

**RAJYA SABHA**

*Friday, the 17th February, 1961/the 28th  
Magha, 1882 (Sdka)*

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR.  
DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE  
OF THE HOUSES ON THE  
MATERNITY BENEFIT BILL, 1960**

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat):  
Sir, I beg to lay on<sup>1</sup> the Table a copy of the  
Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses  
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.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRIMATI  
RUKMANI BAI**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to  
inform Members, that the following letter  
dated February 11, 1961 has been received  
from Shrimati Rukmani Bai:—

"I humbly submit that due to protracted  
illness I have become very weak and I am  
unable to undertake a journey. I shall not,  
therefore, be in a position to attend the  
current Session commencing in the month  
of February. I request you to kindly grant  
me leave."

Is it the pleasure of the House..that leave be  
granted to Shrimati Rukmani Bai for  
remaining absent from, all meetings of the  
House during the current Session?

<sup>m</sup>  
•*No hon.* Member dissented)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Permission  
to remain absent is granted,  
969 R.S.—1.

**STATEMENT *HE* GOVERNMENT  
BUSINESS**

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY  
AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA) :  
"With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce  
that Government business in this House for  
the week commencing 20th February, 1961  
will consist of—

- (1) Further discussion of the Motion of  
Thanks to the President for his  
Address.'
- (2) General Discussion of Railway  
Budget for 1961-62.
- (3) Further consideration and passing  
of the Delhi Shops and  
Establishments (Amendment) Bill,  
1960.
- (4) Consideration and passing of the  
following Bills as passed by Lok  
Sabha—
  - (i) The Industrial Employment  
(Standing Orders) Amendment  
Bill, 1960.
  - (ii) The Motor Transport  
Workers Bill, 1960. (iii) The  
Telegraph Laws (Amendment)  
Bill, 1960.

**MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESI-  
DENT'S ADDRESS—*continued***

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when the House  
rose last evening, I was offering remarks on  
the Congo. I have just a few words more to  
say on that subject before I leave it.

Sir, if the Congo has to be put on its feet,  
on the road to democracy, and if the U.N. has  
to rehabilitate itself in its lost prestige, it is  
necessary for the U.N. to take these  
measures:

- (1) To clear the Congo of all  
Belgian adventurers and other foreign  
adventurers;
- ii) To release all politic\*!  
prisoners;

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

- (3) To disarm all the Congolese troops and to place in the Congo more United Nations Forces; and
- (4) To reconvene Parliament and to stay there as long as the Congo Parliament has not acquired a hold on the Congolese territory.

Now, Sir, I have to express the admiration which we all have for our nationals, namely, Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal and others, who are doing an excellent but thankless job in the Congo.

It is but meet that the President has given the first place in his address to the incursions on our borders with China. Sir, our worst fears are confirmed by the first overtures by China to Pakistan. That is quite clear because China has held out its hands of embrace to Pakistan and if we can judge by the recent and the latest speech of President Ayub Khan made in Dacca, Pakistan is prepared to enter that embrace. Sir, I believe it will not take long for Pakistan to realise, just as we have realised to our cost, that the embrace would be a Dhritarashtra-alangana, and I hope\* that both the countries will realise the real position sooner rather than later. The President, Sir, has expressed our grim determination not to allow any incursions on our border to strengthen our defences. Sir, our neighbouring countries which have had ages-old friendship with India—Bhutan, Nepal and Sikkim—are in great danger. I admire, Sir, the wisdom and statesmanship of the Maharaja of Bhutan who has entrusted to the Government of India all negotiations on defences respecting the borders of Bhutan with China. Sir, it is a very sad thing to note that for all its friendship and the good offices that she has done to China, India has received only ingratitude.

Then, Sir, I have to make one suggestion. Although the President has not directly referred to the position of our nationals in Ceylon, as

there is a very progressive Government in Ceylon under that distinguished lady, I request our Government to take up the matter relating to citizenship rights of the people of Indian origin in Ceylon and also try to remedy the situation, as far as Indian citizens trading in Ceylon are concerned, in the matter of restrictive legislation that has been imposed on the Indian traders in Ceylon. I hope, Sir, the time is now propitious for easing the situation in Ceylon, as far as this subject is concerned. The same, Sir, would be the case with Burma.

By looking to the amendments that have been proposed to the Motion of Thanks, Sir, one finds that there is a general agreement with regard to the achievements that the Government of India have attained in the past year and there is general approval of the policies which the Government of India have followed so far. Usually, Sir, we have a long list of amendments, but this time, Sir, whether looking to the remarks of the Members of the Opposition which have been offered so far or to the amendments proposed, one feels convinced and gratified that there is very little to differ from whatever the Government of India has done or from the objectives which the Government of India has placed before itself. Therefore Sir, I do not wish to offer any remarks on that subject. I only wish that this year, as the President has expressed the hope, will be a year of achievements not only for India but a year when the international situations will be eased and our border question also although it is a faint hope, Sir, will be solved. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, deem it a great privilege to register my appreciation of the Address given to the joint House by the President of India. I feel much beholden to him, because he has drawn our attention to the most urgent national problem, i.e., the dispute over the Sino-Indian border. He has further

expressed a feeling of concern. We all have come to this end that there is a sense of despondency.

We observed with great interest the proceedings that took place between the officials of the Government of India and those of the Republic of China. Though we never expected that there would be some spectacular results, still we thought there might be some common points which prove useful later on for the solution of certain aspects of this problem.

Sir, when I talk of China, I am reminded of that long history of our friendly relationship with that great country covering a period of about nineteen hundred years since Matang Kashyap, that great Indian scholar, -visited that country in the first century A.D. We find that there was a stream of pilgrims coming to this country with sentiments and feelings of reverence unequalled in the annals of history. Many of us who have gone through the pages of Buddhist history know that some of those pilgrims who came to this land refrained from wearing their shoes lest this land of Lord Buddha, the Enlightened One, would stand polluted. This was because of our cultural affinity with that great land and the great reverence born out of this relationship which kept us together. Of course, I talk about—not exactly the pre-historic times—the early history of India and we kept up that tradition right up to our pre-independence days as could be seen from the policy advocated by the Indian National Congress.

The Indian National Congress was the only representative body in our pre-independence period which took firmly a line of friendship with China in the whole of Asia. If we remember, at the Calcutta session in 1937 we passed a resolution to the effect that the aggression by Japan against China was a brutal one, that it was a piece of imperialist aggression, and we expressed our sympathy for China and

affirmed our solidarity with her against this brutal attack. Later on we took a stiffer position at the Hari-pura session of the Congress and passed a resolution ratifying the earlier resolution of the A.I.C.C. which met at Calcutta and advocated a policy of boycott of Japanese goods just to register our protest in a more effective manner. It was again ratified at the Tripura session when we decided to send a medical unit under the guidance of Dr. Atal. These are the examples to be cited on the floor of this House to remind those people who have been striving for good relationship between China and India.

Sir, it was in this context that we initiated talks with China after her emergence as the People's Republic of China in 1949 as a great Power. We conducted so many negotiations and right up to September 1959 there was absolutely no difference of opinion as far as our border was concerned. China had accepted our position that the McMahon Line was the only border that could be admitted. Now, we find that things have happened in a different fashion. China has repudiated it and the repudiation contains some acrimonious feelings also which are really a sad commentary on the whole affair. China, rather, spoke in a fashion which was not consistent with our earlier negotiations. Of course, she has said that the whole border question has been dealt with against the spirit of co-existence since all those parts which happen to be within the Indian border once formed part of the territory of China and they were annexed to India only as a result of British imperialist aggression. That is the stand that China has been taking consistently in her talks.

Sir, we have paid a very heavy price for our friendly relations. Sir, I do not want to use the word 'sacrifice' though I feel impelled to speak in that fashion but the most euphemistic expression at this stage would be to say that we probably

[Shri Satyachanan.] ignored the interests of Tibet just to see that our friendly relations with China could be maintained. After this comes the claim of China to about 48,000 sq. miles of our territory and recently they have added another 2,000 sq. miles probably at the time of the talks between the Government of India officials and the Chinese officials. So, it comes in all to 50,000 sq. miles of territory over which China has laid claim. It is also a fact that out of it, 12,000 sq. miles of our territory have already been taken in possession by the Chinese people. Whenever there is any talk of negotiation, they say that it is their right to have it and they talk a lot about imperialist aggression.

Sir, if we accept that position, things would be rather more against the interests of the Chinese themselves because the whole of the Chinese Empire or most of the areas that happen to be within the Chinese border now are there because of continuous conquests made by them. If that position is taken, probably we shall have to ask China to concede a lot of land to us that falls within her territory. There is evidence to the fact that in 1841 Captain Zorawar Singh, one of the captains of Ranjit Singh's army, visited Kailash, encamped there and declared it a part of Kashmir territory. There is another very curious example to which I may refer at the present moment. It was in 1900 that some Indian army personnel visited a fortress which lies high up in the Pamirs near Karakoram range. The name of the fortress is Shahejehan. There were about 200 Indians residing there. It is said that the fortress happened to be within the borders of India in the reign of Shahjehan. Then the Indian border extended right up to that place. So, if we accept this argument, I think we shall have to ask Russia to concede some of the areas and also China to hand over Mount Kailash and also the territory adjacent to Manasarovar. But we abhor to follow that line which is

not consistent with the principles of negotiations. We have to stick to certain ideas and ideologies which we have so far pursued.

Sir, China has also argued that our Prime Minister has toed the same line as that of the imperialists and the castigation against him is that he has been imperialistic in outlook. In the last summit conference held at Moscow, our Prime Minister was said to be bourgeois and he was equated with Eisenhower. And our socialist pattern which is such a progressive measure and has brought about a silent revolution in our country, has been dubbed as bourgeois monopoly. This is what is happening before us and we have to speak in a language which is consistent with our sentiments. After all these accusations and the way she has moved, we find that China has created a lot of trouble not only in the border areas, but in all the countries adjacent to our border. She wanted to have negotiations with Bhutan independent of India, refusing all the traditional relationships that we have with Bhutan. They have also denounced all those niceties of diplomatic traditions which have been so far followed with Bhutan. From the statement that the Maharaja of Bhutan gave before a Press conference at Calcutta on January 30th, it is quite clear that certain overtures were made to him for direct negotiations with China. He refused to do so. Now, when the officials of the Government of India had talks with the officials of China, the latter refused to talk about Sikkim and Bhutan, as if these two countries were the preserve of China and that India was not competent to discuss the matters of these two countries.

Things are most disquieting if you go to Nepal and study things there I know a little more than many of the hon. Members sitting here, since the country happens to be on the other side of the border of my own district. I know that a movement as sponsored in Nepal known as

Maha Nepal' and it was sponsored accusing India of imperial designs. Our own Indian Embassy staff, our Prime Minister and also Members of Parliament were accused of complicity with all those factions that wanted amalgamation of certain portions of Nepal with India. I have records with me. They are so very evident. It is because of sponsoring that offensive propaganda against India that the stooges of the Chinese people said openly that—it was a two-pronged movement—India had taken away their lands and they had to be handed over to Nepal, that is, Darjee-ling and Kalimpong in West Bengal, Tehri Garhwal, Tarai areas and the districts of Dehra Dun and Saharan-pur in Uttar Pradesh, Spiti and Lahaul in Himachal Pradesh and Simla in Punjab. They demand all these territories. This is one aspect of their movement. Number two, they have said that we have sinister designs of probably taking away the Nepalganj area which happens to be : on the border of India in West | Nepal. So, they have a two-pronged movement. On the one side, they indict us for imperialist or expansionist designs. On the other hand, they have sponsored a movement claiming certain portions of Indian territory. Apart from what the Chinese have swallowed themselves and t)h<sub>e</sub> claims that they have made over 48,000 to 50,000 square miles of our territory they have incited others also to do the same. This is the most difficult position in which we have been put. Things have now come to a saturation point. We are not to indulge in platitudes and also we are not to indulge in a language full of terminological squabbles. Things have taken a different turn. It has come to a culmination point when we have to speak without reservation in our minds, if we are patriots—and all of us sitting here are patriots except a handful of people, a section of people who have said that the Chinese issue is a trivial issue which is of no major Importance. I do not understand, if a major offensive is taken against India and a big slice

has been taken away from our mother country and even then it is not a major problem, what on earth could be a greater 'major problem' than this? I should say it must impinge on their conscience, and remember they have to bear the guilt and posterity would never forgive them for the sins that they commit today.

Here, at this stage I must say that China—the way it has behaved internationally and the way it is already going ahead—is advocating the cult of inevitability of war and denial of co-existence, in spite of the summit conference that was held in Moscow in November last. I have to say that in this global tragic drama that is being enacted, China is the villain of the piece. We have to see that this country is brought to its proper proportions. We have been a tolerant nation. We probably thought that China today or tomorrow would come to her senses and would concede things that we legitimately claim. But it has gone out of bounds. Now, I am not speaking in a vein of hysterical outburst, but I make a very cold, calculated and reasoned suggestion, with respectful sentiments, to the Government of India that the time has now come to announce our diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Government and for the application of economic sanctions against that country. Now, this is the time I say. The issues, of course, are not trivial. We took these two measures against South Africa since certain people who happened to be of Indian origin were maltreated. They were not given equal treatment, on racial grounds, with the other inhabitants. If the same thing is not applied to the People's Republic of China, after her doing all the injustice that she could do and after playing mischief and constantly hitting at our head, it is really a most difficult situation. Like the Greek God Janus, China or Peking has two faces. With one face it talks in an amiable fashion about co-existence. And the face on the obverse, we find,

[Shri Siatyaeharan.J disfigures with scowls. Simply because it feels that it has power enough to quell us, it gives orders for aggression and so many other things allied with it. This has been a consistent policy of China with India, a policy of kicks and kisses. We are not going to tolerate them any more. As I told you, I made a very humble but emphatic suggestion in a most respectful spirit that the time has spiralled to a climax when there should be a diplomatic rupture, because we are not going to stand this mischief. What are we going to do with a nation which has absolutely no confidence in the theory of co-existence and in the niceties of diplomatic talks and relationships? So, this is my humble submission to all the Members of Parliament. Hon. Members must think now without reservation. We have to take effective steps. The age of protest is now over. That had happened long ago. If it continues, the nation may lose its faith and confidence in its conduct of affairs. That is why while speaking on the President's Address, I urged all of you to think alike in the same spirit, which is consistent with the sentiments of the nation.

Thank you.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I agree that the year we left behind was one of great stress and strain.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Say something about China.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I know what he says. He need not help me. I can understand the anxiety of my friend because during last year the most vexed problem that confronted our nation was the border dispute between India and China and it is a pity that the question still remains unresolved. At the same time, the official team which has been deputed—I am proud to say—has done a commendable work in collecting indisputable evidence to justify our claim. When the official team was appointed,

I do not think that anybody thought that the dispute would be settled between these two official teams. On more than one occasion it was stated that this commission was more or less a fact-finding commission. Now, the facts are there, and the facts are very strong ones from our side.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): "Our" means what?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I thought that she knew that I am an Indian. This is the kind of thing that weakens our case, I mean the Indian case. My friends on the other side want to exploit the situation to fight us. This type of attitude is not going to strengthen our position against any other nation. So, Sir, I feel that I cannot agree with the suggestion put forward by my friend that there should be a diplomatic rupture. I think it would be bankruptcy of diplomacy to do so at this time. When we are very well fortified with sufficient evidence, this is the time when we should press for negotiation and settlement of this question, and in this I share the optimism of the President when he says that China will persuade herself to settle this question satisfactorily.

While we were in the joint session hearing the President, I know that our hearts were heavy with the sad news of the cold-blooded murder of Mr Lumumba. Frightened at the mighty liberation movement in Africa, the imperialists and their stooges are trying to suppress the movement there, and on this African question I hope our Government will take a more stern stand.

With regard to the internal situation, the President has correctly stated that the national income of our country during these years has increased. It is true that our national income has increased by 40 or 42 per cent. It is also true that the per capita income has increased by 40 per cent. It is correct to say that agricultural production has gone up by 40 per cent. It is also

correct to say that industrial production has gone up. But, Sir, this is only one side of the picture. The statistics supplied by the Government of India show that while wealth was increasing in this country, people were getting more and more pauperised. In 1950 people who had an earning of less than Rs. 200 were 50 per cent. But in 1957-58 the percentage is 65. Think about this very seriously. You know the agricultural workers are the lowest socially and economically.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Where did you get these figures?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: They were published in "Matribhumi" in October 1960.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is not a Government of India paper.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Well, if you want the governmental publication itself, I will find it out and get it, but "Matribhumi" is a Congress paper which honestly publishes all these Government statistics. It is not owned by the P.S.P. or the Communists. So, the fact remains that in spite of the growth of wealth in our country, large sections of the people, the agricultural workers, the factory workers and so on, are getting more and more pauperised. There is also another interesting feature of the statistics. The percentage of those people whose earnings were above Rs. 500 has gone down. From 8 per cent, it has gone down to 4.5 per cent. I think this is a very serious matter for all parties in this country to consider, and this kind of development instead of strengthening our nation is weakening it.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): May I know the sector which has benefited according to the same source?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Two sections. One the industrialists, and the other politicians.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Are you quoting the same statistics or is it your own version?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Is it all parties? Make it clear.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: You know what I mean. Then, another dangerous phenomenon that has developed during recent times is the insecurity of the minorities. You know we had occasion to discuss the disturbances in Assam a few months ago. Now we know what has happened in Jabalpur.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): What about the Catholic minorities in Kerala?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: In Kerala the Catholic minorities are ruling.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Are they a minority or a majority?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Now, you say they are a majority. What happened in Jabalpur I need not explain because I think it is fresh in the memory of all Members here as it was a recent occurrence. Even in yesterday's papers, especially the "Statesman", there was a report as to how hooliganism was perpetrated in certain parts of Madhya Pradesh. Resentment against certain crimes may be justified, but that does not mean that people belonging to one particular community, innocent people, should be attacked. That kind of thing is very dangerous for national security, and I think it is a matter which we should seriously consider.

Then another very dangerous tendency that is developing in recent years is the attack on democracy. It started in Kerala. Well, you are laughing. You, the Congress people should think seriously about what we have done in Kerala . . . (*Inter-ruption*)

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : The hon. Member is quite right. It started in Kerala, but

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] Kerala has thrown out the anti-democrats.

*(Interruption.)* \* •

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I am very sorry that a great ex-Judge like Mr. Sapru should come and defend the action of the Congress Parliamentary Board when they give permission to start direct action against an elected Government.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): Are you not accepting the verdict of the people of Kerala?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: We have accepted it. We have not started direct action as you have done. Do you not see that we have accepted that verdict? On the other hand you are not prepared . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please address the Chair.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: If it had ended in Kerala, I would have been very happy. But what I am pointing out now is that the tendency which you have encouraged in Kerala is spreading, and today certain legal luminaries are doubting whether this Parliament is supreme and sovereign, whether the President has extra right over Parliament. Well, I think it is time for us to state categorically that we do not want any Kasavubu here in India to rule supreme over Parliament.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: What do you mean by it?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: This has been a matter of discussion in the public. After working the Constitution for ten years, some people are entertaining a doubt whether the President is not above Parliament. That is why I say that the time has come when we have to state categorically that Parliament is supreme and that the President is only the constitutional head.

Again, it is surprising that the President of the Congress has given expression to his new ideas on democracy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. We are not concerned with what the chief of the Congress has said.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The Congress is the ruling party in India and when the President of that organisation expresses his views about the democratic set-up in India, it is a matter to be seriously considered. I do not make mention of the suggestions put forward by such a highly imaginative man as Mr. Jayaprakash Narain, because his is a small party.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nair, we are concerned now with the President's Address, not with what party leaders have said outside the House. Please confine yourself to the discussion of the President's Address.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: A suggestion has been put forward by the head of the ruling party in India that indirect election should be held in place of direct election. It is a serious matter concerning our people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with the President's Address.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: But this tendency which has developed in India now has got to be checked but the President has said nothing about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot debate over that here in this House.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The President in a democracy . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want you to be relevant.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I will be relevant.



MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 'You ) are not relevant. We are not concerned here with what other people have said outside the House. We are now discussing the President's Address. If you have got any comments to make on it, you can do so.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: This is the tendency now developing in India against its democratic set-up, that is against parliamentary elections. This is a very serious matter which this House has to take into consideration, and we expect a lead on that from the President himself. Unfortunately, I regret to say that the President has omitted to mention that aspect of the matter. That is why I am saying that.

I can only conclude my speech by saying that this dangerous tendency which is developing in India has to be checked and if anything is in danger in India today, it is democracy, and I think this House should stand up to defend democracy in every way. Thank you.

SHRI M. M. MEHTA (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President's Address has recorded the achievements during the year that has passed and has indicated in a broad way what the Government would like to do in the coming year.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

There are many points in the Address but I would like to touch only on the economic and the moral points. I will not take the time of the House by discussing foreign affairs which have been so widely discussed by all the Members as well as by the Prime Minister on the floor of this House. The following points are of economic importance. Firstly, agricultural production in 1960-61 is likely to be far better than in the previous year. The targets for minor irrigation and seed multiplication farms, laid down in the Second Five Year Plan, are expected to be realised almost fully. Secondly, 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. The manufacture of industrial machinery and machine-tools has made satisfactory progress. Thirdly, new sources of oil have been discovered, notably in Ankleshwar in Gujarat and in Sibsagar in Assam. It is expected that trial production will commence this year. Work on two refineries is proceeding, and a third refinery is also going to be established. Fourthly, labour relations, apart from the recent regrettable strike by Government employees, have improved. The Code of Discipline has exercised a healthy influence. The Employees' State Insurance Scheme has been extended to further areas to cover about 15-8 lakh factory workers. Lastly, the national income for 1959-60 is estimated to be Rs. 12,210 crores at 1952-53 prices, as compared with Rs. 10,920 crores in 1955-56. Price levels have registered a rise of about 6 per cent, as compared to the previous year.

One major compulsion in our national life is the attainment of maximum economic growth in the minimum time. It is true that there are various limitations such as the vagaries of nature, dearth of technical personnel, etc. But the test of successful planning lies in mitigating and overcoming them. Viewed in this light, India's record presents a very mixed picture. Economic growth, as expressed in terms of annual rate of increase in the national income, is not as much as was expected. We find that the national income in the Second Plan is only 20 per cent, though it was expected to be 25 per cent. This is, of course, definitely due to the setbacks in our agricultural production in 1957-58 and 1959-60. It is expected that in 1960-61, there will be a bumper crop, approximately 77 million tons. Even then, it is short of 5 million tons. Besides, the present rate of growth of population is so much that various States will come under the brand of over-populated areas, such as Kerala, West Bengal, eastern T.P. and Bihar, and unless rigorous and concentrated steps are taken to stop

[Shri M. M. Mchta.] this growth of population, all our efforts will be negated. Unfortunately, Government's policies relating to land reforms and co-operative farming do not help in more production. For example, the Land Ceiling Bill which is now before the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly brings within its purview sugarcane farms attached to factories and orchards which have been specially recommended for exclusion by the Planning Commission, in view of the specific nature and character of their operation. Sir, these policies disclose evidence of submission to pressure. It may be ideological or otherwise, but it is an economic reality.

Sir, a brighter picture is of course presented on the industrial front. Industrial production in 1960 is estimated to show an increase of 14 to 15 per cent, as against 9 per cent, in the previous year. Targeted capacity has already been exceeded in several directions. But the country's population is so large and as such it must be kept in view that this progress is very little as compared to the requirements of the country.

It is necessary to refer in this connection to the ideological conflicts and administrative delays which have retarded the rate of progress of the country. Nobody seems to have a firm grip over the administration. There has been too much divided responsibility with the result that there is generally reluctance to take decisions. For instance, it took no small time for Government to decide the question of permitting private collieries to work the new or non-contiguous, areas. If the decision taken subsequently had been taken earlier, there would have been no coal shortage not only for the important iron and steel factories but also for the other industries using coal. Similar is the case with fertilizers. And if the fertilizer permits had been given earlier, we would have been able to save the foreign exchange that we had to spend on importing fertilizers. Similar is the

case with copper, lead and zinc in Rajasthan. It is necessary therefore that there should be certain decentralization of functions and responsibility so that decisions are taken timely and we have not to spend our precious foreign exchange unnecessarily. I think therefore that there is need for a thorough overhaul of the entire administrative machinery.

Sir, the President's Address makes no mention of the balance of payments position. Imports in 1960 are valued at about 1000 crores of rupees whereas exports remain stagnant at about 635 crores of rupees. There does not appear to be any prospect of diminution of the size of our adverse balance of trade. Similarly, the deepening of the foreign exchange crisis has brought to the fore the question of maintaining our imports at the essential level. There has been shortage of several items, such as, certain categories of high quality steel, non-ferrous metals, tool and alloy steel, rayon yarn, dyestuffs and their intermediates, and some basic chemicals and their intermediates. It is obvious that the existing capital resources should be employed to the full and that the installed capacity is kept going, and it is against this background that the proposal regarding the establishment of factories for the manufacture of small cars and watches, etc. should be viewed. There does not seem to be any co-ordinated policy or co-ordinated thinking in the different Ministries of Government.

Sir, my next question relates to the maintenance of the price level. It is obvious that when the country is developing so fast prices are apt to go up. But when the national income is not fluctuating, or rather when the national income is not sufficiently going up, then attempts should be made to keep the prices at the minimum level, and production is the only device which can keep the prices at a low level, and not these palliative measures.

As I said, the President's Address\* has touched on all the major develop-

ment aspects, but the Government has absolutely neglected a very vital thing, though a very small one rather in extent but which is vital as far as the daily life is concerned. I do not talk of food, I do not talk of cloth, I do not talk of shelter and I do not talk of \ medical aid and other equally important requirements. I come from a part of India where there is not a single place where, according to the health department, water which is fit for human consumption is available. It is not that only. There are plenty of villages where the people have to •walk a distance of 2 to 10 miles to procure drinking water. Also, unfortunately, every third year there is scarcity or famine of everything, especially water, and people and cattle have to go in search of water from village to village. In Kutch during the last fifteen years five natural calamities have befallen the people. This year too scarcity threatened us, but fortunately nature was kind enough to rain, though it was unexpected in this season, and the people got water, though unfit for human consumption. The delay in meeting this vital need of the people there has definitely diminished their enthusiasm which they felt after the country attained independence.

A nation does not live on: bread only; I would like to say about the moral aspect of it. Economy is not the only thing on which a man or a nation can live. There is something else, something very vital which is required. It was Gandhiji who gave the code and the principle of life to the people. Not only that; he prepared people to live like that, and this gave vitality to the nation to live as a nation. Today we find every leader saying and every paper writing editorials almost every day that disintegrating forces are coming up in India, and those who have followed the history of the country in the last fifteen years will know that the gradual rate of growth of the disruptive forces is in proportion to the rate at which the authority of the Central Government and the authority of the

central leadership of all the parties\* have been weakened. They know how the Central Government has made concession after concession to regional groups and how the ruling party has failed to enforce any kind of discipline on their units in the States and how every opposition party has yielded to pressure from its regional groups, and how caste and communal lobbies, have influenced policy decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI M. M. MEHTA: The last thing that I will place before the House is this. Perhaps, this is the only country which administers the most, and I think you will agree that too much administration is not good. Let us concentrate on the Five Year Plan and appeal for national unity to make it a success instead of going in for legislation for each and every thing which is unconnected with the Plan and thereby the country's progress, and thus fulfil the dream of the maker of modern India on the national front while he is doing his utmost on the international front.

12 NOON.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray. The President's Address enumerates the achievements of the country of which any honourable citizen can be proud. While supporting the motion I cannot but observe that the dispute between the Railways and the Coalmines or between the Railways and the Ministry of Mines is creating a condition in which cities of northern India, particularly those of Uttar Pradesh, are feeling the coal scarcity. In Kanpur one mill has threatened to close down because of shortage of coal. Something should be done immediately about it and the two Ministries must learn to work in unison to supply the much-needed coal to the industries of Uttar Pradesh and other States of the country.

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

The President's Address makes a mention of labour relations which, we are happy, have definitely improved in the country and but for the short-lived partial strike of the Central Government employees last year the country has seen a period of unprecedented industrial peace.

It must, however, be mentioned that this industrial peace, an achievement of the country, it is not based on a proper distribution of national income. It was with a view to giving the labour of the country, the working people of the country, a share in the rising national income that the Second Plan provided for the appointment of Wage Boards for certain industries. It is a matter of not a little disappointment that Wage Boards were set up only for three out of the eight industries for which they were provided during the Second Five Year Plan. Labour in the country has helped a great deal in achieving the industrial progress of which the President has correctly made a mention. It is the hard work, discipline and enthusiasm of the working people which is responsible for the improvement in our economic situation of which a mention has correctly been made. It is this section of the working people of our country which has, unfortunately, not shared the gains of productivity, which has not shared the gains of improvement in the economic life of the country. It was with a view to giving the workers a reasonable share of the gains of our increasing prosperity that the Wage Boards were thought of for eight major industries. The workers in the country are disappointed that only in the case of sugar, cotton and cement industries Wage Boards were appointed and these bodies finished their work during the Second Plan period. That disappointment is further accentuated because of the fact that the employers in the country have not readily and enthusiastically implemented the unanimous recommendations of these bodies which were tripartite in nature, in which the employers of the country were also re-

presented. The Government has not made up its mind about the recommendations of the Wage Board for the sugar industry and even the Government resolutions in the case of cement and the cotton textile industries have not been implemented by the industrialists. It is a matter of great disappointment. It indicates that the people who talk so much of industrial peace are really not interested as much in industrial peace based on sharing of the gains of increased production as they are interested in intensifying the rate of exploitation. The Government should be able to see that its resolutions in the matter of recommendations of Wage Boards, particularly in the case of textile industry, are impeded by the industry of the country as a whole.

Sir, there are certain industries whose workers are making a significant contribution in the matter of our economic growth. To mention only two, the rising engineering industry and the public utility industries like the electricity supply industry are the very corner-stones of our industrial progress. It is a matter of great disappointment that the Government has not yet appointed Wage Boards for these industries.

Sir, it is well recognised that the employees in the public utility industries like electricity supply and water supply are denied certain rights as the right to strike and the right of direct action which employees in other industries readily enjoy and it is only fair that the employees in the case of public utility industries, like electricity supply, should be among the first to be given the advantages of tripartite bodies like Wage Boards, and their conditions of work, their wages, their standards of living should be increased as a matter of course, as a matter of administration of social justice. It is a great disappointment to the workers in the electricity supply and engineering industries of the country that Wage Boards for these industries have not so far been appointed.

Sir, the President's Address mentions the implementation of Employees' State Insurance Scheme. That scheme is a benefit for which the workers of the country are highly thankful. The scheme of Employees' State Insurance guards the health of the workers and ensures that during the period of their sickness they not only get medical leave but also half their wages. That is a great relief to the workers and we are thankful that the scheme has been extended from one area to the other. It is, however, a matter of some disappointment that in spite of the fact that the Act was enacted in 1948 and the pilot scheme of E.S.I. was inaugurated in 1952, the scheme does not cover as many factory workers of the country as it should. Only 15-8 lakhs out of the 36 lakh workers of the country are covered by this useful scheme. The fact that this scheme has been found useful by labour and industry in the country and the fact that both workers and industry contribute to the running of this scheme makes it all the more necessary that the implementation of this scheme should be accelerated and all the 36 lakhs of factory workers in the country should be brought under the scheme. The fact that the scheme which was inaugurated in 1952 at Delhi and Kanpur has been extended to several centres is of course encouraging and I only hope that the Government and the Employees' State Insurance Corporation will see the justice of the demand that more and more workers of the country should be brought under this scheme.

One of the significant schemes concerning labour of which the President has made a mention is the scheme concerning the workers' participation in management. That scheme is in accordance with our ideals of socialism and it is only proper that the workers should have a share in the management before they are expected to realise the responsibility of running the industries. In that matter progress has been made and a pilot scheme has been introduced but it appears that industrialists are not as enthusiastic about it as they

should be. Particularly important is the lack of enthusiasm in those responsible for managing the public sector industries. It is in the public sector industries that one thought that the scheme of workers' participation, accepted and implemented by the Government, would get a fair trial, would get an enthusiastic response. I am sorry to say that those responsible for managing the public sector industries have not shown the enthusiasm about this scheme which will make us proud of the public sector. We cannot expect the private sector to be enthusiastic about workers' participation in management. The private sector is zealous of its powers. It has several things to hide. It knows that once the workers' participation becomes a reality, profit-sharing bonus over which disputes are going on will also become the order of the day but the public sector industries should have nothing to hide from those who operate them. They should have nothing to hide from the worker, and it should be those industries which should show themselves as model employers which encouraged the workers to work not merely for wages but for the love of running the industry. That will be possible only if the scheme of workers' participation in management is not only accepted theoretically but made a compulsory feature of all the public sector industries. I hope the Government will give greater importance to this than it has done. All the same, I am thankful that our country has accepted the scheme of workers' participation in the management and it has implemented it.

It is a matter of gratification from the labour point of view that masses of workers are being educated and prepared for taking their due place in the management of industries. The scheme for workers' education financed by the Government is doing a great good to the toiling people and I am sure that if that scheme is pursued, it will prepare the mass of workers, the army of workers who will not only know how to run their

[Shri Arjun Arora.] trade unions but will also know how to play their due part in the management of industries.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, on the 14th morning while I was coming to attend the opening Session of Parliament, I met on the way, the Presidential procession, the President seated in a coach under a big umbrella and a long cavalcade of mace-bearers, liveried men carrying flags and festoons and the whole scene struck me as a cross of British Imperial and Indian feudal traditions. What was missing from the picture was the free democratic modern India, proud of her culture and the scene fitted admirably with the City of Delhi with its exotic 'buildings, its sophisticated faces and its air of official hierarchy and high-brow. Sir, an hon. Member, in his speech, had characterised this occasion as something solemn, which was degenerating into a ceremonial affair. I would go a step farther and think that this was being crystallised into a ritual, a meaningless ritual, fixed in sophisticated forms in which even if you consult the Address of the previous years, whole paragraphs are repeated verbatim in platitudinous words. When the Address was being delivered, when the President made a reference, to the Royal guests from the United Kingdom, there was an applause from the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

DR. A. N. BOSE: All respects to the Queen . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): When he referred to the presence of the Maharaja of Bhutan, then there was an applause.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I am sorry, I correct myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He stands corrected.

DR. A. N. BOSE: All respects are due to the Queen of the United Kingdom and her Consort, the Duke.

We should extend to them a hearty welcome and all possible courtesy but why should a Government go crazy over this reception? We have received the Head of the U.S.A. and the Head of the U.S.S.R; but never have we seen a craze of pomp and extravagance like this. Is this because the Secretary of the Commonwealth Relations reminded us that the Queen of England is also the Head of the Commonwealth of Nations and so, are we to learn that we have a Head, a Sovereign, above our President?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Come to the substantial points.

DR. A. N. BOSE: There was the shooting of tigers, animals and birds . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: And crocodiles . . .

DR. A. N. BOSE: ... and crocodiles in the country of Gandhi, in a country which swears by the ideals of Gandhi and which is taking so much pains for the preservation of her wild life, her animals and birds. Strangely enough, the protest came not from the land of Gandhi but from the British press who reminded us that this smacked of the old British days when Maharajas and Nawabs used to entertain their guests by arranging tiger-hunts. This was a truly Gandhian reception which we are giving to our Royal guests!

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): All this enthusiasm because it is a Queen and a very charming Queen too . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. He has not yet come to the points.

DR. A. N. BOSE: The first half of the Address is devoted to foreign policy, to external affairs. But unfortunately in this brief Address nowhere is any enunciation of our policy. One is at a loss as to what is our foreign policy. We are told that it is a policy of peace with firmness.

'a peaceful but firm policy'. Peaceful it is, but where is the firmness? It is a policy of peace with appeasement and not of firmness. Sir, it pains me, as it should pain anyone, to criticise our Prime Minister and his policy. He has undoubtedly raised India in the eyes of the nations, by his own greatness and by his own personality. But the merits of a foreign policy are not to be judged by our prestige abroad or by what other nations speak of us. It is to be judged by the material interests secured by that foreign policy. Sir, it is because of this policy of appeasement that thirteen years after the attainment of independence, Indian territories are under occupation by three foreign Powers, namely, Portugal, Pakistan and China. Within recent years we have made, or are going to make, three major concessions to Pakistan. We have signed the Canal Water Treaty by which Pakistan has been given the right of using the waters of the three western rivers- We have signed an agreement and have passed a Bill by which we surrender 31,000 acres of land in our western frontiers for 10,000 acres of land and in the east valuable tea estates and timber resources and the land of Berubari for Takergram which was already ours but which was forcibly occupied by Pakistan. And we are shortly going to surrender the right of communication across Indian territory between the two Pakistani. In exchange, what have we got from them? We have got the impending border agreement between Pakistan and China delineating the northern line of 'Azad' Kashmir. And we have all the continued firings across the ceasefire line and violation of Indian territory by Pakistani troops. And further, we are going to have very shortly Pakistan's claims to the sources of the three rivers the right of using whose waters we have just conceded to Pakistan.

As for China, Sir, in the year 1954, we surrendered all our extra-territorial rights, post offices, telegraph offices, telephones, lands and buildings

and twelve rest houses situated in China, free of cost. And we have further admitted the suzerainty of China over Tibet, and all this only for the recognition of the existing rights of Indians trading in and of Indian pilgrims visiting Tibet. We hardly thought that a Communist country and a totalitarian country cannot tolerate for long private trade in its land, particularly by foreigners and also the continued influx of pilgrims through its territory. We recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet, because of what? We did it, because the previous British Indian government had recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet! It is wonderful to be guided by such precedents. Assuming, not admitting, that China had some treaty rights of suzerainty over Tibet, much stronger was the right of the British Empire over India. And suppose China, twenty years ago, had made a treaty with the British, recognising the British imperial power over India, how should we have felt? What fault did Dulles commit when he declared that Goa was part of Portugal? Sir, we did not look into the mind of Tibet, into the rights at the Tibetans or listen to the voice of Tibet, when we tacitly recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet, without caring to protect its autonomy. Suzerainty does not mean sovereignty. Suzerainty implies autonomy of the vassal State. But we did nothing to protect the autonomy of Tibet. We could have utilised the occasion when we surrendered our extra territorial rights and recognised the suzerainty of China, to protect Tibetan autonomy and to get recognition to our traditional, historical and natural frontier with China. But our rulers, in fact, were too eager to perpetuate the existing trading rights in Tibet, little thinking that those trading rights cannot survive in a Communist country.

On December 8, year before last, the Prime Minister stated in this House that he did not expect that China

[Dr. A. N. Bose.] would behave in the manner she had behaved. Sir, this is a pathetic confession to be made by a Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and this pathetic ignorance and negligence is at the root of the whole mess. For two years the Prime Minister was ignorant of the construction of the Aksai Chin road and even after he was aware of it he kept us ignorant. Then as late as in October 1959, our patrol party was captured fifty miles ■ within Indian territory. And then Tor years together aircraft from the direction of China are flying over Indian territory without even a single one of them being mechanically detected or identified. Apparently we are happy with the Chinese denials. We are happy with the denial that they are not Chinese planes. Have we not got the necessary equipment to identify them, to spot them, if not to bring them down?

Sir, in the light of all these things, it is quite easy to understand the nervousness of Sikkim and Bhutan. China has occupied Indian territory almost as much as the total area of Sikkim and Bhutan, without firing a single shot. And we are pledged to defend the territory of Sikkim and Bhutan! Why should this little friendly allies lean upon a broken reed? It speaks highly of the sagacity and sensibility of the Maharaja of Bhutan to have identified his fate with us, in spite of the bates offered by China. He has had the sense to realise that as soon as he surrenders to this bate, his fate would be that of Tibet. He has got that sense in spite of our weakness, in spite of the inefficiency which we have demonstrated in protecting our own frontiers.

