

[Secretary.]

held on the 14th February, 1961, has adopted the following motion extending the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Maternity Benefit Bill, 1960:—

MOTION

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to regulate the employment of women in certain establishments for certain periods before and after childbirth and to provide for payment of maternity benefit to them, be extended up to the 17th February, 1961."

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

श्री गंगा शरण सिंह : माननीय डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब, अभी हाल में जो घटनायें घटी हैं उनमें कांगो में जो कुछ हुआ है वह सब से दर्दनाक, सब से शर्मिंदगी की बात है और सब से अधिक खतरनाक घटना घटी है। जो कुछ कांगो में हुआ है वह यही नहीं कि गलत है बल्कि वह नितान्त अमानुषिक है। उसकी क्या क्या प्रतिक्रिया हो सकती है उसकी पूरी संभावनाएं शायद आज हमारे सामने नहीं हैं और अभी शायद हम उनकी कल्पना भी नहीं कर पाते हैं।

कांगो के सम्बन्ध में आम तौर से जो रुख हमारी सरकार ने लिया है वह सही था और उसके साथ हमारी सहमति रही है। लेकिन आज जो एक नई परिस्थिति कांगो में उत्पन्न हो गई है उसमें इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि जो नीति हो उसे ज्यादा मुस्तैदी के साथ काम में लाया जाये और जो कुछ विचार हों उन्हें ज्यादा

मुस्तैदी के साथ कार्यान्वित किया जाये। मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि जब आज इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि कांगो में यूनाइटेड नेशंस ज्यादा कारगर हो, ज्यादा इफेक्टिव हो, तो ऐसी हालत में यह चर्चा चलाई जा रही है कि यूनाइटेड नेशंस की फोर्स को वहां से वापस बुला लेना चाहिये। मेरा ख्याल है कि इस समय यूनाइटेड नेशंस की फोर्स की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत कांगो में है और अगर यूनाइटेड नेशंस की फोर्स वहां से वापस बुला ली जायेंगी तो जो परिस्थिति पैदा होगी उसका हम आज अन्दाजा नहीं लगा सकते और इस की बहुत संभावना है कि हमें शायद एक और विश्व युद्ध का सामना करना पड़ जाये। इसलिये आज यूनाइटेड नेशंस की ताकत को मजबूत करने, यूनाइटेड नेशंस को वहां प्रभावशाली बनाने और उसके जरिये से काम करने की कांगो में नितान्त आवश्यकता है। जो मांग हमारी सरकार ने पहले रखी थी कि कांगो की पार्लियामेंट का अधिवेशन बुलाया जाना चाहिये, खुशी की बात है कि आज अमेरिका भी उस मांग का समर्थन कर रहा है। आज सब से ज्यादा जरूरत इस बात की है कि कांगो में वास्तविकता लाने के लिये, शांति लाने के लिये और सही सरकार की स्थापना के लिये वहां की पार्लियामेंट को शीघ्र बुलाया जाना चाहिये और उस पार्लियामेंट के द्वारा निर्धारित या उसका समर्थन प्राप्त वहां जो भी सरकार बने उसके साथ यू० एन० ओ० और दुनिया की दूसरी ताकतों को व्यवहार करना चाहिये।

आज दूसरी ताज्जुब की बात मुझे यह मालूम होती है कि एक और यह कहा जा रहा है कि यू० एन० ओ० की फोर्स को कांगो से बुला लिया जाये और दूसरी ओर सेक्रेटरी जनरल को हटाने की ओर उन पर अविश्वास की चर्चा हो रही है। कांगो में जो कुछ यू० एन० ओ० की तरफ से हुआ उस से हम खुश नहीं हैं, लेकिन उसमें सेक्रेटरी जनरल का

कसूर मेरी समझ में नहीं आता । अगर कमजोरी किसी ने दिखलाई तो सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल ने दिखलाई । सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल ने मुस्तैदी के साथ कोई कदम नहीं उठाया । आज दुनिया में जो ताकतें भिन्न भिन्न कैम्पों में बंटी हुई हैं उनकी पैतराबाजी ने, उनके अड़गने ने बहुत हद तक यू० एन० ओ० को प्रभावशाली नहीं होने दिया । सेक्रेटरी जनरल का यह काम रहा है कि यू० एन० ओ० में फैसले हों, जो सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में फैसले हों उनको वे कारगर बनायें । उसमें मैं समझता हूँ कि नीति का जहाँ तक प्रश्न है यू० एन० ओ० में और सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में ढिलाई जरूर हुई है और कोई नीति मुस्तैदी से नहीं चलाई गई । जरा हम कल्पना करें कि अगर सेक्रेटरी जनरल को इस समय हटा दिया गया तो क्या परिस्थिति होगी । उसके बाद नये सेक्रेटरी जनरल के चुनाव के सम्बन्ध में फिर पैतराबाजी शुरू हो जायेगी । इसके बजाय कि यू० एन० ओ० वहाँ प्रभावशाली बने, जोर की दलबन्दी शुरू हो जायेगी और जो यू० एन० ओ० की शक्ति है उसको धक्का लगेगा । इसलिये आज की परिस्थिति में सेक्रेटरी जनरल का बदला जाना सही नहीं होगा । जो सेक्रेटरी जनरल हैं उनको रहना चाहिये और साथ ही साथ यू० एन० ओ० को पूरी ताकत के साथ ही अपनी नीति को वहाँ कारगर करना चाहिये । जहाँ एक ओर इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि जो बाहर की ताकत है, बाहर की फौज है, बाहर के फौजी अफसर हैं, उनको कांगो से हटाया जाये, वहाँ दूसरी ओर इस बात की भी आवश्यकता है कि जो कांगोली आर्मीज हैं, जो कांगो की फौसेज हैं उनको भी डिस-आर्म करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये, नहीं तो संभावना इस बात की है कि जो फौसेज वहाँ हैं और वे जिस तरह से बरताव करती रही हैं, जिस तरह से व्यवहार करती रही हैं और जो आचरण उन्होंने अभी किया है, उससे पता यह लगता है कि यू० एन० ओ० के ब्रेस्ट इंटेंशन के बावजूद, अच्छी से अच्छी

नीति के बावजूद, जो कुछ यू० एन० ओ० वहाँ करना चाहता है वह नहीं कर सकेगा । इसलिये यू० एन० ओ० के निर्णयों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिये जो वहाँ की फौसेज हैं उनका डिसआर्म किया जाना जरूरी है । इसीलिये हमें सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में पूरी मुस्तैदी के साथ अपनी आवाज को पहुँचाना चाहिये । हालांकि हम उसके मेम्बर नहीं हैं, हमारा देश उसका मेम्बर नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी बाज बाज मौकों पर हम अपनी बात वहाँ कहने के लिए जाते रहे हैं, उसी तरह इस बार भी हमें वहाँ अपनी पूरी बात कहनी चाहिये और जहाँ तक परिस्थिति बिगड़ चुकी है उसको आगे बिगड़ने से रोकना चाहिये । ऊपर से ऐसा लगा कि जो बेलजियम साम्राज्यवाद है वह कांगो से विद्वेष कर रहा है, वापस हो रहा है, टेकनिकल तरीके से, बाजाबता तरीके से शायद वह वापस भी हो गया, लेकिन फिर भी शायद मन के भीतर, दिल के भीतर वह वापस नहीं हुआ । इसी लिए वापस होने के बाद वह ऐसी कार्यवाहियाँ करता रहा जिस के चलते ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा हुई । आज साम्राज्यवाद का विरोध करने की आवश्यकता है और इसके साथ ही साथ जहाँ साम्राज्यवाद का विद्वेषण होता है, साम्राज्यवादी जहाँ से हटते हैं, वहाँ हमको इस बात की चेष्टा करनी चाहिये कि वह सिर्फ टेकनिकल न हो बल्कि वह मेंटल भी हो, सिर्फ ऊपरी सतह पर न हो बल्कि भीतर से भी विद्वेषण हो । यदि ऐसा नहीं होगा तो बाद में वे अपनी फौजें भेजेंगे, हवाई जहाज भेजेंगे, अपने आफिसर भेजेंगे और वहाँ के लोगों को लड़ा कर अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से अपना अधिकार कायम रखने की कोशिश करेंगे जैसा कि कांगो में हुआ है ।

एक ओर पुर्तगाली साम्राज्यवाद अफ्रिका है और दूसरी तरफ हम देखते हैं कि हमारे मुल्क में भी गोआ का उपनिवेश कायम है । अभी भी हमारे देश में एक

[श्री गंगा शरण सिंह]

हिस्से में साम्राज्यवाद का खंगुल पड़ा हुआ है। खुशी की बात यह है कि आज पोर्तगाली साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ उसके जितने उपनिवेश हैं उनमें भी और स्वयं पुर्तगाल में भी आवाज उठ रही है। लेकिन हमें सिर्फ इस पर निर्भर नहीं रहना चाहिये कि अफ्रीका में जो पुर्तगाल के उपनिवेश हैं वे जब विद्रोह करेंगे, वे जब सिर उठावेंगे या स्वयं पुर्तगाल में जब कुछ होगा तब हम भी उस कतार में जाकर शामिल हो जायेंगे, हम भी उनके पिछलग्गू बन जायेंगे, बल्कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि सिर्फ प्रतीक्षा न करके हम कोई सक्रिय कदम उठावें। कम से कम हमारे देश से साम्राज्यवाद का नामोनिशान मिट सके, इसके सम्बन्ध में सिर्फ प्रतीक्षा करने की जो नीति है उसका अन्त होना चाहिये। इस दिशा में हमें कोई सक्रिय कदम उठाना चाहिये और जो कलंक साम्राज्यवाद का हमारे देश पर है उसको दूर करने की हमको पूरी चेष्टा करनी चाहिये।

जहां एक ओर अफ्रीका और एशिया के कुछ अंश में अभी भी पुराने ढंग के साम्राज्यवाद का दौर दौरा है, वहां दूसरी ओर एक नये तरह का साम्राज्यवाद भी विचारों के नाम पर, प्रगतिशीलता के नाम पर फैल रहा है। उसका बाहरी रूप दूसरा है, उसका काम करने का तरीका दूसरा है, लेकिन वह भी एक तरह का साम्राज्यवाद ही है। जिस पद्धति में, जिस तंत्र में जनता को राय देने का हक न हो, जिस पद्धति में किसी को अपनी बात बहने का हक न हो, जिस पद्धति में राजनैतिक दलों के निर्माण का हक न हो, जिस पद्धति में जनतंत्र के लिए कोई जगह न हो, जिस पद्धति में सारा कंट्रोल ऊपर से हो और सिर्फ अपने देश से नहीं बल्कि दूसरे देश से हो, उसे न तो आप जनतंत्र कह सकते हैं, उसे न तो आप राष्ट्रीयता कह सकते हैं, उसे न तो आप समाजवाद कह सकते हैं, वह तो एक तरह की डिक्टेटोरशिप

है, जिसे आप तानाशाही कहिये, इम्पीरियलिज्म कहिये या जो भी नाम दीजिये, लेकिन दूसरी शक्ल में वही चीज है जो पुराने जमाने के साम्राज्यवादियों में पाई जाती थी। उसका सब से ताजा नमूना, सब से निकट का नमूना हमारा बंगल का देश है चीन। चीन ने तिब्बत में जो कुछ किया मैं उसे भी एक तरह का इम्पीरियलिज्म ही कहता हूँ, एक तरह का साम्राज्यवाद ही कहता हूँ। जहां तक तिब्बत का प्रश्न है, जिस तरह की कायंबाही वहां की गई है, जो कुछ वहां हो रहा है वह क्या है? वह एक देश का दूसरे देश पर कब्जा करना है, उसका शोषण करना है, उसका अन्त करना है और वहां की राष्ट्रीयता को, वहां के विचारों को, जो कुछ भी उस देश के नाम पर उसका अपना है—जो उसकी अलग आइडेंटिटी है, जो उसकी अलग सत्ता है,—उस सारी सत्ता को नष्ट करने का प्रयत्न आज वहां हो रहा है। इस दिशा में हम और कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं तो कम से कम इतना तो करना ही चाहिये कि जो आज वहां ज्यादाती के विरोध में जो आवाज उठा रहे हैं उनका जो मारल है, उनका जो साहस है, उनकी जो हिम्मत है उसको टूटने न दें, उनकी हिम्मत कायम रहे और हमें अपने कामों के जरिये से उस हिम्मत को विकसित होने का, बढ़ने का और ज्यादा कारगर और प्रभावशाली होने का मौका देना चाहिये। हमारा इतिहास और सारी दुनिया का इतिहास यह बतलाता है कि जो प्रगति की ज्योति होती है, जो आजादी की ज्योति होती है, जो किसी जुल्म के खिलाफ प्रकाश होता है वह अगर थोड़ा भी बचा रहता है, उसकी अगर थोड़ी भी लौ जाग्रत रहती है तो एक जमाना ऐसा आता है जब कि वह छोटी सी लौ एक बड़े प्रकाश के रूप में धक्क उठती है और उस सत्ता को, उस अधिकार को, उस ज्यादाती को, उस अत्याचार को मिटा कर अपनी स्थिति कायम रखती है। तिब्बत में जो कुछ हो रहा है उसके लिये पता नहीं तुरन्त क्या किया जा सकता है

