगत बात नहीं है। मैं यही कहूंगा कि इस तरह से शिकायत करना कोई ईमानदारी की बात नहीं है और राजनीति में इस तरह से नीचे गिर कर बात नहीं करनी चाहिये।

अब मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के संबंध में केवल एक-दो लफ्ज बहुत ही नम्रता के साथ कहना चाहता हूं। (Time bell rings) मैं एक-दो मिनट में अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगा।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नफीसुल हसन): आप दो तीन मिनट ले सकते हैं।

श्री अवधेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह: हिन्दी मेरी मातृ भाषा है, परन्तु जब राष्ट्रपति जी हिन्दी में अपना भाषण सुना रहे थे, लेकिन मैं समझ नहीं पा रहा था, क्योंकि लाउड स्पीकर इतना खराब था कि मैं कुछ भी नहीं सुन सक रहा था। जो लोग इसके जबाबदेह हैं, उन्हें इस बात का ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि जब सभापति जी इतना कष्ट उठाकर अपना अभिभाषण देने आये और जो करीब ७५० मेम्बर वहां पर थे, वे अच्छी तरह से न सुन सके, तो यह कोई

अच्छी बात नहीं है। हमें जो तकलीफ हुई, उसका अधिकारियों को पहले से ही ख्याल करना चाहिये था। जब हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी अस्वस्थ अवस्था में भाषण देने आते हैं और हम अच्छी तरह से न सुन सकें, तो यह उचित बात नहीं है। १६ अप्रैल को फिर ज्वाइन्ट सेशन होने वाला है और मुझे आशा है कि इस तरह की गलती उस समय नहीं होगी।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि दूसरे मुल्कों में जहां डेमोक्रेसी है, वहां के रोति रिवाजों के बारे में थोड़ी बातें मुझे मालूम हैं। यहां चार अंगरक्षक राष्ट्रपति के पीछे रहते हैं, किंतु हमारी जो शानदार डेमोक्रेसी है, उसमें मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि बट्टा लग रहा है। हमारे यहां इस तरह की चीज नहीं होनी चाहिये। विलायत में जब किंग या क्वीन पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर आते हैं, तो उनके जो अंगरक्षक होते हैं वे पार्लियामेंट के बाहर ही रहते हैं। यहां उनके अंगरक्षक भीतर क्यों आते हैं, इस बात को राज्य सभा तथा लोक सभा के जो हमारे बड़े अफसरान हैं, या हमारे चेयरमैन साहब हैं, स्पीकर साहब हैं, उनसे मैं यह विनय करूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति की रक्षा के लिये जो चार अंगरक्षक आते हैं क्या वे ही उनके अंगरक्षक हैं? हम ७५० मेम्बरान जो वहां पर मौजूद रहते हैं क्या वे अंगरक्षक नहीं हैं? राष्ट्रपति जी की रक्षा के लिए हर कोई जान कुरबान करने के लिये तैयार है। इसलिये आगे से यह चीज नहीं होनी चाहिये। मैं बहुत नम्रतापूर्वक इस बात को रख रहा हूं और मैं आशा करता हूं कि १६ अप्रैल को जब ज्वाइन्ट सेशन होगा, तो दुबारा यह नागवार चीज हमें देखने को न आयेगी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ ।

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, naturally there is a feeling of unreality in the discussions today. The new elections have been held. Large numbers of Members are new in the coming Lok Sabha. In the Rajya Sabha also shortly one-third of the Members will retire by rotation and many who come here will be new. A new Ministry has to be sworn in. Though we expect it is a Congress Ministry and Panditji will continue to lead, still things may change. Many things may change. In these circumstances it is but natural that there is an unreality in the discussions. Yet by tradition we have the President's Address and it has to be discussed. I do not propose to speak very long and shall mention only a few points. While the Congress has done well in the elections and the elections may be taken as an indication of the support of the people to the Government—to the members of the Government and its party—it is also for us to see that certain new features have emerged out of the elections. Certain new parties have come into existence. Certain new parties which were not counted before have acquired strength. What does all this indicate? While in a State or two the Congress has come out with greater strength, in many States their strength has been reduced. Though we expect that this time also in all the States Congress Ministries will be formed, the strength that they command will be different, in some States, from what they commanded before. All these are facts which make us ponder, which make us think. It is undoubtedly true that generally the people have given support to the policies of the Congress Government—in the Government of India certainly—though it must be said in varying measures about the various States.

