

[Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin.]

wish to dilate on the merits of the issue on which the Indian Pilots' Guild resorted to this extreme step of going on a lightning strike. The Hon'ble Members will agree with me that a strike in a public utility industry like the Air Transport, without notice and without any attempt at negotiations, is unjustified, and at this stage, I would only express the hope that at least in the future the Guild will not resort to the extreme step of a strike, and recourse will always be had to discussions and negotiations with the Management.

For the information of the Hon'ble Members, I place on the Table of the House, a detailed statement, together with copies of relevant correspondence between the Guild and the Management and a statement indicating the pay and allowances of the Pilots as finally agreed to on the 2nd January, 1960. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1884/60].

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued.

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened with close attention not only to the Address which the President was pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament the other day, but also to what the speakers before me have said about it.

Sir, I for one am not in complete agreement with the rosy picture that has been painted of the conditions prevalent in this country today. There is much of which the present Government can justly be proud, but there is also much about which it must be deeply concerned as most of us in this country are concerned today. I would like to say a few words at the very beginning about what the President was pleased to mention in the opening paragraphs of his Address, that is, the Sino-Indian dispute about our borders with China. Something was said yesterday by my friend from Bihar re-

garding a speech made by the Defence Minister at Chandigarh about not giving away India's administered borders. I am not going into that, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to something which has happened in Burma very recently. I was reading with great care and attention the negotiations which had taken place between the Premier of China and Gen. Ne Win of Burma. I have also read—and I am sure the House must have read it—the communique which was issued after their meeting and the agreement that has been made to institute a kind of a Boundary Commission on behalf of both the States—China and Burma—to demarcate their borders. It would be of interest if we go into that a little more closely, and we find that in this demarcation it is not only the south-eastern borders of Burma that are to be put before this new Boundary Commission, but also the MacMahon Line. Sir, when the MacMahon Line was first laid down in 1914, Burma was a part of India, and although India has been saying all along that it stands by the MacMahon Line and that it is our definite frontier—as our Prime Minister was pleased to say when we had a debate here on China or as the Premier of Burma when he visited India was pleased to say that they were also taking their stand on the MacMahon Line—here is Burma, away from India and without consultation with this country, accepting the position that the MacMahon Line so far as Burma is concerned is a disputed area and will be subjected to the decisions of the Boundary Commission which both these States have now set up under this agreement. That means that so far as the Government of Burma is concerned, it has accepted the position that the MacMahon Line so far as it concerns Burma is not a traditional frontier and it is subject to change by mutual negotiation. I think that this thing has some lesson for India. It means that one of our neighbours who was affected by this boundary is not willing to go the whole hog with us. Another thing which has disturbed me is what the

Prime Minister of Nepal said the other day. I am very glad that he was given a tumultuous welcome; we are all glad and happy that it is a friendly country. But in one of his utterances—I think perhaps, it was at a press conference—Mr. Koirala when he was asked whether he was agreeable to have a military pact with India against aggression, said that that was not necessary. Now, Sir, maybe it is not India's policy to conclude military pacts with its neighbours. It may be that Mr. Koirala was only saying aloud what was discussed between him and our Prime Minister. But, Sir, I feel that so far as Nepal and India are concerned, our relationship with each other cannot be put on par with our relationship with other countries with which our ancient ties, historical ties and cultural ties are not as close as those with Nepal. I should have thought that at this time when India had large parts of her territory under Chinese occupation—wrongful occupation, because a boundary which has always been our traditional boundary has been violated, and also because of the feelings of the people in this country over it—it would have been most natural for the Governments of India and Nepal to issue some kind of a communique whereby their interests were to be jointly protected in case of any aggression against either of them. This is all that I wanted to say about this matter. I do not know how the attitude of wait and see, which the Government of India is adopting at the present moment, is going to do us good in the long run, because the condition today is that it is our territory which has been violated; it is our area which is under the occupation of the Chinese, and they can just sit on it and wait and see what we are going to do about it. I very much hope that the visit of the Russian Prime Minister today, to which we in the country have been looking forward, will help us with some solution of this delicate problem. There are of course reports in the press and elsewhere that the Russian—what we might call—attitude in this dispute with China has been one of neutrality and that

the Russian Government has been asking the Chinese Government to go slow. I do not see any signs, except in the newspapers, as to what that policy is, whether it is what it is said to be. That of course will remain to be seen, but I hope that with the Soviet Prime Minister's visit to this country a way will be found by which we will be able to settle with China this question. It must be settled amicably and—I would respectfully submit—expeditiously because, I think, any long time taken in these things would only make it more difficult for us to achieve the status quo.

Having said that, Sir, I would like to say a few words about the internal conditions in the country. It is true that agricultural production in India has risen; it is true that the crop is estimated at 73 million tons, but it is also true that we still depend upon the vagaries of weather and on the long delayed agrarian reforms. Sir, I had the privilege of saying a few words about it last time when I addressed the House on the debate on the President's Address and spoke a few words. I said then, Sir, that our policy regarding agrarian reforms was halting. I also said then that we were not going ahead with full speed so far as placing a ceiling on agricultural holdings was concerned. I also said then that unless we had a dynamic approach to this problem, the question of self-sufficiency in food-grains would not be solved, and I am afraid, Sir, that not much leeway has been made in the years that have passed, in this direction, and unless we concentrate on this vital problem of land in this country, we cannot hope for any appreciable rise in production.

Then, Sir, I am sorry to say that oil exploitation has not been what it should have been. I was listening very closely to what the hon. Minister for Mines had to say the other day on mineral resources, oil exploration and so on, and I was rather unhappy when he said, after all these drillings and explorations, after all

[Shri Anand Chand.]

the newspaper reports about gas and oil in Jwalamukhi, Lunej and Cambay, nothing much had come out—no concrete results had been achieved—and this is not so only in the matter of oil. India is rich in mineral resources. We have a Geological Survey. It was given out by them that very great efforts were being made to find out the minerals. But have we found them to any appreciable extent even after these more than twelve years since independence? Of course some parts of India are really unapproachable but we know the country very well. The country has been existing there for so long. There are administrations established in all parts of it. Why then have we not been able to make more progress in this field? Oil to us is a vital necessity. We depend for it on foreign countries and if we are not self-sufficient in oil, making efforts in that direction in times of peace, the need for it will be more so in times of war, and if we cannot be self-sufficient, why then this outlay, Sir, and why then all this money spent in boring wells which, after giving very rosy pictures in the papers, turn out to be nothing hopeful in the end?

Then, Sir, I would like your permission to speak a few words about education. There is no doubt that it is a State subject and there is no doubt too that some States have made **headway** but, Sir, let us see the overall picture in this country eleven years after independence, after we have given to ourselves a democratic Constitution where every man above a certain age has the right to vote. And is it not the primary duty of the Government to see that education in this country is universally given. I think it must be a matter of great regret to us all that today even, in India, the percentage of literacy is not more than 25 to 27 whereas in a country like Russia—I have been reading about Russia—I do not know about China—they were able to eradicate illiteracy and attain over 90 per cent. literacy within a period of ten years.

And here we are eleven years after independence still going with our figures of 25 per cent. and 27 per cent. I think this is all wrong—we are not concentrating on educating the citizen. Without educating him, how will he know what he is voting for, how will he know what is democracy and what are democratic parties, and how will he know that he is voting the correct people or party to power so that this country is governed according to democratic traditions? I think, Sir, this is a very serious matter, a matter to which we must give our fullest thought, not only in the remaining year of this Five Year Plan, but more especially so in the Third Five Year Plan because, unless we can educate the youth of this country, unless we can educate the uneducated in this country, we cannot hope to make democracy progress in any appreciable measure.

Then, Sir, with this education has come indiscipline. We do not pass a day without seeing in newspapers reports of growing indiscipline in our universities, closure of our universities because the students do not behave properly. Now why is this so? Why have we not been able to find a remedy for it? I have my connections with a few educational institutions and what I have been able to see is that this indiscipline, this growing misbehaviour of the students emanates not from them only; it also emanates from the teachers, from the professors and from the authorities in the colleges themselves. It is because we do not treat these boys and girls as we should treat them; it is because we are callous to their wants; it is because we do not have the same approach as our ancients had, the *Guru-Sishya* ideal, that our youth today feels frustrated in these universities, develops habits which are very very unsatisfactory and then, in the end, there is indiscipline, there is uproar against the very teacher or the Vice-Chancellor, because he has not done his duty diligently. So, Sir, it has become a vicious circle. If we want to break it, if we want the

students to behave, we must see that the teachers who teach them in these temples of knowledge are people of sterling character, are people who have imbibed all the best in our Indian tradition and culture. Thereby alone we will be able to leave an indelible mark on the taught and thereby only could their behaviour change and accordingly result in the good of this country.

Then, Sir, the President was pleased to say something about the establishment of Panchayat Raj. There is no doubt that Panchayats in this country, in the various States, are making headway, but there is also no doubt that in many parts the elections to these Panchayats are still by the crude method of show of hands. I was rather surprised at it when my hon. friend from Calcutta said that even in Andhra Pradesh, so far as the Panchayats were concerned, the election was not by secret ballot. I thought it was only in Himachal Pradesh, my own territory, that this was so. Now, Sir it is quite true that in the Panchayats the less politics we inject, the better, because those are the people who have to deal with the every-day problems of their villages and they should be kept away from political influence as much as possible. I have no doubt that this is the correct approach. But then the point is that, when we go through the democratic mode of election, we must devise some method whereby these Panchayats are elected unanimously, whereby people of different views settle their differences and have their Panchayats chosen unanimously, but if there is going to be voting, then I submit that it is wrong to have Panchayat elections by show of hands, because that only accentuates the differences and thereby group rivalry becomes all the more because, when they vote openly in the villages, they are not so democratic as to forget the insults hurled at them by some people voting for the rival candidates. The factions get deeper and what happens is, among the Panchas who are elected or the Surpanchas who are

elected by a few more votes, there is deeper rivalry and the work of the Panchayat becomes next to impossible because the rival groups begin to fight with each other. They do not forgive and forget as the better educated people in the towns and in the other areas do. I suggest that the elections to the Panchayats, if we are to establish them as the real foundation of democracy in our country, must not be by show of hands. They must be by a secret ballot or some other method may be devised by which the man who is elected to the Panchayat is by selection among the people of the villages concerned, and not through the vote at all.

I read with some concern in the President's Address and I heard it also, what he was pleased to say about the ex-servicemen. I come from an area which has a lot of people serving in the army and I am glad that the President showed concern so far as the ex-servicemen were concerned. I am unhappy, however, to tell you and the House that these people, these ex-servicemen, to-day are a neglected lot. Let us not forget it. With the best of intentions, I know at least in my own State and in the adjoining State of Punjab and in some other places, that the Sailors, Soldiers' and Airmen's Boards which are there, are mere paper boards. They have meetings perhaps once a month or once in two months. Not much interest is taken. They are handicapped by lack of funds and they are not able to do much for the ex-servicemen. When we are trying to mobilise in our country a kind of feeling for national defence, as it should be there, when we are going to tap all the sources, as we do in the colleges and other institutions, why should we neglect the ex-servicemen? My appeal to the Government is that some steps may be taken to reorganise, make more lively the functioning of these boards and put more money in their hands so that the ex-serviceman does not feel that he is forgotten as soon

[Shri Anand Chand.]

as he leaves the service but that he and his family are well taken care of even in his lean days when he is not in service.

I am happy to find that the Government have taken a decision to create two States, Maharashtra and another, out of the Bombay State. I wish the decision had been taken at the time when the States were reorganised. I know that there were keen differences of opinion then in the other House and perhaps in this House also. I also know that the main question at that time was as to what should be done with Bombay City. But if we took away the question of Bombay City, there was no doubt that opinion was unanimous that the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat should be formed and I think it was a wrong step to have amalgamated all these units and to have left the big bilingual State to continue because it has only resulted in certain bitterness. Now that the Government have revised their decision, now that the President has been pleased to say that legislation for the separation will be introduced in this Session, I hope it will be passed expeditiously.

So far as the State of Maharashtra is concerned, I have been rather concerned reading in the papers that there were some proposals to give the State, the name of Bombay. I hope it will be left to the Legislature. I hope it will be left to the legislators of the area in Parliament whether in the Rajya Sabha or the other House. I hope that no false prestige will stand in the way so far as the renaming of the State is concerned, I mean of the new State of Maharashtra. Of course, should they want it as Bombay, it is another matter but if they want it as Maharashtra, I hope that no false prestige will stand in the way.

About the border area, I do not know, there are people more efficient than myself in this House. There are

people who have studied the problem, as my hon. friend here, sitting next to me, who was on the States Reorganisation Commission itself has done, but there is a legitimate feeling so far as the Balgaum problem is concerned, so far as the borders with Mysore are concerned. I hope when this question is being decided, it will be decided once and for all and that no source of friction will remain and that the Government will see to it that the people of Maharashtra, when they are being given this new State of Maharashtra, after so much turmoil and suffering, feel that it is the fulfilment of their dreams, that it is a State according to the linguistic distribution as we find in this country.

One last word about my own area and I will have done. Now that the State of Bombay is going to be bifurcated, the only bilingual State in the country that remains is the State of Punjab. I do not know how far I would be right in speaking about it since I do not represent it in this House but I do represent an area which is closely allied to it and I know that in Punjab also there is a great sentiment, there is a great feeling about the Punjabi and Hindi areas. In 1956, when this question was debated in the other House and in this House, the question of the Punjabi Suba was there. Now, I am sorry that in many of our minds there is the mistaken notion or the notion has been deliberately implanted that the idea of the Punjabi-Suba flows from communalism. Punjabi is one of the recognised languages under the Constitution. Punjabi is a spoken language, it is a written language and it is a language which is spoken by at least 100 lakhs of people. I do not therefore see why, when we speak about any Punjabi-speaking State, the idea of a certain community springs in our minds. It is spoken by both the communities. The only question is, are the people of Punjab, which today comprises both Hindi-speaking and Punjabi-speaking regions, of the view that the Punjab State as such should be bifurcated on

the linguistic principle? When we have accepted, after long deliberation, the idea of unilingual States in India, why do we want to deprive the Punjabis of their right if they, by common consent, want to have a Punjabi-speaking State? Here again let there be no false prestige. Let there be no stand on issues which are beside the point. Of course, it is another matter—as I said in the other House and in another context—if the Punjabi-speaking Hindus and the Sikhs of Punjab themselves are not able to evolve a basis about the new Punjabi-speaking State. But if the communities are in broad agreement and they are Punjabi-speaking and they have a State or homeland which they can rightly claim as their own, rich in their own language, culture and tradition and which is also self-sufficient so far as finances go, with well-defined boundaries, where is the reason left for us to deny it to them? I do not see much sense in withholding thought from this problem and with this problem is connected the problem of the territory from which I come.