लेकिन जो कुछ भी हो हमें दुनिया की राय को और उस लौ को जाग्रत रखने में पूरी तरह से मदद करनी चाहिये। चीन ने तिब्बत में ही सिर्फ यह सब नहीं किया है और आज भी जो कुछ चीन की तरफ से हो रहा है वह सिर्फ आश्चर्यजनक ही नहीं है बल्कि बहुत ही खतरनाक भी है। अभी तक यही समझा जाता था कि हमारे और चीन के बीच में सिर्फ सीमा का ही प्रश्न है लेकिन अभी जो रिपोर्ट हम लोगों के सामने आई है—इतने थोड़े समय में उस पूरी रिपोर्ट को पढ़ सकना तो सम्भव नहीं है लेकिन जो उसका संक्षिप्त रूप है, जो उसका अन्तिम अंश है—उसको पढ़ने से पता चलता है कि चीन आज सिर्फ सीमा का प्रश्न लेकर ही हमारे सामने नहीं है बल्कि उसने कई नये प्रश्न खड़े कर दिये हैं। आज भूटान का प्रश्न है, आज सिक्किम का प्रश्न है। भूटान के साथ, सिक्किम के साथ जो हमारा सम्बन्ध है वह ज्यादाती का सम्बन्ध नहीं है, वह आपसी सम्बन्ध है, समझ बूझ का सम्बन्ध है, दोनों की राय से वह सम्बन्ध कायम है लेकिन उन सम्बन्धों के बारे में चीन संका प्रकट करने लगा है। काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में भी आज चीन का रुख बदल गया है। इतना ही नहीं, वही शब्द जो कि जब हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर और चाऊ-एन-लाई में बातें हुई उस समय दूसरे मायने रखते थे और आज उन्हीं शब्दों को दूसरे मायने पहिचाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। तो हमने यह भी देखा कि इस तानाशाही मुल्कों में सिर्फ पद्धति ही नहीं बदलती है बल्कि शब्दों के मायने, शब्दों के अर्थ भी बदलते हैं, उनकी व्याख्यायें भी बदलती हैं और वे अपने समय के अनुसार, अपनी सहूलियत के अनुसार उनमें परिवर्तन करते हैं और उनका उपयोग करते हैं। हम सोचते थे कि काश्मीर के मामले में चीन शायद हमारे साथ है, लोगों का यह ख्याल था कि काश्मीर के मामले में चीन हमारे साथ है लेकिन अब पता चलता है कि काश्मीर के मामले में भी चीन हमारे साथ नहीं है। इन नये प्रश्नों को उठाने के

अलावा एक और सब से बड़ी खतरनाक चीज की जा रही है और वह खतरनाक चीज यह है कि आज चीन हमको हमारे पड़ोसियों से अलग करने की चेष्टा कर रहा है। हमारे हर पड़ोसी के साथ वह अलग प्रकार की कोई संधि कर के या और कोई बात करके या ऐसी कार्यवाहियां करके हमको अलग करने की कोशिश कर रहा है जैसे कि वे आज चीन के ज्यादा करीब हैं और हमसे वे अलग हैं। तो यह चेष्टा भिन्न भिन्न रूप में, प्रत्यक्ष रूप में और छिपे रूप में जारी है। जिस किसी पड़ोसी को लीजिये, बर्मा के साथ, नेपाल के साथ, पाकिस्तान के साथ, सब के साथ इस तरह का प्रयत्न जारी है जिससे कि उनसे हिन्दुस्तान को अलग किया जाये, हिन्दुस्तान को आइसोलेट किया जाये, हिन्दुस्तान को अकेला किया जाये। ऐसी अवस्था में, मेरा ख्याल है कि हमारी तरफ से पूरी कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि पड़ोसियों के साथ हमारे जो सम्बन्ध रहे हैं वे सम्बन्ध पूरी तरह से कायम रहें, उनमें वृद्धि हो और हमारा और उनका जो साथ है वह ज्यादा मजबूत, ज्यादा नजदीकी, ज्यादा सुदृढ़ और ज्यादा व्यापक हो। एक ओर तो चीन फौज के जरिये से हमारे देश पर हक जमाने की, अधिकार जमाने की, कब्जा करने की कोशिश कर रहा है और दूसरी ओर राजनीति के क्षेत्र में, डिप्लोमेसी के क्षेत्र में, मित्रता के क्षेत्र में हमको परेशान करने की, तंग करने की, हमारे पर खींचने की कोशिश कर रहा है। इस तरफ हमारी सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिये और इस तरफ उसे मुनासिब कदम उठाना चाहिये। हमारे राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इसका न तो कोई जिक्र है और न ही इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार क्या सोचती है उसका कोई उल्लेख किया गया है।

आज जो कुछ चीन कर रहा है उस के सम्बन्ध में जो हमारे पड़ोसी हैं उन से

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

सम्बन्ध बढ़ाने के अलावा हमें अपने देश में भी बहुत कुछ करने की जरूरत है। मुझे पता नहीं है कि हमारी सरकार ने इस प्रश्न के प्रति चेतना जाग्रत करने की कितनी चेष्टा की है। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस का कोई जिक्र नहीं है कि आज हम राष्ट्रीयता की नींव को ज्यादा मजबूत करें, आज जो कुछ चीन कर रहा है उस सम्बन्ध में अपने देश में चेतना उत्पन्न करें। एक ओर तो हम देख रहे हैं कि देश में तरह-तरह की विश्वखल-तायें फैल रही हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमारे देश पर आघात हो रहा है। अगर हम ने देश में एक राष्ट्रीय चेतना नहीं फैलाई, देश के सामने जो खतरा है उस की पूरी तरह से जानकारी लोगों को नहीं कराई तो मुझे इस बात का खतरा मालूम होता है कि हम प्रत्येक मामले में पिछड़ जायेंगे और हमारा बहुत बड़ा नुकसान होगा। जब दो राष्ट्रों के बीच में इस तरह का मामला आता है या किसी भी राष्ट्र में जब इस तरह का प्रश्न उठता है तो यह फैसला सिर्फ फौज नहीं करती, यह फैसला सिर्फ हथियार के बल पर नहीं होता बल्कि फैसला इस पर होता है कि उस राष्ट्र में कितनी जीवनी-शक्ति है, कितनी एकता है, उस को राष्ट्रीयता का कितना ज्ञान है, उसे कितना अपने देश के ऊपर आने वाले खतरे का पता है और उस के लिये वह कितना त्याग करने को, कितना कष्ट उठाने को तैयार है। यह चीज ज्यादा कीमती, ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण और ज्यादा उपयोगी होती है बनिस्वत दूसरी चीजों के और मेरा ख्याल है कि उस के सम्बन्ध में इस देश में कुछ नहीं किया जा रहा है।

सीमा पर जो कुछ हो रहा है वह ठीक है लेकिन जितना जो कुछ हो रहा है वह काफी नहीं है। मुझे स्वयं कई क्षेत्रों में जाने का मौका मिला है और जो कुछ मैंने देखा उससे मुझे यही लगा कि सीमा-क्षेत्रों में जो कुछ हो रहा है वह एक नार्मल स्टडीन वर्क

की तरह हो रहा है। बाहर से ऐसा ही मालूम होता है। जैसेकि वहां रोड बनाने का काम हो रहा है। एक जगह की बात मैं आप को बतलाता हूँ। एक बस कम्पनी से कहा गया कि यह जो नई बनी हुई सड़क है उस पर तुम अपनी बस चलाओ। कम्पनी के—वह यूनिजन है कम्पनी नहीं है—मैनेजर ने वह जगह मुझे भी दिखाई और कहा कि पी० डब्लू० डी० के और पुलिस के जो अफसर हैं वह कहते हैं कि तुम बस चलाओ लेकिन हमारी बस जितनी चौड़ी है सड़क एक फिट उस से कम है तो हम उस पर बस कैसे चलायेंगे। तो आज वहां जो काम हो रहा है—जैसे कि सड़क बनाने का ही काम ले लीजिये—उसमें पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० के बीच में, पुलिस के अधिकारियों के बीच में, कांस्टेबल के बीच में कोई समन्वय नहीं होता है, उन के बीच में कोई संगठन नहीं है, तारतम्य नहीं है और अलग अलग चीजें चल रही हैं और बहुत आराम से चीजें चल रही हैं।

दूसरी चीज यह भी है कि हर निर्माण के काम के चलते चलते कुछ समस्याएँ भी उत्पन्न होती हैं। उदाहरण के लिये, जब पहाड़ी इलाकों में सड़कें बनती हैं तो जो सब से बड़ी समस्या उस के तुरन्त बाद आकर खड़ी होती है वह बेकारी की समस्या खड़ी होती है। जब वहां सड़क नहीं रहती है तो भेड़ वाले, खच्चर वाले, घोड़े वाले और दूसरे सामान ढोने वाले यात्रियों का सामान ढोते हैं। इसके अलावा वहां चट्टियां होती हैं, दुकानें होती हैं और उस के लिये दुकानदार वगैरह होते हैं और दूसरी तरह के काम करने वाले होते हैं। जब सड़क बन जाती है तो वे चट्टियां समाप्त हो जाती हैं, उन भेड़ वाले, खच्चर वाले और दूसरे सब लोगों के रोजगार समाप्त हो जाते हैं। सामान सब ट्रकों पर जाता है और उस से दुकानदार, भेड़ वाले, खच्चर वाले, घोड़े वाले सब बेकार हो जाते हैं। तो जहां एक ओर सड़क बनती है—सड़क

बनाना निहायत जरूरी है—वहां दूसरी ओर इन लोगों के रिहैबिलिटेशन की भी चेष्टा करनी चाहिये। जो ट्रांसपोर्ट का अरेंजमेंट होता है, जो कम्युनिकेशन का अरेंजमेंट होता है और जो बसें वगैरह चलती हैं उन में क्यों नहीं इन को लगा सकते? इन को लगा सकते हैं, इन का पैसा उस काम में लगा सकते हैं और इन के शरीर से काम ले सकते हैं और इन लोगों की बेकारी दूर कर सकते हैं। दूसरे अनेक काम इन के लिये सीमा पर हो सकते हैं जिन को कि तफ़्सील में कह कर मैं आप का समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूं अधिक समय नहीं है।

इस विषय में दूसरी चीज़ यह है कि सीमा पर यहां से वहां तक एक इंटिग्रेटेड पालिसी होनी चाहिये। मेरा तो ख्याल है कि आज गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को कोई ऐसी बाड़ी बनानी चाहिये, कोई ऐसा कमिशन बनाना चाहिये, कोई ऐसी आथोरिटी बनानी चाहिये, जो सारी सीमा को, काश्मीर से लेकर नेफा तक की सीमा की, देख भाल कर सके, उस में सामंजस्य स्थापित कर सके और समन्वय कर सके। आज भिन्न भिन्न इलाकों में जो काम हो रहा है उन में आपस में समन्वय नहीं है, ऐसा मेरा खुद का तजुर्बा है। वे अपनी अपनी तरह, अपने अपने ढंग की राह में चल रहे हैं। आज तक इन इलाकों में यह निश्चित रूप से तय नहीं हो पाया कि चेक पोस्ट पर पुलिस प्रान्त की होगी या केन्द्र की होगी। इनर लाइन के सम्बन्ध में भी हमारी नीति कुछ स्पष्ट नहीं कि इनर लाइन कहां पर होगी, कितनी दूर पर होगी, इनर लाइन के भीतर का क्या हाल होगा। ये सारी चीज़ें आज भी बहुत मामलों में अस्पष्ट हैं। आज सिर्फ चीन का जो रवैया है उस की दृष्टि से नहीं बल्कि अपने देश की इन्टीग्रेट करने की दृष्टि से, अपनी सीमा को इन्टीग्रेट करने की दृष्टि से और सीमा के लोगों और जो समतल के लोग हैं उन में एकता लाने की दृष्टि से हमें सीमा की तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। आर्थिक दृष्टि से भी

हमारे सीमावर्ती लोग ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए हैं। उन का आर्थिक विकास ऐसा होना चाहिये जिस में उन को रोजगार मिल सके, उन को ज्यादा सहूलियत मिल सके, उन का जीवन स्तर ऊपर उठ सके। इसलिए आज प्रश्न राजनीति का नहीं, फौज का नहीं बल्कि सामाजिक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, आर्थिक अवस्था का प्रश्न है। सामाजिक और आर्थिक स्तर को ऊपर उठाने का प्रश्न है। आज सीमा के लोगों में शिक्षा का अभाव है और आर्थिक अवस्था उन की बुरी है। वहां स्थानीय इंडस्ट्री शुरू होनी चाहिये, वहां उद्योग शुरू होने चाहिये, वहां शिक्षा का विशेष प्रयत्न होना चाहिये और साथ ही साथ राष्ट्रीयता की भावना का विकास। देश के बाकी हिस्सों के साथ सीमा के लोग एकता का अनुभव कर सकें, एकत्वता अनुभव कर सकें, इस के लिये विशेष रूप से शिक्षा देने की नितान्त आवश्यकता है, नहीं तो गरीबी वहां इतनी है, परेशानियां इतनी हैं और जीवन की अनेकानेक समस्याएं इतनी हैं कि उन के चक्कर में बाकी चीज़ों को सोचने का लोगों को मौका ही नहीं मिलता है। मौसम भी कुछ ऐसा होता है जो वहां के लोगों के लिये बहुत सहायक नहीं होता। इसीलिये आज सीमा पर हमें विशेष ध्यान देने की जरूरत है और वहां पर रहने वाले लोगों को संगठित करना और सब दृष्टि से उन का विकास करना नितान्त आवश्यक है।