Coming to a few points that have been mentioned by the President at

pages 1 and 2 of his Address, referring to agricultural production, to my mind, there is an amount of complacency in this matter. While I was going with an American specialist, who has recently come here at the invitation of the Government of India to help in our food production, he made an observation which made me think and which I thought I might share with this House. It is expected that by the end of this Plan period we will require 110 million tons of foodgrains. Today we produce somewhere between 80 and 90 million tons. We want to increase food production. I am not sure whether this 110 million tons is not a conservative estimate looking at the way in which our population is growing. To my mind, it is a conservative estimate. Today we know that millions of people are underfed, millions of people do not get a balanced diet. Calculating on the basis of the present state of affairs I think this 110 million tons is on the low side. Calculating for a better deal that we should give, calculating for the increase of population at the rate at which it is going on today, the 110 million tons is a conservative estimate. But I am not sure that we will reach even this 110 million tons of foodgrain without imports from other countries. The way in which we are progressing, the way in which we are going I am not sure whether we shall be able to produce the 110 million tons. We have many schemes. 'Seed farms' undoubtedly is one of the ways in which agricultural production can be increased. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is not only the money spent that we must account for but we must see many times that the progress of our schemes are commensurate with the money spent on each item. It seems to me that we should devise other and better methods of finding the effectiveness of our Plans. For example, in food production, better seed farms are an essential aspect in food production, and the report that we had occasion to read in the last session said that the seed farms had not done very well. Manufacture of

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]
fertilisers is undoubtedly one of the measures through which we could increase food production. But we have found that while in some cases the need for fertilisers is not met, in other cases the need is met at the wrong time. Agriculture has its seasons. Fertiliser will be very useful to increase food production tremendously when it comes at the proper time. If it does not come at the proper time, it will do nothing to increase food production. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to my mind we should not only see that money is allotted and spent but the money that is spent yields the proper result that we want it to yield.

Then there are other aspects of food production. I want research to be done in arid areas—in which there is not so much water—whether we cannot find it. In South India we have only 26 per cent. irrigation with all the resources of the Cauveri utilised to the extent of 95 per cent, whereas with regard to Godavari and Krishna only 8 or 9 per cent. is utilised and 90 per cent. goes unutilised to the sea. In the Madras State 95 per cent. of the resources of Cauveri are utilised. The problem there is to produce something out of less water. I want research to be done so that even with less water resources, grains could be cultivated. Again, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to refer to another matter. There is Kerala nearby with plenty of water. Their difficulty is over-water. There are 2500 inches of rainfall in certain areas of Western Ghats. All goes to the sea. Their problem is over-water. In this side the problem is no water. And then India is certainly one country, but when it comes to the question of utilisation of water, we seem to be different. There are quarrels, there are differences. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have constituted some River Board, this Parliament has passed Acts, but to what extent are these Acts utilised? I know there are difficulties. We cannot seek the provisions of the Act against the wishes

of the people, and the Ministers have to react very delicately to public opinion and public prejudices. These are there. But still the problem before us is: are we supplying enough food to the teeming millions? On that problem we prosper or perish. Having in view the importance of that problem, I want to use an expression which an American technician used: "Are you aware of the seriousness of the problem? Then you must put this problem on a war footing. What is a war footing? War footing means, nothing else matters but success, and everything that is necessary to succeed in that direction is done." And that is what I want to impress upon this House. This is problem number one to which everything else is secondary because if we do not produce sufficient food, whatever industrialisation we may have will be of no avail I am not sure whether there is not a certain amount of complacency in this respect. We must gird up our loins. We must be aware of the seriousness of the situation and do our best here and now.

Now I come to another aspect, and that is about our exports. I quote from page 3 of the Address:

"Our trade deficits show a welcome decline from 364 crores to 218 crores... My Government by their continuous and strenuous endeavours to promote exports have added new items of export and newer markets, and established new incentives to augment export trade."

I am not aware of many new incentives. But I know this. Why has our export trade fallen? Why are we not able to export things made here to other countries? The Third Plan has made it very clear that our prices are very high. Our cost prices are very high. A standing example is the motor car. We pay for a motor car Rs. 15,000, which you can get in an outside country for Rs. 6,000. The

Americans here import cars here. We make rules and regulations that they should not sell them for two years. After two years the car which they purchased for Rs. 15,000 they sell for Rs. 45,000. We know that, everybody here knows these things, because when those technicians retire, the greatest things their friends are after are their cars. Could we expect ever to export motor cars to other countries for sale?