Sir, I was bold enough to state in this House last time also on the President's Address that the Union Territories to-day are the forgotten parts of India. I do not include Delhi in them because Delhi is the heart of India and everyone knows the difficulties and the good things of Delhi, but speaking about the others, whether it is Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura or the Andamans, they are neglected areas, because in the new concept of things, they are denied the right of self-government. Of course, it is quite right that when we have accepted the States Reorganization Commission's Report, we have, by principle, divided this country into units, into two classes, one of full-fledged States and one of Union Territories. It is also true that being Union Territories, it could not be a full-fledged State and *vice versa*. But the question remains that in their own Governments, these Territories were to find increasing, what I might

call, appreciation of the democratic principles by their greater representation in Parliament. It is true that we have more nominees in Parliament than the other areas according to our population, but it is also true that Parliament, being preoccupied with other things, more serious and more complicated in nature, finds very little time to devote to the affairs of the Union Territories. Therefore, what happens is, we are left aside. The people hope that by sending representatives to Parliament, their interests will be well looked after by the supreme body. But when we actually come here to Parliament, we see that Parliament is so preoccupied, even preoccupied for legislative measures. Barring the Delhi and Manipur and Tripura Land Reforms Bills which are before this august House now, I think if we see the legislative part of Parliament during the last ten years or even the last three or four years, we can hardly find any legislative measure pertaining to these areas. Today, in Himachal Pradesh there are Acts passed by the defunct Himachal Pradesh Assembly which are on the Statute Book since 1956, some of them quite obsolete. But time has not been found here to bring measures relating to them before this august House, because the Home Ministry with its multifarious duties has not been able to find enough time to devote to these matters. Therefore, my request once again to the House and to the Government is that something should be done to change the pattern of administration in these areas. As I said last time, I cannot advocate Statehood for them since their resources are very meagre. As far as the Union Territory of Himachal Pradesh is concerned, there is a legitimate desire, a legitimate and overwhelming desire on the part of the people that the adjoining hilly areas in Punjab and Uttar Pradesh, by the consent of the people living in those areas, may be united to Himachal Pradesh to make it a sizeable area and to confer Statehood on it. That, of course, is something which I would not like to touch on today. But I would like to say

[Shri Anand Chand.]

this with all seriousness that the Territorial Councils that we have adopted is a new experiment that we began in 1957. They deal with education. They deal with other matters also, with health and with matters like small village roads, veterinary matters and so on, not very much. Then we have the Advisory Council consisting of Members of Parliament here, to advise the Home Ministry, and they meet once in two or three months. But they do not fill the gap, they cannot fill the void and some method for these Union Territories has to be devised by which the people living in these areas may find satisfaction of their aspirations, so that they may feel the glow of freedom which other people living in other parts of India, in the States, feel. I hope and trust that the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Government of India will give this matter their deepest and most earnest consideration and devise a method by which people coming from the Union Territories may also find the same glow and happiness that comes from governing their own affairs.

That is all I have to say, Sir

श्रीमती सीता युद्धवीर (आंध्र प्रदेश):
सभापति महोदय, श्रीमन्, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण का हार्दिक स्वागत और अनुमोदन करती हूँ। यह बहुत ही खुशी की बात है कि गत वर्ष हमारे लिए बहुत ही महत्व का वर्ष रहा और हमने हर क्षेत्र में तरक्की की। जब हम द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के चौथे वर्ष को देखते हैं तो हमें यह महसूस होता है कि हमने जिस दिशा में कदम रखा उस दिशा में सफलता प्राप्त हुई। अब तो योजना का आकार ४५ सौ करोड़ रुपये तक कर दिया गया है, इस बात की भी हमें खुशी होती है। सब से महत्वपूर्ण काम सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में तीन फौलाद के कारखानों का बनना है।

हमारी सरकार का यह प्रयत्न हो रहा है कि न केवल शहरों में बल्कि देहातों में भी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना द्वारा जागृति पैदा की जाय। मगर श्रीमन्, हमें इस बात को नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि हमारे सामने दो महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे हैं जिनका हल हम अभी तक नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। एक तो अन्न की समस्या है और दूसरी बेरोजगारी की समस्या है। जहाँ तक बेरोजगारी का संबंध है—मैं मानती हूँ कि भारत की बढ़ती हुई जनता के कारण यह समस्या हमारे लिए गंभीर हो रही है। जहाँ तक अन्न की समस्या का कारण है, उसके लिए भी हमें कुछ बातों पर ध्यान रखना चाहिये। अगर अन्न महंगा होता गया तो देश की आर्थिक अवस्था पर उसकी बहुत ही बुरी प्रतिक्रिया होगी। अन्न महंगा होने के कारण मजदूर ज्यादा वेतन मांगते हैं और इस तरह से मिलों द्वारा जो माल तैयार होता है वह भी महंगा होता जा रहा है। मिलों द्वारा जो माल तैयार होता है अगर उसके दाम बढ़ जाते हैं तो उसका असर हमारे एक्सपोर्ट पर पड़ता है और जब एक्सपोर्ट कम होगा तो उसका असर हमारे फारेन एक्सचेंज पर पड़ेगा और उसमें कमी आ जायेगी। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि हम बाहर से जो कच्चा माल और मशीनरी मंगाते हैं उसमें कमी आ जायेगी और इसका असर हमारी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना पर पड़ेगा। इसलिए आर्थिक अवस्था को ठीक करने के लिए हमें सबसे पहले अन्न की महंगाई को दूर करना चाहिये। यह सच है कि भारत ने थोड़े ही अर्थों में काफी प्रगति कर ली है लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ हमें कई समस्याओं का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। यह बात ध्यान में रखनी चाहिये कि जब हमारे पेट में आग लगी हो—जब अन्न की महंगाई की वजह से हम उसका सामना अच्छी तरह से न कर पा रहे हों तो ऐसी हालत में किस तरह से हमारा और जनता का दिमाग इन योजनाओं को पूरा करने में लग सकता है। इसलिए आज हमें यह देखना है कि अन्न की महंगाई

के क्या कारण है? हमें यह देखना होगा कि हमारे देश में जो डैम और तालाब बने हैं या बन रहे हैं उनमें सिंचाई अच्छी तरह से और और वक्त पर हो रही है या नहीं। रसायनिक खाद का प्रयोग अच्छी तरह से और वक्त पर हो रहा है या नहीं। अगर इन चीजों का प्रयोग अच्छी तरह से नहीं होगा तो हमें काफी अनुत्पन्न उठाना पड़ेगा।

श्रीमन्, जहां तक मैं समझती हूं खेतीबाड़ी और सिंचाई का काम राज्य सरकारों के तहत रखा जाना चाहिये था। अब राज्य सरकारें यह महसूस करती जा रही हैं कि अन्न की समस्या और अन्न विभाग पर केन्द्रीय सरकार को इतना हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिये जितना वह कर रही है क्योंकि यह मवाल राज्य सरकारों की हद में आता है। तो मेरा यह सुझाव है कि इस समस्या को हल करने के लिए प्रत्येक राज्य सरकार को स्वतंत्र कर देना चाहिये जिसमें वहां की जनता को काम करने में प्रोत्साहन मिल सके।

श्रीमन्, कुछ समय पहले एक हिदायत दी गयी थी कि प्रत्येक राज्य सरकार के मुख्य मंत्री खेतीबाड़ी के विभाग को स्वयं सम्भालें। तो इस संबंध में मैं यह पूछना चाहती हूं कि इस हिदायत के अनुसार कितने प्रदेशों में मुख्य मंत्रियों ने इस कार्य को अपने हाथ में ले लिया है? अगर हर प्रदेश का मुख्य मंत्री इस विभाग को अपने हाथ में ले ले तो वहां की जनता को यह काम करने में काफी प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा। केन्द्रीय सरकार का काम केवल यह होना चाहिये कि बाहर से जो अन्न आता है उसको राज्य सरकारों की हिदायत के अनुसार वहां पर भेज दे।

श्रीमन्, गत वर्ष जब मैंने इस समस्या को हल करने के लिए इसी तरह की मांग रखी

थी तो उस समय आध्र में गेहूं का भाव ३५ रुपया मन था। आज हालांकि हम महसूस कर रहे हैं कि अन्न के क्षेत्र में हमारे यहां काफी तरक्की हुई है लेकिन फिर भी न जाने क्यों आज हमें ४० रुपया मन गेहूं खरीदना पड़ता है। इस विभाग में मेरा कुछ इंटरेस्ट होने के कारण और कई बार स्वयं राशन खरीदने की वजह से मुझे यह बात मालूम होती है कि जब भी मैं खरीदने जाती हूं तो हर मर्तबा मेरे में दो पैसा या एक आना ज्यादा देना पड़ता है और इस तरह की बात मुझे अन्य लोगों से भी सुनाई देती है। जब मैं यह महसूस करती हूं कि मंहगाई की वजह से मध्य वर्ग को बड़ी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा है तो उस गरीब जनता का क्या हाल होगा जिनके कई बाल बच्चों हैं और वे किस तरह से अपना पालन पोषण करते होंगे। तो श्रीमन्, अगर राज्य सरकारों को इस मामले में स्वतंत्रता दे दी जाय तो बहुत बेहतर होगा। हमने द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में अन्न की समस्या को मुख्य स्थान दिया है। इसलिए हमें यह सोचना होगा कि किस तरह से यह समस्या आसानी के साथ हल हो सकती है। अगर हमारी अन्न की समस्या हल हो जाती है तो और समस्या भी आसानी से हल हो जायेगी।

श्रीमन्, जहां तक योजना का संबंध है, हमने एक बड़ी योजना बनाई है—जनता के लिए बनाई है और हम उसको पूर्ण करने का हर तरह से प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। जनता भी यह समझती है कि सरकार ने यह योजना हमारी भलाई के लिए बनाई है और इसे पूरा करना हमारा काम है। अगर हमें जनता का सहयोग लेना है तो हमें जनता पर कोई कार्य नहीं ठूसना चाहिये बल्कि उनका सहयोग प्राप्त करके काम करना चाहिये। मैं यह

[श्रीमती सीता युद्धवीर]

मानती हूँ कि हमारी ग्रामीण जनता अनपढ़ है और बड़े बड़े कामों को पूरा करने के लिए हम उसका सहयोग नहीं ले सकते हैं। लेकिन ग्रामीण स्तर तक जितना हम उनका सहयोग इस योजना को पूरा करने में ले सकते हैं उतना हमें लेना चाहिये। जैसे गांवों में कुएं बनाने के काम हैं, घरेलू उद्योग धंधे हैं, खेती बाड़ी का काम है, इस तरह के कार्यों में हम जनता का आसानी के साथ सहयोग प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। योजना को राष्ट्रीय योजना नहीं बनाना चाहिये। योजना को प्रजातन्त्रात्मक योजना बनाने में हमारी योजना आसानी से सफल हो सकती है।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.]

श्रीमन्, मैं इस बात के लिए हार्दिक बधाई देती हूँ कि हालांकि हमारे सामने समस्याएँ हैं और उनको हल करने में हमें काफी कष्ट होता है, मगर फिर भी दूसरे क्षेत्रों में हमने काफी सफलता पाई है जैसे कि पिछले दिनों में यहां हिन्दुस्तान में बाहर से श्री आइजनहावर, श्री बोरोशिलोव और आज श्री खुश्चेव पधारे हैं। आज जब कि मानव जाति शांति के लिए प्रयास कर रही है, इन नेताओं का यहाँ पर आना इतिहास में एक महत्वपूर्ण घटना है। इस तरह से हमने केवल यहाँ पर ही ख्याति नहीं पाई है बल्कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में भी हमें एक सुदृढ़ आधार मिला है और इसके लिए मैं पंडित जी और अपनी सरकार को हार्दिक बधाई देती हूँ।

श्रीमन्, हम सारा इतिहास देखते हैं तो आज हम यह महसूस करते हैं कि आज के दिन हमारी जनता में जो एक उद्देश्य की

एकता आई है वह हमने पहले कभी नहीं देखी। राष्ट्र की स्थिरता के लिए जो संगठन है वही इसका मुख्य कारण है और उसके कारण ही हम आर्थिक विकास कर रहे हैं। मुझे खुशी हो रही है यह कहते हुये कि आंध्र में और राजस्थान में पंचायत समितियाँ और जिला परिषदों द्वारा वहाँ का जो प्रशासन है उसको बांट दिया गया है। वहाँ की देहाती जनता खुद समझती है कि अपने कल्याण के लिए उसको किस तरह से जिम्मेदारी उठानी है और काम करना है। मैं चाहती हूँ कि इसी तरह से जिला परिषद् और पंचायत समितियों का काम दूसरे प्रदेशों में भी शुरू हो, उसके पीछे जो भावना है उसका अच्छी तरह से प्रचार किया जाय, और एकता, प्रगति और स्थिरता, ये तीन शब्द सब के कानों में गूँजे, जिससे हमने जो कदम उठाया है उसमें हमें सफलता मिले।

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks moved by our senior colleague, Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor. It has been customary to move such a Motion and equally customary for the Opposition to be critical of such a Motion of Thanks. I believe that the President's Address had been set forth in dignified terms and though spoken in a low and modest tone, it has been fairly objective so far as the summary of the activities of the past year is concerned, and I should think that the tasks that lie ahead of us in the next year have also been put in their proper perspective. President's Address has to be couched in very dignified terms; it cannot be a colourful speech by the very nature of it and it cannot be aggressive in tone either. I believe, on the whole, the Address, despite its modest and soft terms, also reveals a very firm determination on the part of the Government to move forward to carry on with the objectives that we have set for ourselves.

First of all, I am personally very much pleased with the graceful reference—and the Opposition Members have also been pleased with it—made to the assassination of the Prime Minister of Ceylon and also with the very nice words, understanding in meaning and significance, that have been uttered by the President in respect of Pakistan, both our very close and intimate neighbours. The phrases used in connection with the welcoming of the Presidents of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would also commend themselves to everybody. In that connection, the President has set forth in very clear and very definite terms the peaceful objective of our Government and our people. He has described the august visitor who has graced this city today as a “messenger of peace” and there is hardly any soul in India that would not respond to that beautiful phrase that has been used in respect of Mr. Khrushchev.

