

RAJYA SABHA

Friday, 17th May 1957

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

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING AMEND-
MENT IN THE DISPLACED PERSONS
(COMPENSATION AND REHABILITA-
TION) RULES, 1955

THE MINISTER FOR REHABILITA-
TION AND MINORITY AFFAIRS
(SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA): Sir, I
beg to lay on the Table, under sub-
section (3) of section 40 of the Dis-
placed Persons (Compensation and
Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 a copy of the
Ministry of Rehabilitation Notifica-
tion S.R.O. No. 1487/R. Amdt. XIV.,
dated the 26th April, 1957, publishing
a further amendment in the Displaced
Persons (Compensation and Rehabili-
tation) Rules, 1955. [Placed in
Library. See No. S-40/57.]

NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING AMEND-
MENTS IN THE DELHI MOTOR VEHICLES
RULES, 1940

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND
COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJ
BAHADUR): Sir, I beg to lay on the
Table, under sub-section (3) of sec-
tion 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act,
1939, a copy each of the following
Notifications issued by the Delhi
Administration:—

- (i) Notification No. F. 21(41)/
56-MT&CE, dated the 22nd
February, 1957, publishing
certain amendments in the
Delhi Motor Vehicles Rules,
1940.
- (ii) Notification No. F. 12(64)/
54-MT & CE, dated the 23rd
February, 1957, publishing an
amendment in the Delhi
Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940.
- (iii) Notification No. F. 12(72)/
51-MT&CE, dated the 23rd
18 RSD—1.

February, 1957, publishing an
amendment in the Delhi
Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940.

- (iv) Notification No. F. 12(154)/
56-MT&CE, dated the 11th
March, 1957, publishing an
amendment in the Delhi
Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940.
- (v) Notification No. F.12(25)/52-
MT & CE, dated the 4th April,
1957, publishing an amend-
ment in the Delhi Motor
Vehicles Rules, 1940.
- (vi) Notification No. F. 12(32)/57-
MT & CE, dated the 4th April,
1957, publishing certain
amendments in the Delhi
Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940.
- (vii) Notification No. F. 12(31)/53-
MT & CE, dated the 20th
April, 1957, publishing an
amendment in the Delhi
Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940.
[Placed in Library.]

See No. S-44/57 for (i) to
(vii).]

ELECTION TO CENTRAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL CADET CORPS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. H. N. Kunzru
being the only candidate nominated
for election to the Central Advisory
Committee of the National Cadet
Corps, he is declared duly elected to
be a member of the said Committee.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESI- DENT'S ADDRESS

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr
Chairman, Sir, the President has made
a comprehensive review of the econo-
mic situation in the country and has
laid emphasis on the strains on our
internal and external economies
caused by our resort to deficit finan-
cing. I do not wish to speak much
about these points because these have
been, or will be, covered by other
speakers. But I was particularly

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.] struck by one sentence of his Address. At page 2 he says: "The determination and fervour of our people their readiness to accept discipline, to respond to the call for efforts and their resolve not to be led into anti-social behaviour, such as by hoarding or wasteful spending, alone will help the country to pass successfully through the present crucial period of our Second Five Year Plan." This, to my mind, is much more important than any other part in his Address. The Vice-President has also made some very pointed remarks about the demoralisation that has set in as shown by the last elections and also by the States Reorganisation squabbles in certain areas. The Prime Minister himself yesterday spoke about 'self-deception' among our people and said firmly that it should stop. All this is most important at this juncture because, if the Second Five Year Plan is to be carried out successfully, we need much greater discipline than we have been showing in the last few years.

I am now speaking on moral issues. But I happen to be an economist who has been speaking the language of economics for nearly forty years. Why this change? It is because I find as a result of my experience in different parts of India all these years that the real impediment to economic progress in this country is not the lack of economic or even scientific knowledge, but the disinclination on the part of our people to do hard work, to be honest and to work in team spirit. Lack of these is the chief cause of our people still being steeped in poverty. If agricultural production or industrial production has not sufficiently increased, it is chiefly because of lack of hard work first and foremost, lack of sufficient honesty and lack of trust in each other. No planned progress is possible without these moral qualities.

Let us take one example, the cooperative movement. I was brought up at a time when the cooperative movement was ushered in and

we were hoping much for the rapid growth of the co-operative movement. But, except in certain parts of Madras and Bombay, co-operation has not succeeded to any appreciable extent. The causes of this have been very carefully and correctly brought out in the Report of the Rural Credit Survey carried out by the Reserve Bank of India. It describes how our social and moral weaknesses for instance, casteism, communalism, selfishness and dishonesty have been responsible for this failure and I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that Members of Parliament will read this report very carefully. They will see in it the real causes of the slow growth of production in this country, of the too slow rise of living standard here.