जब हम सीमा की चर्चा करते हैं तो बरबस हमारा ध्यान हमारे पड़ोसी देश नेपाल की तरफ जाता है। कांगो में जो कुछ हुआ है उस के पहले तक, राजनैतिक स्तर पर नेपाल में जो कुछ हुआ वह शायद इधर की सब से महत्वपूर्ण घटना थी। और, उस में हमारी दिलचस्पी कई दृष्टियों से ज्यादा होनी चाहिये थी। हमें नेपाल के आंतरिक मामलों में दखल नहीं देना चाहिये, देना भी नहीं चाहते किसी भी दूसरे देश के मामलों पर, खास कर नेपाल में। लेकिन बहुत से

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

मामलों में नेपाल और भारत में इतनी समानता, इतना आदान प्रदान रहा है कि जो कुछ नेपाल में होता है, उसकी प्रतिक्रिया भारत में होना स्वाभाविक है। और नेपाल में भी जो कुछ हुआ—वहाँ की चुनी हुई पार्लियामेंट को भंग कर दिया गया, वहाँ के चुने हुए प्राइम मिनिस्टर को और दूसरे मिनिस्ट्रों को जेल में रख दिया गया—ये घटना ऐसी नहीं है, जिसका असर सिर्फ नेपाल में हो, बल्कि इसका असर भारतवर्ष में और दूसरे देशों में होना अवश्यभावी था और हुआ। इसीलिये आज आप पाते हैं कि नेपाल में पार्लियामेंट भंग किये जाने के बाद इंग्लैंड में, दूसरे मुल्कों में और यूरोप के मुल्कों में आज नेपाल में पार्लियामेंट की और जनतंत्र की स्थापना के लिये कमेटियाँ बन रही हैं, इसके लिये वहाँ आवाज उठ रही है, इसलिये कि सिर्फ नेपाल में जनतंत्र को ठेस नहीं लगी बल्कि इस की जो प्रतिक्रिया होगी, वह भारत पर और दूसरे देशों पर भी पड़ सकती है। कहा गया—जो नेपाल के महाराजाधिराज हैं, उनके प्रथम वक्तव्य में—कि वहाँ शांति कायम करने के लिये यह कदम उठाया गया। फिर किसी ने यह भी कहा कि कम्युनिस्ट डेंजर से बचाने के लिये, कम्युनिस्ट एक्टिविटी को कम करने के लिये पार्लियामेंट को भंग करना पड़ा। और भी तरह तरह के कारण बतलाये गये, वहाँ के प्राइम मिनिस्टर और दूसरे मिनिस्ट्रों को गिरफ्तार करने के। लेकिन जो कारण बतलाये गये वे इतने विरोधी थे कि आपस में उन का एक दूसरे से कोई सम्पर्क नहीं था। वहाँ अगर देश की रक्षा करनी है, देश को संगठित करना है, देश को ताकतवर बनाना है, देश में शांति रखनी है और बाहर से आने वाले खतरों से देश को बचाना है तो जनतंत्र को मजबूत करना चाहिये। जनतंत्र जब तक मजबूत नहीं होगा, तब तक किसी देश की हिफाजत नहीं हो सकती, खास कर नेपाल जैसे देश की जहाँ आवागमन के, आने जाने

के साधन नहीं हैं, बड़ी असुविधाएँ हैं, और जहाँ रहने सहने में नीचे और ऊपर के तबके में इतना अन्तर है और जहाँ मुट्ठी भर लोगों के पास अपरिमित धन है और बाकी लोगों के पास खाने को, पहनने को नहीं है, जहाँ शिक्षा का अभाव है, जहाँ यातायात का अभाव है। इसलिए नेपाल में जो कुछ हुआ है, उस के सम्बन्ध में हमें ज्यादा दिलचस्पी दिखलानी चाहिये और सही सलाह अपनी तरफ से देनी चाहिये, सही ढंग से अपनी राय को रखना चाहिये। आज जिस तरह से हम कांग्रेस के बारे में कहते हैं कि वहाँ की पार्लियामेंट को बुलाना चाहिये उसी तरह मेरा खयाल है कि हमें जनतंत्र के नाम पर कहना चाहिये कि नेपाल की पार्लियामेंट को बुलाना चाहिये, पार्लियामेंट जो फैसला करे। बाज़ाब्ला चुनी हुई पार्लियामेंट है, खुद महाराजाधिराज के संविधान के मुताबिक चुनी हुई पार्लियामेंट है, यह नहीं कि किसी दूसरे की मर्जी से थोपी गई है। मेरा खयाल है कि ऐसी पार्लियामेंट को भंग करने का कोई कारण नहीं था। इसलिये सब से बड़ी ज़रूरत नेपाल में यह है कि पार्लियामेंट को बुलाया जाये और जो फैसला हो वह महाराजा पर भी लागू हो और जनता पर लागू हो। जिस तरह से हम दूसरे मुल्कों के बारे में कहते हैं, जोर लगाते हैं, अपनी राय कहते हैं, उस के संबंध में प्रचार करते हैं उसी तरह से नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में भी हमारी नीति होना बहुत ज़रूरी है, नहीं तो मुझे यह लगता है कि नेपाल में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसकी प्रतिक्रिया भारतवर्ष में होगी और वह भारतवर्ष के लिये खतरनाक स्थिति होगी। इसलिये नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में यह समझ कर कि हमारी तटस्थ नीति है, हमें चुप नहीं बैठना चाहिये, कम से कम हमें अपनी आवाज तो बुलन्द करनी चाहिये और आज जो लोग नेपाल में जनतंत्र की खातिर संघर्ष कर रहे हैं, उनकी मदद करनी चाहिये, उन के साथ हमारी सहानुभूति होनी चाहिये और जो कुछ संभव हो, उचित हो, वह हम को करना चाहिये।

नेपाल के अलावा लाओस में जो कुछ हो रहा है उस में भी भावी खतरे की संभावना है और मेरा ख्याल है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर, हमारी सरकार उस तरफ भी जरूर ध्यान देगी। आज दुनिया में जो दो सब से खतरनाक जगहें मालूम होती हैं वह एक तो कांगो है दूसरा लाओस है। उन दोनों के सम्बन्ध में मेरा ख्याल है कि पूरी ताकत के साथ हमें काम करना चाहिये, अपने विचारों को स्पष्ट रूप से रखना चाहिये और उन्हें कार्यान्वित करना चाहिये, सिर्फ अपनी दृष्टि से नहीं बल्कि विश्व शांति की दृष्टि से। आज निरस्त्रीकरण होने के बावजूद, उस की चर्चा होने के बावजूद मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि निकट भविष्य में ऐसा निरस्त्रीकरण होने जा रहा है, जिससे शांति को खतरा नहीं है। तो जब तक हम निरस्त्रीकरण की उस अवस्था तक नहीं पहुंच जाते तब तक हमें इस बात की पूरी चेष्टा करनी चाहिये कि जो वर्तमान परिस्थिति है, जो वर्तमान लाचारियां हैं, जो वर्तमान सीमाएं हैं, उन सब के भीतर भी हम विश्व शांति को कायम रख सकें और इसके लिये वातावरण तैयार कर सकें। यह निहायत जरूरी है।

श्रीमन्, मैंने प्रारम्भ में ही जिक्र किया था कि हमारे महामहिम राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में बहुत सी बातों का उल्लेख नहीं है और जिनका उल्लेख है, उनके सम्बन्ध में भी एक पार्सिंग रेफरेंस जैसा दिया हुआ है, कोई संजीदगी से, तफसील से बात नहीं कही गई है, आगे क्या पालिसी होगी, यह नहीं बताया गया है। अपने देश का ही प्रश्न लीजिए। उस में सिर्फ यही नहीं है कि कुछ बातें छोड़ दी गई हैं और संजीदगी से नहीं कही गई हैं, बल्कि ऐसी बातें भी हैं जो इस तरह से कही गई हैं कि जिन से तथ्य स्पष्ट रूप से सामने नहीं आता है। जहां तक राष्ट्रीय आय का प्रश्न है, जो आंकड़े राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में हैं, उनसे पता यह चलता है कि १९५५ से १९५६-६० तक चार वर्षों में

सम्भवतः ११ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है, लेकिन इस का उल्लेख नहीं किया गया कि ११ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि तो होती है लेकिन इन चार वर्षों में जनसंख्या में भी ८ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। इस तरह से यह वृद्धि सही मानों में ३ प्रतिशत की ही बच जाती है। ११ प्रतिशत वृद्धि के साथ ही इसका भी स्पष्ट उल्लेख होना चाहिये था। बाहर से तो यह ११ प्रतिशत मालूम होता है लेकिन वह जो ८ प्रतिशत जनसंख्या में वृद्धि हुई है उस के चलते जो इस में कमी हो जाती है उस का यहां उल्लेख नहीं है, उस का स्पष्ट उल्लेख होना चाहिये था। उस के साथ ही साथ यह भी प्रश्न उठता है कि यह जो ३ प्रतिशत बचता है, या जो भी बचे, उस का बटवारा किस प्रकार होता है? इस सम्बन्ध में दूसरे सदन में भी चर्चा हुई, यहां भी चर्चा हुई, देश में भी चर्चा हुई और जहां तक मुझे स्मरण है, शायद इसके सम्बन्ध में कोई कदम उठाया भी गया और अगर कदम उठाया गया, तो उसका क्या परिणाम निकला है? इसलिये आज आवश्यकता इस बात की भी है कि राष्ट्रीय बचत बढ़ने के साथ साथ, उस के बतलाने के साथ साथ यह भी बतलाया जाना चाहिये कि यह जो राष्ट्रीय बचत हो रही है, उसका कितना प्रतिशत किस वर्ग के लोगों को पहुंच रहा है। लेकिन देखने में यह आता है कि यहां पर औसत की बात बतला दी जाती है जो बड़ी खतरनाक बात होती है। मुझे इस प्रसंग पर एक कहानी की याद आ जाती है। एक बारात को नदी पार करना था। नाव या पुल नहीं था। सवाल यह आया कि नदी के पार किस तरह से जाया जाय, क्योंकि यह भय था कि नदी बहुत गहरी होगी और पार करते वक़्त गहराई की वजह से कहीं लोग डूब न जायें। वहां एक बुजुर्ग भी मौजूद थे जो बहुत आंकड़बाज थे। उन से लोगों ने यह पता लगाने को कहा कि नदी कितनी गहरी है। उन्होंने आदमियों को किनारे और बीच में भेजा कि यह मालूम कर लायें कि नदी कितनी चौड़ी है और किस स्थान पर कितना गहरा

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

पानी है। जब सब स्थान पर पानी की गहराई और नदी की चौड़ाई मालूम हो गई तो उन्होंने ने आंकड़ों के द्वारा औसत लगाई कि नदी दो फुट गहरी है। इस पर उन्होंने कहा कि इस पार से उस पार के बीच केवल दो फुट गहरा पानी है और सब लोगों को पार हो जाना चाहिये। जो लोग छोटे थे वे तो डूब गये और जो लोग बड़े थे वे बच गये। इस पर लोगों ने उस वृजुर्ग से जब पूछा कि क्या बात हुई कि तने लोग डूब गये। इस पर उन्होंने सोचने के मूड में बार बार यह कहना शुरू किया कि :

लेखा जोखा थाहे,
लड़का डूबा काहे ?

इसलिए जो औसत की बात बतलाई गई है कि अनाज के उत्पादन में जो वृद्धि हुई है वह इसी प्रकार औसत के ही आधार पर बतलाई गई है और मुझे भय है कि उसका भी यही हाल न हो।

श्री शीलभद्र थाजी (बिहार) : यहां पर डूबने की सम्भावना नहीं है।

श्री गंगाशरण सिंह : डूब रहे हैं। सम्भावना का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है और सबसे खतरनाक बात यह है कि जो लोग डूब रहे हैं उनको यह भी पता नहीं है कि वे डूब रहे हैं या नहीं। यह बहुत ही खतरनाक बात है। इसलिए आज इस चीज के साथ ही साथ दो चीजों की आवश्यकता है। एक तो इस बात का पता लगाया जाये कि यह जो राष्ट्रीय आय होती है, राष्ट्रीय आय में वृद्धि होती है, यह कहाँ जाती है और किस तबके के लोगों के पास जाती है? इस बात की चेष्टा की जानी चाहिये कि जो लोग महत्त्व हैं, उपेक्षित हैं, जो औसत से नीचे के लोग हैं उनके पास

आमदनी जाय, बजाय इसके कि ऊपर वाले लोगों के पास जाय। इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कुछ कदम उठाये गये हैं, क्या कुछ किया गया है, मुझे ठीक पता नहीं है। लेकिन कम से कम राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात का कोई जिक्र नहीं है कि इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कदम उठाये गये हैं और भविष्य में सरकार क्या करने जा रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त आर्थिक विकास के जमाने में आज की परिस्थिति में सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जो राष्ट्रीय आय में वृद्धि हो, उसका अधिक से अधिक अंश नीचे वाले तबके के लोगों के पास जाये और इस बात की चेष्टा सरकार को अवश्य करनी चाहिये। लेकिन अभी तक यह पता नहीं है कि इस आय का कितना अंश किस के पास जाता है। इस आय का कितना अंश ऊपर वाले लोगों के पास जाता है और कितना अंश नीचे वाले लोगों के पास जाता है। अगर इस वृद्धि का फायदा नीचे की आय वाले लोगों को नहीं पहुंचेगा तो इस वृद्धि से देश को कोई फायदा पहुंचने वाला नहीं है।

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh):
The Second Agricultural Enquiry Committee says that the *per capita* income of agricultural labour has gone down.