On the 9th September, 1959, the Prime Minister declared on the floor of this House that as long as his Government would remain in power, they would stand by certain basic principles and would not surrender to the conveniences of the day. True to this

declaration, true to the basic principles of coexistence and toleration, we have surrendered our territorial and material advantages to Pakistan and to China. But we have also done the reverse. Our Government have also surrendered basic principles for certain conveniences of the day. They surrendered basic principles for the conveniences of the day when butcheries were going on in Hungary and Tibet. There was no basic principle in our attitudes towards the Hungarian and Tibetan crises. Sir, in this connection it may be recalled that the Minister of Katanga who had just announced the murder of Mr. Lumumba had stated in the same breath to the press defiantly and sarcastically that the same thing was done on a much bigger scale in Hungary and Tibet and if the United Nations did not interfere in Hungary and Tibet when butcheries were going on there on a much larger scale, they had no business to interfere in the affairs of the Congo. The Congo justice is her own internal justice just as China's was her own and Hungary's her own.

Coming to our Missions abroad under the External Affairs Ministry, the work of our foreign Missions has been considerably lessened with the increasing communications and with the increasing activity of the United Nations. Major things are nowadays decided by delegations but still our Missions are kept in the same strength. Almost everywhere it is highly overstaffed. The High Commission in London has got about 1,400 people, about double the number than is necessary. It is a lot, I am sorry to say, de-nationalised, imperious, discourteous and apathetic towards its own nationals in England. The foremost duty of a diplomatic Mission in a foreign country is to keep its Government aware of the developments in that country. According to the old diploma'ic maxim, they have to keep their eyes and ears open and their



mouths shut but our Missions are ' keeping everything shut and even their doors shut to their own nationals. Whenever there has been a crisis in a foreign country, the Head of the Mission is almost inevitably found absent. During the Suez crisis, our Ambassador was not at the spot nor during the Hungarian crisis. During the military coup in Pakistan, our High Commissioner was not in Karachi. During the military coup in Turkey our Ambassador was not in Ankara and during the latest coup by the Maharaja of Nepal, our representative was away from Kathmandu. Sir, we are spending quite a lot of foreign exchange on the maintenance of our Missions abroad but neither the Government nor the people are getting any commensurate benefit for this expenditure.

Sir, in the amendments moved from this side of the House, reference was made to the omission in the Presidential Address of the disintegrating tendencies growing apace in our country. The mover of the motion himself regretted the growing fissiparous tendencies within the nation. I admit, Sir, all of us should share the guilt in some measure. But in whose hand does it lie primarily to check this tendency and to restore a national outlook? Our nation has been growing as a synthesis of numerous autonomies, autonomies of region, autonomies of language, autonomies of vocations, autonomies of culture and it is a tradition of Indian nationalism to grow as a synthesis of all these autonomies. Our Government, instead of promoting and supporting the legitimate aspirations have always stood against them. Reasonable aspirations voiced by the people have not received recognition in due time; and when these aspirations have grown beyond proportion, when they have broken the limits because of continued resistance and broken into violence, our Government have stood dumb and defenceless against these outbursts.

Sir, the proper thing for a Government to do is to give due recognition to proper and legitimate aspirations so

964 R.S.—2.

long as the aspiration is voiced peacefully and legitimately and not to oppose it. Then, if such aspirations grow on reactionary and violent lines and threaten national integrity, the proper thing for the Government to do is to meet it with strength. Our Government have done neither. Sir, who is responsible for the continued hostility of the Nagas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I do not absolve myself. Let us share it amongst ourselves; but the responsibility must be shared in proportion to power.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*]

Sir, we have done hardly anything to develop our backward areas and our backward people. Merely reserving certain seats in our legislatures or reserving a few high appointments for the backward tribes and scheduled castes and merely giving a few scholarships for foreign studies are not conducive to the development of backward areas and backward people. An economic holding has to be given to every tiller; industrial development must be pursued so as to provide gainful employment for every individual and universal free education must be made available to all. These are the primary things, necessary for the development of backward areas and backward people and to make them feel that they are part of the nation. The Naga hostiles who have been fighting for so many years have never been made to feel that they are part of India. Even now we have not undertaken any such policy in our border areas. I would like to say with all the emphasis I can command that that is the only way for providing not only national integrity but also national security against our hostile neighbours. To give economic holding to every individual, to give gainful industrial employment to all, to spread universal free education and thereafter to provide arms to every adult

[Dr. A. N. Bose.] and give them adequate military training—that is the policy we have to adopt at the border to defend it against incursions by foreign Powers.

Sir, today the faith in our Central Government remains badly shaken. Our Government have proved their weakness abroad in dealing with foreign Powers and also in dealing with internal problems. They have not adequately dealt with these regional and communal outbursts which recently happened in Assam and Jabalpur. What is needed above all is a sympathetic but strong upright administration.

Sir, I shall make a brief reference to my own home State, West Bengal, even at the risk of being misunderstood as parochial-minded. West Bengal has bitter sores, festering sores, which account for the continued distemper in that State. Three years ago I had brought before this House a motion regarding the construction of Parakka Barrage. The hon. Minister of Irrigation who is sitting there will bear me out that in that debate he had promised that the construction of the Barrage and of the bridge across Fa-rakka would be taken in hand as soon as the survey operations were complete. We were told on that occasion that survey operations were going on and that for quite a few years. And today even after three years thereafter we are in the same position. Sir, on the construction of this Barrage and the bridge depends not the prosperity but the very existence of Bengal, the very existence of Calcutta. The city of Calcutta is now facing a severe crisis. That has been underlined by the experts of the World Health Organisation who have warned that in a matter of months Calcutta may be buried under its own sewage. There is a veritable crisis in the water supply and in the drainage system of the city.

Sir, I need not remind the House again about what happened in Assam

and what the Centre did about it. Even yesterday we had no promise from the Prime Minister that the Centre took full responsibility for the rehabilitation and resettlement of the unfortunate victims of linguistic passion in Assam. Sir, on the top of all these has come the secession of Berubari. And all the wounds which have been inflicted remain to be healed. For all the sacrifices which Bengal has made from the struggle for independence down to the appeasement of Pakistan what this State has received are only sarcastic comments from our Prime Minister.

Sir, in the President's Address there was some feeling of optimism over the growing national income. We have been told that during the last four years the national income has gone up by Rs. 1,290 crores. coming to about Rs. 300 per head per year. I need not dilate upon the point which has been raised by many hon. Members earlier, that is, how far this increasing national income has gone down to the lower levels, how far it has reached the villagers. In spite of rising national income we have rising vagrancy, rising beggary, rising unemployment and rising population in the camps for displaced persons.

Sir, who is to see that the wealth of the country reaches down to the bottom? I do not think that a highly centralised State, unless it is a dictatorial State, is equal to the occasion. Our Government was right when it took the decision to set up panchayat- on their feet, when it took the decision to revive the old communal autonomies. I do not mean communal in any religious sense. Communal autonomies mean associate autonomies, popular group autonomies. But unfortunately the Government could not stand faithfully to their decision, could not go the whole hog and boldly part with power when such parting was necessary. It is only the

villagers themselves who can look to , their own good. The whole Plan must be village-based, must be village-oriented and if the villagers are to be actively associated with the Plan, they have to be given statutory powers and responsibilities and necessary resources.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): They are being given in Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan.

DR. A. N. BOSE: It is quite true that in some places like Andhra and Rajasthan this experiment has been partly successful but in other places I am sorry to say that this experiment has been a miserable failure, at least in my part of the country where these Community Development Blocks have been merely spending agencies of Government money. Sir, this cannot be done unless the people themselves feel that they are the makers of their own destiny. Without a sense of community there cannot be any experiment on community development. Where is the sense of community? Where is economic equality? Where is universal free education? We are pledged in our Constitution to universal education but we are far away from that goal. Before the experiment of panchayats can succeed, before the experiment of village autonomies and decentralisation can succeed, there must be universal education and there must be equalisation of land and income. At least there should be a reduction of the gross economic disparity that exists in spite of the land reforms and the various development projects, which have been pursued with some success. With these words I support the amendments which were moved by Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha.

SHRI P. L. KUREEL *urf* TALIB (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, on a point of order, I moved my amendment yesterday and so far I have not been able to express myself on my amend-

nent. As a matter of fact I should have been called first, so that other Members might have been able to express themselves on my views.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

SHRI P. L. KUREEL *urf* TALIB: [t is very strange.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will get your chance.

SHRI P. L. KUREEL *urf* TALIB: Is it because I belong to the Socialist Party?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Vijaivargiya.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, many Members of this House have spoken about China and Tibet. I have to say a few words about this affair. Some Members have said that we might have saved Tibet, but our wrong policy destroyed Tibet. In this connection, I would refer to a great controversy which took place in the United States of America. When, after the Second World War there was a civil war between Chiang-Kai-Shek's forces and Mao Tse-tung's forces and China was lost to Mao, at that time in America there arose a great controversy as to who was responsible for the loss of China. There was one side which laid the blame at the doors of the U.S.A. administration and said that the weak policy of America was responsible for the loss of China. Then, when the shock cooled down, the Americans realised that they could not order all the events in the whole wide world and that in spite of them, revolutions did take place. They understood that there were events which were independent of their power. Such a big Power as the U.S.A. could not prevent China from falling a prey to communism. Now, there are critics amongst us of our

[Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya.] foreign policy who say that we could have saved Tibet from falling a prey to communism. The position is this. Long before India recognised in 1954 the *de facto* position in Tibet, the Dalai Lama had already surrendered to Peking's armies and had signed his own death warrant in 1951 in the form of an agreement with China. Even the old British Government and the Chiang Kai-shek's Government always claimed that the suzerainty over Tibet was Chinese. Just as any number of Macarthys could not prevent the fall of China to communism, similarly any number of our critics here or any number of parties could not have prevented the tide of events in Tibet. Who can save a man who signs his own death warrant? Jaswant Singhji said that the operation was successful, but the patient died. We never wished that the patient should die. But what happened? He had already surrendered himself in 1951, long before we accepted the *de facto* position, to the forces of China. I think we in India should not assume the role of a Messiah for the whole world, as if India is powerful enough to save all the countries of the world. Therefore, I referred to that controversy in America where many Americans at that time assumed a kind of righteous role, of saving the whole world from communism and thought that they could dictate to the whole world. We should not assume a similar position about our own country. We in India cannot think that we are all-powerful Messiah. If we think like that, nothing but frustration will remain with us. Just as it happened in America, they had to give up that delusion and they could ultimately see that even the great force of America could not fashion the whole world to their liking or after their ideology. Similarly, in respect of Tibet, we should also be very realistic. The President in his Address has said that We are alert to the aggression and incursions which have taken place on our borders. Our policy is peaceful

but firm. We have not said that we accept the claims on our territory by China, and we are strengthening our defences. These are reassuring things and I think it will be very unwise to rush in for a war without preparation. Therefore, I think our policy is quite wise. Similarly, in respect of plunging ourselves into the wars of others, that also would be an unwise policy. There are two camps in the world and both the camps want war. We should guard our interests first. Therefore, we should not take sides in these great wars which are before the world. In this respect we are uncommitted and our policy is that of non-alignment. I think that is the best policy in the interests of India itself. Those who think that the policies of the United States are full of virtues or the policies of the Soviet Union are full of virtues or *utce versa* are both mistaken. Both these countries have committed mistakes and we cannot be the camp-followers of any of these two countries. Therefore, I think that under the circumstances the policy of India is quite realistic and is in the interests of our country.

Now, Sir, about the report submitted by the officials of India and China, I think that the report well proves the strength of our contention based on treaties, customs and usage. That report will create a moral atmosphere for our claims and for whatever we have been saying up to this time. Therefore, our policy has been a wise one with respect to China also. About war with China, I think it is better, as the President's Address mentions, that we strengthen our defences. Therefore, marking time is very necessary. In respect of China and in respect of the danger which is coming from outside to our country I would like to quote a 'sloka' from the Maha-bharata. When the Kauravas and Pandavas were fighting and quarrelling, some danger arose. At that time, Yudishthira said: \*No doubt we are five and the Kauravas are one hundred. But when there is a danger from outside, we are not five and hundred but one hundred and five:

वयं पञ्चः वयं पञ्च वयं पञ्च शतानि ते  
परैः सह तु संवादे वयं पञ्चत्तरं शतम् ॥

What I mean to say is that all parties and persons should keep united at a time when there is danger from outside, and no party should take political advantage of the situation that does not lie in our hands.

Sir, about other international affairs . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; You can continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

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

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA; Sir, before rising for lunch I was speaking about the need for unity on the part of all the parties in view of the dangers from across our frontiers. I will also add one thing that it is the custom and usage of all mature nations and mature parties that they should not differ, and they do not differ, on policies on external affairs. Usually all parties present a united front on foreign affairs. That has been the practice in America also, and I think that we should adopt such mature practices that no parties should present a divided picture but that they should present a united front on external affairs. About other international matters, Sir, I do not want to say much because more or less they are non-controversial, and I fully share the views of the President. About the Congo, the new administration of the U.S.A. is coming nearer to our point of view, and it is a further justification of our stand. But in that case

also our country should think that we are not the Messiah of the whole world, and we should give our advice in an unattached way, in an *anasakta* way as the Gita has said.

Now, Sir, about internal affairs, I fully agree with the basic objective of our Plans which is socialism with democracy. In spite of many difficulties our Second Plan is going to be a good success, and the Third Plan is also a good enough plan. The ideal of Panchayati Raj is good and should be pursued. The labour policy on the whole has been good. In our country oil has been discovered, and we are making use of atomic power for peaceful purposes. All these are milestones of progress. Our budgetary position also appears to be good and hopeful. The Railway Budget is already before us, and that is a balanced and progressive budget. Every year we are making great progress in respect of railways. In my area a new railway line is proposed to be laid from Guna to Maksi, and I welcome it and I think that the line will be completed very soon. I think the General Budget may also prove to be hopeful, because the agricultural position is quite good and the industrial production is also equally good. Sir, one feature which is of some concern is the price line mentioned by the President himself. In one year the prices rose by 6 per cent. This is a disquieting thing and must be checked. Another thing is, although the national income is increasing, it is not increasing according to our expectations. This is also another disquieting factor, and I wish that enough attention must be paid to it. A committee has been appointed to look into the question of how this national income has been distributed, and I think it will give us some good facts. Recently, I went on a *padayatra* in my area of Guna district. The condition of the poor classes, particularly the Adivasis, is a very appalling one. It appears as if Swaraj has not come for those poor people. We should radically change the economic condition of our country and raise the living standards of the poorest people, particularly the Adivasis. Of course I know

[Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya.] that for all this there is no other way except planned progress, but it should be first of all in the interests of the poorest.

Sir, one point more and I finish. Whenever I speak, I do say something about administrative efficiency. Wherever we go, this point always comes up. When we mix with the lowest of the people, there we find that there are great defects in administration. Whatever our great achievements be, the defects of our administration are our great weaknesses. I sometimes have expressed the opinion that our Constitution is at fault here. I entirely disagree with the chapter on Services in our Constitution. We have given too much of security for the Services. Some security must be given, but I think the security given for the Services in our Constitution is quite incommensurate with that in any other Constitution of the world. Some radical changes should be made, rather a high-powered commission should be set up to give some kind of scheme for improving the administration, for giving a clean and speedy administration. Of course in paragraph 38 of the President's Address this point is stressed, and I hope serious attempts will be made to improve the administration. Although this is the position, the whole picture is not gloomy or dismal. Our country is still progressing, and I support the motion moved by Dr. Ray on the President's Address. Thank you, Sir.

**श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' :** उपासभापति जी, अब तक मैं अंग्रेजी में बोलता आ रहा हूँ। जब मैं सेंट्रल एसेम्बली का मेम्बर था, जब मैं लोक सभा का मेम्बर था और जब मैं यहां पिछले सेशन में था तब मैं अंग्रेजी में ही बोला था। अब मैं यह बात महसूस करता हूँ कि मुझे हिन्दी में बोलना चाहिये। हिन्दी हमारी कौमी जवान है और एक दिन उस को तमाम मुल्क की जवान होना है। इसलिये बहुत से मेम्बर जो हिन्दी नहीं जानते हैं मैं उन से मुआफी मांगूंगा।

हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने जो अभिभाषण दोनों सदनों के सामने दिया है उस में बहुत सी ग्रहम और जरूरी बातों का जिक्र नहीं है। और ये ऐसी बातें हैं जिन को कि बुनियादी बातें कहा जा सकता है, जहां तक कि समाजवाद का ताल्लुक है और जहां तक कि जम्हूरियत का ताल्लुक है। उन्होंने ने अपने अभिभाषण के आखीर में जिस को कि तमाम अभिभाषण का निचोड़ कहा जा सकता है, कहा है :

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."

उन्होंने ने डिमोक्रेसी का और सोशलिस्टिक सोसिटी का जिक्र किया है, यानी जम्हूरियत का और समाजवाद का जिक्र किया है। जम्हूरियत और समाजवाद के लिये दो तीन बुनियादी बातें होती हैं। समाजवाद के लिये सब से पहली बुनियादी बात है डीमैन्ड-लाइवेलीन आफ पावर। ग्राम के, जनता के हाथ में दुरुपत की शक्ति होनी चाहिये, सब से छोटी यूनिट के हाथ में शक्ति और ताकत होनी चाहिये। हमारे देश में पंचायतें भी बन गईं, हमारे देश में ग्राम सभायें भी बन गयीं, हमारे देश के अन्दर जिला बोर्ड भी हैं। म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड भी हैं और कारपोरेशन्स भी हैं। मगर जैसा कि आप जानते हैं, उन को असली ताकत, हकीकी ताकत, नहीं मिली हुई है। उन में जो भी बातें होती हैं उनकी तरफ ऊपर से इतारा होता है, मतलब आप ग्राम सभा को ले लीजिये। आज भी ग्राम सभा अपनी मरजी से कोई काम या कोई स्कीम लागू नहीं कर सकती है। अगर वह एक चप्पा जमीन भी किसी बेतिहर मजदूर को देना चाहे, किसी लैंडलैस लेबरर को देना चाहे तो या तो उसके लिये ए० डी० एम० की स्वीकृति की जरूरत होगी या डिप्टी कमिश्नर की स्वीकृति की जरूरत होगी। इसी तरह से अगर वह

पुलिस की मदद चाहे तो वह खुद पुलिस को आदेश नहीं दे सकती है। बल्कि उस के लिये पुलिस सुपरिन्टेन्डेंट को लिखना पड़ेगा या डिप्टी कमिश्नर को लिखना पड़ेगा। इसी तरह से हमारी जिला परिषद् है। उस के हाथ में भी कोई ताकत नहीं है। वह एक किस्म से एडवाइजरी कैपसिटी में काम करती है। तो जब तक डीसेन्ट्रलाइजेशन आरूपावर नहीं होता है, जब तक आम जनता के हाथ में ताकत नहीं आती है तब तक इस देश के अन्दर किसी हालत में भी, कभी भी सोशलिज्म नहीं आ सकता है, यहां पर समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता है।

दूसरी बुनियादी चीज यह है कि हमारे देश के अन्दर सामाजिक और आर्थिक समानता होनी चाहिये, असलियत में समानता होनी चाहिये। देश को आजादी मिल गई है, किन्तु मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अभी अस्पृश्यता बनी हुई है और छद्मछात्र, कास्टीज्म और जात पात का जहर फैलता जा रहा है। एक किस्म का रिएक्शन नजर आता है कि हमारी छोटी जातियों में जिन लोगों ने उन्नति का रास्ता अख्तियार किया है और जो बड़ी बड़ी जगहों पर पहुंच गये हैं, उन की तरक्की को, हमारे समाज में कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं, जो नहीं देख सकते हैं। अगर हमारे बैकवर्ड क्लास के आदमी हमारे दूसरे दोस्तों के लेवेल में आना चाहते हैं तो ये लोग उन की उन्नति में रुकावट डालते हैं। हमारे समाज में जो लोग गिरे हुए हैं वे जब खुद अपनी कोशिश से ऊंचा उठने की कोशिश करते हैं, दूसरे लोगों की बराबरी में आना चाहते हैं तो समाज को भी उन की सहायता करनी चाहिये। मगर देखने में यह आता है कि समाज के कुछ लोग उन की इस कोशिश में रुकावट डालते हैं। असलियत तो यह है कि छद्मछात्र का जहर अब भी हमारे मुल्क में मौजूद है। इस समय जरूरत इस बात की है कि सारे देश में छद्मछात्र को खत्म किया जाय। इस बारे में जो एन्टी अनटचेबिलिटी ऐक्ट बना हुआ है उस पर किसी भी स्टेट में