I should be failing in my duty if I did not refer to some of the criticisms that have been levelled by the Opposition in respect of the total attitude of the Address, also in respect of certain other matters of detail. First of all, I must make a reference, though I had no intention to, to the President's Address and its reference to the unfortunate dispute between my country and our great neighbour, China. In his Address, the President has referred to the deep regret that we have all felt here in respect of this incident and the strongest phrase that the President seems to have used in this connection is that of “breach of faith”, a phrase to which has been taken a very strong exception by the Leader of the Communist Group in this House. I believe, this phrase “breach of faith” is a very modest statement of a fact that cannot be concealed by any jugglery of words. China happens to be a signatory to the Bandung Pact and bound by a treaty with India, well-known to everyone. But she

chose to throw everything to the winds, everything that the Pact and the treaty stood for. China must have had knowledge of the deep feelings of esteem and regard that we have for China, for the Government of China and the people of China. Knowing all these to intrude into our territory and to occupy it for hundreds of square miles without giving us any warning, any opportunity of even having the slightest knowledge of it, is something which, if it has been termed as a “breach of faith” is only a very mild statement of a very plain fact. My friend, the Leader of the Communist group, advises the President and the Government of India, as also the Members of this House, to talk moderately. This is a very noble advice indeed; personally I do believe in a language of moderation but coming as it did from the Leader of the Communist Group in the House, I felt a little taken aback. In fact, so far as I know, the language of the communist parties all the world over has been something which we cannot say has been the language of moderation. As you know perhaps, there is a Communist vocabulary which is distinct from any other vocabulary known; its aggressive tone, its choice of words, its phraseology is different, different from everything that we can choose to call moderate. I would only say that if the attitude of moderation that Mr. Gupta speaks of was maintained and followed in this House or anywhere else outside by those who belong and subscribe to the faith of the Communist Party of India, this country and the world would have been a slightly better place.

My friend, Mr. Anand Chand, has drawn our attention to one aspect of the question. He referred to the case of the Sino-Burmese dispute and how it was brought to an end. I have a little knowledge of the Sino-Burmese frontier and more than once I had been in that area. About 65 or 70 square miles comprising three villages were all that were in dispute and the problem of China and Burma or the

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]
 problem of China and Indonesia, to my mind, cannot be looked at from the same point of view as the problem we have between India and China. The objective situation is different; the facts of the case are different. I would like further to point out to my esteemed friend, Mr. Anand Chand, that in the whole communique, in the whole terms of the agreement the phrase 'MacMahon Line' has not been used even once.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: It is not the absence of reference; it is certain villages which were well within that line—I do not now quite remember the names—that has now distinctly been agreed upon would go to China.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: If they have not mentioned the MacMahon Line, it may be argued that tacitly China had accepted the MacMahon Line. But that is a question of detail. All that I wanted to say is that the nature of the facts, the facts themselves, and the character of the situation in Burma and in India have been altogether different. There has been no encroachment by China nor any armed intrusion by China into Burma. All that had happened in the three villages—I have seen these areas for myself—was that a good number of Chinese had settled down on this side of the Burmese frontier in those villages and since they had Chinese nationality despite Burma's asking them to accept Burmese nationality the problem grew up. Turning to another point, we have been reading in the newspapers that the Chinese have produced maps and the Chinese Government have based some of their arguments on the facts that are taken from the Encyclopaedia Britannica and other well-known reference books. As a student of history I do believe—and the External Affairs Ministry must be in the know of this—that there is need for a great deal more researches into the matter. I

am certain that maps would be available, maps that would tell us that the Government of China had tacitly accepted our traditional boundary whether it is described as the MacMahon Line or not. There are other facts also and those facts have to be carefully gone into. A little more research into facts of history and geography in the course of the last 100 years would give us more light, and more strength to the case that India is trying to build up. The President's Address lays down that we have complete faith in the method of negotiations, in peaceful methods; certainly we have, but hurt as we are to the very core of our emotions and sentiments, if the President has said "breach of faith", I think he has put it in the very mildest of terms.

Sir, I also commend the Address for the decision arrived at in respect of the bilingual State of Bombay. Much has been said on this subject, that the ruling party and the Government of India made a mistake. Bilingual or trilingual States—maybe in the context of Indian history and Indian social conditions of today—perhaps are not a practical proposition, but it is an ideal, and a valid ideal. I do personally believe in bilingual and trilingual States and despite many words of criticism said at that time I personally threw my lot with the proposal for the amalgamation of Bengal and Bihar because basically I believe that, if we are to cut across the fissiparous tendencies that have always marred the history of India, it is the only solution. One day—maybe that this great day is not yet—we shall come to a position when we shall have to find that solution if we are really to fight the fissiparous tendencies. Basically we have to admit that we have not been able to rise above tribal and linguistic considerations, rise unto the level of national consideration above tribal, racial or group considerations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): So, as I understand, the hon. Member's contention is this, that by

dividing now the bilingual Bombay the Government is committing a mistake.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: I do not agree with my friend. The Government is only taking into consideration the facts that exist today. As I said, in the context of social and historical conditions of today, it is the courage of the ruling party, it is the courage of the Government of India, that they are prepared to abide by the verdict of the people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which one is the mistake? The earlier one or this one?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions please.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: I believe I need not point out to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that what is considered to be a mistake today may not be a mistake tomorrow. He knows better the history of Communism than I do and if he is to go by the very basic tenets of Marxism, he has to agree, I believe, that what is considered a mistake in the social context of today may not be a mistake in the social context of tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are concerned with today.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: If we are concerned with today, then we must admit that we have to act in the context of today, but let us not say that the ruling party or the Government of India made a mistake. They only carried out an experiment, an experiment on behalf of a noble ideal and if that experiment failed, you cannot say that there was something wrong in the ideal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Like the American rockets.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Now I would make only one other point. What has grieved me somewhat as an educationist is that there is only a very brief reference to education in

four or five lines. I believe that so far as the Third Plan is concerned—and that should have had some reference in the President's Address, to my mind—for the first time in India we are going to make some investment in human material. For the first time in India we are going to make an experiment of free and compulsory universal education. That is the biggest step, the most important step, that we are going to take in the social and economic reconstruction of this country, the first investment is going to be made in human material. I have also felt that this Address weighs too much on the side of material reorganisation of the country.

1 P.M.

I would have liked to read in the Address and I would have appreciated it if there was some underlining of the fact that not only we are keen on organising ourselves materially, but that steps are also being taken to organise ourselves in other ways than purely material. And one of these ways is certainly education, education and more education. Blame has been laid at the door of the students themselves and the teachers and perhaps the educational administrative authorities also. The students, the teachers and the educational authorities do not exist in a vacuum. They are part and parcel of the society and if there is wide-spread indiscipline, they are certainly very disturbing symptoms in the educational world of today. We must be able to find out the reasons not only there, but also elsewhere, in the general community. Compromises with ideals and aspirations not only on the political field but also in other fields we are making every day, and students and teachers of today understand these compromises much better than we used to do in our student days. They are much more sensitive today, I should say a little cleverer, than when we were at school or college. It is on this plane I feel that a little reference should have been made to education, the problems that confront us and how we propose to deal with them. Certain attempts are

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]

being made and very important attempts are being made outside of the House and outside of perhaps the Ministries. A little reference to these attempts would have given the Address some more moral and spiritual import than purely material. I have been very much touched by the confident tone of the Address. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said that the President has only given a rosy picture and has not referred to the pitfalls, the failures that we have made, the dangers that lurk. Why mention in the President's Address the dangers and the failures we have gone through? Who does not know that we have failed in very many things? But why mention in the President's Address our failures? Speak of courage, speak of determination. We are fully conscious of the dangers. We have faced them. We have been facing them for the last ten years. We have faced them and we are prepared to face them even ahead. Therefore, it is with courage and determination that we must go forward and never speak of failures. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): We rise for lunch. We meet at 2.30.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Bombay): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is exactly one year to the day since I rose to speak on the President's Address last year. I had voiced my feelings of dissatisfaction, particularly the feelings of dissatisfaction of the area from which I come. I am very glad to see that the situation has now changed and that Government have made up their mind to rectify the injustice that was perpetrated on the

State of Bombay. I need not go into that further, but I do feel a sense of gratification that the task for which the representatives of Gujarat in the Bombay Legislature have sent me here has been accomplished.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): Along with the Maharashtra representatives.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: With their co-operation if you like. I am quite willing to say so. I do not say that in any spirit of bravado or boastfulness. I only recognize the fact, and in recognizing it in great humility I have to say that the task before us is still greater. I am sorry I miss references to that in the President's Address. I will come to that a little later.

Sir, what is in the mind of everybody in this country has been very rightly touched upon by the President himself first in his Address, and that is the incursions on our border by a neighbouring, avowedly friendly, State. After all people are judged by their actions much more than by their statements or their boasts. I think it was before we dispersed in the last session that I drew the attention of our Prime Minister to this, and whether our policy is failing or succeeding will also be judged from that standard, the standard of what is happening and in the light of what we achieve. In theory, Sir, non-alignment is good, *Panchsheel* is good, but what the practical result is and how it affects our country is a matter which the people of this country would be concerned with much more. Sir, there is a feeling growing in the country that we have not been taken into full confidence in regard to what has been happening on our borders with China for years. This is not a new thing, and what has been happening since we last debated the question, one does not know. Are we in a stalemate or, while we are keeping quiet, are any further inroads being made into our territory? The territory is very difficult to approach, access is

difficult, staying there is difficult particularly in this weather; that is granted. But what is happening there, and how is it that our neighbour who avowed friendship with us all these years has been steadily making inroads and trying to colonise in that area? That is a matter which is agitating the whole country very much. While the whole country is behind the Prime Minister in his approach to that question when he says that we will not yield an inch of Indian territory, the country would like to know what we are doing practically in that matter. Are we prepared to face the worst? I remember those days—of course we were then under alien rule—when the presence of a Japanese submarine in the Arabian Sea in the vicinity of Bombay was reported, Bombay became a deserted city. I happened to stay in what is called the newly built Marine Drive area, a place where a lot of people come for a walk in the evening. Not a lady was seen there. All the houses or most of them were locked. There were a few men looking after them. Sir, I should like to know whether we are in the same condition now in this country. Have we developed the courage of our youth so that they will stand up and face the situation and not run away from it? Sir, it is easy to say 'yes'. I wish I could say it with the same emphasis as the friends opposite I would be very glad to say it, but saying it does not make it practical. And what I would like to see is practical result.

Sir, there is a very weak link in our defence policy. Everybody knows and it has been repeated very often, whatever the Prime Minister's personal views in the matter may be, that there are grave doubts whether the Defence Minister is the right person to hold that post just now. This has been repeated inside here, outside and everywhere, and I suggest most humbly that it is time that the Prime Minister thought about it and revised his policy in the matter.

Sir, in the brief time at my disposal I would like to mention one thing, and I had said so last time also, that the development of Gujarat has been sorely neglected during the last ten years since independence. That is why Gujarat wanted separation. I mentioned the example of Kakrapara project. Nowhere in this whole country has there been any river valley project for which farmers in the rural areas have been asked to contribute a loan of a specific amount before the project would be taken in hand. Workers went round the whole of the Surat district and collected a substantial portion of that loan before the Kakrapara project was taken in hand. Sir, it is now ten years. Mr. Nanda had promised irrigation and power in five years. It is now ten years, and I would be happy to know if about 60,000 or 80,000 acres of land would receive water this year, though the promised target is very much more. And what about power? Gujarat is starved for power.

Another scheme started very early was the Mahi River Scheme which would give irrigation and power to Gujarat. Work was started in a great hurry. The main canal has been dug. When it was pointed out that the Government had made an error and that the gradient was too steep, promptly cement lining was made with an extra expenditure of Rs. 3 crores. But what is the result? How many acres were irrigated? How much of electric power has been given to Gujarat? Nothing, Sir. Rupees twenty crores have been spent or a little more. No benefit has come to Gujarat. As you all know, Gujarat is business-minded and it is an industrial place. For industry the most essential thing is power, and we are starved for power.

The next subject I would come to is oil in Gujarat. I had referred to that on a previous occasion in this House. Sir, we feel that the resources of oil and natural gas in Gujarat are not being exploited sufficiently and revised his policy in the matter.

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

ment of Gujarat. I do not know why. The Russian experts have said publicly more than once that they are satisfied that there is sufficient oil in the Cambay region. Only drilling is going on at such a slow pace—I do not know—that it is not proving useful. Somebody, a private individual, brought forward a proposal for establishing a refinery. The man spent a lot of time and money in satisfying the Government that he had the know-how, that he had the resources; that he did not want anything from the Government, but that he wanted only their permission to establish a refinery in Gujarat. Perhaps, he had his own information or faith that oil would be coming out of Gujarat. But he did not depend upon that. He said that he would import crude oil and refine it, so that other industries along with the refining industry might be established. But permission was refused after the man had been hanging on to Delhi going up and down from one Ministry to another for three years. This is how progress is stopped, and I dare say that this is not stopping the progress of Gujarat alone, but stopping the progress of the whole country. It is necessary to pursue our policy with regard to oil and natural gas exploitation as fast as we are pursuing our policy in the matter of steel.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But as soon as they take it in their hands, it slips out.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We spend a lot of money on the import of oil. It would save us so much foreign exchange and it would help our industries. We have to bring a lot of coal to Ahmedabad to run the mills and also for electric supply, all the way from Bengal. What a tremendous amount we spend in hauling this freight! The solution for that area lies in developing another source of power, and that is oil.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You have discovered lignite.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruption please.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is not an interruption; it is an addition.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Well, that may be something additional, but I am speaking today mainly on the question of the neglect of these two things—neglect of the completion of Gujarat's river valley projects and neglect of the development of the oil and natural gas resources of Gujarat.

The next thing that will come up is the development of the ports of Gujarat. I heard recently a broadcast by a prominent industrialist from Ahmedabad saying something—whether a certain port is suitable or not. I do not know whether it was inspired or he did it on his own. But I hope—I wish rather—that the instrument of the All India Radio is not used for just boosting the Government's policies and pushing schemes that Government likes or does not like. Government should take a firm view of these matters. Surely, they should take the view of experts. There are a number of ports in Gujarat that can be developed. It is unfortunate that the Kandla Port has not been developed as fully as it was originally planned to be developed. We have no broad-gauge link with Delhi. Kandla has no broad-gauge link with Ahmedabad. I now understand that they are taking up in hand the work of linking Ahmedabad with Kandla soon. But what is going to happen to the link with Delhi and Northern India?

Sir, these are the points on which I would have liked some reference, particularly with regard to the rapid development of this neglected area, to have been made in the Address.