Now something like this can be said of our Community Projects and the National Extension Service Blocks. Of course, they have been a greater success, but even there the huge money spent and the number of officials appointed in that connection are not commensurate with the measure of success achieved. This has, I believe, been brought out by the Appraisal Committee of the Planning Commission, which recently reported.

We are now engaged in carrying out planned development on a democratic basis. Many countries have carried out planned development on a democratic basis, but only countries with highly disciplined people have been able to carry it out properly. Take the case of Germany, for instance. I have seen Germany at her two very dark periods, in 1922 and again in 1945, that is to say, at the close of the first and second World Wars respectively. In both these periods Germany was in dire distress, but on both the occasions her prosperity revived rapidly, chiefly due to their hard work. It was a country which on both the occasions had been completely ruined by the World Wars. What is she today? West Germany is now next only to America in point of per capita income. They

have rebuilt Germany wonderfully well and Germany today is a far more prosperous country than before the last war. Recent statistics will bear this out. It was all due to hard work. There the people in general begin their day's work at 7 in the morning. Even in Government offices 7-30 is the usual time, whereas in a country like India where we have still a long way to go upward, we begin work in our Government offices much later; in some of the State capitals work begins at 11 o'clock or 11-15. I remember the time when most of the farmers, in the village I was born, used to get up at 5 in the morning and go to their farms soon afterwards with their ploughs and cattle. Now-a-days they begin work much later in the day. Well, if things go on like this, how can you expect the necessary increase in our production targets, particularly if you.....

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): How many hours will you suggest here?

DR. P. J. THOMAS: That is a different point. I am not here talking about hours of work. The point is that if we must have planning on this democratic basis, we will require highly disciplined people. Particularly, if we want to carry out the Plan with deficit financing, we require this all the more.

I find there is much worry about deficit financing. I am an economist who has always been advocating that, for a country like India, the conditions being what they are, deficit financing is largely applicable. In India we have large undeveloped resources and much idle manpower. These two conditions make deficit financing justifiable and make it work well, provided, of course, the people work hard and are honest both individually and in groups. The present economic conditions in the northern parts of India may not be quite suitable; in Delhi and Punjab, for example, the purchasing power of the people has considerably risen and

there is less unemployment comparatively speaking, whereas in southern India in these respects the position is different and so deficit financing can be more safely resorted to. But even there, it should be resorted to only if people are prepared to work harder and produce more, more particularly food in large quantities. We had been lulling ourselves with the belief that everything was all right and our food production was increasing. We have some very good harvests because the monsoon conditions had been good. And so, we were thinking that everything was all right. Now, we know that things have not been all right. There has not been adequate increase in production. There should be more production per acre and per man. This is only possible if people work harder. Therefore, the real need of the hour is hard work. You must produce the ordinary consumption goods in large quantities and supply the requirements of the people. In the alternative, we have to impose heavy taxation, and thus take away the surplus purchasing power. This is essential for planning on the democratic basis. But, if we fail to produce more food and other articles and also fail to tax heavily to absorb purchasing power, well, only by resort to totalitarian methods is planned development possible.

Now, I do not want to take much time of the House. What I would like to say is that, while we are thinking of building up factories and dams, we are not thinking in terms of building up our manhood. We want a new manhood in the country, we must build up worthier generations of people, ready to work hard. Only such people can use the dams and factories successfully. They must work in a team spirit. They must learn to work in a co-operative way. This is the most important thing for us today.

China has lately shown an example in this matter. They are doing much of the work of their Five Year Plan

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.]

through young men working in brigades and camping together all over the country. They are earning their living and are also learning a trade. Thereby in a few years, most of these young men will become very good agriculturists or industrial workers. In that way, we may organise our young people fresh from schools, particularly the unemployed young people; bring them together and make them work hard. We may thus build up a new generation of hard workers. I know that the Planning Commission, as also the Education Ministry are doing something in this regard. I find that much work is being done through schools. A few work and orientation camps have also been started in West Bengal and Kerala States. I know they have done much work, but we can hope for much out of them, because, to my mind, they are on the right lines. We have to expand this work and make it into a big movement. It is only thus that we can build up a new manhood, a new generation of better workers and more honest people, more capable of working, co-operative organisations.