श्री गंगाशरण सिंह : मुझे एक बात और निवेदन करनी है और वह यह है कि राष्ट्रपति द्वारा जो बात कही जाती है उस पर काफी मुस्तैदी से स्थिर रहना चाहिये और काफी सोच विचार कर राष्ट्रपति के मुंह से बातें कहलाई जानी चाहियें। मुझे इस बात का अफसोस होता है कि पिछले साल राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में—जहां तक मुझे स्मरण है—इस बात का आश्वासन दिया गया था कि जो बिल पेश किये जायेंगे उनमें दो मेम्बर वाले कांस्टीटुएन्सी निर्वाचन क्षेत्र हैं, उन्हें विभाजित करने का बिल भी पेश किया जायेगा। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति के द्वारा इस तरह की घोषणा करने के कई महीने बाद कांग्रेस पार्टी की बैठक होती है और उसमें यह प्रश्न

रखा जाता है कि जो दो मेम्बर वाले कांस्टी-टुएन्सिज हैं उन्हें कायम रखा जाना चाहिये या नहीं ? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की कार्यवाही राष्ट्रपति के सम्मान, देश के सम्मान और सदन के सम्मान के खिलाफ है। राष्ट्रपति के मुँह से जो बात कहलाई जाती है, वह क्लिंग पार्टी पहले बैर कर फ़ैसला करती है। यह कोई प्रोसीजियर या पद्धति का प्रश्न नहीं है, बल्कि इसमें ज्यादा चीजें इनवाल्व्ड हैं, इस बात का मुझे दुःख है। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन यह है कि शासक पार्टी का यह अन्तिम दृष्टान्त होगा और आगे इस तरह की कार्यवाही नहीं की जायेगी। अगर आपने कोई चीज तय नहीं की है, अपनी नीति निर्धारित नहीं की है तो राष्ट्रपति के मुँह से इस तरह की बात नहीं कहलाई जानी चाहिये थी। हम यह बात जानते हैं कि जो भाषण राष्ट्रपति देते हैं वह सरकार की नीति के बारे में होता है और सरकार की तरफ से राष्ट्रपति इस नीति को अभिभाषण के रूप में देते हैं। जब राष्ट्रपति के मुँह से कोई बात कहलाई जाती है तो उसका विशेष महत्व हो जाता है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि भविष्य में सरकार की ओर से इस तरह की बातें नहीं की जायेंगी और राष्ट्रपति के पद की और उनकी मर्यादा भंग करने की चेष्टा नहीं की जायेगी।

इस देश में सबसे प्रधान कृषिजीवी हैं। यह खुशी की बात है कि तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में कृषि का विशेष उल्लेख किया गया है, लेकिन जहाँ तक द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना का सवाल है जैसा कि अंग्रेजी में कहा जाता है 'लिप सैम्पेथी' उसी तरह से एग्रीकल्चर के साथ व्यवहार किया गया था। यह स्वाभाविक बात है कि इससे सारे देश को नुकसान पहुँचा। इस देश में कोई भी प्लान तब तक सफल नहीं हो सकता है, देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था सुधर नहीं सकती, जब तक कि कृषिजीवियों की तरक्की के लिए, उनकी उन्नति के लिए, उनके विकास के लिए आर्थिक

और सामाजिक और अन्य दृष्टियों से सहायता नहीं की जाती। जब तक इस तरह का कार्य कृषिजीवियों के लिए नहीं किया जाता, तब तक हमारी योजनाएं सफलीभूत नहीं हो सकती हैं। हमारे जितने प्लान हैं वे कागज पर सफल होने पर भी धरती में सफल नहीं होंगे। इसलिये मुझे यह कहना है कि आगे जो प्लान बनाया जाये उसमें इस तरह की चेष्टा की जाये कि वह धरती में भी सफल हो सके और देश में एक नया वातावरण पैदा हो जाये। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ अगर हमने इस तरह की नीति अपनाई तो हमारे जितने भी कार्य हैं वे धरती पर ही सफल नहीं होंगे बल्कि आसमान में भी सफल होंगे।

अन्त में मुझे इतना ही कहना है कि आज की परिस्थिति में जिस संजीदगी से सरकार को राष्ट्रपति द्वारा हमारे सामने आना चाहिये था, जिस तफ़्सील के साथ आना चाहिये था, वह उस तरह से नहीं आये। इसके साथ ही साथ एक दिक्कत हमारे सामने यह भी है कि राष्ट्रपति द्वारा जो बातें कही गई हैं उन्हीं के सम्बन्ध में हम अपने अमेण्डमेण्ट दे सकते हैं। जिन बातों का उल्लेख राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में नहीं होता है उनके सम्बन्ध में संशोधन नहीं रखे जा सकते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि बहुत सी बातें देश के सामने नहीं आती हैं और न ही उनके सम्बन्ध में संशोधन ही पेश किये जा सकते हैं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि सरकार आगन्दा ऐसा कदम नहीं उठायेगी और न ही इस तरह की नीति चलायेगी जिसके चलते हम एक ब्लकनेस शून्यता अनुभव करें, एक असमर्थता और लाचारी अनुभव करें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने दो संशोधनों को आपके सामने रखता हूँ।

3 P.M.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in intervening in this debate on the Motion of grateful Thanks to the President, I would like to say that the

[Shri A. D. Mani.] country will be reassured by the firm declaration made by the President that the Government would try to maintain its defensive strength in the face of continued hostility from across the frontier. Some of us would have very much liked this declaration to be more firmly worded, though I must disclaim any intention to cast any aspersions on the sincerity of the statement of the Government. I think the country at large is satisfied that the Government has made up its mind to see that aggression on our frontiers is vacated. I lay stress on a little more firm declaration which has been made outside the House that the people of this country would take back the territory which belongs to them and which is now in illegal occupation by the Government of our great neighbour. I feel it necessary that we should state our intentions more and more dearly, because over the years, on account of the fact that we were lulled into a feeling of security on account of China's adherence to our policy of Panchsheel, there has been a sort of waning of the resistance psychology of the people. What is required at the present moment is not only a defensive psychology, but a resistance psychology also and I have no doubt that the Government would take appropriate action in defending our frontiers and increasing our defensive strength in all vulnerable and strategic areas.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say here that we have been appalled by the disclosures made in the documents which were published two days ago about the talks that the Indian officials had with their opposite members at Peking. We have been driven to this pass that we have to publish a 600 pages book to show that 50,000 square miles of Indian territory belong to Indians; and we have also been driven to quoting tape recordings to show that the other side is not speaking the truth. I think these developments call for a slight reorientation of our policy in respect of China and the United Nations Orga-

nisation. It is true that over the years India more than any other country has been responsible for building a climate of opinion in the United Nations Organisation for the admission of China and we were almost on the way to success last year. But I think China too should realise her obligations to the United Nations Organisation. We realise that the absence of China at the United Nations has weakened the utility of that organisation and that it is not representative of the world as a whole. But this should not make us overlook the fact that the United Nations Organisation stipulates certain obligations which are to be carried out by its members. The Preamble to the U.N. Charter itself says that the Organisation has been established to see that conditions in which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law are maintained. I think Sir, that in terms of the Preamble of the U.N. and in terms of the objectives of the Charter, China at the present moment on account of the way she has disregarded her obligations arising out of her treaties, may not be fully qualified to seek entry into the United Nations Organisation. I am not suggesting that we should oppose the entry of China into the U.N. That would mean identification with the policy followed by the governments of the United States of America and those countries which are taking an active part in the cold war. But I think, Sir, the time has come for us to take up a new attitude in respect of China's admission into the United Nations and we would have very sound justification for doing so because of China's refusal to recognise the legality of the accession of Kashmir to India; and in view of the attitude that China has displayed in respect of treaties which she is bound to honour solemnly, there is substantial ground for us to remain neutral whenever the question of China's entry into the United Nations comes up for discussion. Sir, an abstention vote in the United Nations is not regarded as a negative vote and every member-nation is given an opportunity of

expressing its views as to why it abstained on a particular issue. We can very well say that we regard China's entry into the United Nations as necessary as that would strengthen the organisation, that we would like to see her one day a member of the U.N. which loyally carries out the obligations of the U.N. Charter. But we can also say at the U.N. level that we are not now voting for China's entry into the United Nations because she has not honoured her treaty obligations with India. I know this would lead to aggravation of our strained relations with our great neighbour and I am at one with the Government in its view that as long as China is our neighbour, it is necessary for us to maintain the most possible friendly relations with her and her government. But, Sir, a stand of that kind would also give other nations of the world an opportunity of realising India's point of view on this vexed question. There are parts of the world in which there is inadequate knowledge about these details of the controversies over our frontiers and the U.N. would give us an excellent forum for putting forward the point of view which has been made clear in so many documents that have been published. This is the first point I want to make on this question of China.

In the memorandum, which contains a precis of the talks that the Indian officials had with their opposite numbers in Peking, there is a reference to China's charge that we are supporting the independence of Tibet. We are all bound by our treaty obligations and we recognised as soon as our country became independent that China's suzerainty over Tibet remained. But we were also bound to see that the autonomy of Tibet was also maintained by the Chinese Government. It is now quite clear that there is a resistance movement in Tibet and that there is growing dissatisfaction with the conditions and the overall control which the Chinese Government have tried to impose on the people. We would not like to

take a hostile attitude or to indulge in any hostile action towards our great neighbour. But I think nevertheless the people of Tibet are entitled to a moral gesture from us, that we sympathise with them in their plight and we would like them to regain the autonomy to which they are entitled under the treaty obligations which China had with Tibet. This would mean a little reorientation of our policy again and that would be giving a moral support to the Tibetan resistance movement.

Sir, I would like to refer to the observations made by the President in respect of the Congo. I believe that this House will have an opportunity of having a debate on foreign policy at some stage in this session and this question may come up for full and detailed examination at that stage. But I would want to say now, Sir, that we are entitled to some credit—not that we ask for it—but we are entitled to some credit for the fact that we more than any other country foresaw the possibilities of the events in the Congo. At a time when the late Mr. Patrice Lumumba was not recognised as more than a factional leader, we recognised him as the possible leader of a united Congo when that view was disapproved by many nations at that time. It is unfortunate that Mr. Patrice Lumumba was murdered and there would be universal expression of sympathy to the family of the late Mr. Lumumba as well as to the African people in the great loss that they have sustained in the loss of a person who had raised the standard of nationalism in Africa. I would, however, like to say, Sir, that in the evolution of this matter at the United Nations level we took one decision which perhaps affected our relations with the local factions in the Congo, and that is the negative vote which was cast on behalf of the Indian Delegation on the question of seating the government of Kasavubu in the U.N. That has greatly strained, if I may say so, our relations with Mr. Kasavubu who regards India as being hostile to him,

[Shri A. D. Mani.] and I think it is necessary that an expression should be made in this House that India or for that matter the Government has no desire whatever to take part in the internal wrangles in the Congo, that we would like the people of the Congo to be united if possible or to have their own form of government. I believe it has been the declared policy of the Government that as far as the future of the Congo is concerned, we would like to see the Congolese Parliament summoned. I would like to go a little further than that and that is, we should now leave it to the Congolese Parliament to decide not only the nature of the Government but also the nature of the constitution under which they are going to live. There has been quite disturbing evidence from the nature of elections held I before the Congo became independent as well as later that in the Congo the fissiparous tendencies, which we saw in the linguistic agitations in India, have assumed a very aggravated form and there is no doubt that parts of the Congo would like to have some sort of loose federation. But whatever they decide, I think the policy of the Government might be made a little more clear, that we allow them to choose their own constitution and have their own Government. I am not sure, Sir, whether it is possible for us to look upon the Congo as a more or less long-term assignment of the United Nations because at some stage the United Nations has to clear out of the Congo. I think the United Nations has taken upon itself a very heavy responsibility in undertaking to control the situation in the Congo because neither the Charter nor the structure of the Security Council provides for effective action in matters of a controversial character, of the kind that have arisen in the Congo. I think we should now take the stand that if the Congolese Parliament asks the United Nations to withdraw, the United Nations accepts the wishes of the Congolese Parliament and clears out of the Congo. Sir, Members might have seen that

today the Soviet Union has tabled a proposition asking for the liquidation of the Congo operations. It is not possible for us to expect that the United Nations or its members will continue to support very expensive operations in the Congo or continue to supervise the evolution of orderly government there. Precipitate withdrawal of the United Nations Forces or the United Nations at this stage from the Congo may perhaps lead to a serious crisis, but I would like to say that my proposition is that the moment the Congolese Parliament is summoned, we should have their opinion on the subject whether the United Nations should continue in the Congo or not. Sir, the Prime Minister made a statement yesterday. We do not have the detailed verbatim record of the statement. I do not know whether it has not been made readily available. In that statement he said that we were prepared to send even combatant troops to the Congo. Everyone would share with the Prime Minister his sense of horror about the incidents that have happened in the Congo and about the tragedy that has overtaken Mr. Lumumba as well as about the murders and gangsterism that have been taking place there. We entirely agree with the Prime Minister in his denunciation of those violent methods which have disfigured life and events in the Congo but before Government takes any decision—and these decisions may be taken any moment—about sending combatant troops to the Congo, we trust Government will give an opportunity to Parliament to consider the matter in all its detail. I am saying this because our personnel is limited and our own frontiers have to be safeguarded and we may keep our own troops to guard our frontiers a little more effectively than has been done in the past rather than spare them for the Congo operations.