I would like to say a few words on agriculture also. I do feel that there is scope for co-operative farming under the present-day conditions in

this country, but it is necessary to be clear as to what we exactly mean by co-operative farming, and what its relative merits over family farming are, which has been the picture of things in this country for so many years. My general feeling is that while co-operative farming has a role to play in agriculture in this country, the present method of farming by the family as the unit of cultivation has proved its efficiency and capacity, and has risen to the occasion every time when there has been a shortage in this country. If one looks at the figures of agricultural production including food production, during the last few years, it will appear that the performance of our farmers has been quite satisfactory, nay praiseworthy, even though it may not have been matched by the requirements of the country. Almost all the targets set in the First Five Year Plan were reached. The Indian farmer has over the last decade responded fully to the demand for making the country self-sufficient in food, and in most commodities like cotton and jute the production has gone up. The production of raw cotton has gone up from 21·88 lakh bales in 1947 to 48 lakhs in 1958. I will not quote the other figures, but similarly there are other figures. I would, therefore, urge upon the Government not to try to push means which have not been tried or which have not worked successfully, supplanting that which has stood the test of time and which has worked very successfully in this country.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is right that our President began his Address with a reference to the menace on our northern frontier, which has been a worry all over the country. It was assuring to hear from him that measures, diplomatic and defensive, were going to be adopted for containing this menace. It was heartening to be told that defence production was being stepped up, that the National Cadet Corps and the Territorial forces were going to be expanded and that there was going to be a bigger allocation

in the Budget for defence purposes. But these are not enough to allay the anxiety of the country; much more is needed. In the first place, our whole frontier has got to be surveyed and mapped in every detail. A few months back there was a fling in the foreign Press that nobody knew exactly where our frontier lay. There is some substance in this, because we ourselves have created this impression by our tacit acquiescence in the occupation of thousands of square miles of our territory by China. We have been responsible for creating this feeling that the exact location of the frontier is not known. What has got to be done is to draw the exact line, to spot every ridge and watershed mentioned in our State papers, and this being done, we have to connect the hinterland with the frontiers by means of a network of roads. This is highly expensive no doubt. We have to fight against the terrain, against geography. The terrain is in favour of the Chinese, it is opposed to us. The Prime Minister had rightly reminded us that this border which had been dead had lately become a live border and that it was destined to remain so, not for some years, but for hundreds of years. So we have to fight against geography, against nature, at whatever cost, and make a long-term plan for connecting the entire border with the hinterland of the country by a network of roads, and also by constructing air-fields at the appropriate places. The borders of Ladakh area are more than a hundred miles away from Leh, and I do not know whether any road connections have been made between Leh and the set borders.

Sir, after this has been done, the next step is to raise the morale of our people. How? I should suggest that we take courage in both hands, trust the people and the hillmen in the borders, give them training in arms and equip them with arms at the shortest possible notice. Sir, it is not possible to pile up armaments *ad infinitum*; it is not possible to run an armaments race with powerful coun-

[Dr. A. N. Bose.]

tries like our northern neighbour; there is a limit to armament and we have to make up this deficiency by raising the morale of the people, by training our people, I mean universal military training for every adult person, particularly in the frontier regions, and preparing them for the defence of the country. Sir, I am not going to create a scare. My purpose is not to create a psychosis of war; far from it; but the people have to be aroused to a sense of urgency.

It is unfortunate, Sir, that the House was not taken into confidence when the areas on our border were occupied by the Chinese. Many things are still done which are not brought before this House, very often on grounds of security. I do not know how far this plea is a valid plea, but it happens very often that things which are not given to us, things with which this House is not trusted, nevertheless go beyond the Himalayas to the other side. Sometimes, the Press is ahead of us. The Press has more information than the Parliament. A few weeks ago our Defence Minister went on an inspection of the defence arrangements on our frontiers. It was very good; it was also very good that this news along with the places he visited went into the Press along with the photographs of our Defence Minister taken in a very dramatic pose. I welcome the news and I welcome the publicity, because the people should know that our Defence Minister is up to the job, that he has taken our defence very seriously—the people should know that; nonetheless, Parliament also should know that; Parliament also should know the places he visited and the security measures—I do not mean every detail thereof—but in broad outline the measures which are being adopted, at least before they are published in the Press; let Parliament be taken into confidence at least to the same extent as the Press.

Sir, the President has also referred to diplomatic measures that are being

adopted to curb the aggression from the north. Obviously he means the steps being adopted to bring the pressure of world opinion on the Chinese, these steps being adopted to isolate China and show her up in regard to her aggression on our north. That is quite good, and it is good to know that India has earned quite a large measure of public support from abroad. But, Sir, I cannot reconcile this line with India's advocacy for the admission of China in the United Nations. I am afraid, Sir, we have not realised the full implications of this advocacy. As soon as China becomes a member of the United Nations, she will claim the permanent seat in the Security Council—that is according to the Charter—and India will have no reasonable grounds to oppose this claim, because Formosa is not China; People's China is the real China. According to the Charter, if People's China becomes a member of the U.N.O., she has a rightful claim to the permanent seat in the Security Council. As soon as she gets that seat, she is in a vantage point. She has the right to veto; she will have the right to block any resolution or any enforcement action that may be proposed to be adopted, that may be prejudicial to the interests or policies of China. Of course, there is the way to get the thing discussed and passed in the General Assembly; there is the provision that when the Security Council is stultified by the exercise of veto, the General Assembly may meet on its own initiative and may adopt certain measures including enforcement measures. But, Sir, it is a long-drawn process. On the other hand, if China is kept out of the United Nations, that does not rule out any enforcement action against her, should such a situation arise. Action was taken by the United Nations against North Korea when she committed aggression on South Korea, although she was not a member of the United Nations. Of course, China is not North Korea, action against China does not mean the same thing as action against North Korea, but then these difficulties are not obviated, on the other hand rather

much more aggravated if China is brought within the United Nations and given a permanent seat in the Security Council.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Two minutes more, Dr. Bose.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Sir, whatever time I take may be deducted from our quota.

I appreciate, Sir, that much good work has been done towards enlisting moral support of the European countries in favour of India, but I am sorry to point out, Sir, that we have badly neglected our neighbours. While our relations with Pakistan have been improving, we have not yet approached Indonesia, who has her quarrels with China, and we could not keep Burma on our side, who made up her differences with China without any reference to India. Nepal is sitting on the fence for obvious reasons; she is afraid of casting her lot with her southern neighbour. We have very badly lowered our stocks by allowing 4,000 square miles of our territory to be occupied while we were sleeping. It is obvious, Sir, why these small neighbours should not dare to identify their fate with India. I submit, Sir, that even now there is time to repair the past mistake, to adopt a bold policy and to infuse some confidence in our neighbours and to build up a common policy, defensive and diplomatic, comprising all the countries of South Asia.

Sir, I shall now make some brief reference to the internal situation. The President's Address gives us a very bright picture. We 3 P.M. are told that after the Third Five Year Plan, the national income will be doubled, the *per capita* income will rise much higher, etc., but we are not told how far this prosperity will be brought to the common man, how far the increased national income will be brought to the lower income levels. Have we made any survey as to what extent the rising income is going to these lower levels?

How far the poorer people have improved their conditions not merely by increasing their monetary earnings but also by getting more goods and commodities? How far the rise in the national income has been reflected in making more goods and services available to the poorer man? That is the criterion. If income has been rising, prices also are rising. Rising prices are chasing rising incomes. The unemployment position is getting worse. The position of landlessness is where it was and all these are, according to the confession of the Planning Commission themselves. Among the four objectives of the Commission there was reduction of economic disparity. Have we made any advance on that line?

Then, about the talk of corruption. Much worse than the actual volume of corruption in the administration, is this talk, this wild talk. These talks about corruption are shattering the faith of the public in the administration, and that is much worse than the actual extent of corruption. Nobody can say, at least I cannot, the actual volume or the extent of corruption that is prevalent in the administration. So, I think, not to satisfy a grouse, not as a sop to the Opposition but to maintain its own reputation, in its own interest, to vindicate its own honour, the Government should accept the proposal for the setting up of a judicial tribunal to look into every case of corruption and malpractice.

Sir, I conclude with a few words about the Plan. Nobody denies that great achievements have been made. Plants have been set up for producing steel, cement, fertilizers, electricity, machine-tools, etc. Big irrigation projects have been completed. But for whom? These things could have been done by a contractor. Is this State a big contractor only entrusted with constructing certain plants? The State is expected to do much more. It has to evoke the enthusiasm of the people. Unless that is done, the whole planning structure is sure to come to grief some day. It is unfortunate that we have started build-

[Dr. A. N. Bose.]

ing up our socialism and democracy from the top and not from the bottom. Much has been said about Panchayat Raj but in practice it is but a fiction. Is Panchayat Raj a reality? Have Panchayats been given any power, responsibility and funds? We should take courage and start planning from the village at the initiative of the villagers themselves. Thus alone can we create these contents of democracy and socialism to which reference has been made in the President's Address but which have been sadly missing.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, much has been said and in the few minutes that are left to me I would like briefly to reply to one or two points raised by the other side and to say what I feel is important in the present context of this country.

Sir, we watched when Mr. Bhupesh Gupta spoke on the President's Address and we sought to find some change of mind in the Communist Party. For their recent experiences in Kerala, for the complete rout that they have had, if I may say so very humbly, the greatest contributory cause has been their attitude towards the Chinese border question. I had hoped that they would have learnt better after this experience but there are some who learn very slowly. Reference was made by Mr. Ganga Sharan to certain speeches of the Defence Minister. It is not for me to speak, to defend or explain that speech. That must come from higher quarters. But I should like only to say that the very strong reference that has been made in the President's speech to the Chinese question is itself a guarantee that that question is receiving a great deal of attention at the hands of the highest in the land. Now, times are different to-day from what they were about 50 years back. War or peace—it is now totalitarian. Time was when battles were fought by the armies in the front but to-day war means that not only the man in

the front but every worker in the fields, every craftsman in the factories, has to do his job and so, in war or in peace, the greatest forces of progress are in the tremendous good atmosphere that we should maintain for the progress of the country. I would like to refer to page 2 of the President's Address wherein he said:

"Defence, however, is effective only with national unity and strength. Our economic and industrial advance, the gearing of our production and our plans to greater endeavour and larger and speedier results, which will enable the country to make available to itself the means and the resources for modern defence and, at the same time, help the nation to become strong and disciplined, can alone render her secure."

Reference has been made in certain newspapers about the good offices which some of the countries may use in this matter. To my mind, all help is welcome wherever it may come from but the main guarantee of our peace will be the development of our strength. If we are strong, if the nation is absolutely sound, if we have within ourselves the strength to defend and the scientific and technological development that is needed to support it, it is only that and that alone which is a guarantee of our strength, of our peace and of our freedom. So, while we should leave aside these matters and negotiations to be decided by the Prime Minister and by those who have this responsibility in their hands, for us the main thing is not to give merely advice, because that advice has been often given and nothing new has been given to-day, but it is for everyone of us to put in our efforts to strengthen ourselves in every aspect of our national life. For that the greatest co-operation of all the people of this land, of all the parties, we want. It is up to us to examine what it is that constitutes a high national character and integrity, what it is that will inspire the people from top

to bottom if we are to be strong as a nation. I would like to mention these and would like to examine what it is that we should improve and what it is that we should supply to the national element which is very much needed to-day. The maintenance of a high national integrity and strength will involve high devotion to work, purity of administration, opportunity to everyone to contribute his best towards the progress of the nation, a socialistic pattern of society which will narrow down differences between man and man and create opportunities for men of merit to rise to positions. To my mind, if we provide for these aspects of our national life, then our country becomes tremendously strengthened. It is unfortunate that certain trends that we have seen in the near past have been very painful to us. A speaker before me referred to one aspect of the matter. In Uttar Pradesh alone three universities were closed because there were strikes. Some of them have opened, but after a very long-drawn struggle. Is it not up to us to examine the cause for all this? Is it not up to us to examine ourselves also and find out what made those strikes possible? Not only in U.P. but there have been similar strikes in the recent past in the South, for example the firing in Mysore just a few weeks back, in Rajasthan for example, in Annamalai University and so on. So it is not as if they are confined to any particular area though they may be very much in evidence in particular areas. It is up to us to examine what is the reason for these strikes. We say there is demoralisation among the students. We trace this demoralisation to teachers. Even the previous speaker said, and I think rightly said, that this is due to the lack of proper teachers in our universities and that is responsible for this lack of idealism, this lack of unity, lack of cohesion among the students. But what about the merchants and other classes? Sir, we know that the sales tax reports have shown that there is as much evasion of payment of sales tax as there is payment of it. Go anywhere

and go to any merchant. He asks you whether you want the thing with bill or without bill. If it is with bill there is one price and if it is without bill there is another price quoted. Why is it so? That also shows another aspect of our national life which requires a great deal of attention and improvement.

Now let me come to Government servants. Ask any Deputy Secretary who is in charge of affairs either here or anywhere else. What is counted is time spent and not the amount of work done. Everybody says the quality of work has deteriorated. Why?

AN HON. MEMBER: Frustration.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: He says "frustration". It is up to us to find ways and means to avoid this frustration. We need not wait till things come to a crisis.

AN HON. MEMBER: People have committed suicide.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Sir, recently there was a strike in the Air India International. Under the law or regulations, at least fifteen days' notice should have been given, but nothing was given. The strike happened and later on, when the strike was withdrawn, the Government very nicely and very graciously said that the strike days would be converted into leave, casual leave which is allowed. Sir, these are evidences to show that something is not well. They are people who receive payment of nearly Rs. 3,000 a month, about Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 3,000, very highly-paid staff. They are not like peons and other low-paid staff. They are very highly paid persons.

People speak about corruption. I do not believe that in the higher ranks of our services there is very much of corruption. The higher ranks of our services are good; they are still quite pure. But in the lower ranks,

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] due to a variety of causes, it is almost universal. If this is the condition in which we live, how are we to build up national solidarity which is the basis and foundation of our strength? To my mind, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we should do something more than merely speaking. We should do something more than merely passing laws. We must go into the vitals of this question.

To me the steps that we should take in this direction are few and not very difficult. India is a land of castes. Previously we had the Brahmana, Kashatriya, Vaisya, Sudra castes. But today we are abolishing these old castes and creating new ones. There are the Ministers, the Members of Parliament and so on. Yes, we are a separate caste, asking for separate privileges.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What caste an ex-Minister belongs to?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: The administrator comes first and as the lowest comes the man who produces. The reason for the national fall in this country was that the man who produced, the Sudra, was put lowest. Those who remained quiet, men with leisure and so on, they were on the top and the result was national degeneration. There was degeneration because work was not treated with dignity. Work was not respected. Even today the trader is the richest man. The producer, the agriculturist, is the poorest man, living from hand to mouth. I say if we really are to have a socialist pattern of society, these differences must be closed down. The average national income even today is about Rs. 200 or Rs. 300, but there are incomes of Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 5,000 also. That difference, that gap, must be closed.

Not only is there difference in these pays, but also in the way of life. In Russia the people live alike and that brings about some kind of a unity. Children going to schools have the same dress and that brings

about unity. There is solidarity in that, in that uniform. But here, Mr. Vice-Chairman, all these various new castes are there, each claiming its own privileges. Recently I heard of an incident in Bombay, in the Indian Airlines. Well, the term VIP is a very big word. In this country men honour a man for the post or job he holds, not the man himself. Recently we heard of an incident, a very bad incident which mars public life, which mars anybody's life. I say these privileged classes, all these privileges, must go and we must learn to live together. But everybody wants separate and easy and better treatment. Abolish all that and do away with different treatments. There must be closing up of the salaries and the creation of an atmosphere of integrity where the really honest man is respected as also the man who produces. One thing we must remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Read the history of any nation in the world, read the facts about any nation in the world, and you will find that wealth is not produced by administrators. Food is not produced by administrators. Cloth is not produced by administrators. Chemicals are not produced by administrators. Everything that is necessary for our national life is not produced by administrators. But here the administrator pushes everybody out. Unless we learn to respect the man who really produces, we cannot improve. Today no producer in the country would go to an office. He is not respected. Sir, I think we must create a pattern of society in which the producer is respected, in which the man of integrity is respected and for this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we must have the abolition of the privileges and the closing up of the ranks, of the differences between the low incomes and the huge incomes.