Therefore, I wish to urge that along with our Five Year Plans we require a plan to build up our manhood. Our young men should be brought together in camps, in companies or brigades and made to work. There is also the possibility of works contracts being given to such societies. I know that persons like Shri Vaikunth Mehta were keen to proceed along these lines, and the Planning Minister too, but I do not think Government has been pushing along these lines. We do require such co-operative societies of young people to work together in brigades. I do not want to elaborate this point just now. I only want to place before the House, Mr. Chairman, that by merely pushing on with our Second Five Year Plan and by raising heavy taxation for this, we cannot achieve the required success. We have to put forth a special effort to build up a new man-

hood here, a new womanhood too. These people will be able to work harder and raise the country to a much higher economic level. Only then can we think of an egalitarian society. Otherwise, this talk of an egalitarian society can only be a make-believe. I hope that this idea will be taken up because there is no point in people talking about an egalitarian society as I am doing. We do want the Planning Commission to go into this matter and make proper plans for this purpose. Our young men from schools must be made to work. They may not like work if they are merely working under a contractor, but if they are organised into societies of their own, they will do any kind of hand soiling work, and work very hard too. Some of the Bharat Sewak Samaj Camps have been very successful and they are doing very good work. If only we work along these lines, certainly we will be able to build a new manhood and make our Second Five Year Plan a success, as also the Third Five Year Plan. Then will be the time when we will be able to bring about a socialistic or egalitarian society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have 26 speakers on the list here. Even if we give 10 minutes for each speaker, it will take about five to six hours. I hope speakers will limit themselves to 15 minutes each. There will be no lunch hour. The reply will be made by the Government on Monday, not today. I am doing this merely to enable as many people as possible to participate in the debate. Mr. Samuel. I want to give a chance to the new Members.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I rise to make only two observations on the Motion of Thanks to the President. The first point is rather the welcome and perhaps correct emphasis in the Address on national affairs, instead of on international affairs. It is a measure of the anxiety of the Government in regard to internal affairs more than in regard to international affairs. It is

also a measure of the Government's desire for co-operation from people of all shades of opinion to come forward and help accomplish the tasks facing the country. The General Budget presented by the Finance Minister the other day gives perhaps a little picturesquely, even if in a sombre manner, the difficulties that the facing our country. Everybody seems anxious about the food situation, but the Food Minister in his statement on Tuesday, did not give it as much importance or did not consider it as serious as some people have imagined. Even if it is not so serious, it is well for us to take into account the possible danger and take steps to avert a greater calamity that might befall us if we do not take proper action in time.

The Second Plan which we have embarked upon is of such a magnitude that no one can dare predict its success nor even face up to it with any sense of equanimity. The core of the Plan, as Mr. Krishnamachari has said, is steel, coal, cement, transport and ancillary power. We need steel very much for our industrial development. We don't produce even 10 per cent. of the steel that we require for our industrial development. Our steel plants will probably take until the end of the Second Five Year Plan to produce even the minimum of what is required for our Plan. The Railway Ministry has been asked to provide under the Second Plan a carrying capacity to the extent of about 180 million tons by the end of the Second Plan. They have been given Rs. 1,125 crores, to accomplish that task. With that money, I hear, they can carry out probably about 160 million tons of carrying capacity. If a newspaper report is correct, the Planning Commission, I think, has done well or is doing well to give Rs. 200 crores more for the Railway Plan. In fact, I believe, it is not enough for the Railways to keep up with the pace of economic development. On the other hand, they should go ahead a little more and anticipate the measure of our economic development and provide

in advance the carrying capacity necessary; otherwise, there will be bottle-necks and hold-up in the execution of the Plan. However, the Budget which, in my opinion, is very courageous and adventurous, will, I believe, enable us to achieve the targets that have been set in the Second Plan as we did so gallantly in regard to the First Plan targets.

I mention these points merely to point out the grim picture that we face. We have to take notice of this picture diligently and earnestly and the President's Address has rightly given priority to these things and we should give more time and thought for our own internal problems. When I say that we should give more thought to our internal problems, it does not necessarily mean that we should ignore international affairs. It is true that we have been playing with success a great role in international affairs. That role is a peace-making role and we have played it now for 8 years, I think, with considerable success. We have played no mean part in bringing about the end of hostilities in Korea, then in Indo-China and then recently in Egypt. Our own influence in the developments in Hungary, whatever the Western estimates may be, have helped to normalise the situation there. Industrially and economically, perhaps our position in the world is not commensurate with the part we are playing in international affairs. It is our ideals that have succeeded in international affairs, not our internal strength, and the President's Address is a call to the nation to help build our internal strength. This really is the prime task facing us today. Therefore, I say, let us not dabble in international affairs and neglect the tasks that are facing us internally. It is a fashion in the country—perhaps I am a little guilty of it too—that we want to learn more about other countries and take more interest in international affairs than perhaps people in America and Europe take about other countries; but people in America and Europe take more interest in their own national

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]
affairs, much more than international affairs. We do not do that. Therefore, we ought to start somewhere to take more interest in our own affairs.