I would like to go on, if I may, to another aspect of the Congo situation. In the coming few weeks or months, there might again be a question of casting our vote on this or

that s.de, of seating this or that Government. Murder and assassination promote chain reactions and we *do not know* how long the Government of Mr. Kasavubu would remain in the saddle but if a choice has to be made, I would suggest that at the United Nations level or at any other level where the decision has got to be given, Government might remain neutral because we do not want our intentions to be misunderstood at all in the Congo that we have personal interest in the kind of Government that might emerge in that area.

Sir, I would like to go to another aspect of the President's Address and that is his reference to Goa. The President has said,

"Goa continues to be under the colonial domination of Portugal. My Government stand committed to the peaceful liberation of this part of India where a decadent colonialism still survives."

I believe three years back. Goa occupied the front seat in the matter of those subjects which required the consideration of Government but in the last two years Goa has been again pushed back a little, more towards the back benches. It is not suggested that we have lost interest in Goa but we have had so many problems to tackle that we have not been able to give sustained attention to the subject. I believe there is an amendment tabled expressing some measure of dissatisfaction about the handling of the Goa problem. I would like to say here that the people of Goa must fight their battle themselves *and* that it is not possible for a Government, in conformity with our obligations to the United Nations, to take any other action excepting giving its moral support to the people of Goa, but I believe there is some confusion in Goa about the possible status that Goa might get in the Indian Union after that area is merged. I have no evidence to support what I have said but in the numerous talks that I have had with people from Goa, they

would like to know where they would stand in the new set-up of the Indian Union, and as there are signs that the regime of Dr. Salazar is now receiving many challenges from various quarters, it may be necessary for us to have a blue-print for Goa because that would give a clear indication to the people of Goa as to what status they will occupy in the Indian Union. I am not suggesting that any unit of the Indian Union should occupy a privileged status; all units must be equal but there are matters like language, religion, customs and so on, where perhaps certain assurances from the Government might stimulate the resistance movement in Goa. I would also like from the Government a statement about the material that they put out on the radio to the people of Goa during the last two years because, with censorship remaining in Goa, it is absolutely necessary that we have got to reach the people through the radio as far as possible.

I would like to conclude by referring to the labour relations to which the President has made a reference in his Address. He has said,

"Labour relations, apart from the recent regrettable strike by Government employees, have improved."

I am not sure whether that would be regarded as a completely correct statement because the manner in which Government handled the employees' strike has left many painful memories at least in the ranks of labour. Let us be quite clear that there is no point in talking about labour relations until Government is prepared to set up an example itself. On this question of the Code of Discipline I would like to say that it has not worked as satisfactorily as one might have expected and the Planning Commission itself has stated: "The new concept with such far-reaching aims in a different field will require a considerable period of earnest endeavour before it gets fairly established in practice.... The deplorable

[Shri A. D. Mani.] consequences of inter-union rivalry both for industries and for workers are well-known. The failure to implement awards and agreements has been a common complaint on both sides; and if these were to continue, the codes would be bereft of all meaning and purpose." I would like to say that the Third Plan, as suggested very often here and elsewhere will succeed or fail On the capacity of Government to control prices and a trust that the Government will evolve an integrated labour policy which will take into account not only the needs of labour but also the needs of orderly expansion of industry without inflationary pressures.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my good friend, Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, with regard to our expressing our heart-felt, deep and grateful thanks to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the House of Parliament assembled together on the 14th February, 1961. Sir, this Address delivered by the Head of the State is highly illuminative, interesting, instructive and inspiring and above all it is full of nobility, dignity and restraint. It deals with the national and international problems of the country, with our achievements in the past year, with our situation at the present moment and also with our aspirations for the coming year. Naturally, Sir, in this Address international affairs have taken precedence over national affairs though national problems are not less important.

Among the international problems, our big neighbour China's attitude has drawn his foremost attention. I am sure everyone of us Indians is most disturbed by the attitude that our big neighbour China has adopted towards us. It is very unfortunate that China has forgotten the great past, the sweet relations that have been existing between our country and China from time

immemorial. The culture of India as well as that of China has been flowing both ways in this millennium, if I may say so. In the recent past our country, of all the countries of the world, had given the greatest moral support— whether it be in the United Nations or outside—to maintain the status and dignity of China. All this has been forgotten and forgotten in the wake of an agreement based on Panchsheel which is once again based on the culture of India as well as that of China and on the loving kindness and goodwill between these two countries. In spite of all that China has stabbed us in the back for no fault of ours. It is well known what attitude India has been taking in all international affairs; we have valued peaceful co-existence; we have valued non-interference, non-hurting but in spite of all that China has stabbed us in the back. Sir, it is a very sad story. The great Himalayan mountains which offered protection to us through the millennia are now required to be protected against invasion by a foreigner. This is a very sad story but still that is what is happening. I do not know for what fault of ours China has taken up this attitude towards us. Could it be because we gave asylum to the Dalai Lama of Tibet that China has taken up this attitude? If this is the ground on which China has taken up an aggressive attitude against us, a hostile attitude towards us, then I say this is the unkindest cut of all. China has been very generous and she comes to an agreement with Burma on border matters; she settles her problems with Nepal situated as it is today and she is even prepared to come to an agreement with Pakistan. She is prepared to come to an agreement with everybody else and she wants to isolate India. This is a very sad thing in our international affairs. The recent document given to us shows that no less than an area of 50,000 sq. miles has been claimed by China. Of course our officials in the team have said that these borders are defined by nature, confirmed by history, sanctioned by traditions and usage and voluminous evidence has been produced before

China but all that seems to be of no consequence so far as China is concerned. Sir, we would like to tell China once again that this world is too dangerous for anything but truth, that this world is too small for anything but brotherhood. Let them not persist in their aggressive attitude towards us. Rightly our President a3 Head of the State has put upon himself the greatest restraint when he says that the problems of aggression on and incursions into the sovereign territory of the Union have yet to be resolved. What a great restraint he has put upon himself. He does not say any harsh word about Ch'na. He says that he hopes that this problem will be resolved and resolved amicably. That is the hope of the Head of our State. That is the restraint he has put upon himself as against the aggressive attitude shown by China. Now, we are not satisfied with merely hoping for the best to happen. Let us not be scared merely because the Head of the State does not show sufficient aggressiveness towards China. Only the other day our Prime Minister said that there is such a thing as a great nation refusing to submit, there is such a thing as the determination of the people and more than all these there is such a thing as solid military action. India is not going to yield to any threat from any quarter. Any contingency in the northern border will be faced with advantage to ourselves. Sir, this is speaking from strength. We are not scared; we are not nervous. We are quite sure that there is the determination of this big nation to stand up against the aggressive attitude of China and given goodwill and patience we shall, I am sure, emerge victorious.

Now, with regard to Africa our attitude is well known. It is one of the most significant events in the history of the world that Africa has emerged and is emerging as an independent continent. Very many countries of Africa have become free from colonial domination and it is a thing for which, ever since our independence, we have been struggling. Our aspirations are

being fulfilled slowly but steadily but unfortunately there are large areas in which colonialism is still prevailing and the Congo is an instance which is causing concern all over the world today. In regard to the Congo also our stand has emerged victorious. It is only today Mr. Kennedy in his Press conference has admitted that he strongly agrees with the view of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that it would be a disaster if the United Nations went out of the Congo. This is a fitting tribute to the stand India has been consistently taking not only in the cause of freedom of all the peoples of the world but also in the cause of weaker peoples. Sir, if a person like Mr. Kennedy who has been elected President of America "refers to the soaring idealism of Mr. Nehru as the guiding star of his policy, what further tribute is necessary for our foreign policy? Our foreign policy has stood the test of time at the bar of public opinion and it has earned applause, admiration and approbation. Sir, this nation which had secured independence only 12 years ago has already shown maturity and it is one of the foremost countries championing the cause of freedom for all peoples.

Sir, there is one other problem which has also been referred to in the Address and that is the apartheid policy followed by South Africa. I am sure that all these problems will be satisfactorily solved and ultimately the entire world will follow the idealism, the soaring idealism of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Some reference has been made to Goa saying—■

"Goa continues to be under the colonial domination of Portugal. My Government stand committed to the peaceful liberation of this part of India where a decadent colonialism still survives."

Goa is a small speck of our country. It is not very difficult to drive away the Portuguese from there by the might of the nation. But still that is not our attitude. That is not our aspiration. That is not our way of doing

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] things. Our way of doing things has been completely different. We hope our peaceful persuasion will ultimately prevail. Public opinion in the world will ultimately shape itself in such a way that the Portuguese will be elbowed out without our having to fire a single shot. Even on this ground, the restraint that has been shown is commendable indeed. Therefore, in every respect the foreign policy that has been followed by India has been one of unique importance in the world. That is evidently brought out in the President's Address thus:

"India's relations with her neighbours and other countries have continued to be peaceful. My Government, firmly adhering to the policy of peaceful co-existence and good neighbourliness, seek to promote these relations without becoming entangled in military alliances with one country or another."

This is how our foreign policy is being conducted and I am sure this is the safest and the best in the world. Now, Sir, we are also believing in the outlawing of war as an instrument for settling disputes between countries. This principle culminates in the noblest of aspirations and thus we are showing to the world that disarmament should be followed and with disarmament peace could be restored in the entire world. That is our aspiration.

Now, Sir, coming to national problems, there are very many challenges which we are facing today. There is the challenge of mass poverty. There is the challenge of mass illiteracy, ignorance, ill health and a rising population. The challenge of unemployment is there. We are faced with so many internal problems. But we are successfully tackling these problems through our Five Year Plans. Once again, our illustrious leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, is the father of the Five Year Plan movement in India. If we have not done very well, as much as we ought to have, we are sure to solve all these problems satisfactorily

in course of time, given some time. Some gentleman was referring to the national income and the falling *per capita* income. Instead of a falling *per capita* income, it is a rising per capita income. If I may refer to the per capita income, from Rs. 246 in 1950-51 it had been steadily rising up to Rs. 283 in 1956-57. Unfortunately, due to the low agricultural yield in 1957-58...

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): What about the figures before?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: It was much lower before. In 1957-58, it had fallen down a little to Rs. 275. Now, I am told, if I am to believe the Press reports, that it is somewhere about Rs. 301, which speaks for itself. I should think that it is only as a result of our Five Year Plans that such an enormous achievement has been made. We can really be proud of our achievements.

Now, Sir, internally our food problem has been worrying us very much. The latest figures that are available go to show that we have peached the big production of 76 million tons. This is really a tribute to the administration and the Congress administration in India. I am sure that before the end of the Third Five Year Plan our target of production of 105 million tons of foodgrains will be achieved, and we have every hope, looking at our past record, that we are within easy reach of our goal.

With regard to industrial production, we have made outstanding progress. It is within the knowledge of every body and the President has also referred to this increase as follows:

"Industrial output has risen, in some cases, spectacularly. For the first ten months of 1960, the production index was 167 as against 149 for the corresponding period of the previous year."

This speaks volumes in praise of our Five Year Plans. It is not enough. We are not satisfied. We are prepared to go much faster ahead in the

Third Five Year Plan and I am sure that we will sufficiently silence all the critics of the Government.

What is ultimately wanted is this. The President wants it, and of course in the last but one paragraph he refers to national integration. I was not able to follow the speech of my friend on the other side, which was •del vered in Hindi, but I am sure he has referred to this national integration in a way. That has not been forgotten at all. We are certainly very conscious of the need for national integration. That certainly shall be achieved as quickly as possible. If only the obstructionist activities of some of our Opposition Members are stopped it shall be achieved much more quickly and more easily than it could otherwise be.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): It is due to your own factions in the Congress.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: The President's Address says: —

"The unity and the social well-being of our entire people, the rapid progress to a democratic and socialist society, wherein changes must be timely and progress grow from more to more, must be attained peacefully and by consent."