अच्छी तरह से अमल नहीं हो रहा है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि इस ऐक्ट को अच्छी तरह से लागू करने के लिये हर स्टेट में एक स्थायी मशीनरी होनी चाहिये जो इस ऐक्ट को अच्छी तरह से लागू कर सके।

इसी तरह से बैकवर्ड क्लासेज कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को पेश हुए इतना अर्सा हो गया है मगर उस पर अभी तक अमल नहीं किया गया है। इस रिपोर्ट पर सरकार ने लाखों रुपये खर्च किया। कमीशन एक जगह से दूसरी जगह अपनी रिपोर्ट तैयार करने के लिये गया मगर इतनी इम्पॉन्टेंट रिपोर्ट पर सरकार ने कोई तबज्जह नहीं दी है और न उस पर अभी तक पार्लियामेंट में बहस हुई। सरकार ने इस रिपोर्ट की सिफारिशों को इम्प्लीमेंट करने की भी कोशिश नहीं की है। यह सब क्या है? इस से यह जाहिर होता है कि जम्हूरियत का निजाम ठीक तरह से नहीं चल रहा है। अगर जम्हूरियत में कोई कमीशन बनता है तो उस को काफ़ी अहमियत दी जानी चाहिये। लेकिन हम यह देखते हैं कि सरकार इन बातों की तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दे रही है और अनटचेबिलिटी के जो भी केंज स्टेट्स में होते हैं उन की ओर भी वहां की सरकारें कोई ध्यान नहीं देती हैं। इसी तरह से और भी बहुत सी बातों में निछुड़ी जनता के साथ अन्ध्रा सलूक नहीं किया जा रहा है। आज समाज के अन्दर कई बातों में समता नहीं है। सरकार का यह काम है कि मुल्क में जितनी भी जनता है उस के साथ समान सलूक किया जाना चाहिये। आज हम समाज के अन्दर आर्थिक, सामाजिक और कई तरह की विषमता देखते हैं। अगर शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का या बैकवर्ड क्लास का कोई आदमी व्यापार करना चाहता है तो उस को व्यापार करने के लिये मौका नहीं दिया जाता है। अगर हम इस देश में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं तो हमें अपने विचारों और कार्यक्रम में बुनियादी तबदीली करनी होगी। मैं आप को एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूं। अगर कोई बैकवर्ड

### [ श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' ]

या शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का आदमी इम्पोर्ट और एक्सपोर्ट का व्यापार करना चाहता है तो उस को लाइसेंस नहीं दिया जाता है। उस से कहा जाता है कि तुम एक इस्टैबलिश्ड एक्सपोर्टर और इम्पोर्टर नहीं हो और न तुम्हारा बैंक बैलेंस ही है, इसलिये तुम्हें लाइसेंस नहीं मिल सकता है। इसी तरह से नौकरी में भी शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोगों के साथ इसी प्रकार सलूक किया जाता है। जब ये लोग आर्मी में नौकरी करने के लिये जाते हैं तो उन से कहा जाता है कि तुम मार्शल रेस में नहीं आते हो, इसलिये तुम्हें आर्मी में नहीं लिया जा सकता है। मार्शल रेस में न होने की वजह से वे लोग सफर करते हैं और उन्हें आर्मी में नहीं लिया जाता है। आर्मी में रिजर्वेशन नहीं है इसलिये ये लोग आर्मी में नान मार्शल रेस होने की वजह से भर्ती नहीं हो सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं सरकार से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम मुल्क में समाजवाद की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं तो हमें अपने विचारों में बुनियादी तबदीली करनी होगी। अब भी हम अंग्रेज हुकुमरानों की तरह सोचते हैं और अपने विचार तथा कार्यक्रम बदलने को तैयार नहीं।

मैं एक चीज आप के सामने और रखना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि जब मैं सेन्ट्रल असेम्बली का मेम्बर था तो उस वक्त हमारे श्री जगजीवन राम जी ने लेबर आफिसर की नौकरी के लिये दरस्वास्त दी थी। यह नौकरी लेबर वेलफेयर कोलमाइन्स, धनवाद के लिये थी और लेबर डिपार्टमेंट के मातहत थी। उस समय इस नौकरी का फ़ैडरल पब्लिक सर्विस से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था और लेबर डिपार्टमेंट ही को आदमी रखने का अस्ति्यार था। उस समय श्री जगजीवन राम जी को इस नौकरी के काबिल नहीं समझा गया जब कि वे बी० एस० सी० थे और सब तरह से उस नौकरी के लिये क्वालीफाइड थे। शायद उन की नाक चपटी, आँठ मोटे और रंग ठीक न होने की वजह

से वह जगह नहीं दी गई क्योंकि वे अच्छे न दिखाई देते हों। लेकिन आज हम श्री जगजीवन राम जी को दूसरे मंत्रियों के मुकाबले उतना ही एफिशिएन्ट पाते हैं। उन्होंने जिस तरह से अपनी काबिलियत का इज्जत किया है वह सबको मालूम है। आज हम देखते हैं कि कितने ही इस तरह के लोग हैं जिन्हें आगे बढ़ने का मौका नहीं मिलता है और वे मिट्टी में रुल रहे हैं। अब समय आ गया है कि जब हमें हर एक को आगे बढ़ने का मौका देना चाहिये चाहे वह कितना ही छोटा या गिरी हुई जाति का क्यों न हो। अगर हम लोगों को जो कि गिरे हुए हैं, आर्थिक और सामाजिक तौर पर आगे बढ़ायेंगे तब ही हमारा देश उन्नति कर सकता है और इसी तरह से हम सच्चे मायने में इस देश में समाजवाद को कायम कर सकते हैं।

मैं इस बारे में ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ और अब मैं सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने सन् १९६० में जो मांगें रखी थीं उस के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने अलाभकर खेती का लगान खत्म करने के बारे में, इमेथियल कमोडिटीज के दाम मुकर्रर करने के बारे में, शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स, शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स और बैकवर्ड क्लासेज और अल्पसंख्यक और औरतों को नौकरी में ६ प्रतिशत जगह देने के बारे में आन्दोलन किया था। इस के साथ ही साथ उस ने मुल्क की सुरक्षा और हिन्दी भाषा को सरकारी कामकाज में लाने का आन्दोलन छेड़ा था। हिन्दी आन्दोलन के सम्बन्ध में हमने अंग्रेजी बोर्डों को हटाने के लिये सत्याग्रह शुरू किया और इस तरह से हम ने एक सिम्बोलिक प्रोटेस्ट किया। आज हमारे कुछ आदमियों के दिमागों पर अंग्रेजी का इस तरह भूत सवार हो गया है कि वे रात दिन अंग्रेजी की ही बात सोचते हैं मानो वह हमारी मदर टंग है। आज वे अपने बच्चों को पब्लिक स्कूलों में भेज कर अंग्रेजी में तालीम देते हैं। आज मुल्क में बड़े बड़े आदमी क्लबों और नाइट क्लबों में जा कर नाच गाने करते रहते हैं और इस तरह से अंग्रेजियत को बढ़ावा देते हैं। ऐसे आदमियों



का एक विशेष वर्ग बन गया है और यह लोग एक दूसरे से एक जंजीर की तरह बंधे हुए हैं। यही लोग नौकरियों में जाते हैं और यही लोग व्यापार में काबिज होते हैं।

इस के साथ ही साथ हम यह देखते हैं कि जब नौकरी के लिये इन्टरव्यू में बुलाया जाता है तो वहां पर भी अंग्रेजी में ही सवाल जवाब किये जाते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि जो उम्मीदवार अंग्रेजी अच्छी तरह से नहीं जानता है और ना ही अंग्रेजी में बोल सकता है वह इस तरह की नौकरियों में नहीं आ सकता है। अमीरों के लड़के जो अंग्रेजी स्कूलों में पढ़े होते हैं उन्हें अंग्रेजी का ज्ञान ज्यादा होता है और वे अंग्रेजी में फ्लुएंटली बोल सकते हैं, उनके चेहरों की रंगत भी ठीक होती है जिससे वे हर प्रकार की नौकरियों में आसानी के साथ आ जाते हैं। इसके मुकाबले में जब गरीब के लड़के जाते हैं तो उनके चेहरों की रंगत ठीक नहीं होती है और न वे अंग्रेजी का ज्यादा ज्ञान रखते हैं और न ही अंग्रेजी में सवाल जवाब दे सकते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि जितनी भी अच्छी नौकरियां हैं वे सब बड़े आदमियों के लड़कों को मिल जाती हैं और गरीब आदमियों के लड़के रह जाते हैं और उन्हें रिजेक्ट कर दिया जाता है। आज देखने में यह आ रहा है कि एक कप्तान का लड़का आर्मी में कप्तान हो सकता है मगर गरीब का लड़का कप्तान नहीं हो सकता है। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि जो गिरी हुई जाति के आदमी हैं उन्हें नौकरी और व्यापार में कोई जगह नहीं मिलती है। अगर हमने अपना यह रवैया नहीं बदला तो हम सच्चे मायने में समाजवाद की स्थापना नहीं कर सकेंगे और जो गिरे हुए आदमी समाज में हैं वे कभी भी ऊंचे नहीं उठ सकेंगे।

अब मैं कौमी जबान के बारे में कुछ बात कहना चाहता हूं। हिन्दी हमारे देश की कौमी जबान है और यू. पी. की आम बोल-

चाल की जबान है। हमारे यू. पी. असेम्बली के सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के नेता श्री राज नारायण ने हाई कोर्ट में एक रिट पिटीशन के सम्बन्ध में हिन्दी में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया था तो उसको नहीं लिया गया। हाई कोर्ट से कहा गया कि हिन्दी हमारे मुल्क की कौमी जबान है और कांस्टीट्यूशन में भी यह बात दी हुई है। मगर हाई कोर्ट ने यह बात नहीं मानी। जब कहा गया कि अगर एक कैदी जिसको कि फांसी की सजा हुई हो तो अगर वह जेल से हिन्दी में अपील की दरखास्त दे तो क्या हाई कोर्ट उसकी दरखास्त न लेगा। इतना कहने पर बड़ी मुश्किल से दरखास्त ली गई। आज हालत यह है कि एक आदमी को कोर्ट में अपना मुकदमा लड़ने के लिए वकील रखना पड़ता है क्योंकि कोर्ट में सब काम अंग्रेजी में होता है। इस तरह से जजमेंट को समझने के लिए भी अंग्रेजी पढ़े वकील के पास जाना पड़ता है ताकि यह मालूम हो सके कि क्या फैसला हुआ है। इस तरह से आज गरीब आदमी को न्याय बहुत महंगे दाम में मिलता है। इन सब चीजों को मद्दे नजर रखते हुए हमने अपनी डिमांड्स मनवाने के लिए एजिटेशन किया। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी अपनी मांग मनवाने के लिए तशद्द से काम नहीं लेना चाहती है, वायलेंस से काम नहीं लेना चाहती है। वह तो शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से एजिटेशन करना चाहती है। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि हमारी पार्टी के ऊपर प्रिवेन्टिव डिटेन्शन एक्ट लागू होता है। मैंने लखनऊ में शराबखारी के खिलाफ सत्याग्रह करने का फैसला किया था तो मुझे पकड़ लिया गया। गवर्नमेंट कमिटी ने भी लखनऊ में नशाबन्दी के बारे में सिफारिश की थी। महात्मा गांधी जी ने जब नमक आन्दोलन शुरू किया था तो ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट ने उनको तब तक नहीं पकड़ा जब तक उन्होंने अपने हाथ से नमक नहीं बना लिया। मगर आज देखने में यह आता है कि जब कोई सिर्फ यह कह देता है कि मैं सत्याग्रह करने जा रहा हूं तो उसे गिरफ्तार कर लिया जाता है। हमारे नेता

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब']

श्री राज नारायण जी जैसे ही असेम्बली से बाहर आये वैसे ही उन्हें गिरफ्तार कर लिया गया। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की जो कार्यवाही सरकार की ओर से की जाती है क्या इसे ही जम्हूरियत कहा जाता है? क्या इसे ही समाजवाद कहते हैं?

मैं इस सवाल को यहीं पर छोड़ देता हूँ और एक दूसरे प्रश्न पर कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। आप सब लोग जानते हैं कि किस तरह से हमारे मुल्क का हज़ारों पुरख्वा मील इलाका दुश्मन ने अपने हाथ में ले लिया है। इसकी तमामतर ज़िम्मेदारी हुकूमत पर होनी चाहिये। आज़ादी के बाद यह पहली मिसाल है कि इतनी ज़मीन हमारे हाथों से चली गई और चली जाने पर भी हुकूमत बरसरे इक्तदार है। अगर किसी दूसरे मुल्क में ज़रा सी ज़मीन कोई दूसरा मुल्क हथिया ले तो वहाँ के मंत्रि-मंडल को इस्तीफा देना पड़ेगा। हमारी सरकार सिर्फ़ मुँह से बात कहती है, कोई क्रियात्मक कदम उठाने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। आप बार्डर एरियाज़ को मजबूत कीजिये। वहाँ के लोगों की बेकारी दूर कीजिये, गरीबी दूर कीजिये। वहाँ पर उनको संतोष दीजिये। उनके अन्दर असन्तोष की भावना नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर वे खुश हैं तो वे अपने आप को डिफेंड कर सकते हैं। खाली मिलिट्री से देश का डिफेंस नहीं हो सकता है। सिविल पापुलेशन का मॉरल सपोर्ट सब से ज़रूरी चीज़ है। आज बार्डर एरियाज़ में बेकारी है, गरीबी है और वे मर रहे हैं। आज बहुत आसानी के साथ उनको खरीदा जा सकता है। आज बहुत आसानी के साथ उनको अपने साथ मिलाया जा सकता है। अगर बार्डर एरियाज़ के लोग चीनियों से मिल गये या ज़रा सी भी उनके साथ हमदर्दी दिखला दी तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि हमारा तमाम हिन्दुस्तान गुलाम हो जायगा। इसलिये मैं हुकूमत से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि बार्डर एरियाज़ के लोगों में जो असन्तोष फैला हुआ है उसको

वह दूर करे। इसी तरह से हमारे देश के अन्दर लैंडलेस लेबरर्स हैं, गरीब पिछड़े हुए किसान हैं, जिनकी दिक्कतों को दूर करने की ज़रूरत है।

इन तमाम बातों को कहते हुये एक चीज़ की तरफ़ मैं खास तौर से तबज़्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि हमारी आर्मी जो है उसके अन्दर केवल एक तबका के लोग हैं जिनको राजपूत कहा जाता है। हम को इस वक्त एक ऐसी आर्मी बनाने की ज़रूरत है जिस को सही माने में नेशनल आर्मी कहा जा सके। मगर हम देखते यह हैं कि हमारी आर्मी में सिर्फ़ एक तबके के लोगों को जाने का अधिकार है। हालांकि कमिश्न में कोई स्कावट नहीं है, मगर दूसरे लोग जब सिलेक्शन बोर्ड के सामने जाते हैं तो वहाँ वे रह जाते हैं। मैं जिस फ़्रंटिली से सम्बन्ध रखता हूँ उसके कोई लोग कमिशन रैंक के हैं। इस लिए मुझे पता है और मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि दूसरे तबकों के लोग क्वालिफ़ाई करके जब सिलेक्शन बोर्ड के सामने जाते हैं तो उनके सामने ऐसे प्रश्न रखे जाते हैं जिससे वे न लिये जायें। Every man is a soldier at the time of war. दूसरे मुल्कों में हर आदमी तलवार उठा सकता है, हर आदमी लड़ाई के लिए जा सकता है, मगर हमारी आर्मी में सिर्फ़ एक तबका के लोग हैं। चूँकि कोई रिजर्वेशन नहीं है, इस लिए गवर्नमेंट कह देती है कि और तबकों के लोग भी हैं, लेकिन हमें यह नहीं मालूम है कि कितने हैं, कितने नहीं हैं। उनको कमिशन रैंक में नहीं लिया जाता है बल्कि स्वीपर्स और सेयज़ एण्ड माइनर्स में लिया जाता है। पिछली लड़ाई में दूसरे तबका के लोगों की जो बॅटेलियंस बनाई गई थीं उनके बारे में जनरल आक्रिनलेक ने कहा है कि उन्होंने बर्मा फ्रंट पर बहुत सी खिदमात सरअंजाम दीं। उनका रिकार्ड अभी तक मौजूद है। चमारों की भी एक बॅटेलियन बनी थी, महारों की भी बनी थी

जिस जाति के डाक्टर अम्बेदकर थे। उनको मुस्तकिल बनाने के लिए बहुत कोशिश की गई, लेकिन लड़ाई के महार बैटेलियन को छोड़ कर दूसरी सब बैटेलियन डिस्बैण्ड कर दी गई। मैंने सेंट्रल असेम्बली में यह प्रस्ताव मंजूर कराया था कि यह बैटेलियन दुबारा बनाई जायें और उनको परमैनेन्ट कर दिया जाय, लेकिन लड़ाई खत्म होते ही उसको डिस्बैण्ड कर दिया गया और फिर नहीं बनाया गया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन छोटी जातियों का बाकायदा आर्मी में हिस्सा होना चाहिये ताकि सब लोग मिल कर देश की हिफाजत कर सकें।

मैं और ज्यादा न कहते हुये इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि वेलफेयर स्टेट में तालीम युनिवर्सल होनी चाहिये, जम्हूरियत में सब के लिए तालीम का इन्तजाम होना चाहिये। यह जम्हूरियत की बैक-बोन है। जब तक सब के लिए तालीम का प्रबन्ध न हो तब तक कुछ नहीं है। कहा यह जाता है कि यह है, वह है, यह हो जायेगा, वह हो जायेगा, लेकिन जो हो रहा है वह आप जानते हैं। तालीम दिन पर दिन महंगी होती जा रही है। गरीब आदमी अपने बच्चों को तालीम नहीं दे सकते हैं। उसका जो हथ्र होता है वह आप जानते हैं। जम्हूरियत में तालीम का न होना एक बड़ा भारी पाप है, बड़ा भारी गुनाह है। कम से कम मैट्रिक स्टैंडर्ड तक तालीम मुफ्त होनी चाहिये। सब लोग पब्लिक स्कूल में अपने बच्चों को तालीम नहीं दे सकते हैं। ज्यादातर लोग अपने बच्चों को मामूली स्कूलों में पढ़ाते हैं। इसलिए उनके लिए पूरा इन्तजाम होना चाहिये।

और ज्यादा न कहते हुये मैं सिर्फ एक बात और कहूंगा। डिफेंस के लिए यह निहायत जरूरी है कि जो हमारे हमसाया मुमालिक हैं उनके साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात मजबूत हों। अफ्रीका में जो बहुत से मुल्क आजाद हुये हैं और हो रहे हैं, उनको हम अपने साथ लें। मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि श्री नेहरू को थर्ड ब्लाक की

लीडरशिप करनी चाहिये। बड़े मुल्कों का साथ देने के बजाय उनको छोटे मुल्कों का ब्लाक बनाना चाहिये और उसको लीड करना चाहिये। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि बनिस्बत हिन्दुस्तान के चीन के ताल्लुकात बर्मा से ज्यादा मजबूत हैं। इसी तरह से नेपाल के साथ उसने गहरा सम्बन्ध जोड़ लिया है। जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है, लंका के साथ भी ऐसा ही है। मगर हमारी सरकार ने अभी तक इन कंट्रीज के साथ ताल्लुकात मजबूत करने के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठाया है। इन मुल्कों के अलावा हमें अफगानिस्तान के साथ ताल्लुकात मजबूत करना चाहिये और जितनी जल्दी हो सके उतनी जल्दी हमें पाकिस्तान के साथ सब समस्याओं को हल कर लेना चाहिये। इस तरह छोटी छोटी नेशंस की मदद से आप अपनी आजादी कायम रख सकेंगे और ज. ह. रियत भी कायम रख सकेंगे।