Sir, we have been talking very much about raising the standard of life. Yes, I want to raise the standard of life of our people. But what is it actually that is meant in this context? Does it mean having a radio,

going to the cinema every alternate day? In many families I hear they save on their meals and then buy clothes and go to cinemas. Sir, we want a new message to go forth, the message of low living and high thinking. I want that message to permeate in our lives, in the life of Parliamentarians here and the Ministers, because the man in the street, the ordinary man, needs that. In the old days Gandhiji was an example to everybody. They all copied that example. After all heroism counts. People copy those whom they think to be big. Today who are the big men whom the students can copy, whom the officers may copy? There is a hierarchy. I say, Sir, simplicity of public life, simplicity of personal life, is as important as personal integrity.

I would submit, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that these are points to ponder over and to be acted upon. These are very difficult things. I do not say they are easy. But just as we are planning for these big projects, just as we have been trying to have these big plans and projects, for other things also we must sincerely try and set about avoiding these privileges and these differences so that men may be inspired. Sir, we have done much in the past and I want this country to do much more in the future and God willing, we shall do so.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA (Bombay): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support this Motion. The President has given us a lucid survey of the events of 1959 and a dignified statement of our position.

شری فرید الحق انصاری (اندر)

پردیش): ہندی میں بولکیے -

† [श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश): हिन्दी में बोलिये ।]

श्री हर प्रसाद सक्सेना (उत्तर प्रदेश): हिन्दी में ही बोलिये ।

† [] Hindi transliteration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think you better leave it to the choice of the speaker himself.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: We are concerned with his speech, Sir. We want to hear him speak in Hindi.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): He speaks very well in English, Sir. Let him continue in English.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Dr. Raghu Vira, you decide yourself and go on in whatever language you are pleased to speak.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): He was already speaking in English.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He can make up his mind again.

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज (मुम्बई):
ये तो हर वक्त हिन्दी में बोलते हैं, हिन्दी में अयारिटी है। इनको हिन्दी में बोलना चाहिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Rajabhoj, you have no right. You must understand that the speaker has full choice and independence to speak in any language he likes. You cannot impose anything on him, especially on a Professor and a senior Member like Dr. Raghu Vira.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA: Sir, I had been practically always speaking in Hindi and I believe that I speak with greater freedom in Hindi than I do in English and yet on this problem, I would like to express myself in English. I shall apologise to my Hindi friends and my apology is a sincere one. I hope to make up for my lapse on some other occasion.

The President's Address was a lucid survey and I think I would be in a position to support almost each and

[Prof. Dr. Raghu Vira.]

every syllable that has been uttered by our worthy President. The Hindi version was fine example of chaste and refined Hindi, worthy of India's premier national language; only here and there I found a few jarring expressions. I shall refer to one of them: Here is:

वैधानिक नान लैप्सिंग शिपिंग विकास फंड

How much it jars on the ears of a Hindi writer can well be imagined. How is this to be made clear? I could make it clear only by giving its corresponding English version. Instead of using the English version "Statutory non-lapsing shipping development fund", if we were to have a form corresponding to the Hindi version that I have read, it would be like this: "Statutory development

अ-यपगामी जलयान-निधि "

(Laughter). That would be the counterpart. I have not said it with light heartedness; it is a serious matter.

Next I come to the problem of India's defence. Many friends have spoken about it from both sides of the House. Deep in my mind is concern over our neighbour's dreams and intentions, our neighbour China, because these dreams and intentions affect us, affect us, maybe, fatally. Mr. Mao delivered a marvellous speech saying, "The Eastern wind is conquering the Western wind", and West includes India. India is to the west of China and in Chinese literature, India has always been referred to as a Western country. The famous book, *Si-yu-ki* of Hiuen Tsang refers to India as the Western land. When I mentioned this to some of our responsible persons in the country, they said that these were all wild statements. I thought so too but, no, Sir, as the Germans say, "Nein, es sind keine leere trau me", they are not empty dreams. These dreams of Mr. Mao are based upon concretisations, upon the organisation of 7½ lakh villages into 26,000 militarised communes where as I mentioned last time, there was compulsory

total conscription. The words "total conscription" are unknown elsewhere.

On December, 25, 1954, Mr. Mao opened two roads of happiness (or, as the Tibetans have described them, two roads of annihilation) ten to twelve thousand feet above sea level, 1300 to 1400 miles long. These roads were opened to Lhasa, and subsequently to the Indian frontiers across glaciers and swamps, drifting sands and precipices, Sikang to Lhasa and Shining to Lhasa. We went on looking with stony eyes, our hands remaining limp. Then came the third road which was not advertised in India, Urumchi to Kashgar to Karakorum. Then came the fourth road from Karakorum to Rudok through Aksai Chin, cutting through our forehead. Along these roads came the arsenals and caravans of armed might. These are the dreams of Mr. Mao and they are being made concrete. The first victims were the Tibetans. We looked on, Mr. Panikkar is sitting here; he has had something to do with the affair. Now, the Tibetans are being eradicated. It is not just a liberation of people but it is eradication of a whole civilisation, of a whole way of life. As far as India is concerned, a buffer State was removed. Lithang, Bathang, Tachienlu, Chando—mention any town in Tibet. It was overwhelmed by armies whose number was greater than the number of people living in that town. Now, they are being colonised by the Chinese numbering five or six times the residents.

Then came the rape of our own frontier and the making of brazen demands on our territory. India is disgraced in the eyes of Asia and the rest of Asia has been overawed. I would not say that we have been overawed. Two thousand years of Chinese aspiration of the Middle Kingdom, treating everybody round about as a barbarian, is now given military sanction. We say that China has betrayed friendship.

Now, that is not how China views the matter. Mao says—I have a

minor poem here—warning Southern Asia and the world:

"I am coming,
Prepare if you can
To welcome if you can
To resist if you can;
I shall liberate you from your
freedom fevers."

And now, Sir, comes the news that Urumchi is preparing to explode her first atomic bomb of Hiroshima size by the end of 1960. Is it true? The British and the French are disposed to believe it. Sir, China is not afraid of a clash with us or its outcome while we, on the other hand, are mighty afraid of a clash. This unilateral fear of clash and what it will bring to us can just be imagined.

Now, let me convey to you another side of the Chinese picture—the intra-party power relations and their possible bearing on the Indian situation. On September 17, 1959, Marshal Lin Piao, an honoured name in Chinese military history, replaced Marshal Peng Te-huai, the right hand man of Mao, as Minister of Defence. With this change it has been assumed—and I think correctly assumed—that the power of Mao in the Army has gone down and the power of Liu Shao-chi has gone up, and this is in better synchronization with Moscow's line. If Liu Shao-chi is better in line with Moscow, that perhaps may help us in solving our problem too. But no; it is only one side of the picture. On the other side, there has been during his period an increase of one million soldiers, deployed in Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, Sinkiang or Chinese Turkestan and Tibet. How far these figures are correct, I cannot say and I have no means of verifying them. Another development as a result of the coming in of Lin Piao is the greater co-operation of Russian scientists to help the Chinese to learn and make the atomic bomb.

There is another thing which will interest all of you and it is about the

small boundary strip between China and Afghanistan. I find in this map issued by China . . .

(Displays a map)

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: You cannot make a speech through the map.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA: But it will give you some idea.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): There are people who would not be able to see and it will create confusion. You finish your speech and you can hang it somewhere. Then they will see.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I suggest that the map may be laid on the Table of the House.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA: I cannot spare that. You can come to me and see.

This is that small portion, which is shown here in this map issued by the Chinese in 1956 as a boundary between China and Afghanistan. This small strip.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Like an appendix.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA: Yes; this appendix-like portion is now omitted in the 1959 map issued by the Soviet Government in the Malaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1959, Vol. IV., page 817. This matter is very serious, whether China is going to have a boundary line with Afghanistan and thus have a window on the Middle East. This matter has been taken up by Lin Piao with the Soviet Government and he hopes to succeed.

Now, as far as we ourselves are concerned, may I say that we are prepared for the best only? We are prepared for peace; we are prepared for trade contracts; we are prepared for wielding the *bhiksha* bowl; we are

[Prof. Dr. Raghu Vira.]

prepared for conferences below the summit, but are we prepared for the worst? We have put all our eggs in one basket, the peace basket. Our other baskets are too small.

We have our friends. We do have our friends but we have no military allies. Now, let us see what our friends are doing.

One of our great friends is the Soviet Union. We cherish our friendship with the Soviet Union. We welcome all guests from the Soviet Union and we look up to them for help and it is true that Russia is helping us. But it is Russia that has helped China in the building of these strategic roads and most of the topmost engineers who built these roads have been Russians. The Chinese arsenals are being fed by the Russians. Ten-ton trucks are being supplied by the Russians. Atomic bombs are being prepared by the Russians for the Chinese and the Chinese are being trained in that art. They are being helped with machines, with know-how and with materials.

Now, we come to America, another great friend of ours. She has filled our *bhiksha* bowl from time to time. We are grateful for that but is she not helping Pakistan to build up a force which would be adequate to meet the Soviet and the Chinese power in that region? And, according to the latest reports appearing in the Press, Pakistan will use the latest atomic weapons if need arises in this region. During previous years we have protested violently and persistently to America but now even our protests have stopped. Will the economic help that is given to us by America be sufficient to buy all that we require as military weapons from other parts of the world even if they are available?

We have another friend in Nepal, our blood brother. But have we not left Nepal to her own fate as far as China is concerned? Have we not pushed Nepal to the front and said,

'Go and tackle China yourself just as Burma has done'? With Burma, China has signed a contract for ten years but liberation armies can still operate against all contracts.

Then there is Cambodia. Prince Norodom, Prince was here some time ago to discuss his problems and to see if we could help him to solve his problems. I do not know if he went away satisfied or dissatisfied. I have no knowledge of that but only one thing I know that he went to Paris and declared that if his friends did not help him to solve his country's problems he was going to find shelter somewhere else, that is, in the Chinese lap, not in the lap of India. We have not given our lap; we have not embraced him. So China is stealing away and will steal away our Asian friends and with a little imagination she can neutralise even America and Russia to a considerable extent. Russia's good words are for us but Russia's good weapons are for China. To keep peace between India and China, there is one condition and that is the re-establishment of Tibet as a sovereign State as she was between 1912 and 1950.

(Time bell rings)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have already given five minutes more to you, Professor.

(Time bell rings)

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA: Just one sentence, though I have many things to say. I cannot refrain myself, in the end, from quoting the *Bhagavad Gita*:—

“यदहंकारमाश्रित्य न योत्स्ये इति मन्यसे ।
मिथ्यैष व्यवसायस्ते प्रकृतिस्त्वां नियोक्ष्यति ।”

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are grateful to our respected President for his lucid survey of our international and domestic situation and for drawing our attention to the tasks that lie ahead

of us. In his opening remarks he has drawn attention to the legitimate and widespread resentment that the people of this country feel regarding the incursions into parts of our territory across our traditional and well-understood borders. He has correctly said that they represent a disregard by China of the principles which have been mutually agreed to between us. The President has assured us that his Government has taken prompt and calculated measures, both defensive and diplomatic, to meet the threat to our sovereignty. Some of our Members, notably my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, have expressed the view that he should not have described the Chinese action as a 'breach of faith'. I am not able to appreciate or understand the point of view of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who seems to think that his country can never be right. Assuming that China feels that there is a border issue and that there is a case for a revision of our traditional borders, what was the proper attitude for her as a friend to adopt? Surely unilateral action involving seizure of territory belonging to us can only be described as a method of force and cannot be regarded as the proper method of settling international or border disputes. It is not the border issue, but the manner, the mode, the method in which it has been raised by China which is truly disturbing or annoying. It is a method calculated to shatter one's faith in the plighted word of the other country. It is a method which we regard as inadmissible in dealings between two neighbouring countries whether big or small. We have taken our stand against this method. This does not mean that we should immediately adopt a warlike attitude towards our neighbouring State of China. The border between India and China is a permanent one. We cannot, as was emphasised by Mr. Panikkar in the speech he delivered in the House in the last session, change the facts of geography or history. For the first time in the history of this country, this country has to face a big neighbour. Obvious-

ly both China and we have to live together.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA) in the Chair]

The method or the way to solve this dispute is by negotiation and diplomacy. The President is, therefore, right in hoping that it would become possible for us by diplomacy, by measures which do not involve sabre-rattling, to convince China that it is to our mutual interest to settle this dispute amicably in accordance with the treaties, customs and usages that have governed sovereignty over these territories for more than a century. We can trust our Prime Minister, who knows the international situation very well, to take appropriate action regarding this matter. Obviously it is not wise to talk, as Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha seemed to do yesterday, in terms of ultimatums. That is not the language of diplomacy. Wisdom demands that we should be ready to talk and negotiate when a suitable opportunity occurs—and I emphasise these words "suitable opportunity"—regarding the dispute with our Chinese friends. What I am suggesting is emphatically not appeasement. What I am suggesting is, I submit, a policy dictated by commonsense and by those principles which are dear to us in our dealings with other countries. What I am suggesting is something which is in the mutual interests of both India and China, for both these countries are under-developed countries. They need long times of peace in order to give to their peoples a worthwhile standard of living. We are glad that China has made remarkable progress during recent years, but she has got to go a long way yet before she can be said to be a truly great power. There are gigantic tasks that lie ahead of us both in the present and in the future. We should not dissipate our energy in fighting shadows. We cannot dissipate our energy in quarrels which do nobody any good. The pressure of world opinion will,

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

I have no doubt, make itself felt. How much easier would it have been for us to have this question settled amicably had China been a member of the United Nations. Dr. Bose in the speech he delivered today almost seemed to delight in the fact that China was not a member of the United Nations. I feel sorry that that is the viewpoint from which he has approached this question. Maybe a China which was a member of the United Nations would have been less bellicose than a China which is not. The Prime Minister is, therefore, right in not laying down inflexible conditions for meeting Mr. Chou En-lai. A meeting today will do no good, because the points of view, as vealed in the correspondence which was released in the press and published some time back, reveal a wide divergence. This does not mean that we should rule out a meeting between the two great Prime Ministers for all time.