The President's Address, I repeat, rivets our attention to problems at home. Out of the 8 pages of the Address, 5½ pages deal with matters at home and only 2½ pages with international affairs. Curiously, it occurs to me that this is perhaps the right proportion in which I, for my part, would like to distribute my attention. Some amendments moved to the Motion of Thanks complain about the neglect of some foreign matters, but I am not sorry, as I said, I am rather happy that national affairs have taken much more precedence, a greater precedence over international affairs.

The second point that I want to make is the suggestion of Dr. Jarring for arbitration on the point whether the conditions for holding a plebiscite in Kashmir have been fulfilled by Pakistan or not. I am mentioning this point because it is most likely—and there are already signs of it—that Pakistan is probably taking the line of propaganda that whereas it has agreed to arbitration on this point to enable a plebiscite to be held in Kashmir, India has rejected the decision and therefore is not very anxious for a settlement. I know some Western observers have considered this rejection on our part as rather unfortunate, but I want the Government to present to the world our point of view on this subject even before the Security Council takes up discussion of the Jarring report.

Well, we do not know how many proposals of Dr. Jarring have been rejected by Pakistan which Dr. Jarring has not mentioned in his report. For ought we know, there might have been several. Then again, a very influential newspaper in the West had suggested that this question might now be referred to the World Court. We have heard both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan rejecting the suggestion outright. For

the shrewd people, I think, there is some meaning in it. The conditions for a plebiscite were laid down in the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949. There were three conditions in effect—that Pakistani forces, tribesmen and nationals, must withdraw from the so-called Azad Kashmir; that the terms of the cease-fire and Truce Agreement should be strictly observed; and that peaceful conditions should be created within the State for holding the plebiscite. Now, we all know that none of these conditions have been fulfilled. In fact, no peaceful conditions exist, and every-body knows that. Instead, there are cries of war against India and there is vilification of Kashmir leaders. These are well-known facts. As Mr. Krishna Menon said, they are "self-evident" and no person is in a better position than Dr. Jarring himself to pronounce a judgment on this subject because he was his country's envoy in Pakistan for some time and then later in this country too. He knows conditions in both the countries, but he did not think it necessary to pronounce any judgement for his own reasons.

In fact, Sir, arbitration was referred to earlier in regard to Kashmir in the resolutions passed by the Security Council on March 13, 1951. It was said that all outstanding points of difference between the two countries should be referred to arbitration. Neither country followed up this suggestion probably for their own reasons.

Now, arbitration is an ancient custom. It has been in vogue for a long time, even in ancient times, but it fell into disuse later and was rarely resorted to in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. The 18th century has been said by international jurists to have been a century of mediation, of peaceful negotiations; but in the 19th century, arbitration came again into vogue; and from the Jay Treaty of 1794 between the United Kingdom and the United States, right up to 1904,

the United States itself was involved in about 76 arbitration cases, and by 1910, about 90 arbitration treaties were communicated to The Hague. All of them related to maritime seizures, mutual claims, pecuniary claims, liquidation and so on; but it is significant to note, Sir, that all these treaties excluded subjects involving vital interests, national independence and honour. I repeat these things, Sir. These treaties excluded vital interests, national independence and honour. These are the very things that almost always lead to war.

The fundamental principle of arbitration has been stated as "regulation of relations by general principles applied in particular cases by a judicial body". Perhaps that might come within the context of judicial arbitration, but there were in those times no precise international law by which judicial arbitration could be brought about. One of the authors on arbitration, Grotius, spoke about arbitration as a "method for humanising warfare". If there is any lesson in history that every country must learn, it is that arbitration nearly always and in every case, failed to prevent wars.

Sir, international arbitration is not the same thing as arbitration in case of industrial disputes or domestic disputes where a sovereign State can enforce the decisions of these arbitral bodies. It is not the same thing in the case of two sovereign States. If one of the parties to the dispute later backs out and does not want to abide by the verdict of the judicial body, you cannot enforce or carry out the verdict of the arbitral body except by resort to war, or as international law puts it rather euphemistically, "self-help or self-redress". Besides, arbitration does require mutual consent, willingness of the two parties to come together, and, having failed to arrive at a satisfactory settlement to refer the matter for arbitration with goodwill. There must also be confidence between the two parties

that whatever is awarded by the arbitral body would be carried out. Now, in this case of Kashmir, as everybody knows, in our relations, none of these conditions exist.