आखिर में मैं फिर यह कहूंगा कि जम्हूरियत में अपोजीशन को एजिटेशन का हक होना चाहिये। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आइन्दा अगर किसी किस्म का आन्दोलन हो तो उसको बजाय खत्म करने के उनकी बातों को समझने की कोशिश की जाय। अगर अपोजीशन मजबूत है तो आपकी जम्हूरियत भी मजबूत है। चाहे कम्युनिस्ट हों, चाहे पी० एस० पी० के मेम्बर हों, चाहे सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के मेम्बर हों, हम सब के दिल में वतन के लिए हमदर्दी है और वतन की बेहतरी के लिए हम हमेशा आपका साथ देंगे और आपके पहलू ब पहलू चलेंगे। आप यह न समझें कि अपोजीशन के लोगों को वतन से कोई हमदर्दी नहीं है। अगर कोई मुसीबत आयेगी तो वतन के लिए हम सब आपका साथ दें।

श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, हमारे राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का अधिक भाग वैदेशिक समस्याओं से सम्बन्धित है। इससे स्पष्ट है कि इस समय विदेशों से जो हमारे

## [श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

सम्बन्ध चल रहे हैं, विशेषकर चीन से, जिस का उसमें जिक्र किया गया है, यह समस्या इस समय बहुत गंभीर हो रही है। केवल दोनों सदनों का ध्यान नहीं, सारे देशों का ध्यान इस समय चीन का जो बार्डर का प्रश्न है उसके ऊपर लगा हुआ है। चीन की जो पीपुल्स रिपब्लिक बनी वह सन् १९४९ में बनी और हमारा देश सन् १९४७ में आजाद हुआ। हमारे यहां जो संविधान बना, उसके संबंध में कई वर्षों तक बातें चलती रहीं और सारे संसार के सामने उसकी बातें प्रगट हुईं। चीन ने वर्षों तक इस प्रश्न को सामने नहीं रखा कि वह भूमि जिस पर उन्होंने अब नाजायज कब्जा कर लिया है, उनकी है। बराबर जो बातें हमारे यहां से कही गईं उनका उन्होंने समर्थन किया। सन् १९५४ में, १९५८ में और दिसम्बर १९५९ तक यही बात चलती रही। परन्तु अब वे इस समय हठधर्मी कर रहे हैं और जो पक्ष ले रहे हैं वह अन्यायपूर्ण है। वहां के प्राइम मिनिस्टर का टैप रिकार्ड यहां पर मौजूद है, उनके जो पत्र हैं वे भी यहां पर मौजूद हैं। उनके होते हुये भी वे कहना चाहते हैं कि जो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने बातें कहीं वे डिस्टार्शन है। यह उनका अन्याय और

उनकी हठधर्मी है। अब 3 P. M. जो दोनों देशों के अफसर बैठे

थे उनकी रिपोर्ट के प्रकाशन से सारे संसार को स्पष्ट हो जायगा कि जो हमारी नीति है, जो हमारा सिद्धांत है और हम जितने हिस्से को भारतवर्ष का बता रहे हैं उसमें कहां तक सत्य है और जो चीनी कह रहे हैं उसमें कहां तक असत्य है। हमारी केवल प्राकृतिक बाउंडरी ही नहीं है जो कि सैकड़ों वर्षों से चली आ रही है बल्कि उसके बाद कई दफा ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के जमाने में और उसके बाद भी इसकी चर्चा हुई और चीनियों ने एक शब्द भी कभी नहीं कहा कि वह गलत है। आज जब यह प्रश्न सामने आता है तो वे कहते हैं कि ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट अपना इम्पीरियलिज्म बढ़ाना चाहती थी इस वास्ते

उन्होंने अपना यह बाउंडरी कायम किया था लेकिन एक ओर तो ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट की उस समय की बाउंडरी के सम्बन्ध में वे यह बात कहते हैं और दूसरी ओर अगर उनके समय के रिकार्ड्स में कोई बात जरा भी अपने पक्ष में मिलती है तो उसका समर्थन करते हैं। चीनी अगर यह समझते हों कि भारतवर्ष कमजोर है तो यह उनकी बिल्कुल गलती है। इतनी बड़ी ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट की जो साम्राज्य-शाही थी उसको तो हमने सत्य और अहिंसा के आधार पर निकाल दिया और उनको हमारे देश को छोड़ कर जाना पड़ा तो यह छोटी-सी बाउंडरी की बात क्या चीज है जिसको कि हम हल नहीं कर सकेंगे। जिस सिद्धांत पर महात्मा गांधी ने इस देश को चलाया और जिसके आधार पर हमारा देश स्वतंत्र हुआ उसी नीति पर हमारी सरकार आज तक दृढ़ है और कायम है। यह तो बड़े सौभाग्य की बात है कि वैदेशिक नीति, वैदेशिक कार्य हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ में सुरक्षित है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के व्यक्तित्व की छाप सारे संसार पर पड़ चुकी है और संसार के सभी देशों ने इस बात को माना है कि भारत के प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू संसार के उच्चतम व्यक्तियों में से हैं और उनकी महानता को स्वीकार किया है इसलिये हमको एक उतावलेपन में नहीं आना चाहिये। एकदम से जोश में आकर के ऊटपटांग बातें कह जाय और यह न सोचें कि इसका क्या असर हमारे देश पर और हमारे देश की नीति पर पड़ेगा तो यह हमारे लिये गलत होगा। हम इस बात का ध्यान नहीं रखते हैं। सभी पार्टियों को जितने भी राजनैतिक दल अथवा साम्प्रदायिक दल हैं सब को एक आवाज से अपनी सरकार का पूर्ण रूप से इसमें समर्थन करना चाहिये जिस बात पर हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने जोर दिया है वह यह है कि यह आवश्यक है कि हम एकसूत्रता में बंधें। दूसरा देश अगर हमारे ऊपर किसी प्रकार से भी आक्रमण करना चाहता है या शीत-युद्ध की घोषणा करता है तो हम सब

सोचों को अपने मतभेदों को एक तरफ रखकर चाहे वे जैसे भी मतभेद हों, साम्प्रदायिक मतभेद हों, भाषा सम्बन्धी मतभेद हों, राजनीति सम्बन्धी मतभेद हों, सब को एक तरफ रख कर एक आवाज से इस नीति का समर्थन करना चाहिये ।

हमारे देश में इस समय कुछ ऐसे दल अवश्य हैं जिनका ध्यान, जिनकी दृष्टि दूसरे देशों की ओर लगी रहती है । मैं जानता हूँ कि कुछ लोग इस बात को कहेंगे कि मैं गलत कह रहा हूँ परन्तु उपसभापति महोदय, मैं कहूँगा कि हाथी के दाँत खाने के और होते हैं और दिखाने के और होते हैं । ऐसे कुछ लोग हैं जो कि ज़ाहिरा तौर पर कहेंगे कि हम आपके साथ हैं किन्तु कई बातें ऐसी हैं जो कि स्पष्ट रूप से रिकार्ड में आ चुकी हैं, प्रकाश में आ चुकी हैं कि क्यों वे दूसरे देशों की ओर दृष्टि लगाये हुये हैं उनको आर्थिक सहायता मिलती है, उनको प्रोत्साहन मिलता है इस वास्ते वे अपने स्वार्थवश कभी कभी देश के हित के विरुद्ध जाने की चेष्टा करते हैं । इस सम्बन्ध में मैं अधिक नहीं कहूँगा क्योंकि काफी कहा जा चुका है और मुझे विश्वास है कि सरकार की जो नीति है उसी के आधार पर हमारी विजय होगी ।

अन्तर्देशीय प्रश्नों के सम्बन्ध में मैं सब से पहले अपने मित्र श्री कुरील को इस बात के ऊपर बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने आज यह स्वीकार किया और सदन के ऊपर बड़ी कृपा की कि वह हिन्दी में बोले । उन्होंने कहा कि मैं हमेशा अंग्रेजी में बोलता रहा हूँ । उनका जो संशोधन है उसमें हिन्दी के पक्ष में कुछ कहा गया है इसलिये शायद आवश्यक हो गया कि वह हिन्दी में बोले । वास्तव में हमारी सरकार का ध्यान हिन्दी की प्रगति की ओर सन् १९४८ से है । बराबर ऐसी चेष्टा की जा रही है कि शिक्षा का माध्यम हिन्दी हो । इस बात का उद्योग किया जा रहा है कि हमारे सरकारी दफ्तरों में, हमारे प्रशासन

में, केन्द्रीय प्रशासन में, राज्य के प्रशासन में हिन्दी का प्रचार हो । मैं तो डा० श्रीमाली को हार्दिक बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने बाहर अपने एक भाषण में कहा कि देश स्वतंत्र हो गया परन्तु आज भी कुछ लोग देश में ऐसे हैं जो कि अंग्रेजी को बनाये रखना चाहते हैं, यह लज्जाजनक और अपमानजनक बात है । इस बात पर मैं उनको बधाई देता हूँ । लोग यह कहते हैं कि हिन्दी के लिये गवर्नमेंट कोशिश नहीं कर रही है परन्तु हिन्दी के प्रसार में पूर्ण रूप से गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान है । मैं उन मंत्रियों को भी बधाई देता हूँ जिनकी मातृभाषा हिन्दी नहीं है फिर भी वे प्रश्नों का उत्तर हिन्दी में देते हैं । चाहे वह टूटी-फूटी ही हो परन्तु वे इस बात को तो साफ करते हैं कि उनका लक्ष्य हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा बनाने का है । मेरी धारणा तो यह है कि अगर हिन्दी की काफी प्रगति नहीं हो रही है तो इस में गवर्नमेंट का दोष नहीं है, इसमें हमारा दोष है । हम लोग खुद उसकी प्रगति में सहयोग नहीं देना चाहते हैं । इस सदन में या दूसरे सदन में मुश्किल से १० या १२ माननीय सदस्य ऐसे होंगे जो कि शायद हिन्दी को बिल्कुल न समझ सकें, शायद १०, १२ भी न हों । चाहे हमारे यहां मदरासी हों, चाहे बंगाली हों, चाहे महाराष्ट्री हों, चाहे गुजराती हो, चाहे सिन्धी हों, सब लोग हिन्दी जानते हैं, बोलते हैं और समझते हैं और राजस्थान, पंजाब, बिहार, उड़ीसा, मध्य प्रदेश, उत्तर प्रदेश इत्यादि के जो भाई हैं वे तो हिन्दी अच्छी तरह से बोल ही सकते हैं परन्तु यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हमारे इस सदन में शायद, ३, ४ या ५ ऐसे सदस्य होंगे जो हिन्दी में बोलते हों । तो हम हिन्दी के प्रश्न को क्या समर्थन दे रहे हैं? मैं नहीं जानता कि इसका क्या कारण है । यह कारण तो वे ही जानें परन्तु कुछ सदस्यों से मेरी इस सम्बन्ध में बातें हुई हैं । एक माननीय सदस्य ने हमको यह बताया कि एक बार राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव रखने का कार्य उनको ही सौंपा गया और वह ४५ मिनट तक हिन्दी में बोले

[श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

परन्तु अखबारों में जो निकला वह इतना था कि शायद वह १ या २ मिनट ही बोले हों। उन्होंने कहा कि हम लोग जो हिन्दी में बोलते हैं उनका समाचारपत्रों में प्रकाशन नहीं होता है। यह बात बिल्कुल ठीक है क्योंकि इस समय अंग्रेजी के अखबारों की हिन्दी के प्रति उपेक्षा है और हम लोगों की तो है ही, इस में कोई संदेह की बात नहीं है। मैं इस बात को स्वीकार करता हूँ कि हम लोग अधिकतर यह चाहते हैं कि हमारे भाषण और हमारे प्रश्न अखबारों में छपें यह स्वाभाविक है। तो इस में न तो बाहर से सहयोग मिलता है और न हम लोगों से। अगर हम लोगों में से ४०, ५० सदस्य भी हिन्दी में बोलने लगे तो समाचारपत्रों को विवश हो जाना पड़ेगा कि वे इस सदन में अपने हिन्दी के रिपोर्टर रखें।

दूसरी बात जो हमारे मित्र श्री कुरील ने कही वह पंचायत राज्य या ग्राम-राज्य के सम्बन्ध में थी। उनकी बात से मैं बिल्कुल सहमत नहीं हूँ। उनका कहना है कि डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन नहीं हुआ। यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है। शायद पंचायतों से अधिक घनिष्ट सम्बन्ध उनका नहीं रहा है और अगर रहा है तो कई वर्ष पूर्व रहा होगा। आज ग्राम सभा अपना बजट बनाती है, आज ग्राम सभा जो उसके यहां निर्माण-कार्य हैं उनका तखमीना बनाती है। अगर ग्राम को स्वास्थ्य के सम्बन्ध में या शिक्षा सम्बन्धी कामों के लिये कोई आवश्यकता है तो ग्राम सभा ही वह प्रस्ताव पास करती है। ऐसा कुछ वर्षों पहले था कि जिला पंचायत अफसर पूरा ब्यौरा लिखकर भेज देता था और ग्राम-सभा को उसे मानना ही पड़ता था। अब यह बात बदल गयी है। अब दूसरे प्रकार की प्रणाली चल गई है। अब जो पंचवर्षीय योजना बनती है उसके लिये भी ग्राम सभाओं की बैठक होती है। केवल रूप-रेखा उन्हें बताई जाती है कि इतने हृद के अन्दर तुमको

काम करना है और जो डिटेल्स हैं, जो उनकी तफसीलें हैं वह खुद ग्राम सभा बनाती है। उसके बाद फिर ब्लाक लेवल पर उस पर बहस होती है और तब कहीं जिला का जो पंचायत अफिसर है वह इस बात पर विचार करता है कि किस तरह से सारे जिले का प्लान बनाया जाय। डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन इतनी हद तक पचहुं चुका है कि जून सन् १९६० में श्रीनगर में जो कान्फ्रेंस कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट की हुई थी, उसमें उन्होंने और फिर उसके बाद अभी दिसम्बर में जो लोकल सेल्फ गवर्नमेंट के मिनिस्टर्स की कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी, उसमें भी इस बात पर जोर दिया गया है कि ग्राम सभाओं को महत्व दिया जाये, उनके अधिकार और बढ़ाये जायें और उनके ऊपर जिम्मेदारियाँ और डाली जायें। इससे स्पष्ट है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट की बराबर यह नीति है कि जितना भी विकेंद्रीकरण हम ग्रामों में कर सकें और सच्चा स्वराज्य, ग्राम स्वराज्य, ग्रामों में स्थापित कर सकें उस दिशा में पूरी चेष्टा के साथ कार्य किया जाय।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कहा है कि हमारा उद्देश्य यह है कि हमारे प्रजातन्त्र में और उसके विकासोन्मुख महान् आर्थिक और सामाजिक कार्यक्रम में प्रत्येक स्तर पर जन साधारण भाग ले सकें। इस के सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना यह है कि ग्राम जनता के सामने सार्वजनिक कार्यकर्ताओं को पहुंचने की और उनसे सम्पर्क स्थापित करने की विशेष आवश्यकता है। अभी जो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं उनके द्वारा ग्रामों में हमारे योजना के सम्बन्ध में प्रचार किया जाता है। मैं जानता हूँ कि कई स्टेट्स में, कई राज्यों में, ऐसे अधिकारी हैं जो कि जिले के चार्ज में रख दिये जाते हैं जिनको कि ग्रामों की समस्याओं का पूरा ज्ञान नहीं होता है। इस बात को केवल एक डांग्मा नहीं समझना चाहिये, ऐसा न मानना चाहिये कि अगर कोई अफिसर आई. ए. एस., आई. पी. एस. या पी. सी. एस. है तो



वह सर्वज्ञ है, उसको सबके बारे में ज्ञान है। लेकिन उसी को केवल वहां रखा जाता है और कभी इस बात को नहीं सोचा जाता कि जो सार्वजनिक कार्यकर्ता हैं, जो कि ग्रामों में रहे हैं, ग्रामों में दिन रात जिनका जीवन बीता है, जो कि ग्रामों की समस्या को समझते हैं उनको ऐसी जगहों पर क्यों न लिया जाये। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उन जगहों पर सरकारी अफसरों को नियुक्त न किया जाये, बल्कि इस बात की जरूरत है कि जिन लोगों को ग्रामीणों से सहानुभूति है, जो ग्रामों की समस्याओं को समझते हैं वे ही उस लेवल पर रखे जायें। लेकिन अगर गवर्नमेंट समझती है कि हमको डिप्टी कलेक्टर, कलेक्टर या मैजिस्ट्रेट को ही वहां रखना है, सरकारी आदमियों को ही रखना है, तो मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि जो ब्लाक डेवलपमेंट आफिसर्स हैं, जिनका कि दिन रात जीवन गांवों में ही बीतता है और गांव वालों से जो दिन रात सम्पर्क में आते हैं, क्यों न उनको जिला नियोजन अधिकारी बनाया जाये, क्यों न उनको पदोन्नति दी जाये ? जैसे कि दूसरे विभागों की सेवायें हैं—उद्योग विभाग की सेवायें अलग हैं, कृषि विभाग की सेवायें अलग हैं, शिक्षा विभाग की और सहकार विभाग की सेवायें अलग हैं उसी प्रकार कम्यूनिटी डेवलपमेंट की सेवायें अलग क्यों न की जायें ? उनकी सेवाओं का कांडर अलग होना चाहिये और उसमें ऐसे लोगों को जिनका जीवन दिन रात ग्रामों में ही बीतता है, जो वहां की समस्याओं को अच्छी तरह समझते हैं, जिनके हृदय में पूरी सहानुभूति ग्रामवासियों के प्रति हो गई है, रखा जाये और उन्हीं के हाथ में जिला का संचालन सौंपा जाये और उनको पदोन्नति दी जाये।

इस के अतिरिक्त मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारे मित्र श्री कुरील ने जो पिछड़ी जातियों के लिये या पददलित जातियों के विषय में कहा मैं उस से सहमत नहीं

हूं। हमारी गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान बराबर इन छोटी जातियों के लिये, पिछड़ी हुई जातियों की उन्नति के लिये चल रहा है। यहां मैं इस छोटी सी डिबेट में और थोड़े से समय में यह नहीं बता सकता कि गवर्नमेंट ने क्या क्या इस बारे में किया है। अगर हमारे मित्र गवर्नमेंट की उन रिपोर्टों को देखने का कष्ट करें जो उन के सम्बन्ध में प्रति वर्ष निकलती हैं तो उन को स्पष्ट हो जायगा कि गवर्नमेंट के सामने बराबर यह लक्ष्य रहता है कि जो छोटी जातियां हैं, जो पददलित हैं या जो हरिजन कहे जाते हैं उन की उन्नति के लिये हर स्तर पर उद्योग किया जाय। इन लोगों की शिक्षा के लिये पुरे पुरे साधन जुटाये जा रहे हैं, इन लोगों को बर्जीफे दिये जाते हैं, बड़ी बड़ी नौकरियों में भी इन के लिये स्थान सुरक्षित रखे हैं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूं यह तो आत्मविश्वास की बात है। अगर हमारे ये छोटी-जात कहे जाने वाले भाई स्वयं अपने ऊपर आत्मविश्वास नहीं रखते हैं तो कोई दूसरा आकर उन के हृदय में विश्वास ठूस नहीं सकता है। क्या कारण है कि आज उन की तरफ से यह कहा जाय कि हमारे लिये लेजिस्लेचर्स में, संसद् में स्थान सुरक्षित रखे जायें ? इस का मतलब यह है कि वे खुद नहीं चाहते कि हम बराबरी पर खड़े हों। वे अपने को खुद ही नीचा माने बैठे हैं। एक बार वे कहें कि हम छोटी जाति नहीं हैं, हम नीची जाति नहीं हैं, हम कोई ऊंचा-नीचा नहीं मानते, चाहे ब्राह्मण हो चाहे भंगी हो हम सब बराबरी के हैं—इस बात की धारणा उन में पैदा हो। मैं इस बात को अनुभव करता हूं कि उन लोगों को हिम्मत नहीं होती है कि आकर पास में बैठें। मैं जिस समय संचालक, पंचायत राज था उस समय छोटी-जात कहे जाने वाले लोग जब मेरे पास आते थे तो मैं अपने पास कुर्सी पर उन को बैठाता था मगर वे इस में हिचकिचाते थे। वे समझते थे कि वे छोटे हैं। इस बात का स्थान हृदय से निकाल देना चाहिये कि हम छोटी-जात

[श्री भगवत नारायण भागवंत]

हैं, या दलित हैं या हरिजन हैं। जैसे एक साधारण भारतीय का भस्मक ऊंचा है वैसे ही उन का भी भस्मक ऊंचा है। क्यों रिजर्वेशन कराने को कहते हैं, क्यों जोर देते हैं कि सरकारी नौकरियों में सीटें सुरक्षित हों? सरकार इस बात पर क्यों से पूरा पूरा ध्यान दे रही है कि कैसे इन जातियों की उन्नति हो और हर प्रकार से, हर स्तर में, हर डिपार्टमेंट में बराबर उन को प्रधानता दी जाती है। केवल बात यह है कि उन को अपनी मनोवृत्ति बदलने की आवश्यकता है।

हम सब लोगों को एक भाव से, एक धारणा से, एक सूत्रता में बंध कर अपनी सरकार की नीति का समर्थन कर के और उस के कार्यों में सहयोग दे कर अपने देश को आगे बढ़ाने का प्रयास करना चाहिये।

SHRI SUDHIB GHOSH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have only a very few, brief, remarks to contribute to this discussion on the President's Address and my remarks are confined to only one subject and that is the present dangerous international situation created by the unfortunate happenings in that unhappy country, Congo in Africa. A good man and a great patriot, the Prime Minister of that country, has been, killed and the Prime Minister of India, in his distress and anger, says that murder has been committed and murder has been committed by men in high places. He expresses the revulsion which is experienced by decent men and women, not only in our own country but everywhere. But if I may, with very great respect, venture to give the Prime Minister a little bit of advice, it would be a very good thing if a man of his level, even when he is distressed, does not use expressions like 'gangsters' and 'gangsterism' and all that sort of thing even when gangsterism is practised by people- who are trying to acquire power. The Prime Minister has a very unique position in international politics today. The world has high hopes in his capacity to throw oil on troubled waters; and he would be

enhancing his effectiveness in this sort of dangerous international situation, if he were to exercise, if he were to show some more restraint and less excitement; and if he were to say to the world in very precise terms what is it that he wants the U. N. to do to arrest the deterioration in that situation, instead of complaining, as he 'has done, rather vaguely that he does not like the passivity of the role of the U.N. in Congo.