This is not a totalitarian regime. We believe in democracy, in the willing consent of the people. With the willing consent of the people, national integration shall be achieved and all our problems and all our maladies shall be solved. We shall march ahead shoulder to shoulder to our set goal of prosperity. Now, Sir, forty crores of people are on the march and nobody shall stop it, not even the Members of our Opposition.

Thank you very much.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, as usual the President in his Address has dealt with problems of national and international importance. He has dealt at length with international

problems with which the Government is faced, and in the latter half of his Address he has dealt with problems of national importance. Sir, in view of the short time at my disposal, I to deal with the international problems which have been stated in the Address, while my colleagues in my group will deal with the national problems.

Sir in paragraph 12 the Address states that India's relations with her neighbours and other countries have continued to be peaceful. If by peaceful relations the President means that there has been no shooting war with any of our neighbours or other countries, I totally agree; but if by peaceful relations he means that our relations have been friendly with our neighbours and with other countries, I am sorry to say that the facts show the contrary. Now, Sir, who are our neighbours? This question has been dealt with in the various discussions on foreign relations, but in a nutshell China of course is the main problem before us to which I will come later, but first of all I will refer in a few words to Pakistan.

Sir, I do not know what is wrong with our policy, but every time we try to do a good turn to our neighbours and to our friends the result is always the contrary, always the reverse. We are always misunderstood. I do not know why it is so, especially when our Prime Minister is so clear in his language, when the documents and statements which the External Affairs Ministry issue are so clear and precise. I do not know why we are misunderstood everywhere. There must be something wrong either with the foreign countries or with us, but it is certain that there is something wrong with somebody. Pakistan extracts benefits out of us every time and then turns round and becomes antagonistic to us. As stated by the Prime Minister in the last foreign affairs debate, we have even given them the sinews of war to hit us back. They make full use of the sinews of war. We provide our friends with those things and they

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] hit us with those things, and even then they are not satisfied. They miss no opportunity to embarrass us. Now, Sir, Pakistan has no common border with China, but it feels that it can embarrass India for all that India has done for it including the supplying of sinews of war to hit us with. They must embarrass us, and as some people say, the Government of India is in jitters. The Prime Minister has said that he is not in jitters. He is only irritated. But all the same if this is friendly relationship with a neighbouring country, I am sorry to say that the facts do not show that.

Then comes Nepal. Nepal has always been consulting us in regard to her problems. **Now** certain developments- have taken place in Nepal and ■we are giving expression to our distress. They are taking certain steps. They are completely ignoring us. They are not only ignoring us but if we go into the incessant anti-Indian propaganda that is being spread in Nepal, certainly we cannot say that our relations with Nepal in spite of what we are doing are friendly.

Then, Sir, comes the case of Sikkim. Sikkim is within our sphere of influence. There was a report the other day in the Hindustan Times from its correspondent at Kalimpong dated the 9th of January in which it was stated that the Maharajkumar of Sikkim attacked an Indian military officer in charge of Chunthang Camp at Lachang Dak Bungalow, and the political observers attribute this incident to the dissatisfaction of the Maharajkumar with the defence arrangements in Sikkim. We have now with us the Maharaja of Bhutan. I do not know how far he will be satisfied with the defence arrangements.

Then there is the question of Goa. Much has been said on this question, but this occasional mention of Goa by the Government does relieve the national resentment by our expression of contempt for Dr. Salazar's

decadent colonialism. In this connection, Sir, because of our actions and our false sense of security we have created two more Goas in our country. There is one actual Goa, and now we have created two more Goas; one is Ladakh in the possession of China, and the other is some part of Jammu and Kashmir State held by Pakistan. By our policy if we can ever hope to get back our territory, we will tx . s paradise

Two more -Goas have now come within our territory, and Dr. Salazar's colonialism may be a decadent colonialism, but certainly under no circumstances the colonialism of China and of Pakistan will be a decadent colonialism. Therefore, there will have to be a complete reorientation of our foreign policy if we want to safeguard the integrity of our territory.

I would now like to deal with China. I have to speak at some length because this is the main burning point. Here I need not refer to the various pinpricks which we are subjected to by China. In reply to questions today many things were said by the Deputy Minister and also by the Prime Minister, but we seem to be so helpless. We cannot help, and certainly when we cannot safeguard the integrity of our own territory, when people coming from some thousands of miles can occupy 12,000 square miles of territory on the one hand and on the other hand when thousands of square miles of territory are occupied by Pakistan, we give expression to pious hopes, and what else can we do except to express our helplessness and to depend on the good sense of the other party to be kind enough to give us back the property which they have seized? The reports of the two official teams of India and China have been circulated to us. It must be said that this report of the Indian team is of the utmost importance, and the authors deserve the expression of gratitude of the whole nation for the signal service they have rendered to the country in dealing with the bogus claims of China. It is a pity that in a clear-

cut, precise and well established case JiKe ours vis-a-vis China's the Prime Minister has never been well posted Jbi the past when he had been talking of bleak and remote mountain tops where not even a blade of grass grew and which had been forcibly occupied by China. If that is so in a clear and precise case like this, I do not know what will be our position when

a controversial question arises 4 P.M with which we may have to

deal. Now what does this Report say? This Report has brought to light many important things which were not known to us. I do not know whether they were known to the External Affairs Ministry but in any case, the House and the hon. Members of Parliament were not taken into confidence is they were known to the Ministry but in this Report which is now a public document, light is thrown on many new problems, particularly the three problems which we are faced with vis-a-vis China. First of all, there is the case of Kashmir. The State of Jammu and Kashmir willingly acceded to India. There is no question about it. Our friends, the Pakistanis, have forcibly occupied a part of it. Well, they are more powerful than we but we cannot help it. Therefore we can only express pious hopes. But so far as other countries are concerned, they have never questioned the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India. Now when our team took up this question for discussion with the Chinese, they refused to discuss it because they did not accept that Kashmir belonged to us. It is an anomaly. They have gone a step further also. This morning I wanted to ask a question but time being short, I could not do so. I wanted to know from the Prime Minister, if the Chinese felt that Kashmir did not belong to us and they refused to discuss this matter with us, what *locus standi* Pakistan had on Kashmir about which the Chinese were prepared to discuss with Pakistan. Here again, the question of our foreign policy comes in. We have failed, as far as I am concerned. Pakistanis are a practical

people, they are not idealists. They know which is the practical thing which is going to help them. The whole world knows that Kashmir has acceded to India. But China is not prepared to accept that position and it is not prepared to discuss Kashmir with us because it feels that India is not concerned with it. Birds of the same feather flock together. Pakistan has forcibly taken possession of our territory in Kashmir. On the other side, the Chinese have taken possession of our territory. They are birds of the same feather. As such, China is prepared to discuss the question of Kashmir with Pakistan. If any of my friends on the Congress side says that our foreign policy has been very successful and laudable, certainly it is very successful as far as only theory is concerned. It is very successful like a successful operation where the patient dies. It is successful but we always lose our ground. That is the misfortune.

The second question that has been brought out in this Report is in regard to our relationship with Bhutan and Sikkim. I have gone through this Report during the short time that I had yesterday. Right up to 1959, the Chinese had accepted our position vis-a-vis Bhutan and Sikkim. Now suddenly they have turned turtle and they do not accept that position and they have gone back. It is because they know that anybody can take up any attitude so far as India is concerned and that India will be helpless.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh):
What are we to do?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I agree with you. What are you to do except to put your hands into your pockets and weep? That is all you can do.

The third thing which has been brought to light is a very important thing. It has revealed the true position. Probably, the Prime Minister

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] has not been well posted with what opened. The Government, in my opinion, has been put in a very embarrassing situation. This third thing is with regard to the relationship of Tibet and China. I will draw the attention of the House to the concluding chapter of the 'Report by the Indian Officials on the Boundary Question'. Certainly I will not take the time of the House in reading it out because that will take a long time. But unfortunately in this Report paragraphs have not been marked and therefore I cannot refer to paragraphs, I will refer to pages. It is the whole of page 14 and the first paragraph on page 15. And what does it reveal? We believe in the capacity of our officials and I have already stated that the nation will ever be grateful to them for the unique service that they have rendered to the country in finding out facts which are incontrovertible. These passages here show beyond doubt that Tibet right along had been independent of China. If we can believe these passages and if this is the position, I do not know under what circumstances we accepted the suzerainty of China over Tibet. I can only say that peace-loving people as we are, we always believe in pleasing our adversaries or other countries I often use the word 'appeasement'. Last time during the foreign affairs debate, the Prime Minister was annoyed and he said, 'If by appeasement is meant friendly and cordial relationship, most certainly I am for it, but if it is a cowardly policy out of fear, I protest. That will be wrong.' Again I beg to submit that I am afraid it is appeasement in the sense in which I understand it and from that point of view, in its anxiety to please China, was not the Government of India rash and did it not show scant regard for the independence of a small country in recognising China's title of suzerainty over Tibet? By this action, we have deliberately invited an aggressive China right up to our doors. This was a crime against Tibet and against our own interests for which the Government will ever be blamed by history.

Can such a thing happen in any country, whether a totalitarian or a democratic State? If such a thing were to happen there, what would have been the fate of the people at the helm of affairs, well, I need not say. But here, with Mr. Nehru at the helm of affairs, anything can be done and still he will be right and they will always be supporting him.

Sir, in this Report we have completely demolished the claim of China. China has no case whatsoever. We feel very happy naturally that we have demolished the claim of China altogether and proved that their occupation of our territory is nothing but sheer aggression, brutal aggression, against a friendly neighbour. But how does it help India? Of course, it does help China. What are we to do? Now here in regard to this matter, the President in his Address— has stated in paragraph 4:—

"They cannot accept the results of unilateral action or decisions taken by China."

It is a matter of interest to know what this statement means. My friend is not here, he has gone out. As he asked, what are we to do? We have nothing to do except to put our hands into our pockets and cry. That is all that we can do.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can smile.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Then the President goes on to say in paragraph 5 that—

"In spite of present unwillingness, or even intransigence, my Government hope that, sooner rather than later, China will persuade herself to come to a satisfactory agreement with our country in regard to our common frontiers."

The President has also talked of our progressive preparedness for defence. No doubt these are pious hopes and very good hopes, but the question is what We propose to do. In my opinion, Sir, our policy has to be com-

pietely reorientated. Otherwise, the best thing for us would be that we forget all about it, I mean our territory which is under the occupation of China and under the occupation of Pakistan; we can as well write it off. If you please you may continue to issue statements saying that any further encroachments will not be tolerated, but our friend knows very well what meaning these announcements by us make to him. If they actually conveyed the meaning they were intended to convey, certainly the Chinese would not have occupied our territory to this extent. Now it is crystal clear that diplomatically we have failed; we have not been able to expose the deceit and greed of China. Now what has happened actually? The smaller countries of South-East Asia, who ordinarily would have come to us for help in their need, now, knowing our incapacity even to protect our territory or to safeguard our territorial integrity, have directly approached China and made up with her. They have adopted the prudent course, have made their own terms with China. Not only that, Sir; they also endorse China's sincerity and China's love for peace. Therefore, Sir, whatever we may say in regard to the intentions of China, the world at large naturally will have to take into consideration the favourable views expressed by even the smaller countries of China as against us, who are directly concerned with them. Now, Sir, our Defence Minister is very fond of making speeches wherever he goes, but he rarely expresses views in regard to China; for some reason or other. If it is Pakistan or western democracies, naturally, he will miss no opportunity to hit them as hard as he can. He is the Defence Minister and he is in a position to hit hard. He has at his command all the might and force of India. But where China comes or the Soviet Bloc comes, he thinks twice before making any statement. All that he has said in regard to China is: "Because of her action China has been isolated." Even a Congress Member, who was speaking a little while ago, said that we had been isolated in this part of the world.

Why is it so? It is this. All the smaller countries in this region, which formerly had looked to us for guidance in many matters, have since made their terms directly with China because they know our incapacity to help them. Also, those smaller countries have said to the world at large that China is sincere in her desire for peace and is a peace-loving nation. So who has been isolated? Not China, but we. Also those smaller countries say that the Chinese are very reasonable people. By implication they want to show to the world that we are an unreasonable people. So in relation to China, diplomatically also we have complete-a led, and therefore our present policy has not borne any fruit. Our policy is very very sound in theory; it is very successful theoretically and it will again and again be approved by the whole House, and as I said a little while ago, it is a sound and good policy like a good and successful operation on a patient; only the patient dies, which the surgeon cannot help. Likewise we also cannot help if we are unsuccessful in our present foreign policy.