We have settled our border disputes with Pakistan and that is something to be really happy about. I hope that this settlement will lead to a 'no war declaration' between the two countries and that will be a more effective step in the direction of improving relations between the two countries than any joint defence alliance evolved by us. We heard in this country the other day a political party advocating that there should be an alliance between the countries of South East Asia. No one has actually suggested that in this House as far as I remember, but Dr. Bose very nearly came to suggesting that. I am not sure that the countries of South East Asia wish to enter into any such alliance. I doubt very much whether Burma would, after her recent settlement with China, desire to enter into any such arrangement. Any move on our part in this direction is bound to be very much misunderstood by our neighbours. They are highly sensitive. They will think—and who will say that they are wrong in saying?—that we are playing power politics.

One of the basic principles of the policy of non-alignment is that countries should cease to think in terms of power politics. We cannot abandon this basic stand. It is our adherence to this vital principle, to this highly ethical principle, which has given us a high status in the international world. It has given us a status as a force making for peace. The visits of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev whom we are glad to welcome, are a testimony to this fact. Apart from this basic objection, such an alliance will not add to the defensive strength of the South East Asia region. It will be in the nature of things a sort of subsidiary alliance, a type of alliance which helped Lord Wellesley to build up the Indian Empire and assure the paramountcy of the British Crown over it. It will bring us into the vortex of the cold war at a time when the world is thinking in terms of ending this cold war. Those who talk like this are obviously opposed to the very principles of non-alignment. Let there be no mistake about it. They cannot expect us to give up something which we hold dearer than life itself. The President has assured us that his Government is not un-alive to the necessity of organising our defences. Our defensive strength lies in our national unity and solidarity. More particularly it depends upon our industrial and economic potential, and it is to the building up of our economic strength by the collective effort of the community that we must address ourselves.

The Defence Ministry should not become what the red rag is to the bull. The Defence Ministry and the Government of India are entitled to the co-operation of all the people in the task of defending this country. That brings me to the task of our economic planning. There are parties today which question the very basis of our planning. They would like the country to go back to the days of Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham and Ricardo. They equate freedom with absence of all restraints. Obviously there is no

meeting ground between us and them, for we believe that the interventionist State has come to stay. Without much State aid, much planning and even control—I emphasize this word ‘control’—of the productive and distributive resources of our country we cannot march ahead. We should be prepared for some regimentation. In order to provide employment and decent standards of living for our toiling millions we have to establish an equilibrium between our production and our population. We have to ensure that our Third Five Year Plan is a big, a wise and a comprehensive one. We have to so arrange matters that it may become easier by working for it to usher in the Fourth, the Fifth and the Sixth Five Year Plans. Possibly this planning will involve us in heavy taxation, I hope only in heavier taxation for the rich. I hope that the taxation will be so arranged that it will **fall on those who are able to bear it**, that it will fail on those who are more fortunately situated in life than others. There is room for a private sector in a socialised economy. But let there be no mistake about it. The private sector cannot be our master or our dictator. Control over the investment policy of the country has to reside in the community.

I would like to say a few words about corruption. It has become fashionable with our people—because there is nothing else to attack so far as this Government is concerned—to talk of it very lightly. They give a picture of this country which is completely untrue to life. They think that it is seething with corruption. They are doing the country by this kind of loose talk immense harm. They are seeking to destroy the faith the people rightly repose in the democratic process. They are holding up the ideal of General Ayub Khan. A permanent corruption tribunal may well paralyse the administration. I do not think that it would be constitutionally proper to have a permanent corruption tribunal. This tribunal will be subject, unless you change the Constitution, to the supervision of the

High Courts under articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution. Anyone who has a grievance against any person will rush to this permanent tribunal. Action will become impossible on the part of any administrator. Administrators will find it impossible to carry on their work in that atmosphere. A permanent tribunal is, I suggest in all sincerity, incompatible with the rule of law as understood in democratic countries which have a system of responsible government. In our penal laws, in our anti-corruption laws, we have effective remedies for dealing with specific acts of corruption. I should like a resort to be made to these laws. Our ordinary law of corruption can be strengthened. I am not against that, but I am definitely against a permanent corruption tribunal. It was said by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that this corruption tribunal has been suggested by an eminent person of the stature of Shri Deshmukh.

I have very high regard for 4 P.M. Dr. Deshmukh, but Dr. Deshmukh is not infallible. He was at one time a member of the Government and he has ceased to be so now. Naturally, he looks at things in a somewhat different light today from what he did when he was a member of the Government. But I would say that when the Prime Minister asked him to give him the names of the persons against whom he said he had a grievance, Dr. Deshmukh declined to do so, and he said that he would place that evidence only before the tribunal if and when it was constituted. In other words, he was asking the Prime Minister to abdicate his functions; he was asking the Prime Minister to do something which as Prime Minister he could not constitutionally do or which as Prime Minister he could not have constitutionally done. If Dr. Deshmukh has evidence against any particular set of persons howsoever high they might be, the proper thing for him is to place that evidence before the Prime Minister; alternatively, if he has that evidence against them, then the proper thing is for him to publish the names of the persons over his name so that they

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]

might be able to defend themselves in courts of law. But, Dr. Deshmukh is not prepared to do any of those things. Therefore, in all seriousness I suggest that this is in the nature of an election stunt. Dr. Deshmukh may not be thinking in terms of election himself, but there are political parties which are thinking in terms of elections and this is a sort of thing which you feel you should state against the administration when you find that there is nothing which can be said against it. I can understand an attack on our party on ideological grounds; I can understand an attack on our party on programmatic grounds, but I cannot understand this crafty way of dealing with a very grave situation. I do not think that it is right for any man howsoever big he might be, to throw out things which hurt or injure the reputation of peoples without their being able to defend themselves. It is not a straightforward way of dealing with the big question of corruption.

Let me also say that I think that this question of corruption in high places is highly exaggerated. Our services—and I say this with some knowledge of our higher services—have a fairly high standard of integrity.

Whatever we may say about our State Ministries, I do not think that we can say that they are, generally speaking, corrupt. Reference was made to a recent Punjab affair. Well, I could go into the details of it, but that is a matter which is *sub judice*, and I do not think that it is right to refer to any particular case to prove my thesis. We should see things—or we should learn to see things—in their proper perspective, and it is not right, it is not wise, it is not patriotic, to talk lightly of corruption day in and day out.

श्री थियोडोर बोदरा (बिहार) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में चीन और भारत के संबंध के बारे

में जिक्र किया और हमारे इस सदन में भी बहुत से आदरणीय सदस्यों ने भी अपने भाषणों में भारत और चीन के विषय में बहुत सी बातें बतलाई। जब भी हम इस सवाल के ऊपर ध्यान करते हैं तो हमारा ध्यान हिमालय पर्वत की ओर चला जाता है। इसके बाद हम देखते हैं कि नेफा एरिया से एक लम्बा सा पहाड़ी मुल्क काश्मीर और कुलू वैली तक चला जाता है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने पिछली बार इस सदन में कहा था कि हमारा जो बार्डर एरिया है उसके डिफेन्स के लिए एक ऐसी सेना की जरूरत है, ऐसे लोगों की जरूरत है जो कि इस पहाड़ी एरिया की डिफिकल्ट कंडीशन और क्लाइमेट को सह सकते हों। जब हम यह देखते हैं कि हिमालय पर्वत के नीचे नेफा एरिया है, आसाम है, नार्थ बंगाल है, नार्थ बिहार है, यू० पी० है, पंजाब है, कूलू वैली और काश्मीर है और इसके साथ ही साथ जब हम वहा की आबादी को भी देखते हैं तो यह पाते हैं कि इन गुफाओं में, इन कन्दराओं में, इन पहाड़ों की चोटियों में हिल ट्राइब्स और आदिवासी लोग रहते हैं। जब हम हिन्दुस्तान के डिफेन्स के बारे में और उसके बार्डर के डिफेन्स के बारे में सोचते हैं तो हमें इन लोगों का ध्यान आ जाता है कि हमें ऐसे ही लोगों की जरूरत है जो कि इस पहाड़ी और जंगली हिस्से में रहते हैं। हमें ऐसे लोगों की जरूरत है जो कि वहां के सब कस्टम्स और पीड़ाओं को झेल सकें और उनका सामना कर सकें। तो हम देखते हैं कि इन इलाकों में जो आदिवासी हैं, हरिजन हैं, बैकवर्ड क्लास के लोग हैं, वे ही इस तरह की कठिनाइयों को झेल सकते हैं और हमारी सीमा की रक्षा कर सकते हैं।

मैं ने बारबार एक आदिवासी होने के नाने, इस सदन का एक माननीय मेम्बर होने के नाते भी कहा कि आदिवासियों, हरिजनों और बैकवर्ड क्लास के लोगों की आर्थिक स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए केन्द्रीय

और प्रान्तीय सरकारों को अवश्य ध्यान देना चाहिये । केन्द्रीय सरकार तो सच्चाई के साथ काफी रुपया इन लोगों की भलाई के लिए प्रान्तीय सरकारों को हर साल दे देती है । आज मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उसने कभी भी प्रान्तीय सरकारों के चीफ मिनिस्ट्रों से यह कहा कि इन लोगों की भलाई के लिए जितना रुपया दिया गया है वह सब का सब उनमें खर्च किया गया है या नहीं ? क्या प्रान्तीय सरकारों ने उन सब हिदायतों को पूरा किया जो केन्द्रीय सरकार ने समय समय पर इन लोगों की भलाई के लिए भेजी थीं ? मैं कहता हूँ कि ये लोग जो हिमालय से लेकर नेफा तक बसे हुए हैं, जो पिछड़े हैं, आदिवासी हैं, हरिजन हैं—जिनकी मांग एक छोटा लोअर या एक अपर स्कूल खोलने की है, गांव में एक कुआँ बनाने की है, पानी पीने की व्यवस्था करने के सम्बन्ध में है, जिनकी मांग है कि हमारे पहाड़ी इलाके में थोड़े बहुत रास्ते बन जायें, सरकारी दफ्तरों में छोटी मोटी चपरासी या फारेस्ट गार्ड की जगह मिल जाय ; जिनके बच्चे मैट्रीक्यूलेंट हैं उन्हें क्लर्क की जगह मिल जाय, क्या इन सब मांगों की तरफ हमारी प्रान्तीय सरकारों ने ध्यान दिया ? मैं यहां पर पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बिहार, आसाम, बंगाल, पंजाब की सरकारों ने इन आदिवासियों की मांगों को कभी पूरा किया और सुना ?

श्री हर प्रसाद सक्सेना : उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने सुना ।

श्री धियोडोर बोदरा : जी नहीं । मैं भी मसूरी और नैनीताल गया हूँ और जो पहाड़ी आदमी वहां के हैं, जो रिक्शा आदि खींचते हैं, बदन में फटे कपड़े पहने हुए होते हैं, जिनका शरीर गर्दों की वजह से काला पड़ गया है, क्या आप लोगों ने इस तरह के लोगों को कभी नहीं देखा ? आप लोगो ने तो अपनी आंखें बन्द कर ली हैं, अपनी आंख में पट्टी बांध ली है । मुझे बहुत अफसोस

के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे कांग्रेस के मेम्बरों ने इन लोगों को ओर से अपनी आंखें फेर ली हैं और इन आदिवासी, हरिजन और बैकवर्ड क्लास वालों के दुःख को महसूस नहीं करते हैं ।

हमारे राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के सम्बन्ध में कहा गया है । इसलिए आज हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा के खयाल से ही आप को चाहिये कि ये जो पहाड़ी जातिया हैं, ये जो हिमालय के बार्डर्स पर रहते हैं उन्हें आप कुछ न दोजिये, मैं उनके लिए सिर्फ एक सेर चावल और दो गज कपड़ा ही चाहता हूँ । ये लोग इतनी डिफिकल्ट कंडीशंस, इतनी खराब क्लाइमेट और इतनी जंगली जगह में रहते हुए खुश रहते हैं और भारत माता की रक्षा के लिए तैयार रहने हैं । यदि लड़ाई छिड़ जाय तो आदिवासियों के पास, हरिजनों के पास और बैकवर्ड क्लासेज के पास मनी पावर नहीं है जिससे कि वे आप को चन्दा दे सकें । उनके पास ब्रेन पावर नहीं है जिससे कि वे आप को ब्रेन दे सकें, उनके पास सिर्फ मसिल पावर है जिसे वे आप को दे सकते हैं । पिछली लड़ाई में वहां के हजारों आदमी दीमापुर और वर्मा में सड़क और रास्ता बनाने के लिए भर्ती हुए थे । उसी तरह मे वहां की लड़कियां वीमेंस कोर में भर्ती हुई थीं । आज भी आदिवासी, हरिजन और बैकवर्ड क्लासेज के लोग बहुत से मसिल के काम कर सकते हैं । यदि आप उनको जिंदा रखना चाहते हैं, तो उनको जिंदा रखने के लिए मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से यही चाहता हूँ कि वहां हर आदमी के लिए प्रति दिन एक सेर चावल और दो गज कपड़े का प्रबन्ध किया जाय । आज बिहार, आसाम, बंगाल, यू० पी० और पंजाब के चीफ मिनिस्टर्स को यह समझना चाहिये कि आदिवासियों को जिंदा रखना हमारा फर्ज है, हरिजनों को जिंदा रखना हमारा फर्ज है, बैकवर्ड क्लास के लोगों को जिंदा रखना हमारा फर्ज है ।

[श्री थियोडोर बोदरा]

मैं झारखंड पार्टी का हूँ, इसलिए अन्त में एक बात कहना मैं अपना फ़र्ज समझता हूँ। एस० आर० सी० के बाद लाल किले में हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा था कि बाईलिंगुअल बम्बई के बारे में पत्थर में लिखी हुई ऐसी लकीर है जो कभी मिट नहीं सकती, लेकिन अब महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के अलग अलग प्रांत होने जा रहे हैं। इस के लिए वहां दंगे हुए, १२० आदमी मारे गये, और बहुत लड़ाई और झगड़े हुए। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अलग प्रांत क्रिएट करने के लिए क्या झगड़ा करना जरूरी है? आप ने आंध्र प्रदेश क्रिएट किया, इसलिए, कि वहां झगड़े हुए, मर्डर्स हुए, लूट हुई और बहुत से रायट्स हुए। इसी तरह से महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में बहुत से दंगे फसाद हुए, उसके बाद आप ने दो प्रांत बनाना मंजूर किया। यदि आप महाराष्ट्रियों को महाराष्ट्र दे सकते हैं, गुजरातियों को गुजरात दे सकते हैं, विदर्भ के लोगों को विदर्भ दे सकते हैं तो झारखंड के लोगों को झारखंड स्टेट क्यों नहीं दे सकते हैं? वह हिस्सा हिन्दुस्तान का इंडस्ट्रियल हार्ट है और वहां आप बहुत से कल कारखाने बना रहे हैं और उन कल कारखानों को बनाने के लिए आप को बंगाल, बिहार और उड़ीसा की सरकारों का कोआपरेशन लेना पड़ता है।

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): What will be the language of the Jharkhand State?