The U.N. is the one hope of all intelligent men and women all the world over, Communist or non-Communist. Agonised mankind, living in the terror of atomic destruction have pinned their faith in the U.N.; and for the first time in the history of the world, we have an organisation which is likely to survive the stresses and strains of international tension. It is obvious that those who wish to save world peace must seek to strengthen the U.N. and those people in the world today who are attempting to use the Congo crisis to seek the destruction of the United Nations, their honesty of purpose is highly questionable.

Mr. Hammarskjöld, the distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is the symbol of the United Nations, has been the target of many attacks from certain quarters. The Secretary-Generalship of the United Nations is a kind of crown of thorns and whoever wears it is going to find his life very hard. It is not easy to find a man who can make a good job of 'hat extraordinarily difficult office. Even if you imagine for a moment that the most intelligent man in the world, who is of course the Defence Minister of India, if he were today appointed the U.N. Secretary-General in place of Mr. Hammarskjöld, well the kind of restraint and forbearance that he would be showing and the kind of impartiality that he would be showing between the Communists and the non-communists of the world, well, all that will be a sight for the Gods to see. Therefore, let no one be in too much of a hurry to cast aspersions on that very distinguished public servant with a very fine record



behind him—Mr. Hammarskjöld—the Secretary-General of the United Nations. It is a matter of great regret for all of us that not only the Communists, but even the leader of our own Delegation to the United Nations, Mr. V.K. Krishna Menon, only a few weeks ago, in New York, said that Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld spoke in the U.N. like Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. I am afraid it was not a very fortunate observation to make and there was a slight insinuation in it which was very unfortunate. It is distressing to see the representative of a great country making that kind of remark about the Secretary-General of the United Nations. No wonder various other people also felt encouraged to make attacks on this very distinguished public servant.

What is poor Mr. Hammarskjöld to do? From all sides of the world we are making all kinds of demands on the Secretary-General of the U.N. He is not the Governor-General of the Congo, with a very large army and a very well-equipped air force and all that at his disposal. He is not in a position to use the physical force necessary to restrain the lawlessness that is going on there. We all condemn the role that has been played by the Belgian imperialists. They have gone back in large numbers. They have supplied arms and ammunition and technicians to all those forces that are ranged against the legally elected government of the country. And they have deliberately fomented some sort of civil war between one lot of the Congolese and another lot of the Congolese. But it is extremely difficult to see what it is that we expected Mr. Hammarskjöld to do, which he has failed to do. He is obviously the servant of the Security Council. It is for him to carry out the instructions of the Security Council and those who are attacking Mr. Hammarskjöld today have yet to show in what manner this distinguished public servant has failed to carry out the orders of the Security Council. We may have our grievances against the Security Council, but that is a different matter. And it is also

easy enough for all of us to see that the position of the U.N. personnel who are there in the Congo, particularly of poor Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal, is becoming more and more untenable every thing we see. But it is very difficult to say in what way Mr. Hammarskjöld has failed in his duty, for which our friends, the Communists, are making all kinds of attacks on him.

Our Prime Minister says that the role of the United Nations in the Congo is a passive one. Presumably he would like the U.N. to play an active role. Would he very kindly define what is the nature of that active role that he would like the U.N. to play in the Congo? What are the implications of that active role of the United Nations in the Congo? And what are the responsibilities which the people who play that active role will have to assume and in what way the Prime Minister of India will be able to share that responsibility and to what extent? Our Prime Minister as well as the Government of the United States have said that they want the Parliament of Congo to meet and to decide who will be the leaders of their Government who will carry on the affairs of the Congo. Now, the gathering together of Parliament obviously presupposes a certain atmosphere, an atmosphere in which people can travel from distant parts of that very vast country and gather together in the capital city as a parliament. It requires a certain peaceful atmosphere for people to gather together as a parliament and to deliberate as a parliament and come to decisions. This kind of atmosphere, does it exist there? How to bring about that atmosphere before the Congolese Parliament can meet and act?

On this matter of the positive role of the United Nations that our Prime Minister would like to see, let us try

in a little more light. Intelligent men and women all the world over for many years now have looked

forward to the day when the United Nations would become a very effective

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.] international police force, a sort of international fire brigade, so to speak, which would rush to any corner of the world where there is a conflagration and try to put out the fire. I think men and women all over the world would love to see the United Nations play that role. But what are the implications of that role in the situation that exists in the Congo?

Since the Prime Minister wants the U.N. to play an active role, is it not possible for him today, since he wants it, to tell us what it is? Of course, I do not know what exactly he wants; he gave us a slight indication of his mind the other day when he said in this House that he would like the United Nations, if need be, to take military action. Now, the Secretary-General of the U.N., with whatever organisation he has got in that country has he got the physical resources, the army, the air force, the equipment and the men necessary, and the authority to use all these things in order to take any military action, any effective military action? In order to push that idea further forward, is the Prime Minister today prepared to demand an immediate recall of the General Assembly of the United Nations and to instruct his representative there to move a resolution, perhaps with the active support of the leaders of the Afro-Asian nationalism, that forthwith a United Nations military command be established in the Congo, with a supreme military commander in charge, with adequate well-equipped armed forces, a Navy, air force etc. placed at his disposal and with the authority to use this force in any way he thinks fit to meet any kind of eventuality? Is he prepared to move that kind of resolution with the support of the Afro-Asian nations? It is much better in such a situation that the Prime Minister of India, with this unique position in international affairs, takes this initiative instead of waiting for our Communist friends or our Anglo-American friends to show that initiative. After all, what is the Prime Minister of India waiting for? He is the

U.N. has much as Mr. Macmillan is the U.N. or Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Khrushchchev is the United Nations.

For this kind of U.N. military operation there is a precedent, though it is not a very fortunate precedent. The United Nations carried out a military operation in Korea. They set up a very powerful and elaborate military setup with a U.N. Supreme Commander in charge of it for military action. That was not liked by many people in the world, because in that matter it was the Americans who took the initiative. The United Nations Command was set up at the instance of the American President; and our Russian friends did not like it at all. They said this was American aggression in Korea under the cloak of the U.N. No wonder, therefore, that the Americans today are not in any great hurry to take the initiative for the creation of this kind of a military organisation for effective military action in which they have to take a leading role. But since we are so distressed and worried about the situation—and it looks a very grave and dangerous kind of situation—why should not the Prime Minister of India take the initiative? The young President of the United States of America said recently that he, like the other men and women of his generation, had derived inspiration from what he called "the soaring idealism of Nehru". I am quite sure he meant it when he said it.

And I am quite sure that the new generation of Americans to whom, as the American President says, the American torch has been handed will be very glad and happy to accept the leadership of a person like the Indian Prime Minister and to work under him and accept him as the great leader of the Forces of justice, decency and progress in this world.

One word more, Sir, and I have done. It is a matter of sorrow for many of us that two great leaders of world opinion, Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow and another, I do not see him here, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in Delhi.

have both simultaneously ceased to recognise poor Mr. Hammarskjöld. One hopes that this is a temporary phenomenon and that these two gentlemen will revise their opinion. We all share their sorrow about the political mure" of a very great national lead\* <sup>Africa</sup>, Mr. Lumumba. Although ptnwtc memory is proverbially short, the outraged conscience of civilised mankind has not forgotten yet that another good and honest man and another great patriot, fcnre Nagy, the leader of the upsurge of the brave people of Hungary was also similarly murdered. The brave people of that little country—all that they wanted was to throw off their backs the outsiders who had impqed themselves upon them. They only wanted freedom from those people and what happened? The outsiders brought their huge machine guns and tanks and they crushed the Hungarian people. The number of brave Hungarian patriots who were seen hanging from lamp posts in the streets of Budapest was very large indeed. The Hungarian Prime Minister, Imre Nagy, came out of his asylum in the Yugsolav Embassy trusting the words of men who had guaranteed him safe conduct and he was murdered by those treacherous men, I need not say, those gangsters. At that time, the principal exponent of Indian foreign policy, our distinguished Defence Minister, made the famous statement that the unfortunate things that were happening in Hungary were really the internal affair of the Hungarian people. Let no Indian dare to say to day that what is happening in the Congo is the internal affair of the Congolese people.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President has, in his Address, surveyed both the national and the international field and he has given us, in a brief and relevant manner, the main points of the business which will be placed before us in the current session. I shall, first of all, deal with the international field. The most important international issue is that of the Congo to-

day. You know, Sir, that the worst has happened so far as the Congo is concerned. Prime Minister Lumumba who was, from all that one could gather, adored by large numbers of people in the Congo has been killed. We do not know the circumstances under which he has been killed teut we may be reasonably certain that it is a case of murder. I think the change of Government in the United States had something to do with the decision to have him removed from the scene of his activity. Mr. Christian Herter, a pale edition of Mr. John Foster Dulles, a Secretary of State without the ability of Mr. John Foster Dulles, was in a way supporting the Kasavubu-Tshombe Clique and when President Kenndy took office and there was a new Secretary of State, I suppose the feeling with the Tshombe group was that Lumumba was a dangerous man and he must be done away with. Because of the very strong suspicion millions of people entertain all the world over, I think an international probe into this matter is absolutely essential if the good name of the United Nations is to be saved. Reference has been made "to Imre Nagy. We all deplore the murder or killing of Imre Nagy but we were not responsible for the security or the safety of Imre Nagy. The United Nations had undertaken no responsibility in Hungary. The United Nations has undertaken a responsibility in the Congo and it is the duty of the United Nations to see that that responsibility is fulfilled. Therefore, the first essential is that there should be an international probe by competent legal personnel into the circumstances under which Mr. Lumumba came to be murdered, to put it bluntly. The second question is, what is the United Nations to do? President Kennedy has indicated what the United Nations can and should do. He is not visualising a passive role for the United Nations. His position today approximates to the position that we initially took up in regard to the Congo. The Congolese Parliament must be summoned and it should be summoned as early as possible. It

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] should be left to the people of the Congo as represented in that Parliament to decide what the nature of the Government shall be. We are not interested in the question as to who the Prime Minister of the Congo shall be; we are interested in 'ensuring that the Congo shall have a stable government. The second essential—I would say that this is really the first essential—is that the Belgians must withdraw from the Congo. Belgian's role in that country has been an infamous one. She left the Congo in disorder; she ought to have left the Congo but still she continues to be there. Her military personnel is there and we have the testimony of Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal that Belgian personnel is functioning there. Now, Sir, you cannot have interference only one way. If there is interference by Belgium, there will be interference by Ghana, there will be interference by the U.A.R. and there will be interference by the U.S.S.R. and the Congo will become the cockpit of international intrigue. The Congo will become another Spain before World War II. and I think that is a situation which must be averted at all costs.

The next question is, should we withdraw from the responsibility that we have undertaken in the Congo? I think, Sir, it would be a dereliction of duty on our part to an international organisation to do any such thing. We cannot, with honour, withdraw from the obligations that we have undertaken towards the United Nations in the Congo but we have a right to insist that the United Nations shall, if it wants to have our help, do the right thing and carry out the right policies. We have a right to insist that it shall follow what I would call a more active policy in regard to the Congo.

Sir, I was just having a look at the Charter of the United Nations. It gives the Security Council ample authority under Chapter VII to intervene in the interests of pe. ee in a situation such as exists in the Congo. When these things have been done.

when technical assistance has been provided on \*a generous scale for the people of the Congo, it will be time for us, and for the other countries which are there, to withdraw but I think in the interests of world peace the utmost priority- sti attach- ed to an internationalw' ->c into the matter of the murder-«»-\*ilr. Lumumba. Lumumba dead is greater than Lumumba living. The dead Lumumba will live in the affections of millions of Africans as the symbol of African nationalism. He stood for the integrity of his country and that is why his personality makes an appeal to large numbers of people. The second thing is that the Congolese Parliament must be summoned. There should be a broadbased Government and the leaders of the Lumumba group should also be invited in that Government. And above all, the Belgian personnel must be withdrawn from there.

Sir, may I just say a few word\* about the India-China border? Reference "was made to it by the President in his Address and many speakers have commented on that part of the President's Address. One of the speakers on the other side said that we must hereafter not support China's admission to the United Nations. Now, Sir, I yield to no one in my detestation of what China is doing in regard to this India-China border. I am as keen as any other Member of the House that our Government should pursue a firm policy towards China in regard to this border dispute. This is a dispute which cannot be settled overnight. It cannot be settled by just taking hold of Longj\* or taking hold of some other part of the country. We cannot of course recognise the right of the Chinese people to negotiate in regard to Ladakh with Pakistan, nor can we recognise their right to negotiate in any manner with the Maharaja of Bhutan whom we had the privilege and honour of having in our country a few days back. But we want to ensure the interests of world peace first and foremost and I have never been able to understand how it is

possible for any disarmament plan to succeed without the co-operation of the Chinese people. If anyone can tell me that the fact of the People's Republic of China can be eliminated from international life in some miraculous way, I shall be greatly obliged to him but short of a thermonuclear war in which all the countries of the world including our own country will be annihilated, there is no way of dealing with the 600 or 700 million people of China. Therefore, it is that the British House of Commons with a sense of realism the other day expressed the opinion that the principle of China's representation in the United Nations must be accepted. I hope that notwithstanding these pinpricks we shall stick to our policy of supporting the admission of China to the United Nations.

Sir, I would like to say one or two words about Laos. The position there is confused but here again we have a new Administration in the United States and the only way out of the difficulty is to revive the old International Commission. The only way is to recognise the neutrality of Laos. Mr. Christian Herter and the group who surrounded him had no use for neutrality but President Kennedy has use for neutral nations and neutrality and I think that is the line on which a solution of the Laos problem is possible.

I shall now say a few words about our domestic problems. In the President's Address reference has been made to the fact that our industrial output has increased spectacularly. The President says, "For the first ten months of 1960, the production index was 167 as against 149 for the corresponding period of the previous year." This is satisfactory as far as it goes but the question is, is the gulf between the rich and the poor being bridged or is it getting wider? I have been reading this book of Prof. Galbraith. Affluent society is not wor-

ried about this question of inequalities. People in Britain are worried about inequalities but in the United States the general feeling is that these ilities do not really very much matter but an affluent society is different from the society that we are visualising. We have in this country a very wide gap between the rich and the poor and I think it is unaesthetic, it is immoral, it is unethical, to have this big gap between the rich and the poor. The problem of redistribution of property cannot be ignored in this country. What shall all be sufferers if that redistribution takes place but the gift of immortality is for the race; the gift of immortality is not for the individual. I think the poorer section of our population has a right to demand that it shall come into its true heritage. Therefore I have always found it difficult to attack the Marxist doctrine of equality. I am not completely Marxist in my thought but there is an ideal of equality which we share with Marxist socialists and I would therefore say that thought should be given to this question of lessening the gap between the rich and the poor. We shall not have a stable society in this country unless we can make the poor man feel that he has a real stake in the fortunes of his country. For this reason I am glad that reforms of a far-reaching character are going to be effected in Nagaland. We have been talking of the emotional integration of this country a great deal; we have been talking of Chinese aggression. I think this Chinese aggression business is a hateful one. But we want the people of Nagaland and the people of the hilly tracts to feel attracted towards us. We want to win them over in the common struggle against poverty, disease and Chinese incursions. I think therefore the question of the redistribution of wealth is a question into which we must go. I know we have taken some far-reaching measures in that direction but I want, Sir, a probe into the question as to how far this machinery which we have set up has succeeded in lessening the gap between the rich and the poor.

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] I often find it said that if you tax people too much, the incentive to effort will disappear. I have never accepted that view of life myself. I think Prof. Galbraith himself points out in his chapter on equality that taxation is very high in Norway and yet the rate of capital formation in Norway is higher than in most of the European countries. The rate of capital formation in Norway is higher than the rate of capital formation in England. These questions need to be approached from that point of view.

The President has indicated to us the various measures which will be placed before us in the current session. I think the merit of the Presidential Address is that it is short and to the point. It is not a rambling document and I do not like rambling speeches.

Thank you very much.

SHRI BIREN ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, much has already been said about the stress and strain with regard to external affairs in this House. The President has also mentioned about the stress and strain internally in this country, but he has neglected even to mention in what way that stress and strain was dealt with. He even ignored the massacre and the inhuman treatment of Indian citizens of Bengali origin in Assam, in an Indian territory, a fact which took place last year and which should have found place in his Address. Even today, after nearly six months of its occurrence, these people are refugees in their own country and they are not being given due protection. At least that sort of friendship and friendly hand is not being extended to them to go back to their homes and hearths, which they had to leave as a result of passions roused, I would not say by one particular political party, but certainly by some people in the party which is in power. Otherwise, these things would not have taken place. The Central Government, which has so much of power and which could very easily put down and quell riots in Jabalpur and other places did not take

any steps at that time, when the poor, hapless people were being put to these strains. Not only that. Even after that had happened, even today these people are still there not rehabilitated. Only technical difficulties, disparity in the numbers and all these things come into the picture, without the taking of suitable steps. Even the West Bengal Government is crying hoarse over it. They ask for money and other help and the Government of West Bengal is itself helpless in this matter. This is one aspect. On top of that, a clean chit has been given—from a report which we find published in the papers—that not one single Congressman was involved. I would not use that word but the word has been used in a way that Congress 'underlings' were involved, a word which I would also not like to use either. Now, such 'underlings' come again within the fold of the Congress. It is most unfortunate. However, that thing has also been whitewashed and on top of the whitewashing comes the announcement of the appointment in place of our late lamented friend and colleague, Feroze Gandhi, a gentleman, a prominent Assamese, who has been defeated at the polls. Does it not show that this is the way to placate people who even carry on fissiparous activities in this country at a time when we want everybody to be enthused to develop our country? That emotional integration of which we all speak, becomes only an emotion when we are here. It is not effective in the whole land. If that were so, such things would not have taken place. Not only that. It would not have created this kind of feelings, such as Bengalis, Punjabis, Oriyas, South Indians and so on. It would have created a feeling of oneness. The President has spoken about goodwill missions abroad to Soviet Russia and other countries and about delegates going there. What kind of amity and goodwill have we created in our own land? Has he or the ruling party gone about after these happenings? Even after such things happening in our country last year, we did not consider that it was at all necessary. Perhaps it is just

meant as a speech to be publicised in the newspapers.