Leaving aside the motor car, let me come to the refrigerator. Refrigerators which are sold outside for Rs. 1500 we sell for Rs. 2500 here. We want by tariff to protect our industry. True, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and for some time it is good. I am not thinking of the consumer. I am not thinking that the consumer pays that and so we must reduce the price. No, but I am thinking when it will be that we can develop an export market if our cost of production is so high.

Now I will refer to something nearby. I was attending Ramleela recently and a foreigner was there by my side. I was purchasing a chocolate piece, and the gentleman asked me its price. I said Rs. 1/4. He asked in surprise, "Is it Rs. 1/4? It is much cheaper at home." Even for the chocolate piece and generally things like that the cost for our manufacturers is higher than outside.

Take sugar. We want to export sugar. We produce it at Rs. 750 a ton and export it at the magnificent price of Rs. 500 a ton. Because our cost price is high we are exporting it at a loss.

Look at our steel. I was asking a question as to why its price was so high, because we were promised that steel price would go down. The answer of the Minister was the steel cost is high because the whole of the steel is not put through. There are various ways of quibbling and we on this side of the House are satisfied to be quibbled.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Because we leave it to you to understand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You need not be satisfied.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: It is imperative, if you want to increase exports, that the prices must be brought down. If the price is to be brought down, we have got to go into the various elements which make the price. One thing I am surprised about. The charges that we are paying to our labourers and others cannot be said to compare favourably with the high charges which are paid in other countries. Still our costs are high. Why? What are the elements that make this cost so high? Sir, the Third Five Year Plan said that a Committee had been appointed to go through that. I do not know what the Committee has done. We shall be glad to be enlightened about what has happened and what conclusions have been reached and what steps are being taken so that our industries can be made more efficient. In this matter it is absolutely imperative, if we want to build up a high export trade, that we should reduce our cost, and there is one other matter in this connection which I would like to mention. This is a matter of collaboration. Ten years back, five years back, collaboration was a very difficult work. Today any industrialist—I know many of them—just goes to the United States of America or to some other country, to Italy or Switzerland, and then comes back with a collaborator.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): What is wrong in it?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Nothing wrong. That is what I am going to say. Collaboration means increased cost. The amount of money that is invested is much more than what is done without collaboration. That is point

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

number one. I want it to be gone through. Unless it is essential for the requirement of the country, collaboration should not be allowed because collaboration means that we get a number of people whom we are paying as experts a tremendous amount. They come for collaboration, not for the love of India, but because they invest their monies. But we must choose and find out in which directions investment of money is good for us. I do not say that there is free trade in collaboration, I do not say that there is *laissez-faire* in collaboration. But still I would like this matter to be gone into that only in certain areas in which development is essential for us should collaboration be allowed. And also I want that many of the industries which have . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): How else is the machinery to be imported when there is no foreign exchange? You have to get these collaborators.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I agree. I have got your point. I am in touch with industry and so I can understand what you say. It is true. But what are the industries in which you want collaboration? What are the items in the industry in which you want collaboration? That I want you to decide. Where we cannot do anything, collaboration is necessary even at a higher cost. You know that American machinery costs much more than German machinery, for example. But we get people to invest money because even if it is costly, we want the work to be done. I agree. But in the areas in which we can develop ourselves without this cost and in the areas in which their collaboration is not necessary . . .

THE MINISTER OF MINES AND OIL (SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA): Could you enumerate certain industries where you think there need not have been investment?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: It can be enumerated and it can be told. I want this matter to be gone into. I am not one of those who are dogmatic and who say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't deal.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: But the field in which this help must be received must be gone into. That is what I am saying. If this is done, we will get better results. The experts come. There is a definition of expert in the Reader's Digest. When one goes to a foreign country, he becomes an expert. It is not very long since we are out of slavery. I mean, one coming from somewhere becomes an expert.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: He is Mr. Export, not Mr. Expert.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Yes. I am not dogmatic and I do not say that everything done has been wrong. But these are the ways in which you can reduce the cost.