श्री थियोडोर बोदरा : चाहे उसको आप झारखंड स्टेट कहें, चाहे इंडस्ट्रियल स्टेट कहें, लेकिन उस का क्रिएशन बहुत जरूरी है। यदि आप हिन्दुस्तान का इंडस्ट्रिया-लाइजेशन करना चाहते हैं तो झारखंड स्टेट का जल्दी से जल्दी क्रिएशन होना चाहिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Shri-mati Ramamurti.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : मैंने पहले से नाम दिया है, लेकिन मेरा नाम अभी तक बोला नहीं गया है। यह नीचे से ऊपर और ऊपर से नीचे नहीं होना चाहिये। यह ठीक नहीं है।

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): Sir, I am here to give my whole-hearted support to the President's Address, all the principles that have been embodied in the Address and all the directions that are given for our future conduct and guidance to build a great nation and a great country.

Now, Sir, fears have been expressed about our neighbours and a sombre picture was drawn as to how we should be very careful with regard to the intentions of our neighbours, and our critics spoke of the imminent danger that is awaiting us. I have not come in that spirit, Sir. Just a few months back, when the Chinese incursions were heard here, both in this House and in the other House, many of my fellow Members drew their sabers, clanged them and said: "Oh, we should resist by all means this kind of inroad into our country." But our Prime Minister, in the true spirit of what has been the avowed policy of this country in regard to our near neighbours and distant neighbours, stood firm and strong and said that while we should strengthen ourselves in all ways, we should make a peaceful and friendly approach to a solution of all problems relating to our neighbours. It reminded me, Sir, of the episode in the great Mahabharata. When Draupadi's Manabhang was taking place, when the Pandavas were very very angered and indignant, when Bhima, Arjuna, Nakula and Sahadeva, all of them, drew their respective weapons and declared, "No, we shall not tolerate this; we shall not stand this; we must fight", Yudhishtira advised them and advocated patience, patience and peaceful approach. That approach, Sir, had been the teaching of the

Father of the Nation, Mahatmaji, and it is that that our Prime Minister had wholly imbibed and had taken on the role of a messenger of peace, of our Panchsheel and principle of Co-existence, and I am here to pay my tribute to our leader for what he has done to lift this nightmare, this tremendous tension that was there a few weeks back. I had been to Australia recently. I do not know what it is in this country, but to whichever State I went, women as well as men there spoke to me with very convincing voices. I am not exaggerating and it is not in any way in disparagement of other leaders in other lands who stand for peace, but these were the words that they used with regard to our Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, and they said, "You know, your Prime Minister is the tallest figure—we think—in the international world and he must be there to promote peace. None of us wants war. None of us wants destruction. None of us wants anything but the promotion of all that is productive and not destructive."

Well, that came from the voices of men and women of other climes and other countries. And therefore, Sir, I stand here to pay my tribute to our leader who had made possible this, which had brought about such friendly approaches as moved other nations, as made the visit by the President of the United States of America, Mr. Eisenhower, to this country possible. And while he was here, were we not thrilled, Sir, by every utterance that he made—"Oh, you people of India stand for peace, stand for democracy, stand for all that Abraham Lincoln had declared in our country, for freedom and rights of people, which we cherish and foster. We and you are agreed on all these lofty principles and ideals, and that the world must go along the way of peace."—of Panchsheel and co-existence? Were we not thrilled by these, Sir? Then several other messengers of peace came in his wake. We had

Mr. Voroshilov recently, who had also said that he and his country would stand by such ideals, and today we are going to listen—we have welcomed him already—the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Soviet Russia, Mr. Khrushchev, and he has come as a messenger of goodwill and peace. Our border disputes with Pakistan, as my sister Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, the Deputy Minister for External Affairs, reported, have nearly been solved—she mentioned several points on which agreement had been reached or is being reached, all in a spirit of peace and good neighbourly relations. All these point to the fact that when you make up your mind to look at others as friends, sisters and brothers, as children of the world and wanting to build a new world order, where amity, friendship and harmony alone should survive, then nothing is impossible in this world. There is a proverb in Tamil: "Erumbur kallum teyum". By an ant creeping continuously over a rock, might be as huge as the Himalayas, even that stone will wear out. That is the policy of this country. We are not using atom bombs, we are not using dynamites but we are approaching through the same way as our ancient forefathers had inculcated into us, that of entering into the hearts of other people to bring about that which is lasting. It is the way that our philosophers had preached, that our Baghavad Gita had held out, that we should live and let live. I would ask of this House: Let us not think so much of the present-day China but let us look back and think of all that China had been to us—about Fa-Hien and Huen-Tsang, the messengers who brought ideas to us and who took great lessons of Buddha to their country. Let us look back to that culture and try to link up our country with that culture and restore China to that pedestal so that the world might go together. We need not talk about South East Asian friendship, or Asian friendship. To me the world is one and let us think and move in that way. West and East must unite to build a

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]
New World order—to promote human welfare and not its destruction.

Another word I would say. I would like to record here my conviction about this Summit Conference. I do not know why they call it 'summit'. Anyway, it is a *top leaders'* conference. That is going to voice the opinions of all the peoples of the world, let me hope. If only the views of the people had been focussed there, I do not think any mother or father or son or daughter would have wanted anything but peace. That conference, let us hope, would not only "limit armaments" but would find a way to decide on "complete disarmament" and lead to a situation when all nuclear tests would be abolished and would find a way when the dawn of that age would be near us, when we would not give priority to defence forces or structures but would give priority to the sadly neglected education that should have commanded priority in all our planning.

Having said all that about the glorious foreign policy of peace that has been pursued, before I pass on to education, I would like to pay my tributes to my sisters in Kerala for the wonderful mass upsurge and resistance to the Communist regime that they had carried out without any incidents.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL) in the Chair]

In large numbers they trooped in and picketed with non-violence with the conviction that the only way was the way suggested by the Father of the Nation, the only way was to have a peaceful solution of problems. Sir, if you had visited Cochin, Travancore or Malabar, the land of the palms and the beautiful canals that had aroused the praise of not only the great Dr. Rabindranath Tagore and other poets of the South but of all the world, and if you had seen its women and their way of life, you would have been amazed at the possibility of such large

bands of women coming out to stand for their rights and to vindicate their cause. The women of Malabar are highly advanced educationally but they are coy and retiring and the only time they come out is when they go to the tanks to have their oil-baths or to clean and then to go to "Ambalams", to the temples, and then to go about their various avocations, to follow their various pursuits but very quietly. As young girls they had come to the Queen Mary's College with beautiful locks and with handsome faces and it would take about twenty minutes for me to get one answer from them. They were so modest, so quiet, so bashful and so beautiful. Such women had found it necessary to rouse themselves as Durgas, but not like her in the act of destruction but in a spirit of righteous indignation against a totalitarian regime, that had destroyed all democratic ideals in Kerala, namely the suppression of free voice of the people, the suppression of all that had been worthy in education, the suppression of all that is worthwhile in the culture and tradition. My tributes, my homage to my sisters of Malabar, of Cochin and Travancore—not 'Karela' but 'Kerala' for their success in this campaign.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it the hon. Member's contention that the 35 lakhs of people that voted for our party were all men? Then she has not got the support of men.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: In my vocabulary 'woman' includes 'man'. *Ardhanareeswar* is our tradition. You cannot separate our culture and our tradition as you have separated yourselves from this land of noble origin and noble tradition and are seeking outside help and outside allegiance. I cannot call this by any other name because I do not want to use the word and because I will not then be a true daughter of Mahatmaji. My tribute goes to them.

Having said that, I want to pass on to the subject of education that had

been sadly put into the background, because if you go through the allotment for education of girls and boys, both for compulsory primary education as well as adult education and for University education, you will find the disparity is growing and is not lessening between the percentage of boys and girls at all stages of educational ladder educated during the First Plan, the Second Plan and the coming Third Plan. With all our magnificent achievements in the realm of industrial advance, in all other spheres of constructive activities, this is a sad chapter in our planning and I hope that something would be done soon to take to the co-operation of all the good-hearted donors and public to come into the problem and solve this problem and make possible compulsory free primary education, not only upto 11 years but even up to 14 years by the end of the Third Plan and also to enlist the co-operation of the thousands of voluntary agencies of women and men, silent and strenuous workers, who have not worked for receiving Padma Bhushan or Padma Shri. Many of them are unknown and many of them do not want to be known. But out of the conviction of their heart and soul, they have worked for years and years. Now the State has come forward no doubt and through the Central Social Welfare Board and the State Social Welfare Boards they are trying to give some assistance and some encouragement to these voluntary agencies so that education may spread along these paths and we may reach the consummation that we desire. But this is not enough—barely touches the fringe of the problem. Some hon. Members have already pointed out that education is at the core of the better functioning of democracy. If adult franchise has been given, education also must be taken to the doors of all those adults. An hon. Member said—and it is a fact—that only about 25 or 26 per cent. of our adults are literate. I do not deny that, but there are people in our land who have experience and knowledge of their trades and professions. There

are the farmers and others at the Farmers' Conferences and at the Agricultural Fair—many of these farmers have great intelligence and are expert in farming and when they see these things, they wonder and say, "What is all this?" Literacy is necessary to read what is written. Of course, it is very necessary that we must know what is happening in the rest of the world. But what I say is, there is a tendency in our country to say that all that is in another country is wonderful and what is in our own country is not worth much. That is not correct. So, there must be adult literacy and there must be education for the young. They are all very necessary in order to work our democracy properly and to build up that sort of citizenship that will be worthy of our nation.

Having said that, Sir, as an educationist, I am really distressed at the possibility of student strikes. Why this closure of universities, the abodes of knowledge? Against what are they striking? Striking against that very knowledge that would enable them to grow to their fullest and highest stature. All these are symptomatic that something is wrong in the whole organisation of these institutions and also something that is dreadfully wrong in the social context that has made possible such strikes and such closure of universities. I cannot say that the fault is all that of the teachers. The teacher is there and you have to look to his salary and so on. Of course, dedication to the cause is very necessary and essential and many of them have dedicated their lives to the cause of teaching and the imparting of the best that is in knowledge. But what about the students? What happens in the homes? They have their parents. What are the parents doing? Why have they allowed them to be used as pawns in the political game? Education should start at home and that should not be neglected. The mothers must not neglect that. I would carry the condemnation to the mothers, because they are the people

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.] who have the handling of the young, who have to cherish and nourish high ideals in the early years of the child. There is the question of moral instruction and religious instruction. I find a committee has reported on moral and religious instruction. I would say that such instruction should come from the parents also and it will be automatic if it is a well-regulated home. It should be given in the schools and even in the colleges. If that is done and if the lives of our great leaders, the lives of our ancients, and if our history are properly taught to the young, there would not be this ugly phenomenon of the *chela* striking against the *guru*. That cuts at the very foundation of knowledge. It was unthinkable in our *pial* schools or in our village schools. In those schools we started with this Tamil prayer:

"Hari Ohm, Nandraha Guru Vazha. Guruve Tunai."

Which means: "Oh God, may the Gur-live happily. He is all in all to me—my guide and protector." That was the first sentence that we learnt when we started in the early morning, at dawn, at five o'clock, not after drinking tea without even washing the mouth, but after fasting. After learning came food. Before learning came bath and all these hygienic principles that we now try to spread in our health schemes here. I would suggest that in our educational scheme we should bring in all that is best in our own way of life and inculcate those principles of religion and morals throughout that scheme of education so that we begin to respect all that we respected in the past and only then there is salvation for our nation. That is very necessary if our youths are to become the basic fundamental pillars of all that is worthwhile in our democracy.

(Time bell rings.)

I would have liked to say many other things, about soaring prices of essential articles of consumption and

the plight of the fixed income—middle and lower-class groups of teachers and clerks—but since the time is up and having said this much, I would only draw the attention of the House to some of the paragraphs in the Address, especially to the portion where the President says:

"I earnestly trust that wisdom and tolerance and a spirit of cooperative endeavour will guide you."

(Time bell rings.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL): You have already exceeded your time.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Thank you very much, Sir.

श्री पं० ना० राजभोज : उप सभा-ध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण पर जो आभार प्रदर्शन का मोशन पेश हुआ है उस को सपोर्ट देने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह अभिभाषण अनेक दृष्टि से महत्वपूर्ण है। एक तो हमारे संविधान को दस वर्ष पूरे हुए हैं और वह मशीनरी अच्छे ढंग से काम कर रही है। उस का रेफरेन्स राष्ट्रपति जी ने ५६वें परिच्छेद में किया है :

"Our Constitution which we gave unto ourselves, wherein all power and authority are based upon and spring from the people, has endured and grown in strength."

हमने जो एक मार्ग अपने संविधान में निश्चित किया है, जिसके अनुसार समाजवादी सत्ता जनता के हाथ में आने वाली है और जिस से शक्ति का संचार हुआ है, उस मार्ग को अपने सामने रखते हुए देश लोकशाही तथा पंचशील की ओर बढ़ रहा है। हमारे नेता पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू तथा पं० पन्त जी की राय से और आदेश से

वह मार्ग तरक्की कर रहा है और यह एक सन्तोषजनक बात है। हमारी लोकशाही अच्छे ढंग से काम कर रही है। इस के दो उदाहरण मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

पहला है केरल में जो चुनाव हुए हैं, उनके बारे में। उस में कांग्रेस पार्टी ने चुनाव जीत लिया है। इस का अर्थ स्पष्ट है कि लोगों को कांग्रेस तथा हमारे नेता श्री नेहरू के नेतृत्व पर विश्वास है, कम्युनिस्टों पर, जोकि हमारी कांस्टीट्यूशन की मशीनरी फेल करना चाहते हैं, उन पर नहीं। भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने कल केरल के बारे में तरह तरह की बातें कहीं। आप लोग जानते ही हैं कि उन्होंने ने केरल के बारे में जो कुछ कहा है, वह बहुत हद तक गलत है। उन्होंने ने एक जगह यह कहा था कि भारत में लोकशाही नहीं रही, उस की हत्या हो रही है, लेकिन यह बात बेवुनियाद तथा असत्य है; क्योंकि उसी लोकशाही के नाम पर कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता को ऊल-जलूल बोलने का अधिकार मिला है। उन की पार्टी को शासक पार्टी के मुकाबले में चुनाव लड़ने का अधिकार प्राप्त है। यह सब होते हुए भी लोकशाही को चलाने के लिये जिन बातों की आवश्यकता है, वह उन की पार्टी में नहीं हैं। सन् १९४२ में जब आज़ादी की लड़ाई चल रही थी, तो मास्को से उन का सम्बन्ध चल रहा था। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब अंग्रेजों के साथ समझौता हो रहा था, उन्होंने पाकिस्तान के निर्माण के बारे में सहयोग दिया। कांग्रेस को गिराने के लिये सभी राज्यों में सभी तरह की पार्टियों से, बल्कि जो साम्प्रदायिक दृष्टि से प्रति-गामी हैं, उन के साथ भी उन का सहयोग होता है। इसलिए केरल के चुनाव के बारे में कांग्रेस ने जो अन्य पार्टियों के साथ गठ-बन्धन किया, उसके खिलाफ बोलने का उन्हें कोई अधिकार नहीं है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि

हमारे देश के साथ भी उन को कोई प्रेम नहीं है। किसी ने कहा है :

“जिसको न निज गौरव तथा निज देश पर अभिमान है, वह नर नहीं, नर पशु निरा है और मृतक समान है।”

मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वे जो ईश्वर और धर्म को अफीम का नशा बताते हैं और जो ईश्वर को ग्रंथ की लकड़ी, जो मानव को बन्दर और लंगूर की संतान बताते हैं, जिन को भारतीय सभ्यता, संस्कृति और उज्ज्वल इतिहास पर गर्व नहीं है, जो दूसरों से प्रेरणा लेते हैं, उनका मुंह ताकते हैं, वे कैसे भारत की भूमि के प्रति वफादार हो सकते हैं। मैं आपके द्वारा, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, कई और बातें बतलाना चाहता हूँ। एक कवि ने कहा है :

“डारविन साहब हकीकत से निहायत दूर थे, कौन कहता है कि पूर्वज आप के लंगूर थे ?”