I have dealt with our neighbours, and within the few minutes at my disposal I would now like to say a few words in regard to the Congo. As to the Congo nobody can doubt the sincerity of purpose of our great Prime Minister in the affairs of the Congo. He is a world figure and we are all proud of the position that he occupies and through him this great country of ours occupies. That is certainly true. And as far as his ideology is concerned and as far as the theory embodied in it is concerned, his policy is first-class; nobody can find any fault with it. Only where it has to be translated into practice, there the difficulty arises, and always confusion sets in. Now, in regard to the Congo and in regard to the position of the United Nations there, one thing is quite clear, whether one accepts it or not, but I as a soldier am accustomed to speak plainly, and I must say that the United Nations can be successful only if the two powers, America and Russia, agree

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] on a particular issue, and where they do not agree on any particular issue, there the United Nations cannot function successfully. I can quote hundreds of examples where the U.N. can be successful if these two powers agreed, and where these two great powers do not agree there is complete fiasco; there it becomes a helpless world body as we are helpless in relation to our neighbours. In regard to the Suez crisis the United Nations was successful, and it was because both America and Russia were united in their aim and purpose. But what happened to Hungary, and to Russia for her part in exploiting the crisis there? And there the United Nations was a complete failure, and the events in Hungary uprooted the set-up there and brought in misery in various ways to that country. The prestige or the potency of the United Nations counts only where on a particular issue both America and Russia are at one, and where they are not so the U.N. cannot make advance even by an inch. And the case of the Congo was more or less akin to that of Hungary. It is agreed that in any trouble spot international intervention is always better than individual intervention, but there again only if these two great powers are agreed, the mission of the U.N. can be successful. Now, as to the Congo, the line taken by Russia is at variance with the line taken by America and the Western Bloc, and since the latter's relations with Belgium, which is involved in the Congo, are friendly, the latter somehow support Belgium. Thus the role of the United Nations in the troubled Congo is not successful and the crisis there is still brewing. It could have been successful even in the first instance if these two great powers saw eye to eye with each other, which they had not done. Secondly, Sir, the task of the U.N. would have been relatively simple if they were to man an international frontier so as to interpose a shock-absorber between hostile armies, or to prevent the introduction of foreign troops or military supplies. If its assignment was like that, it could have

successful as it was the case in Gaza and the Lebanon. But here <he is was altogether different; it was an unprecedented basis. Originally when Belgian troops were in the Congo even after the Congo became independent, but when the U.N. force went there, they succeeded in sending the Belgian troops out. The Belgian troops then had to step into the Congo to protect their nationals against the mutineers in the Congo, but when the U.N. force came the Belgian troops went. The difficult task entrusted to the United Nations in the Congo was something different, and that was to provide the apparatus of internal security. And how would it be possible when there were so many Governments in the Congo? Through a coup d'etat the troops had taken charge of the affairs of the Congo, and so many other unfavourable factors also came in; there was not one single central authority there. In such a state of affairs under no circumstances can the U.N. succeed in its mission. Everybody is sad that Mr. Lumumba, the first elected Prime Minister of the Congo, had been so badly ill-treated there and eventually murdered also. But, Sir, in any country where there is a revolution or a disturbed period, such things will happen, and if we over-emphasise this incident of Mr. Lumumba, we will give cause to the world to suspect that we are partisan. Now, what happened in regard to Hungary? I ask. Was not the Prime Minister there, Mr. Imre Nagy* killed? Originally he had to take asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest. Both the Hungarian and Russian authorities had given guarantee for his protection in order to enable him to come out of his asylum. Believing the word from the United Nations he came out and what happened? He was shot at and killed. That was also a murder, murder of a man who had taken asylum. Why did we not consider that incident as serious as Mr. Lumumba's death? What is the difference between the two?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh):- We did condemn it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, you did condemn. See the proceedings of the House yourself and compare the condemnation for Mr. Imre Nagy with the condemnation in regard to Mr. Lumumba. You compare these two dispassionately for yourself. You will see where there is more emphasis. When it was Russia to be condemned, we did not do it so forcefully because we did not want to annoy it. Now in the case of a small country like the Congo which is going through stresses and strains—of course, the sympathy of the whole world goes to it—we are blaming the poor Belgium. I ask, what can poor Belgium do alone? There are other big powers behind the whole affair. In the absence of such a support could Belgium stand against the whole world? But we do not name the countries which are backing Belgium for taking up this attitude.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): All N.A.-T.O. powers.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If the United Nations' prestige and potency as an instrument for the settlement of international problems and protection of the weak against the aggressive is to be applied, it should be applied to both big and small powers. Then there would be some logic behind your policy. But here a big power like Russia can go scot-free and there is no criticism against its actions whereas against small countries like Belgium and the Congo we go the whole hog to condemn it. Certainly, Sir, a policy which creates disparities or over-emphasises two issues of a similar nature will not cut much ice. Therefore, I submit that while in theory, as I said, our policy is admirable, in the translation of it in practice we have never been successful so far and I can prophesy with confidence that we will never succeed unless our whole policy is reorientated.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion of Dr. Ray. The Address by the President was brief and businesslike, in my view a little too brief and a little too businesslike. Sir,

most of the speakers have concentrated on the foreign policy and particularly the last speaker indulged in bitter and, I feel, rather cheap criticism. He asked more than once . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Thank you very much for the compliment.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is not a compliment, it is a mere description of a fact. Sir, he asked more than once: 'What should we do?', but his own answer was a sort of—I do not know whether he gave at all an answer.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My answer was 'reorientation of the policy completely'.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: He wanted reorientation of policy. Sir, what does this big phraseology mean? There is no doubt that the position regarding China is unsatisfactory. That much is acknowledged in all parts of the House and it is acknowledged in the Report itself. But, Sir, it is the tradition of the Government of India to be extremely restrained in its dealings with foreign issues. But, in spite of this tradition, the President has had to say that the Chinese intransigence continues. Again he has said:

"It is the constant endeavour of my Government to maintain our defensive strength in the face of this continuing hostility from across our frontier."

And, finally the paragraph ends with the categorical statement that—

"They cannot accept the results of unilateral action or decisions taken by China."

Now, beyond that there is only one thing which could be done. If the nation is strong enough and feels that its policy is right, it is to declare war against China and say that we shall continue the war until we have recovered the territory . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Or part with it.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: If the hon. Member had gone so far there, I would

[Shri K. Santhanam.] have admired his courage, though I may not admire his prudence but he dare not come to that conclusion. And when he is contradicting himself in that way, I think it is rather uncharitable and wholly unwarranted that he should speak about the stultifying position of the Government.

The position is unsatisfactory because the facts are unsatisfactory. We do not want war with China and it is a matter of fact that we cannot even be sure of successfully making war with China. So long as this position lasts, we have to be modest and at the same time build up our strength to the maximum extent. That is the policy which the Government of India is pursuing and I think to indulge in cheap criticism is only to lessen the national morale which it should be our endeavour to build up.

Sir, most of the speakers have dealt with the other aspects of our foreign policy which have been detailed. I do not want to go into them because in my view discussions of foreign policy are largely futile at the present juncture of world affairs and in the face of our own lack of strength to deal with them in any effective manner. Of course, now and then we have to express our views and bring such little moral pressure to bear upon the world events as we may be able to do. But it is the internal affairs of the country that we must concentrate upon. It is our thoughts and actions on these things that can bear some fruit.

Sir, the President has expressed, what was called, cautious optimism of the economic situation. In fact, some of the figures he has given make it clear that there is no room for complacency in this matter. He has pointed out that the national income during the Second Five Year Plan has increased only by about 12½ per cent., i.e., 2½ per cent, per year, which is nearly the increase in our population. Sir, it is not a very pleasant position. But in this connection I wish to draw

the attention of the House to the plight of our neighbour, China. We were told that they had made miraculous advances on their agricultural front and that productivity had reached fantastic heights. Now this year it is a matter of great regret that the food position in China should be much worse than it has ever been in our country. I do not think it is a matter of which we need be proud but at the same time I think it is time we should discount the statistical manipulations of totalitarian countries and have faith in our own methods of democratic advance.

Sir, our position is not very satisfactory but our statistics do not delude us to the same extent. We are honest enough to confess the actual facts of the situation and on the basis of truth we are hoping to build up a better and sounder economy. There is no doubt that, thanks to better monsoons and greater efforts to intensify production, our food situation has improved but unless we are alert all the time, there may be deterioration at any moment and it is a matter of satisfaction that the President has not claimed too much. He has not suggested that we can go to sleep. In fact, I wish he had made it very clear and specific that the people should be very cautious and very alert and that they should go on striving to improve the position and that they could not relax at all in the present juncture of affairs.

This Address has hardly anything which may be called controversial. If I understood the speech of the Leader of the Opposition correctly, he was objecting to the omissions rather than to the commissions. I thought he was explaining that certain things which are essential for our country had not been given the proper weight that should have been there. Am I correct?

PROF. M. B. LAL: Colourless. That is what we say.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Therefore, this Address is mostly non-controversial.

sial and I expect that it will be passed unanimously though our friends on this side may have some reservations.

There are one or two matters in which I think I am myself a little dissatisfied with this Address. On page 7, the President has said:

"Two Ordinances, namely, 'The X.J.P. Sugarcane Cess (Validation) Ordinance', and 'The Banking Companies (Amendment) Ordinance', have been promulgated since the last Session of Parliament."

The Constitution has given the power of issuing Ordinance to the President to be used only in emergencies. Article 123 says:

"If at any time, except when both Houses of Parliament are in session, the President is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him to take immediate action, he may promulgate such Ordinances as the circumstances appear to him to require."

So far as the Sugarcane Ordinance is concerned, there may be some justification because I think it was the result of some judicial decision and we cannot have an interregnum in the collection of the Sugarcane Cess but I take strong exception to the issuing of the Banking Companies (Amendment) Ordinance. The Banking Companies (Amendment) Bill was rushed through this House in the September Session. In fact on the last day of that session we were asked to endorse it. I then raised my voice of protest and said, 'You have drafted it in a bad manner, you have done it very hurriedly and you are going to have trouble.', but it was said that unless it was passed immediately, some great harm would happen to the banking structure in this country. Then we had another Session. If that Act had been unsatisfactory, the Government had ample opportunities to have it amended in the next Session but they did not do so. We adjourned on the

24th December, and we have reassembled on the 14th February. In this interregnum there was nothing urgent to justify the issue of the Ordinance. When the President uses the power of issuing Ordinance, he takes away the power of Parliament because once an Ordinance has been issued, then we become more or less committed. It becomes difficult to do anything unless we want to throw the Government out which we do not want. Therefore I think this a bad practice that the Government has got into to justify rather to make up for their failures and inefficiencies through the use of the power to issue Ordinances. I would certainly suggest to the Government that it should not do this.

Again in paragraph 21 I was rather surprised to read this: —

"The outline of the Third. Five Year Plan has been completed by the Planning Commission with the cooperation of the State Governments and has been approved in principle by the National Development Council. As soon as the Draft Report is ready, it will be placed again before the National Development Council, and later before Parliament."

So far as I am aware, the National Development Council has no place in the Constitution. It has not been set up by the Parliament. I have nothing against the National Development Council itself. It is a convenient improvisation to get things done, but to refer to it in this manner in the Presidential Address is to give it a statutory status before the Parliament has agreed to give it that status. I think the President is the guardian of the Constitution and he must see that nothing extra-constitutional is ratified by Parliament in a round about manner.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is subject to finalisation by Parliament...

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is said that it has been agreed to and it will be placed again. We have no concern at :.' rational Development Council. It is the Cabinet that is directly responsible. The chain of responsibility is from the people to the Parliament and from Parliament to the Cabinet and we can have no body which comes in the way of this chain of responsibility. I am speaking from political principles. I am not against the *de facto* National Development Council or its consideration of the Plan. It may be a convenient improvisation but we cannot be bound by the agreement or disagreement of the National Development Council. So far as we are concerned, it is the Cabinet that will be responsible and the habit of certain Ministers saying that the Planning Commission has not agreed to their proposals or that the Council has not agreed to them and therefore they are unable to do anything or that their funds have been cut etc., all these things, are against our system of Parliamentary Government and I would like to raise a voice against this practice.

Only one more point I would mention. This is a solemn occasion. Once a year the President addresses the two Houses. I am wondering—I speak with a great deal of diffidence—whether this solemn occasion is not being converted into a mere ceremonial occasion. I cannot help feeling that the Presidential Address should raise the tone and the spirit of the nation.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: For that the Government is responsible, I think.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: That is a matter of secrecy between the President and the Prime Minister. No one can prevent the President from saying that the Address must be of such and such sort nor can the President say that the Prime Minister should have

no voice. It is a joint product of the two and both of them are great writers and great speakers. It is a matter of disappointment to me that between the two, they could not present to us an Address which will make our hearts beat a little faster. No doubt it is brief and business like but it also reads as a statement prepared hurriedly, without much thought about the effects, the emotional and other effects which the Address is likely to have on the Members of Parliament **and** the vast audience outside. I suggest that the emotional and the artistic effects of the Presidential Address should be given some attention and I hope that this point of mine will be remembered when the Prime Minister and the President have to prepare the next Address. Thank you.