There is only one other matter which I would like to mention and that is about education. I am not happy about what has been mentioned about education. It is said:—

“My Government have made provision for education for all children in the age group of 6—11 during the Third Plan which will enable 90 per cent. of the boys and about 62 per cent. of the girls to be at school....”

There is a contradiction.

“....making a total of 76 per cent. of the total population of all children in the age group 6—11.”

That ‘all’ must be amended because it will enable 90 per cent. of the school boys and about 62 per cent. of the girls to be at school making a

total of 76 per cent. Sir, when we framed the Constitution, we said eight years of compulsory education.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Ten years.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Ten years. And later on, we justified it. The Constitution only said that we would endeavour to provide education. It is endeavouring all this time. The Constitutional provision did not say that you must provide education. We take shelter under that. The First Plan has gone, the Second Plan has gone and the Third Plan is here. They said that they would provide education for everybody. But it is 76 per cent. of the children, and now this 76 per cent. is made up of 90 per cent. of the boys and about 62 per cent. of the girls. This is the net result. I would like to ask: Is it not necessary, while our economy is improved, that education in the country is also improved? That is fundamental. I am not sure that it will be done even by the end of the Third Plan because how do you give educational facilities having experience of and having read about compulsion in education? When does compulsion succeed? Given two conditions, compulsion succeeds. Firstly, the people must have the willingness and the desire to learn and that, I do not think, is lacking in our country. But there is another important thing which is necessary for any compulsion to succeed and that is the circumstances which will make the boys to go to school. Every place with about 250 or 300 children between five and six must have a school. They are not going to walk one mile. Every place must have a school. An elementary school is the right of every child. I cannot ask the child to go to the school in the next village and walk. And no parent will send his child to the next village. And secondly, merely having a school alone will not do. There are the poorest people who earn a rupee. Provide them with facilities. You must give them food. A hungry stomach does not read. Thirdly, you must provide them with

some books. It is creating a difficulty for the parent to send the children to the school. I do not say about the rich boy. He must be provided with these facilities, and unless we do so, our programmes for elementary education and compulsory education will not succeed. And not only that, the schools must be good also.

I do not like to speak very much more but would only say that we have done well. As a Government, the great stability which the Congress has given to this country in the last fifteen years is something great. We have proved that democracy can work and work successfully in this country. Millions of people, eight or ten crores, I should think, went to the polls. How many crores?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Twelve crores.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Twelve crores of people went to the polls without any major incident throughout the country. People stood in long queues, 150, 200, 300, for furlongs. They knew the value of the vote. They knew the value of suffrage, they waited, they came. It was not like the old elections when people were put into the trucks for voting. Many people came, not only men but women in their numbers came. It was a glorious sight to see how democracy worked and it was a glory to the Congress Party that after two terms when they went to power for the third term, people said that they would come and exercise their vote by their own volition, they would be selecting the people who were to govern them. There was no fear, they were not frightened. People in authority did not frighten the people and say that they must vote for a particular party. No. Without fear or favour they voted for whomsoever they liked. I am glad that some non-Congress people succeeded because that proved conclusively that there was no fear complex. People were free to vote. The economic development has been great, the industrial

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] development has been great. In the technical field it has been great, but looking at the way our population has been increasing and the way other countries are progressing, it is not big enough—not that there has not been much work done; surely great work has been done, for which we must be grateful to the millions of our people who participated in it, from the humblest workers to the biggest technicians in every field, to the people in administration and to the people in all fields, who have given a lot of thought to and rendered service in this great work. But then much more remains to be done, and the coming years will be giving us the opportunity.

Thank you.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Mr Vice-Chairman. I am happy I have this opportunity to participate in this debate arising out of the Address by our President to the Joint Session of Parliament. This Address enumerates the achievements which our Government had had during the year that has gone by. But the greatest proof of endorsement of these achievements is the public verdict that we have received quite recently at the polls, thanks to our electorate, thanks to the peaceful manner in which our electorate has given this verdict all over the country. More than a hundred millions of our electorate have gone to the polls and—believe me, Mr. Vice-Chairman—we have demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that our country of 437 millions has turned out to be the most successful experimentation in political democracy, and we have now every hope that parliamentary democracy has come to stay in our country and the more hopeful we feel because, around we see that in many countries in this continent and elsewhere parliamentary democracy could not work. The manner in which it has been able to work and achieve miracles in this country is really praiseworthy, and

most of the achievements which the Government have placed on record here are very significant inasmuch as they have raised the standard of living of the people. Of course I quite agree with some of the Members of the Opposition when they say that much more should have been done. But what I should say is that, wherever we have gone, we have seen that the representatives of the people have more than ever come to realise the responsibility that they owe to this country, and the manner in which some of the Members in the Opposition have been elected is proof positive that our elections have been fair and successful.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: "In spite of that", rather than "because of that".