मैंने अभी थोड़े दिन पहले बताया कि उन की जो पालिसी है, वह “खाने के दांत और, दिखाने के और” वाली है। कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के गुरु रशिया वाले हैं। आज वे यहां आये हुए हैं। तो हमारे ये भाई दिखाई नहीं देते हैं, यह बड़े दुख की बात है। केरल की लोकशाही के बारे में अभी देवी जी ने जो कुछ कहा, उससे मुझे बहुत संतोष हुआ। अब मैं उस को ज्यादा नहीं छेड़ना चाहता हूँ और आपके सामने दूसरी बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ। वह यह कि ग्राम पंचायतों के निर्माण से डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन हो रहा है, यह बात सही है। किन्तु उस में जां गुण्डागर्दी है, अस्पृश्यता और जातिभेद है, उस पर ख्याल रखना चाहिये और जहां अस्पृश्यों को तकलीफ होती है, ऐसी ग्राम पंचायतों को सस्पेंड कर देना चाहिये। इवैल्यूएशन रिपोर्ट में ऐसे बहुत से किस्से दिखाये जाते हैं, जिन पर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये। जब मैं अनुसूचित जाति की बात करता हूँ तो मुझे इस बात की खुशी

[श्री पां० ना० राजभोज]

होती है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभि-
भाषण में इसका खास उल्लेख किया है।
संविधान के आठवें संशोधन से और दस
वर्ष के लिये संरक्षण मिल जाने से और अनु-
च्छेद ३३६ में घोषणा की गई थी कि शे-
ड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के लिये एक कमीशन नियुक्त
किया जायेगा। यह बात अच्छी है। मेरी
यह प्रार्थना है कि साथ ही साथ इकौनौमिकली
बैकवर्ड क्लासेज के लिये भी एक कायमी
कमीशन नियुक्त किया जाय। जब शि-
ड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लिये अलग कमीशन नियुक्त
किया जा रहा है, तो अभी ३३८ के अनुसार
जो कमीशन काम कर रहा है, उसको सिर्फ
शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लिये ही रखा जाय।
दूसरी दो घोषणायें महत्व की है। एक तो
डबल मेम्बर कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी खत्म करने
की और दूसरी बम्बई राज्य के पुनर्गठन की।
सिंगल मेम्बर कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी कई दृष्टि से
अच्छी है, परन्तु उसमें हमें यह डर है कि
अस्पृश्यों को सवर्ण हिन्दू मतदान करेंगे या
नहीं। दूसरी बात यह है कि डबल मेम्बर
कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में कंडीडेट जनरल सीट के
कंडीडेट पर प्रचार और पैसे के लिये
भरोसा करता था और अब उसको अपने
आप इसको करना होगा। जो आदमी इ-
कौनौमिकली वीक है, गरीब है, बैकवर्ड है,
जिसके पास पैसा नहीं है, उसे डर है कि
इलेक्शन में लड़ने के लिये उसके पास कहां
से पैसा आयेगा और इलेक्शन में खर्च कैसे
कम होंगे। डबल मेम्बर कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी
बनाने से सब तरह से फायदा होगा और
दोनों में प्रेम भी बढ़ेगा। मैं जानता हूं कि
अभी हमारे भाई साहब श्री बोदरा साहब
एक अलग पंथ और जाति की बात कह रहे
थे। वे तो यह चाहते हैं कि उनका झारखंड
एक अलग प्रांत ही बना दिया जाय। मैं इस
तरह की बात को गलत समझता हूं। हम यह
नहीं चाहते हैं कि हमारे अधिकार हमेशा बढ़ें,
हमें इस बात का दुःख होता है कि हमें इस
तरह के अलग अधिकार प्राप्त है। हम तो यह

चाहते हैं कि जितनी जल्दी यह अधिकार
समाप्त हों, उतना अच्छा है। हमारे बहुत
से लोग पोलिटिक्स के दौर में रहते हैं, बाहर
के लोगों का काम करते हैं। मैं यहां पर
श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण का जिक्र करना
चाहता हूं। वे सर्वोदय की बात करते हैं।
और जब विनोबा जी के पास जाते हैं तो
पौलिटिक्स की बात करते हैं। अगर
पौलिटिक्स की बात करना है, तो पौलिटिक्स
के दायरे में आइये और अगर सर्वोदय की
बात करते हैं तो पौलिटिक्स की बातों में न
पड़िये। इसके साथ ही मुझे दुःख होता
है कि हमारे सी० डी० देशमुख साहब भी
इस तरह की बातें करते हैं। वे एक बहुत बड़े
आदमी हैं, आई० सी० एस० हैं, होशियार
आदमी हैं, पं० जवाहर लाल जी के कैबिनेट
के एक होशियार मेम्बर थे, लेकिन उन्होंने
इस्तीफा दे दिया। अब वे यह इल्जाम लगाते
हैं कि नेहरू सरकार की कैबिनेट में जो मंत्री
हैं, वे कर्पट हैं। मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि जब
वे मिनिस्टर थे, तो उन्होंने इस तरह की
बात क्यों नहीं कही और जब वे बाहर
आ गये, तो इस तरह की बात क्यों कहने
लगे हैं। क्या उनका उस समय कर्तव्य नहीं
था कि वे सरकार का ध्यान इस बात की
ओर दिलाते? आज वे कहते हैं कि मैं एक
रुपया तनखाह लेता हूं लेकिन उन्हें तीन हजार
रुपया तनखाह मिलती है। मुझे दुःख होता
है, यह कहते हुए—कहूं तो मां.....
(Interruption) हमारे देशमुख साहब
इतने बड़े आदमी हैं, आई० सी० एस० और
वे इस तरह की बातें कहते हैं। श्री जवाहर
लाल जी ने जो जवाब उनको दिया, वह ठीक
है। वे खुद तो इतनी बड़ी तनखाह लेते
हैं, उनकी श्रीमती बड़ी तनखाह लेती हैं
और एक साथ दूर में जाते हैं। एक कैबिनेट
लेवल के आदमी को इस तरह से नहीं बोलना
चाहिये। जब उन्होंने कैबिनेट छोड़ दी तो
इस तरह से बात करना शुरू कर दिया
है। अगर वे इस तरह की बात करना चाहते
हैं, तो उन्हें किसी पार्टी में आ जाना चाहिये।

कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में या किसी दूसरी पार्टी में आ जाना चाहिये और तब इस तरह की बातें कहनी चाहिये। आदमी को कुछ न कुछ सचाई और नैतिकता से काम लेना चाहिये। हमारे सप्रू साहब ने जो भाषण किया, उसको सुनकर मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई। वे एक जिम्मेदार मेम्बर हैं और जिस तरह से उन्होंने यहां पर भाषण दिया, उससे सब को खुशी होगी।

एक माननीय मेम्बर : आपका भाषण भी तो बहुत अच्छा है ?

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज : इसलिए उप-महाध्याक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके जरिये से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमें जिम्मेदारी से बातें कहनी चाहियें और माननीय सप्रू साहब ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो बातें कही हैं, मैं उनका समर्थन करता हूं।

दूसरी बात मैं बम्बई प्रान्त की रचना के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में बम्बई राज्य की रचना की जो बात कही है, वह बहुत अच्छी है और इस सम्बन्ध में जो कार्य हो रहा है, वह ठीक है। लेकिन वहां पर जो कुछ अल्पसंख्यक लोग हैं उन्हें डर लगता है कि उन्हें इस समय जो सहूलियतें मिली हैं वे खत्म न हो जायें। देहातों में उन पर अन्याय होने का भय है। इसलिये उनका हित संरक्षण होना चाहिये और एक तरह से गारंटी मिलनी चाहिये। दूसरा सवाल जो बार्डर एडजस्टमेंट का है, मैसूर और बम्बई में जो झगड़ा है, वह पाटस्कर फार्मूले के अनुसार हल होना चाहिये। जब यह प्रश्न दो राज्यों के निर्माण से हल हो रहा है, तो उनमें असन्तोष नहीं रहना चाहिये। श्री पी० सी० भट्टाचार्य समिति ने जो सिफारिशें की हैं उनसे महाराष्ट्र में असन्तोष है और पैसे के सिलसिले में कांग्रेसी की आवश्यकता है। मेरी आप से यह प्रार्थना है कि विभाजन के इस तरह के झगड़े अब हमें सदा के लिए खत्म कर देने चाहिये। दूसरे प्रान्तों में भी इसी तरह की

बातें चल रही हैं। इस समय हम देखते हैं कि पंजाब में पंजाबी सूबा के नाम पर झगड़ा चल रहा है। वहां पर ८० प्रतिशत लोग हिन्दू हैं और २० प्रतिशत लोग सिख हैं, मगर एक जाति के नाम से वहां पर झगड़ा चल रहा है कि पंजाबी सूबा अलग से बनना चाहिये।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इसको कौन सपोर्ट कर रहा है ?

(Interruption)

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज : अब मैं आपका ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं जिसका उल्लेख राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में नहीं किया। वह बात है, कम्पलसरी प्राइमरी एजुकेशन की। दस वर्ष हो चुके हैं किन्तु इस बारे में हमने कुछ प्रगति नहीं की है। इस बारे में सरकार की क्या नीति है, वह स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये। इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी लश्करी शिक्षा में भी तरक्की होनी चाहिये। चीन के हमले से हम बार्डर के मामले में धोखे में आ गये हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार को एन० सी० सी० की स्कीम को सारे देश में लागू करना चाहिये। और लश्करी की ट्रेनिंग देने के लिए सारे देश में प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये। असली संरक्षण की योजना जनता को संगठित करने में है और जनता का संगठन आज हमारे लिये महत्व का है। हमारी विदेशी नीति में कोई भी दोष नहीं है, किन्तु हमारा आउटलुक भी संगठन का, श्रम करने का और समाजवादी समाज की रचना का होना चाहिये। अगर हमने यह बात की, तो हमें कोई नाबूत नहीं कर सकता है। जब मैं राष्ट्रपति का भाषण पढ़ता हूँ, तो उसमें गिड्यूल्ड कास्ट वालों का उल्लेख पाता हूँ तो मुझे खुशी होती है। सरकार इन लोगों के कल्याण के लिए एक आयोग नियुक्त करने का विचार कर रही है। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। इससे हमारा भी सब प्रकार का भला होता चाहिये।

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

दूसरी एक आखिरी बात मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने ठीक ही कहा है कि चीन ने भारत की सीमा का उल्लंघन कर विश्वासघात का काम किया है। लेकिन उसके सम्बन्ध में हमारे भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो बात कही है, वह बहुत खराब बात है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पंडित जी की जो विदेश नीति है, उसमें हमें सब प्रकार से सहायता करनी चाहिये। हमें सब प्रकार के मतभेद भूलकर राष्ट्र और देश का संगठन करना चाहिये और हमें यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि देश और राष्ट्र के हित में हमारा भी हित है। आज हमारे बार्डर पर कम्युनिस्टों की तरफ से बहुत गलत प्रचार हो रहा है। चाहे आप मिक्किम में जाइये, चाहे लद्दाख में जाइये, हर जगह बहुत झूठा प्रचार हो रहा है। इसे सरकार को रोकना चाहिये। हमारे देश के खिलाफ, हमारी सरकार की इस पालिसी के खिलाफ, जो कोई प्रचार करे उसको सरकार को कानून से रोकना चाहिये, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है। इसी के साथ मेरी यह विनती है कि देश की रक्षा के लिए पंडित जी की जो पालिसी है, उसमें सब राजकीय दलों को हर प्रकार की सहायता करनी चाहिये।

आज हमारे सभी प्रान्तों में लैण्ड सीलिंग हो रही है, लेकिन भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा कि लैण्ड सीलिंग नहीं हो रही है। यह गलत बात है। वे हमेशा दुनिया को बहकाने का प्रयत्न करते रहते हैं। इसीलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जो हरिजन हैं, आदिवासी हैं, भूमिहीन हैं, उनको भूमि मिलनी चाहिये, उनकी आर्थिक स्थिति सुधारनी चाहिये और उनकी रक्षा होनी चाहिये। जब हम समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करने जा रहे हैं, तो सब को भर पेट खाना, पहनने के लिए, कपड़ा और रहने के लिये मकान मिलना चाहिये और इसके बारे में हमारी योजना में ठोस प्रोग्राम होना चाहिये। इसके साथ साथ आदिवासी और दलित जाति के जो लोग हैं, उनकी सभी समस्याओं को जल्दी से

जल्दी दम बर्प के अन्दर हल करना चाहिये। दलित जातियों में से कुछ लोग मिनिस्टर बन गये हैं लेकिन अभी तक कोई गवर्नर और अम्बेसेडर इत्यादि नहीं बना है।

श्री डी० ए० मिर्जा : मिनिस्टर गवर्नर से बढ़ कर होता है।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : और समता स्वातन्त्र्य और बन्धुत्व को अमल में लाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

श्री डी० ए० मिर्जा : आपका चीफ मिनिस्टर भी है।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : एक बन गया, अच्छी बात है। और बन जायेंगे तो और अच्छा होगा।

अन्त में मैं फिर यह कहूंगा कि जो बातें मैंने अपने भाषण में बताई हैं, उन पर अमल होना चाहिये। कभी कभी ऐसा होता है कि जो हम बोलते हैं, उसको अमल में नहीं लाया जाता है। कम से कम जो हमारे खास प्वाइण्ट हों, उनकी जांच होनी चाहिये। इतना कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Since there are only five minutes left, if the House agrees, I propose we may adjourn now.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-five minutes past four of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 12th February 1960.