श्री माधो राम शर्मा (पंजाब) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, आज प्रेसिडेंट साहब के एड्रेस पर यहाँ बहस शुरू हुई है और उस में काफी नुक्ताचीनी भी हुई है लेकिन मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ कि प्रेसिडेंट साहब ने पार्लियामेंट को जो अपना एड्रेस दिया है उस में अपनी गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी बड़ी साफ़ तौर पर बाज़ह की है। यह ठीक है कि चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान की काफ़ी ज़मीन पर कब्ज़ा किया है और उस मामले पर मुल्क के अन्दर एक खलबली है लेकिन प्रेसिडेंट साहब ने अपने एड्रेस में यह ज़रूर कहा है कि वह चीन की इस बात को नहीं मानेंगे कि उस ने जिस जगह पर कब्ज़ा कर लिया है वह उस का हो गया है और जैसे भी होगा हिन्दुस्तान के उस हिस्से को जिस पर कि चीन काबिज़ है खाली कराया जायगा। तो यह बात बहुत संतोषजनक है। इस में कोई श्बह नहीं है कि हिन्द के और चीन के अफ़सरों की मीटिंग की जो रिपोर्ट आज सामने आई है उस से—जैसाकि और स्पीकर साहबान ने कहा है—काफ़ी नई चीज़ें और अचम्भे की बातें जाहिर होती हैं।

आज यह देख कर हम हैरान होते हैं कि काश्मीर के एक हिस्से पर पहले पाकि-

स्तान का बाज था और आज नाजायज कब्जा करने के बाद चीन उस से बाउंडरी का फ़ैसला कर रहा है। कितनी हैरानगी की बात है कि किसी का मकान हो और उस मकान में बाहर से एक डाकू घुस आये और उस पर कब्जा कर ले और फिर दूसरा डाकू आ कर कहे कि आओ आपस में हिस्सा बांट लेते हैं और मालिक मकान बड़ी मजबूरी के अन्दर, बड़ी हैरानगी से उस चीज को देखता रहे। यह मजबूरी बहुत देर तक कायम नहीं रह सकती और न हम मुल्क को खाली एश्यो-रेंसेज दे कर ही सैटिस्फाई कर सकते हैं। अगर किसी बाहर के मुल्क ने हिन्दुस्तान के किसी हिस्से पर कब्जा किया है और उस से मुल्क में बेवैनी पाई जाती है तो वह उसी वक्त ठीक हो सकती है जबकि हमारी गवर्नमेंट उस हिस्से को खाली कराने के लिये मुनासिब और सही कदम उठाये और एक पालिसी ले-डाउन करे कि किस तरीके पर वह इस चीज के लिये मुल्क को तैयार करती है ताकि हिन्दुस्तान का जो हिस्सा उस के कब्जे से बाहर जा चुका है वह वापस लिया जा सके। इसलिये मैं हुक्मत से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि मुल्क की तैयारी के लिये पूरे तौर पर एक प्लान बना कर लोगों को बताना चाहिये कि वह किस तरीके पर किस ढंग से उसे खाली करायेगे और उस के लिये मुल्क को क्या कुर्बानी करनी है। लोग उस चीज के लिये तैयार हैं लेकिन वह चाहते हैं कि लीड हमारे नेता और हमारी गवर्नमेंट ले ताकि उसे खाली कराने में कामयाबी हो। बहुत हैरानगी की बात है कि मैं यह देखता हूँ कि हम चीन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में बैठाने के लिये तो बहुत प्रोपोगैंडा करते हैं लेकिन चीन ने हमारे साथ जो कुछ ज्यादातियां की हैं और हमारे मुल्क का जो कुछ हिस्सा उस ने हड़प लिया है उस के सिलसिले में अभी बाहर के मुल्कों में और अपने मुल्कों में भी हमारा प्रोपोगैंडा उतना तेज नहीं है जितना कि होना चाहिये। उस के लिये मैं ज़रूरी समझता हूँ कि हमें पूरे तरीके पर काम करना होगा। ठीक है,

एक वक्त था जब कि हम ने यह कहा था कि हिन्दी और चीनी भाई-भाई हैं, हम ने उस वक्त यह नहीं समझा था कि हिन्दी और चीनी तो भाई-भाई हैं लेकिन चीन के अन्दर जो गवर्नमेंट कायम है और जिस तरह की हुक्मत वहां पर कायम है वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ घोखा करेगी, वह हिन्दुस्तान को दगा देगी और गलत चीजें करेगी। हम ने समझा था कि जब हम भाई-भाई की बात कहेंगे तो शायद राम और लक्ष्मण की बात होगी कि जब राम बन गये तो चूंकि लक्ष्मण भाई थे वह भी उन के साथ बन गये लेकिन यहां पर तो आज हम दूसरा ही नक्शा देखते हैं। हम तो आज कल के ज़माने के उन भाईयों की बात देख रहे हैं जोकि यह है कि बड़ा भाई अगर मौका लगे तो छोटे भाई की सारी की सारी जायदाद हड़प जाय। यही नक्शा आज चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ पेश किया है कि वह भाई-भाई का गलत नारा दे कर के छोटे भाई को हड़पना चाहता है। तो इस नक्शे को बदलने के लिये निहायत ज़रूरी है कि मुनासिब और कांफ़्रीट स्टेप्स उठाये जायें तो इस सिलसिले में मैं आप के सामने यह कहना चाहता था।

दूसरी बात जोकि हमारे सामने है वह एग्ज़िक्यूटिव प्रोडक्शन के सिलसिले में है। इस में कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि खेती की जो पैदावार है वह पहले से बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ी है लेकिन उस पैदावार के बढ़ने के बारे में हमें बहुत गलतफ़हमी में नहीं रहना चाहिये। बाढ़ों के आने से, बरसात के ज्यादा होने से जहां मुल्क में बड़ा काफी नुकसान हुआ है वहां जैसा कि ग्राम तौर से हुआ करता है बाढ़ों के आने से नुकसान के साथ कुछ फायदा भी हुआ है और वह फायदा यह हुआ है कि बड़े-बड़े सीलाब में जो रेत और मिट्टी बाहर से आ कर खेतों में जम गई उस ने एक सूरत से खाद का काम किया और उस की वजह से यह बम्पर क्राप इस साल भी पैदा होने

[श्री माधो राम शर्मा]

वाली है और पिछले साल भी हुई थी। इसलिये मैं गवर्नमेंट को यह चेतावनी जरूर देना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस मामले में डिलमिल न रहे और यह न समझ ले कि इस साल की जो बम्पर क्राप है वह बहुत ज्यादा इस वजह से है कि चूँकि गवर्नमेंट ने उस के लिये एफर्ट्स किये हैं। यह ठीक है कि गवर्नमेंट ने काफी एफर्ट किया है, तकावी देने में, लोगों को अच्छा बीज देने में, लोगों को खेती बारी की बातों की ज्यादा जानकारी देने में गवर्नमेंट ने काफी कोशिश की है और उस की वजह से पैदावार जरूर ज्यादा बढ़ी है लेकिन जैसाकि मैं ने कहा सैलाब की वजह भी एक फ़ैक्टर है और इस की वजह से भी बम्पर क्राप इस साल होने वाली है। तो अनाज की पैदावार की तरफ आप ने जो कोशिशें की हैं उनको किसी सुरत से भी कम नहीं होने दें बल्कि उन को ज्यादा बढ़ायें। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर इंडस्ट्रीज को डेवलप करने का बड़ा मौका है, बड़ा चांस है, बड़ा स्कोप है लेकिन उस के बावजूद हम कभी इस चीज को नहीं भुला सकते कि हिन्दुस्तान मेनली एग्रीकल्चरल मुल्क है और जब तक कि उस का एग्रीकल्चर स्ट्रांग नहीं होगा, जब तक कि ज़मीन की पैदावार पर हिन्दुस्तान ज्यादा भरोसा नहीं करेगा तब तक कभी भी उस की एकानामी पूरे तरीके पर डेवलप हो कर कामयाब नहीं हो सकती। हिन्दुस्तान का बेस इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन नहीं हो सकता हिन्दुस्तान का बेस एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन ही हो सकता है और उस की बिना पर ही इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन की तरक्की हो सकती है। इसलिये यह निहायत जरूरी है कि इस तरफ हम पूरा ध्यान दें और कोशिश करें कि एग्रीकल्चर को बेस बना कर ही हिन्दुस्तान को इंडस्ट्रियलाइज करें न कि यह कि हिन्दुस्तान को इंडस्ट्रियलाइज कर के फिर एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन को ज्यादा करें।

इसलिये इस बात को महसूस करते हुए मैं यह समझता हूँ कि एग्रीकल्चर की तरफ हम अपना ध्यान दें। छोटे किसान को ज्यादा इमदाद दें, यह एक निहायत ही जरूरी चीज है। जैसाकि एड्रेस के अन्दर कहा भी गया है कि धार्यदा एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन के अन्दर काफी भारी रकम दी जायगी, ताकि वह टागेट जो हम ने थर्ड फ़ाइव इयर प्लान में रखा है उस पर पहुँचने में हम कामयाबी हासिल कर सकें और इस के लिये पूरी कोशिश की जायगी।

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am happy to associate myself with the Motion of Thanks that is under discussion on the floor of the House today. Sir, the Mover of the motion made a remark that the President's Address contains in equal portions his remarks on external affairs and on domestic affairs. I believe, Sir, that the President has rightly given due place for the events which have happened in the international field because I believe that the trend of events in the external affairs today is going to profoundly affect not only the well-being of **our** nation but the well-being of **the** whole world. It is, therefore, Sir, that the President has given very keen and great consideration for the events that have occurred in the field of external affairs. I will take up the Congo first. I know that hon. Members who have spoken before me have made reference to the Congo situation and one might wonder whether any more remarks on this are necessary or proper at all. I do admit, Sir, that what has happened in the Congo is very important not only from the point of view of the Congolese but from our point of view as well. I also believe that if the trend that is seen in the events of the Congo is allowed to continue, nobody can predict as to what course events will take in future not only in that disturbed area of Africa but in other parts of the

world. Sir, the greatest shocking event of the slaying of Mr. Lumumba has far-reaching consequences and I have no doubt that the blame for this most sad and atrocious thing must be laid not only at the door of the reactionary forces in the Congo but at the door of the Security Council as well. I know, Sir, I am making a very serious remark. With due respect to the Security Council, I find that its decisions lack statesmanship. Why did the Security Council decide to send the United Nations forces to the Congo? It is not simply to become helpless observers of what was going on in the Congo. The House will remember, Sir, that the Security Council was requested by the lawful Congolese Government to send the United Nations forces to its aid. So, it was just to help the constitutional functioning of this Government that the United Nations took that responsibility, but what did they do? They saw "to it that they were helpless observers of unconstitutional methods being adopted there and the constitution being jeopardised at every stage by the reactionary forces. If the Security Council wanted the United Nations to fulfil the object for which the United Nations forces were sent there, they ought to have seen to it that the Secretary-General was duly empowered in order to fulfil that object. The Secretary-General was clamouring for more and more power as more and more events came to be revealed there. Outside influences were disturbing events in the Congo, and of these outside forces, the Belgians were the most important factor. The Belgians had to quit that country and they professed to do so; they said they had done so but they did not and they were very active there in almost every sphere and the United Nations authorities, whoever there was, should have been empowered by the Security Council to be able to forcibly and physically prevent external forces from interfering in the Congolese affairs. The second mistake was that

the Security Council did not authorise the Secretary-General to see that the constitution of the Congo functioned and that nobody interfered with the rightful duties of the constitutional authorities. There was Col. Mobutu coming up through illegal means, unconstitutional means, to power and the United Nations forces—the representatives there—thought that it was none of their duty to deal with this man. If the purpose for which the United Nations forces were sent was to have been fulfilled, it was very necessary for the officers to have disarmed the Congolese forces to whomsoever they belonged, whether they belonged to Col. Mobutu or to Mr. Lumumba or to anybody. So long as these forces were not within their proper sphere and were interfering with the constitutional functioning of the Government of the Congo, it was the duty of the Security Council to have empowered the Secretary-General to deal with these forces and to disarm them. By not empowering the Secretary-General, the Security Council as I said, has failed in its statesmanship. Of course, some allegations are made against the Secretary-General. I do not know, and I am not in a position to say whether the Secretary-General did act with perfect *bona fides* or not. For myself, I believe, as I know him from a distance and having watched his activities, that he was behaving with perfect *bona fides* but that he had no powers to deal with the reactionary forces in the Congo in the manner which was necessitated by the development of events there.

Now, there is one risk which the Security Council has taken and that is, the institution of the United Nations has now come to suffer in its prestige and the hopes that the entire people of the world had on the United Nations are now going to be belied. That is the greatest risk. If the world is to have peace and if people are to live at peace with each other, the United Nations was the one organisation in which everybody had confl-

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] dence and everybody rested their hopes on the United Nations but in going to the Congo, the United Nations has met its defeat there and it has allowed savage forces to defeat the purpose and the strength and the prestige of the world organisation and this is the greatest danger, Sir, that has occurred to the world. It is not even now too late to go back upon this though certain irrevocable steps have been taken and certain unremediable situations have developed. It is for the Security Council to seriously think whether they would allow the United Nations to operate and whether they would preserve, let alone enhance, the prestige of this organisation. It is very saddening that big powers are not thinking in terms of the prestige of

the United Nations. I wonder, Sir, how people who at every moment think of free nations and talk of free nations have gone there to aid the Belgians who are trying to deprive the Congolese of their newly won freedom. It is a very sad state of affairs; when big powers take sides like this there is no hope in the world for smaller powers which are still under domination, which have still to liberate themselves.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 17th February, 19(51).