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I feel that in certain fields our achievements should have been still more spectacular than what have been recorded in this Address. I share with Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar the view that in the field of education, in spite of what the framers of the Constitution had visualized more than ten years ago, we have not yet been able to guarantee a hundred per cent literacy—the obligation imposed upon us by the Constitution—but for that, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must have to say that the problem has been colossal in its magnitude, and even for this achievement in the field of education that we have now recorded, if you only try to look at it from the constructive point of view, it is something which we must really feel grateful for, and it is to be wondered at how we have been able to achieve so much of progress in this field of education. Representing, as I do, the State of Madras, in this House, I take special pride in saying this, that in that particular field of education we have made the most marvellous progress. It may well serve as an example and a source of inspiration for our entire country. Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar has

rightly referred to some of the facilities we must make available if children of school age, referred to in this Address, are to be attracted to schools, since most of the children, unfortunately, are the victims of poverty, and in order that our schooling should be made attractive, we have got not only to see that there is ample provision of schooling, in almost every village and every hamlet—such as we have in our State—but we must also see that free midday meals, free uniforms, free books and such other facilities are made available for these children, and for that I think we should not place too much emphasis or too much dependence upon our public exchequer. We have got in our State a people's movement, and under school-improvement activity people have come forward—in every village—vying one with the other—to contribute materially towards the upkeep of the schools and the provision of facilities for the children of school age all over the place, and I hope, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the Government at the Centre will do well to see that such a scheme as is now working there and has proved so successful in the State of Madras, becomes widely applicable all over the country.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must have to say a word with regard to the step that the Government of India have taken in order to promote national integration. I must say here that we welcome this as one of the most vital steps necessary to preserve the integrity of our country. Coming as I do from the State of Madras, I know what dangers we have now in tackling the problem of national integration. In our State we have got now a party—a movement—which is out for separation, and that has gathered momentum at the recent elections. That is a warning for the country, and we cannot allow such separatist tendencies, such fissiparous tendencies, which are now working and dissipating our energies in certain parts of our country. And for that what is the remedy? I do not, like Cassandra,

take an alarmist view of it and I do not say that it spells disaster and catastrophe for our country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Give your surplus votes—in the by-elections—to the Swatantra Party.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I have seen, Mr. Vice-Chairman, after a careful analysis of the conduct of elections in the State of Madras, that we have succeeded in capturing the votes in almost every constituency where we have carried out our developmental activities prescribed in the Second Five Year Plan, and wherever we have not been able to do so and thus carry the masses with us, there, the people, possibly from their own point of view—and rightly perhaps—have disowned our party. I do not say that they had any love for any Dravidastan. In fact, although that was part of the manifesto of the D.M.K. which has come into the most effective opposition in the State of Madras, nevertheless, that was not the catch slogan, I think. But wherever I went—I had covered a lot of that State campaigning—I saw only this that people now are not carried away by slogans but they are carried away by the results of a party's constructive activities promised by them. They gave a verdict for us in villages where tremendous progress had been made by our efforts, and where any such progress could not be made, there the people had rightly given a verdict against our party. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that is the method by which, I hope, we have got to win over those constituencies, and where we failed in that method, there, they have been a loss to the ruling party in the last elections. We have to win them over by love, and we have to win them over by our record of service and sacrifice. But one thing—believe me, Mr. Vice-Chairman—that is troubling me now is the sickening phenomenon that seems to be spreading like a contagion in many States in India, is the craze for a seat in

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]
the Ministry. I am afraid, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that by only having larger Ministries they are not going to solve the problems.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Larger what?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Larger Ministries are not going to solve problems.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But that is for solving the factional problems of the Congress. You know it.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I may tell my hon. friend that in the State of Madras they have the smallest Ministry in the whole of India. They have only eight Ministers there and I must congratulate the Chief Minister there, Mr. Kamaraj, for standing by that number and trying not to extend it, no matter what examples may be set by the other States. I would, therefore, submit, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the powers that be here, should exert their pressure upon the makers of the Ministries in the different States to see that they keep the number to the irreducible minimum.