The President has also spoken about the rise in the national income during the last four years, from Rs. 10,920 crores to Rs. 12,210 crores, an increase of approximately Rs. 1290 crores in four years. That means about Rs. 320 crores per year, an increase of nearly 20 per cent, on the total. At the same time, he also says in his Address that price levels have registered a rise of about per cent, last year. It means that in the four years, as we find it, the increase in price levels is also about 20 per cent. So, it means it is just offset. People paying higher prices are getting pauperised, as income is going up. Then, we are told that a committee has been appointed to go into the statistics as to how this rise in national income has been distributed. We have to wait and be satisfied with it. We know that the per capita income has risen from Rs. 240 to Rs. 300 within the last ten years, that is about Rs. 60. At the same time, the purchasing power of the rupee has fallen by about 30 per cent. It means that if allowance is made for this fall, Rs. 300 would amount to Rs. 240. So, there has been no increase in the *per capita* income. It is simple inflation. Not only that. The whole amount of increase has not gone to the majority of the population, eighty per cent, of whom are in the villages. It only means the enrichment of the rich and the pauperisation of the ordinary middle-class and the poorer class of people. Now, they want that there should be the socialistic idea or pattern of raising the standard of living. What kind of socialistic idea is that when the rich are getting richer and when we find that the money in circulation is not even in the banks? You can easily find out where it is going. When you find that the income-taxes are not being realised, when you find that they are in arrears to the tune of more than Rs. 300 crores, no steps are taken. Nothing happens. You find people in high circles going about with these kinds of people and

, mixing in top society. You find that people, who have cheated the Government not only of income-tax but of other things, have still the social level and they are still controlling the Government in most cases. These people are socially mixable, but not the other people. People in the villages and even in the cities the educated people are getting poorer and poorer. In the city of Calcutta it has been found by statistics that 55 per cent, of adult, educated are unemployed persons there. Industries and other things are coming up there through the help of the Government. Many of the industries are organised, I should say, by non-Bengalis mostly. Even with the efforts of the Government of West Bengal, they could not get the sons of the soil either employed or even get the statistics, as we tried to find out when the Europeans were there as to how many Europeans were employed in European industries. Why is it so? It is because you still do not think in terms of the oneness of the country. You do not think in such terms that they are our brothers. You have to get yourself emotionally changed to bring about integration and then only you can enthuse all the people of the land to

develop the country. You carry 4 P.M. on fissiparous tendencies in different parts of the country and then talk about emotional integration here. That will not do. This kind of hypocrisy does not take us anywhere. This is one aspect of the thing.

Then we come to Berubari transfer where the Bengalis are becoming again refugees. They were refugees from Pakistan to India already, and now they are going to be refugees for the second time from that part of the country. And what was the reason given? That it could not be done because we must be friendly to Pakistan. It seems that Pakistan was very friendly to Us even- at the time when we gave them the Canal Waters. Immediately after the Canal Waters question was settled Mr. Ayub Khan stated that things could not be so nice for us till the Kashmir question was settled. It cannot be settled, and we

will drain all our money over there. Then came the Pakistan-China border question. Only yesterday he has again taken up the cue and said that "We have the right to talk about the border in the region of Kashmir with China; whatever Mr. Nehru may say in his Parliament, we do not care, we have the right". All these things are not very friendly actions. Only we are trying to 'placate' the people either in our own country or even outside whenever pressure tactics are employed. This is a sort of thing which once and for all we should end. We have to see that not only in the East, that is in Bengal, but also in the South, in Madras areas, people feel that industrial development is going to take place in those parts through the sons of the soil over there and that they can move abreast with other States in our country and live as brothers on an equal footing without being discriminated against. That is a thing which we should have seen to before we talked about things like emotional integration, oneness of India and so on. This oneness of India is a thing which we all try to aspire to, but we do not see the ways in which the people in high positions are still carrying on by which the fissiparous tendencies are more widened, and they are going to be so perhaps in the future which will be such a dangerous thing that a break-up may take place.

**श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मिश्र (बिहार) :** उप-सभापति महोदय, डाक्टर राय ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूँ। चीन और कांगो के सम्बन्ध में हमारे माननीय विरोधी नेता श्री गंगाशरण जी ने जो विचार प्रकट किये वे कोई नये नहीं थे। जिस तरह के विचार हमारी सरकार और पार्टी की तरफ से दिये जा रहे हैं उसी तरह के विचार और खयालात उन्होंने प्रकट किये हैं। उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई नई बात नहीं कही। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में यह कहा कि चीन ने हमारे देश की भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है, मगर उस के लिए

क्या रास्ता अस्तित्वार करना चाहिये, वह उन्होंने नहीं बतनाया। यह बात सही है कि चीन ने हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है और सरकार इस बारे में काफी जागरूक है और वह उचित समय में कार्यवाही भी करेगी। उन्होंने जिस तरह से चीन की निन्दा की है, उसी तरह से इधर के सभी लोगों ने भी निन्दा की है, मगर उन्होंने कोई रास्ता नहीं बतनाया, जिससे वह हिंसा वापिस आ सके।

इस सम्बन्ध में एक विरोधी सदस्य ने कहा कि चीन ने हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है, इसलिये लड़ाई खेड़ देनी चाहिये। यह बात ठीक है कि चीन ने जब हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है तो अगर हम लड़ाई भी करें, तो अन्याय नहीं होगा; लेकिन आज के जमाने में लड़ाई खेड़ देने को कहना हमारी बात मालूम पड़ती है। फिर भी जिस मुल्क ने हमारे देश की भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है, अगर हम उसकी जबरदस्ती हटाने की कोशिश करें तो वह लड़ाई खेड़ देना नहीं कहा जायगा। सरकार इस ओर कार्यवाही कर रही है और राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण से भी यह बात प्रकट होती है कि सरकार इस ओर उचित कदम उठा रही है। इसके साथ ही साथ हमारे इधर के एक माननीय सदस्य यह कहते हैं कि अगर हम चीन के साथ लड़ाई खेड़ देते हैं तो उस में हमें कामयाबी नहीं होगी, इसलिये हमें लड़ाई नहीं खेड़नी चाहिये। यह बात सही नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान कोई कमजोर मुल्क नहीं है। उसकी जिस भूमि पर विदेशी ताकत ने कब्जा किया हुआ है, वह उसको हटाने के लिए काफी ताकतवर है। लेकिन हमारी जो नीति है वह शान्तिपूर्ण नीति है, इसलिये हम नहीं चाहते कि इस मामले में एकदम लड़ाई खेड़ दी जाये।

चीन के बारे में हम अपना पुराना रवैया अस्तित्वार किये हुए हैं। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में यह दिया हुआ है "अपने



महान् पड़ोसी के साथ हमारे मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध, जिन्हें उन्नत करने के लिए मेरी सरकार सदा उत्सुक रही है" । अभी तो हमारे उस देश के साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध नहीं हैं, फिर उस देश को महान् कहना नहीं चाहिये । उस देश के लिए "महान्" शब्द की जगह "बृहद्" शब्द कहना ठीक होगा । हम सब लोगों ने अच्छी तरह से देख लिया है कि हमारी ओर से मैत्री का हाथ किस तरह से अपने पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों के लिये बढ़ाया जा रहा है और वे इस चीज का ख्याल न करने हुए दूर चले जा रहे हैं । आज के अखबारों में आपने पढ़ा होगा कि पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति ने कहा है कि कांगो में जिस तरह की घटनाएं घटित हो रही हैं, उसी तरह की घटनाएं हिन्दुस्तान में भी हो रही हैं । इसलिये हमारी नीति अपने पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों के साथ स्पष्ट हो जानी चाहिये । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें रेडियो द्वारा यह प्रचार करना चाहिये कि चीन और पाकिस्तान की जनता दबी हुई है और वह अपनी सरकार के खिलाफ कुछ भी नहीं कह सकती है । पैकिंग रेडियो अपने हिन्दुस्तानी प्रोग्राम में हमारे देश के खिलाफ तरह तरह की बातों का प्रचार करता है । उसने यह प्रचार अब अंग्रेजी में भी बढ़ा दिया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ सरहद का जो झगड़ा है, वह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की हठधर्मी की वजह से हल नहीं हो रहा है । हमारी सरकार की ओर से इस तरह का कोई प्रचार नहीं किया जा रहा है और शान्ति की ही बात कही जा रही है । चीन सरकार की ओर से जो प्रचार किया जाता है उसका हमारी सरकार द्वारा कोई खंडन नहीं किया जाता है । मेरा विचार है कि हमारी सरकार की ओर से भी चीनी और पाकिस्तानी जनता को बताया जाना चाहिये कि उनकी सरकारों द्वारा किस तरह से उन्हें दबाया जा रहा है और किस तरह से गलत बातें उन्हें बतलाई जा रही हैं । जिस तरह का शान्ति और मैत्री का रास्ता हमने अखिलपार किया हुआ है, उसमें काम चलने वाला नहीं है ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि चीन और भारत के बीच जो बातचीत हुई और जो तबसे हमारे सामने आये, उनसे यह पता चलता है कि चीन ने जो नक्शे पेश किये हैं वे केवल दस वर्ष पहले के हैं । लेकिन दस वर्ष पहले भी कहां मैप के बारे में हमारे दूतावास वगैरह में यह कहा गया कि इस तरीके से मैप क्यों बना है ? चीन और हिन्दुस्तान ने जो पंचशील माना वह उसके बाद हुआ । यह होना चाहिये कि जहां जहां विदेशों में हमारे दूतावास हैं वे वहां पूरी तौर से नज़र रखें और जो काम हमारे खिलाफ हो रहे हैं, उनकी खबर फौरन यहां दें । जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है, १९५१ या १९५२ के साल में यहां संसद् में किसी सदस्य ने चीन और रूस के एक मैप के बारे में सवाल किया तो उस पर प्रिविलेज मोशन भी आया । हमने रूम का बना हुआ मैप देखा है । स्टालिन के टाइम में हिन्दुस्तान आज़ाद होने के बाद जो मैप बना था, हमने देखा, उसमें हिन्दुस्तान को आज़ाद दिखाया गया था और काश्मीर को ब्रिटिश । जो चीन आज कह रहा है कि हम काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का नहीं मानते हैं, यह रास्ता वह बहुत दिनों से लिये हुए था । यह नई चीज नहीं है । स्टालिन भी चीन के उस ख्याल को सपोर्ट करते थे । रूस ने जो मैप बनाया था, उसमें काश्मीर को अंग्रेजी राज्य में दिखाया गया था । हमारे दूतावास के ठीक तरह से खबर न रखने से संसद् में जब किसी सदस्य ने उस मैप के बारे में जिक्र किया, तो उस पर प्रिविलेज मोशन आया और कहा गया कि वह बात ठीक नहीं है ।

एक बात देख कर बड़ी खुशी हो रही है कि नागा लोगों के बारे में साफ तरीके से यह कहा गया है कि "मेरी सरकार उन विरोधी तत्वों को दबाने के लिए कुत्सकल्प है जो वहां के लोगों के लिए कठिनाइयां और कष्ट पैदा कर रहे हैं ।" लेकिन अभी तक

[श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मिश्र]

जो कार्यवाहियां वहां हो रही हैं, उनसे मालूम होता है कि वहां कुछ भी नहीं हो रहा है। इतने दिनों से वहां लड़ाई चल रही है, लेकिन आपको यह सुन कर आश्चर्य होगा कि वहां कोई भी विद्रोही अगर किसी को तीर से मारे और भागे तो उसको गोली से मारने का हुक्म नहीं है। वहां कोई पीठ पर गोली नहीं मार सकता है। उनको पकड़ने का अस्तिथार है, लेकिन पीठ पर गोली मारने का अस्तिथार नहीं है। कहा जाता है कि उनको पकड़ने की कोशिश करो, कोई भागता है तो मारो मत, सामना करो। जो गोली चलाता है या तीर फेंकता है, वह मारते ही भागने की कोशिश करता है। जो मिलिट्री के आफिसर वहां काम करते हैं, उनसे यह मालूम हुआ कि उनको एक रुकावट यह भी है कि अगर वे किसी को पकड़ते हैं तो उसको सिविल अथॉरिटीज को देना पड़ता है। ऐसा भी हुआ है कि जो लोग पकड़े जाते हैं, उनको सिविल अथॉरिटीज पूछ-ताछ करके छोड़ देती है और वे फिर आ करके कोई क्राइम करते हैं। हम लोगों को यह चाहिये कि जब यह विद्रोह इतने दिनों से चल रहा है, तो इसको दबाने के लिए जो भी तरीका लड़ाई का है वह सभी इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये। अगर वह नहीं करेंगे तो जैसी आगे फ्रंटियर में लड़ाई चलती थी, उसी तरह से वहां भी चलती रहेगी। फ्रंटियर अप्रेंजों के लिए ट्रेनिंग ग्राउंड था, उसी तरह से नागालैंड हमारे लिए जंगल-वार की ट्रेनिंग ग्राउंड हो गया है। हम रोज सुनते हैं कि वह लोग मार देते हैं और भाग जाते हैं और हमारे आफिसर या हमारी प्लटन के लोग ज़ख्मी होते हैं या मरते हैं। हमको वहां कड़ी से कड़ी कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये। जब वे राष्ट्र के खिलाफ विद्रोह कर रहे हैं तो हमको उनसे कोई हमदर्दी नहीं करनी चाहिये। दूसरी ओर जो शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से कौन्सिल में आ

कर देश की उन्नति करना चाहते हैं, उनको जितनी दूर तक मदद हो सकती है, वह हमको देनी चाहिये।

एक बात और मुझे बहुत आश्चर्य की लगी। जो फ्रैंच कालोनी है, वह वास्तव में हिन्दुस्तान में है, लेकिन अभी तक उसका डी जूरे ट्रांसफर नहीं हुआ है। उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा गया है। उसके बारे में सरकार कहे कि कितनी दूर तक यह बात आगे बढ़ी है।

गोआ के बारे में जो यह कहा गया है कि शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से उसकी आज़ादी के लिए हम वचनबद्ध हैं, यह हम समझते हैं कि बहुत नर्म है। हमारा ही हिस्सा दूसरा दबा कर रखे हुए है और हम कहते हैं कि हम शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से वचनबद्ध हैं। दुनिया का जो रुख है, उसको हमने देखा है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले यू० एन० ओ० में उपनिवेश के खिलाफ रेजोल्यूशन पास हुआ है। हम समझते हैं कि अभी मौका है कि हिन्दुस्तान उसको यह नोटिस दे दे कि इतने दिन के अन्दर छोड़ो नहीं तो हम जैसी चाहेंगे वैसी कार्रवाई करेंगे। वहां जो आज़ादी के लिये कोशिश कर रहे हैं उनको हमें सभी तरीके से मदद देने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये। जो हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जबरदस्ती बैठा हुआ है, उसको हटाने के लिये हमें चुप नहीं रहना चाहिये।

एक बात बहुत खुशी की है कि कांगो के बारे में जो भी हमारी सरकार की नीति है उसका विरोधी दल के नेता ने पूर्ण समर्थन किया है।

अभी मुझे दो एक बातें और कहनी हैं, पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में। शिल्प की उन्नति के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है, लेकिन पब्लिक सेक्टर की जो इंडस्ट्रीज चल रही हैं और उनमें जो भ्रष्टाचार हो रहा है और जो बरबादी हो रही है, उसकी तरफ हमारी नज़र नहीं जाती है। हम जहां से आ रहे हैं वहां रांची

में कई एक आफिस हैं, एन० सी० डी० सी०, हिन्दुस्तान स्टील वर्ग रह। हम देखते हैं कि वहां किस तरीके से चीजों की बरबादी हो रही है और भ्रष्टाचार बन रहा है। यह ठीक है कि वहां टेंडर कॉल होते हैं लेकिन टेंडर देने वाले बहुत थोड़े आदमी रह जाते हैं। अगर कोई आदमी वहां कोई चीज सप्लाय करता है और अफसरों को धूस नहीं देता है तो उसका बिल छः महीने और एक वर्ष तक पास नहीं होगा। इस तरह आहिस्ता आहिस्ता बहुत से टेंडर देने वाले आदमी वहां से हट जाते हैं। जो उसी तरह की कार्रवाई कर सकते हैं, रह जाते हैं। वे हाई टेंडर देते हैं और लाखों रुपया सरकार का बरबाद करते हैं। यह ठीक है कि हमारे देश में शिल्प उन्नति कर रहा है, लेकिन उस पर जितना खर्चा हो रहा है, उतनी वह उन्नति नहीं कर रहा है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI BAIRAGI DWIBEDY (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the discussion on the Address delivered by the President has almost taken the shape of a foreign affairs debate. As such I am confining my speech to some of the internal situations.

#

The Address delivered by the President to Parliament is just a press statement. It fails to inspire the nation to achieve a creative programme. More or less it is a record wherein the foreign tour of the President as well as the Prime Minister is written. Further, we are informed of the visit of many foreign dignitaries. We are given an account of passed Bills, Bills pending and Bills to be placed before us. We are also informed of the promulgation of Ordinances— which I feel is not necessary. I do not understand how these together with other international matters would be able to give an impetus to the nation which is striving for a stomach-ful of food.

Sir, economic planning has come to be accepted by all sections of the Indian people as necessary and desirable.

It is generally assured that the planning system will continue through changing Governments and irrespective of the rise and fall of political parties. In taking stock of the progress made in the first two Five Year Plans and in discussing the Draft for the Third Plan, Indians often wonder how the Plan could be made to play a more intimate part in the life of every single citizen. I regret to say, Sir, that the Address of the President fails to point out any solution to this. A need is felt for some form of assurance that the characteristics of drive and direction in planning will continue in the foreseeable future. No one is satisfied with the rate of development so far.

It is the conviction of the Government, the Planning Commission, the leading political parties and the educated classes that a properly informed and inspired people could alone solve all these problems. The key task would be to create a consensus of public opinion on the immediate and irreducible needs of the country and its individual citizens.

Non-official quarters meanwhile are full of suggestions for diagnosing and redressing the nation's ills. The most authoritative of them, the Congress Party, has a plan, first mooted out in the week-long seminar held at Ootacamund in June 1959, to form, together with other political parties, a National Plan Front with the purpose of securing public participation in Plan projects. This shows that the hon. Prime Minister himself, who led the seminar, and his Congress colleagues recognise that neither the administration nor the Congress Party enjoys full public confidence.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: How do you arrive at that conclusion?

SHRI BAIRAGI DWIBEDY: In fact, when there has lately been much evidence of centrifugal tendencies in the States of vested interests pushed to the forefront by communal and economic groups and by general frustration among the educated middle class—

[Shri Bairagi Dwibedy.] es, the hon. Prime Minister and other leaders find themselves constrained to appeal frequently to national unity, integrity, and greater efforts for the Plans, but, Sir, I regret that nothing is mentioned about national unity and integrity—as if national unity and integrity have been achieved.

For the first time, many thoughtful people are now suggesting that a certain degree of compulsion has become necessary. There is also a demand for greater effort for public relations. The intention of this contribution is to combine the two by showing how improved public relations could themselves produce social compulsion without involving the law and the police. To achieve this end a coalition Government is in existence in Orissa, and other States, but I regret to say that the President's Address fails to record even a word of appreciation of such parties as have formed those coalition Governments and where through national unity, integrity, and the taking up of joint responsibility the coalition Government has come to stay as a stable Government, has launched a suitable development programme and thus proved that the interest of the State is far above the interest of a party. Specially the stand of a State party in Orissa in furthering the national development programme is just a hope and an ideal to the other prominent States where there is a threat to national unity, integrity and to the development programme.

The coalescing parties in Orissa have a common agreement to accelerate planned economy and to get back to Orissa Saraikela and Kharsawan, the two outlying Oriya-speaking areas. In other parts of this great country such State reorganisation on a linguistic basis and the demand for separate States have taken a toll of lives and property through the policy of the present Government having a nonviolent and peaceful co-existence policy internationally. After recourse to violence, in some cases, the Government accepted such demands. But, Sir, to my utter disappointment, in Orissa,

even with our full co-operation with the Government and in spite of our peaceful demand, the request for including the discussion, in the matter of our getting back Saraikela and Kharsawan in the agenda of the Zonal conference was denied, I regret to say, Sir. As such, the President's concluding remarks in his Address: "I am confident that wisdom and tolerance and the spirit of co-operative endeavour will be your guide" is just a formality and is void of sincerity.

No doubt Panchayat Raj is making rapid strides, but in some States the members are elected through indirect voting. The term of village panchayat has been extended through an Ordinance, and Zilla Parishad members are elected by members of such panchayats. The election to village panchayats and Zilla Parishads should always be direct, which alone will be able to fulfil the dream of panchayat democracy.

The Address speaks highly of the definite improvement in agricultural production in 1960-61. The President says:

"The targets of minor irrigation and seed multiplication farms, laid down in the Second Five Year Plan, are expected to be realised almost fully."

But I regret to say that the improvement in agricultural production in 1960-61 is not through the Plan but was made possible through a better and timely monsoon.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the President moved by my hon. friend, Dr. Ray. The President's Address is a comprehensive one; it deals with internal as well as external matters in a balanced manner. Though, as some of the hon. Members have observed, it may not enthuse our hearts, but it is quite matter-of-fact and business-like.

Sir, the President himself mentioned at the very outset that the year which we have left behind was of much

stresses and strains. With this difficult background it is very difficult, Sir, for any body to indulge in any sort of figurative language. Anyhow, the President has rightly stressed the Sino-Indian border dispute and has expressed his grave concern.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE) in the Chair]

The hon. Members who spoke before me, all of them have invariably made a mention of this problem which only shows how the whole House as well as the nation and the country are deeply anxious over this matter. Without very much dealing with this matter any further, it is sufficient for me to say that the policy which is being pursued by the Government is quite satisfactory and it is just according to the general pattern of our foreign policy which we have been adopting since the inception of our independence. Any miscalculating step towards war is likely to result in a world conflagration. It is this feeling which is acting as a restraint upon us and not any feeling of inferiority as some hon. Members have observed. Coming to domestic problems, I all let me mention the remarkable achievements which we have made in the industrial sector. Sir, we are near completion of the Second Five Year Plan and soon embarking upon the Third Five Plan of a great magnitude. Undoubtedly our achievements in the industrial sector have been quite remarkable and they are quite optimistic for even a born pessimist. But somehow or the other there is a feeling that in this industrial development a sort of disparity is existing, disparity between the North and the South, disparity between province and province. I may submit, Sir, that this sort of feeling, whether it may be wholly true or not, should not be encouraged. For example, take the case of Andhra Pradesh. No doubt, Andhra Pradesh is predominantly an agricultural province, but during these two Plans no new industry has been allotted to Andhra. Andhra

have got to say much against this policy. They have got a grouse against the Central Government for not allotting any big industry worth the name to that State.

Sir, we were told that the heavy electrical factory might be allotted to Andhra. A party of experts went and inspected the place also. They did it for the first time when the first heavy electrical factory was in the offing, but ultimately they preferred Bhopal to Hyderabad. We feel that the Centre this time will consider this matter with sympathy and give the heavy electrical factory to Andhra Pradesh which it rightly deserves.

Coming to the agricultural production, Sir, our achievement in that sector also is fairly good, but still we depend upon the vagaries of nature. If nature is favourable our agricultural production goes up; if it is not, it goes down. That means we have not got control over agricultural production. It is quite natural also. Even in the totalitarian countries like Russia and China, who claim to have taken big leaps forward, they are now face to face with famine, famine of the worst type. It is not so easy to increase agricultural production as it is possible in the industrial sector. But it seems that in dealing with fundamental agricultural issues, we are not very much clear. The so-called radical land reforms are still hanging fire. It is time that these land reforms must be implemented as soon as possible and the sort of suspense which is prevailing in the agricultural sector should be removed.

Then, Sir, the question of floor prices—our respected Food and Agriculture Minister is here—is also a very important issue, though I could not decide it as yet. Fixation of floor prices becomes very necessary when we look at it in view of the daily soaring prices by which our middle class is hard hit. It is true that presently the agricultural prices are quite remunerative but if the pace of progress in the agricultural sector continues to be as it is now, an occa-

[Shri S. Channa Reddy.] sion may come when the prices may go below the remunerative level. Therefore, for giving an incentive to the farmer the fixation of floor prices becomes quite essential, and I would request the Food and Agriculture Minister to take up this issue here and now. It is not good waiting for years to come when agricultural prices may go down.

Again, Sir, even if we could implement, these radical land reforms and distribute land among the landless the appalling condition of the toiling millions will not be relieved. After all, agriculture is not in a position to feed each and everybody. Therefore, the endeavour of our Government must be to divert the pressure of population from agriculture to some other avocations, to reduce it from the existing more than 70 per cent, to 45 per cent, or 50 per cent. Then only the farmer will seem to be prosperous and agriculture also will prosper well.

In this connection I may submit, Sir, that the village and small-scale industries are the only solution. They will provide employment to the underemployed and unemployed farmers and villagers. It is admitted that during the first two Plans our achievement in this field was not at all spectacular.

Sir, it is but natural to industrialise cities or to establish big factories in cities and urban areas. But we must now change that tendency and see to it that our villages are electrified and small-scale and village industries are established in plenty. The largely spoken of industrial estates, which are at present confined to district headquarters only, must be established at taluka headquarters also. What I want to stress is that the agricultural population which has been underemployed must be provided with some sort of avocation and it is possible only by establishing village and small-scale industries.

I

As the Minister of Irrigation and Power is here, I would take this opportunity to draw his attention to the problem of water dispute. This water dispute between Andhra and Maharashtra is leading to so many fissiparous tendencies and if we carefully observe the statements which the respective Ministers are issuing from time to time, it seems as if it is a dispute between two foreign countries. It is high time for the Centre to intervene and settle this matter once and for all. May I also submit in this connection that in this dispute, it is the Telangana people who are the worst sufferers in the sense that (he Pochampad project which is to cater to the needs of 5 Telangana districts has been held up, not for any sound reasons but only because of some dispute pending? As many experts gave their opinions, if this project were to be in any other country, the Government would have jumped at it and would have given top priority. It is *so* economic and is technically so feasible that with a sum of Rs. 15 crores it can irrigate 3 lakh acres and that too in an area which is supposed to be the most backward. We were told that **the** work which was started there was suspended on account of this water dispute. Either you settle this dispute-as soon as possible or you allow the Andhra Government to go ahead with this project and utilise the water to the extent to which it is entitled by any calculation.

I will make a mention regarding the administrative set-up. I have nothing to say against any particular official. I think that they are as patriotic as any one of us here but the system itself is so wonderful that even with pious intentions, one can dispose of things as fast as one would desire. Now, I understand that there are different types of administration prevailing in the different States. For example, in Andhra there is the Tottenham system which is not at all helpful in disposing of files quickly.

SHRI AKBAR ALI GHAN: Tottering system.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Anyhow, that is a delaying system. It is not helpful in the speedy disposal of work. Mr. Appleby came thrice and submitted his reports twice. Mr. Gorwala also submitted his report. With all these reports, still we are not able to evolve a common pattern of administration for the whole of our country. I think that it is essential to do this as soon as possible. With this I support the motion and thank you very much.

श्री गुरुदेव (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विगत १४ फरवरी को दोनों सदनों की संयुक्त बैठक में राष्ट्रपति ने जो अभिभाषण दिया और हमारे माननीय सदस्य श्री रे द्वारा जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया गया, उसका अनुमोदन करने के हेतु मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं इस भाषण में से केवल दो तीन बातों पर अपने विचार प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति ने अपने इस अभिभाषण में विगत वर्ष की उपलब्धियों एवं आगत वर्ष की योजनाओं एवं वर्तमान समस्याओं पर विशद प्रकाश डाला है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हमें उनके इस मार्ग-दर्शन द्वारा वर्तमान मंत्र में अपने कार्य करने में काफी सहायता मिलेगी।

आज भारत के सामने हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्र चीन द्वारा हमारी सीमाओं का किया गया अतिक्रमण का प्रश्न चीन की दीवार की भाँति ही भजबूत और दृढ़ रूप में उपस्थित है। हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में सर्वप्रथम उसी गम्भीर और विशद समस्या पर काफ़ी प्रकाश डाला है और उस बारे में अपने स्पष्ट विचार संसद् और संसद् के माध्यम से समस्त भारत बल्कि विश्व के सम्मुख रखे हैं। जहाँ तक चीन के सीमा अतिक्रमण का प्रश्न है, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं कि यह चीन की ज्यादाती है और भारत की सद्भावना पर चीन द्वारा विश्वासघात है। इस समस्या के ऊपर भी राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण

में पैराग्राफ तीन और चार में काफ़ी प्रकाश डाला है और इस बारे में सही स्थिति संसद् के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करने की चेष्टा की है।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण को सुनने के पश्चात् हम उनकी मनोदशा का अनुभव कर सकते हैं कि वे चीन की इस वर्तमान नीति से कितने चिन्तित एवं दुखी हैं और साथ ही अपने कर्तव्य तथा दायित्व के प्रति कितने जागरूक हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि उपरोक्त उल्लेख के पश्चात् राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस महती समस्या के प्रति उल्लेख करने को और क्या शेष रह जाता है? हमारे विरोधी बेंचेज के एक सम्माननीय सदस्य ने यह शिकायत की है, इस बारे में आलोचना की है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में चीन समस्या के ऊपर डीटेल विवरण की कमी थी। मैं नहीं समझता कि राष्ट्रपति ने जितना अधिक इस बारे में कह दिया है उससे भी अधिक कहने की आवश्यकता थी।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के पैरा तीन में उल्लिखित यह स्पष्ट स्वीकारोक्ति, "हमारे राष्ट्र की सर्वाधिकार-सम्पन्न भूमि पर आक्रमण तथा हमारी सीमा के अतिक्रमण की समस्याएँ अभी नहीं सुलझ पाई, किन्तु मेरी सरकार उन समस्याओं तथा उनसे सम्बन्धित समस्त उल्लंघनों के प्रति जागरूक है", क्या राष्ट्रपति और उनकी सरकार की मनोदशा तथा कर्तव्यपरायणता का सही दिग्दर्शन नहीं करती?

इसके आगे भी पैरा चार में राष्ट्रपति जी की यह घोषणा, "मेरी सरकार चीन के एक-तरफा निर्णयों अथवा कार्यवाही के परिणामों को स्वीकार नहीं कर सकती", क्या हमारे सामान्य विरोधी बेंचों के वन्दुओं के मन में यह विश्वास उत्पन्न नहीं करती कि भारत सरकार की नीति इस मामले में दृढ़मूल नहीं है और वह चीन की घुड़की अथवा धमकी में आने वाली नहीं है?

## [ श्री गुरुदेव ]

इतना ही नहीं बल्कि इससे भी एक कदम और आगे राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण के पैरा पांच में यह कहा है, "हमारा यह दृढ़ मत है कि भारत और चीन के बीच की सीमायें चिरकाल से संधियों, रीति-रिवाजों तथा व्यवहार द्वारा भवनी प्रकार निश्चित रही हैं।"

यद्यपि कथन राष्ट्रपति के हृदयोद्गार, उनकी भावनाओं और उनकी मान्यताओं और धारणाओं को स्पष्ट नहीं करना कि राष्ट्रपति भी इस बारे में दृढ़ हैं कि भारत व चीन के बीच की सीमा वहीं मैकमोहन लाइन है जो अब तक चली आ रही थी? चीन के सम्बन्ध में इतना स्पष्ट और दृढ़ नीति का चोख यह अभिभाषण भी यदि हमारे प्रयोग इन के सम्बन्धों को लबर और अपूर्ण लगता है तो पूर्ण क्या है, यह बही जानें। अभिभाषण तो अभिभाषण ही है, मानव के समस्त कार्य अपूर्ण हैं, सबके मानव अपूर्ण हैं, सृष्टि अपूर्ण है, और यदि पूर्ण कोई है तो केवल ब्रह्म। मेरा मान्य अपूर्ण है। ऐसी स्थिति में मुझे यह समीक्षा कुछ कम गवस में आई। चीन के सम्बन्ध में राष्ट्रपति महोदय और उनकी सरकार ने जो दृढ़ नीति अपनाई है, वह न केवल सर्वथा उचित ही है बल्कि भारत के पंचशीत, सहस्रस्वित्व और समस्याओं को शान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से हल करने के प्रवर्तनवात्मक विद्वान् के अनुकूल भी है।

हमारे कुछ भाई यह भी कहते हैं कि चीन में एक कहावत है कि "Dragon never romits. (अर्थात् विषघर कभी उगलता नहीं है)", यानी सांप जो गटक गया सो गटक गया। हो सकती है यह कहावत, पर सवाल यह है कि जब पहली दोस्त बन कर आया और जाने पर दगा कर गया, धोखा कर गया, विश्वासघात कर गया, तो अब जो समस्या उसके विश्वासघात के कारण उत्पन्न हो गई, उसको किस रूप में निबटाया जाये, किस प्रकार मुलजामा जाये?

इसकी केवल दो ही सूरतें हो सकती हैं, एक शान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से उसमें निबटने की चेष्टा की जाये, और दूसरा यह है कि जोश व खरोश में आकर हम युद्ध की दुमभी बजा दें, लड़ाई खेड़ दें और सारे देश को युद्ध की ज्वालामुखी में झोंक दें। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने शान्तिपूर्ण वार्ता द्वारा झगड़ा तय करने की पहली सूरत ही अपनाई है। यह ठीक है कि अभी हमें इसमें सफलता नहीं मिली बल्कि कुछ और नई नई उन्नत चीन द्वारा हमारे समक्ष प्रस्तुत की गई, गड़े मुर्दे उठाड़े गये उनके द्वारा जैसे कि मिचिकम, भूटान और काश्मीर की बाबत। परन्तु हमें कभी निराश नहीं होना है, अपने शान्तिपूर्ण मार्ग से अपने को च्युत नहीं करना है। जब हमने अश्वेजों को अपने देश से मन्द और अहिंसा के मार्ग पर चाने हुए शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से हटा दिया और उनको हटाने के निवेदन को एक बंद भी नहीं बहाई, तो कोई कारण नहीं है कि इन समस्या का भी समाधान न हो सके। साथ ही एक बात चीन के बारे में यह स्पष्ट है कि उनकी वर्तमान नीति साम्राज्यवाद को तोति हो गई है और कम्युनिस्ट विद्वान् को अपनाते हुये वह साम्राज्य-निष्ठा से पूरित है। विश्व की तीन महान् शक्तियों में से यही कारण है कि कोई भी उनकी इस नीति का अनुमोदन अवकाश समर्थन नहीं कर पाई और कम सरीखे कम्युनिस्ट देश ने भी उसको झगड़ा मुजजा लेने का ही परामर्श दिया। ऐसी स्थिति में मेरा ख्याल है कि हमें जोश व खरोश से काम नहीं लेना चाहिये बल्कि हमें अपने देश में इसके निष्प्रबल जनमत अवश्य विकसित करना चाहिये, ताकि यदि भगवान् न करे कभी कोई स्थिति ऐसी आये कि हमारे ताल्लुकात और बिगड़े तो उस समय हमारे लोग, हमारे भाई सुवृत्तावस्था में न पाये जायें और वे यह समझ ही न पायें कि उनसे क्या करने को कहा जा रहा है। इस बारे में मेरा विचार है कि विरोधी दल के लोग भी काफी सहयोग दे सकते हैं और प्रबल जनमत बना सकते हैं।



दूसरा प्रश्न है कांगो के बारे में, जिसका राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में उल्लेख किया है। कहा जाता है कि जुलन और जाद्रू, खून और खांसी सिर पर चढ़ कर बोलते हैं। तो कांगो में वहां के भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री लुमुम्बा की जो हत्या की गयी, निश्चय ही सम्यता के लिये वह एक कलंक है। इसके बारे में हमारे राष्ट्र के नेता प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहर-लाल नेहरू ने भी अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं और इस पर टिप्पणी करते हुये उन्होंने कहा है कि हत्या की गयी है और उन लोगों द्वारा की गयी है, जो कि ऊंचे स्थान पर हैं। जो भी अपराधी हों, उन्हें कड़ा दंड दिया जाये

भारत के रक्षा मंत्री श्री मेनन ने कहा है कि यह बड़ी दुःखदायी घटना है, इससे कांगो समस्या और उलझेगी। अमेरिका के प्रेसीडेंट श्री केनेडी को बड़ा दुःख है। मास्को रेडियो ने इस घटना को उपनिवेशवादियों का खूनी अपराध कहा है और कहा है कि विश्व ऐसे अपराध को क्षमा नहीं करेगा। ब्रिटेन के प्रवक्ता ने भी इस हिंसक कार्य की निन्दा की है। संयुक्त अरब संघ के डेलीगेट ने इसे लज्जापूर्ण हत्या कहा है।

इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं है कि यह घटना बड़ी दुःखदायी है, किन्तु किसी भी देश को आजादी के संघर्ष में कुछ न कुछ बलिदान करना पड़ता है। मैं यह समझता हूं कि शायद लुमुम्बा की यह मृत्यु बलिदान के रूप में ही सामने आयेगी और इससे आगे चल कर वहां की जनता का न्याय मिलेगा। और सुरक्षा परिषद् जो इस मामले को हाथ में लिये हुये है वह भी इसमें अधिक कड़ाई के साथ अपने उत्तरदायित्व का पालन करेगी।

अंतिम बात मैं कहना चाहूंगा राष्ट्र-भाषा हिन्दी के बारे में। इसका भी उल्लेख राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में किया है। इस बारे में मेरा मत है कि केवल एक केन्द्रीय हिन्दी विभाग की स्थापना कर देना ही पर्याप्त नहीं होगा, बल्कि हिन्दी को जब हमने राष्ट्रभाषा स्वीकार कर लिया है तब उसके विकास के लिये और उसके प्रसार के लिये हमें एक निश्चित नीति अपनानी होगी। जिस प्रकार से हम अपनी बड़ी बड़ी समस्याओं को पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के माध्यम से हल करते हैं और रुपये की कमी होने पर रुपया लाते हैं, मांग कर या कर्ज काढ़ कर या विभिन्न उपायों से, उसी प्रकार हमें राष्ट्र की चेतना के लिये, राष्ट्र की एकता के लिये और राष्ट्रीय भावना के प्रसार और प्रचार के लिये हिन्दी को—जिसे हमने राष्ट्रभाषा स्वीकार कर लिया है—बढ़ाने के लिये भी एक निश्चित नीति अपनानी पड़ेगी। अभी निश्चित नीति के अभाव में होता यह है कि जिन राज्यों में पहले हिन्दी में कार्य होता भी था, वह फिर अंग्रेजी में काम होने लगा है। डाइरेक्टोरेट लेवल का अधिकारी केवल अपने सैक्रेटरी के मनोभाव को देखता है और यदि उसको अंग्रेजी में सुविधा हुई तो फिर वह भी अंग्रेजी में काम करने लगता है। इसलिये इसके बारे में एक निश्चित नीति होनी चाहिये। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. DAVE) :  
The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 20th February, 1961.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday the 20th February, 1961.