Next, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must say something about the conduct of the elections. Although appeals were made to communalism, to sectarianism and to casteism yet I am most happy to report to the House that in nearly every constituency where I had occasion to study the situation myself, nearly every community, every caste and every section, had been cut right through by these party politics. It cannot be said against any particular community or any particular caste that it voted one way or the other, for the Communist Party or the Congress Party or even the D. M. K. because of the caste or community of the candidate. Those of different communities and different castes participated in the election and voted according to the different political parties to which they belonged. I know that in certain constituencies these castes might

not have voted very much for the Congress Party; but nevertheless, I am happy that they are now coming under secular traditions and they were able to vote down even members belonging to their own caste, being only convinced by the political ideologies of this or that political party. That, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is a happy sign which speaks well of the future of democracy and the future of parliamentary government here. I welcome it from that point of view. I also welcome the fact that so many people have now come to realise that a candidate simply by the accident of his belonging to a particular community or caste, should not be voted for, unless he subscribed to the political party in which the voter belonging to a community or caste, has faith. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must say that what actually gave our Government, the party which is now in power and to which I have the honour to belong, the greatest proof of popularity in this country is that the people, the electorate, our masters have come to realise in spite of all the propaganda that our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, and the leading lights of his party have carried on, that the Congress Party alone can deliver the goods in this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not come to realise that. You can deliver the goods to the Birlas. That I have realised.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Sir, let me say this. They have come to realise that under the dynamic personality of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Congress has been carrying the message of Mahatma Gandhi and has been able to bring about unity and national integration which no party at the moment is in a position to do in such a measure. That, I believe, is the basic truth which has been recorded here. I am not very much worried here about what Mr. Gupta says. He had this opportunity of a free and fair election all over the country and the people have given us their verdict and they have returned

us with even greater laurels. That I believe, is the best and finest judgment that our people can give about the behaviour and about the conduct and about the achievements of our party. Mr. Vice-Chairman, let me say that the people in the nooks and corners of India have got that faith in the ruling party and in the Government and we can look forward to having much more brilliant achievements, particularly under the auspices of the Third Five Year Plan which lays, naturally enough, greater stress and due emphasis upon agriculture.

Mr. Vice-Chairman. I must say one thing more and that is with regard to our glorious record in the field of foreign affairs. I am happy that a good number of our friends here have spoken of it and paid tribute to the manner in which we have been able to bring Goa back to the motherland. I must say, Sir, that we have vindicated the honour of India. We have also demonstrated our desire for peace. Wherever there have been trouble-spots in the world, be it in Korea, be it in Vietnam, be it in the Suez or be it now in the Congo, in almost every country where there was trouble breaking out, our Government had intervened and at the call of the United Nations, the country has discharged its obligations for the cause of international peace and carried the banner of peace to every country where there was a trouble-spot. That is a glorious record. Thanks to the wonderful and dynamic statesmanship of our Prime Minister, that has borne good results not only at home but also overseas. If so many dignitaries come to visit our country from every corner of the world, both from the Communist bloc and from the Anglo-American bloc, it is not a surprise. That, I think, is the finest compliment that the world can pay to the policy that the Government of India has been pursuing since the advent of freedom, towards promoting international peace and goodwill among all mankind. I am, therefore, happy, Mr. Vice-Chairman,

that in this Address, the President has referred to our many achievements in different countries where international peace had to be served and to the manner in which our army had gone there carrying the banner of peace and trying to restore law and order in those countries where there was trouble. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Address of our President comes in the wake of the general verdict that the people of this country have given. This verdict shows that they have faith in the ruling party—the Congress Party. That augurs well for the future of Parliament in India and I hope that we can go from strength to strength, from success to success, from year to year and see that our country becomes the bastion, the model, the centre or beacon light of parliamentary democracy in the world. Thank you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I consider it a privilege to associate myself with the Resolution of thanks to our respected President for his Address. Sir, I don't know the interpretation of the first sentence in the Address, whether this is the last occasion that our President addresses us or whether there will be one more occasion but I feel it my duty to express our deep gratitude to him that during the whole tenure of his office, he has acted as the friend, philosopher and guide to our Parliament. We will always remember with gratitude the guidance that he has given to Parliament.

Sir, the two fundamental aspects of the Address are these. One relates to international affairs and the other relates to the policies to be observed within the country. Quite appropriately, the Address starts with and gives due importance to the policies to be followed for the development of the country. There also it gives priority to agriculture which is certainly one that deserves the urgent consideration of this Parliament.

I would not go into those details but one thing I would submit about

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

the development of agriculture. Mention has been made of a corporation regarding production of seed and equal emphasis has been placed on the increase of fertiliser plants. I have no doubt that for increasing agricultural produce both these things are very essential but I would like the Government, particularly the Food and Agriculture Department, to see in greater detail that these seeds will be economically within the power of our agriculturists to make use of. Another thing I have felt is that these things do not reach the agriculturists in proper time. With all the advantages that we may have, if he does not get these things at the proper time and at reasonable prices, then I think our desire, our anxiety, to increase production in the agricultural field will come to nothing and we will not achieve any success.

Regarding industrial production I would only refer to the fact that there have been felt—and it has been acknowledged—stresses and strains so far as production of coal is concerned and also in the matter of transport of coal to our industries at the proper time. I am glad that there are countries who are co-operating with us and with the help of these enterprises in the public sector and also with the encouragement that may be given to the private sector, this problem of the coal industry and its transport to our other industries will be satisfactorily solved without further delay.

I have a point regarding education and I am glad that the Education Minister is here. I have always felt that according to our declarations by now we should have completed the scheme of compulsory primary education.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Free.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes; free compulsory primary education. But I am sorry that there has been great delay in this and even in the Third Five Year Plan we do not hope

to achieve that end. I do hope the Education Ministry and the Government of India will not be content only by recommending measures but if necessary they should have to think of taking such measures as would compel the States to see that at least the targets set in the Third Five Year Plan are completed and completed in an efficient manner.

As regards technical education, I feel that there has not been sufficient funds provided to meet the requirements of our developing economy. For instance, private polytechnics and other things have been started with the help of Government on fifty-fifty basis. Now five years have been completed and I learn from my State that recently the Government of India has sent a circular that they would not be able to give further help to such institutions. I know that so far as southern India is concerned—the Regional Committee covers the four States of Andhra, Kerala, Madras and Mysore—in Andhra and Mysore there have not been sufficient facilities available for technical education. Now, with the help of certain organisations and their voluntary donations, such institutions have been started and if at this stage they are not properly helped, I am sure it is bound to give a very serious setback to the progress of technical education and it is bound to affect the development of our economic activities. I want the Government to take a very serious note of the situation and in consultation with the State authorities to evolve some formula so that such institutions are enabled to remain, not only remain but increase their capacity so that they may be able to provide as much technical education as is necessary to meet all our requirements.

Sir, I would not go into further details but I would say that on the whole a very serious effort has been made and is being made and I am sure as it has been mentioned there, there is no complacency about it because we have to go very far in order

to meet the present economic conditions, the poverty and ignorance of our people, unemployment and other economic ills. So I do hope that the Government will continue its efforts to improve the economic condition of the people without which political democracy has no meaning.

Now, coming to the international field, there are two or three aspects to which I would like to refer. Of course, there has been certain criticism about the action which the Government of India took regarding Goa but I am glad to note that as things have been explained and as sufficient information has been communicated to the countries concerned, now a realisation has come about that in the circumstances in which we were placed, after making peaceful efforts for the last 14 years and with the unanimous pressure of all the political parties and public opinion in the country it was not open for the Government of India to take any other course but the one that they have taken. I am sure that public opinion was so strong that the Government would have been thrown out if they had not so acted in regard to Goa. So I hope the countries which have been a little critical referring to our principles of non-violence, will appreciate

that it was a case of security and safety of the State. With our relations with China and Pakistan as they are, we could not afford to have a spot in our own State which might turn out to be a danger spot for us. It was with this realisation that people felt that already it was too late and that it was high time that some decisive step was taken. And I think there is nobody in the whole country, no party in the whole country, which does not support, which does not fully concur in the step which the Government has taken.

Sir, shall I continue tomorrow?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): You have got another three or four minutes. So if you wish . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I would like to take ten minutes more if you please. So I will continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): In that case, the House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 14th March 1962.