(Time bell rings.)

Have I two minutes, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I think we should anticipate this line of propaganda and prepare ourselves and prepare world opinion that at no time in history has any sovereign State referred matters of vital interest, national independence and honour for arbitration. Peace is never maintained by arbitration; peace is not maintained by coercion by any international body. As one international jurist said, "Peace is maintained by justice". Our case on Kashmir is just. May I repeat, Sir, "Peace is maintained by justice"?

Thank you.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I rise to accord my wholehearted support to the Motion of Thanks which my esteemed and honourable friends, Shri Algu Rai Shastri has placed before this House and which has been seconded with singular ability, if I may say so, by my honourable and learned friend, Dr. Anup Singh, Sir, at the outset, I would like to join in the personal tribute which has been paid to the President by my friend, Shri Algu Rai Shastri. We in Bengal have got special reason to feel a bond of affinity with the President who has been an outstanding student of the University of Calcutta in which you, Sir, have been a most distinguished teacher in later years. The President has also been a member of the High Court Bar Association in Calcutta with which I happen to be connected. In working the Calcutta Mysore's Relief Fund started in 1934, after the devastating earthquake in North Bihar, I had occasion to come in intimate touch with him and to observe at very close quarters the patriotism and the spirit of social service which inspired our President,

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]
as the General Secretary of the Bihar Central Relief Committee. All this past history came to my mind when I was listening to the opening words of Shri Algu Rai Shastri. Sir, the Address delivered by the President has given a definite lead to the country on vital questions which face the nation at the present juncture. In sober and dignified words he has sent out a call to the nation for fervour, determination and discipline against anti-social activities at this crucial turning point in the nation's history. He has called upon the Members of Parliament to come to the aid of the Government by putting forth their earnest endeavour and special effort and to support the Government in carrying out measures in that behalf. As the constitutional head of a democratic State functioning under the parliamentary system he could not be expected to deliver a propaganda speech so as to make it "inspiring" according to totalitarian standards.

Sir, what is the outstanding problem that faces the country at the moment? Shall we or shall we not proceed ahead with our Second Five Year Plan? After having wrested power from unwilling alien hands—power to build up our national economy rescued from the grinding mill of a colonial regime—shall we fail and falter? After having proceeded so far, shall we recede and retreat or shall we proceed and progress on the way to execution and fulfilment? That is the problem which confronts us today. Shall we fail to respond to the call of destiny? Shall we be overwhelmed with the difficulties which unquestionably stand in our way or shall we stand up to protect our freedom from degenerating into a mere name? That is the question which stares us in the face and that is the question which has been raised so prominently in the President's Address, which has also supplied the only unerring answer: There can be no abandonment or slowing down of the progress towards our objectives. We must at the same time take note of the difficulties some of which the President has indicated

in his Address. The deficits in the various budgets of the Central and the State Governments, the foreign exchange position, the food position, the corruption that is rearing its head in the country, the inordinate delays in the execution of the various policies, programmes and orders of the Government, these are some of the factors which have got to be tackled by our Government if we have to create and maintain the moral in the country upon which the President has laid stress in his Address.

As regards the budget deficits, the Finance Minister has placed his proposals before Parliament, before the House of the People and before this House also, and they will in the usual course come up for our consideration. I do not think it would be right on my part to anticipate events and to go into a discussion of those proposals in any detail on the present occasion. Parliament will pronounce its verdict upon the acceptability of those proposals either in their entirety or in a modified form. The country is, on the tenterhooks to find out what eventually will be the outcome of those proposals at the hands of Parliament. I shall not proceed on this occasion with any further discussion of that matter as I am doubtful whether it will be relevant so far as the present motion is concerned.

As regards the foreign exchange position, the Government have already adopted the policy of rigidly restricting imports of consumer goods and of development of a spirit of swadeshi so necessary and so essential for the future of this country dominated as it was by a colonial policy for a long series of years. But there we must not end; we must at the same time develop and expand our exports programme. By selling our wares such as they are, particularly raw materials, we can certainly improve our foreign exchange position. At the moment, Sir, a very vital raw material which is necessary for the Western countries to develop their industry comes to my mind. I refer to iron ore. If I am not

mistaken, our stock of iron ore seems to be almost inexhaustible. Even after meeting our own requirements in full we may have a very large surplus which we can utilise to earn foreign exchange by exporting it to Western countries. That is an aspect of the matter which I commend to our financial and technical experts for their earnest consideration.

That question leads me to the consideration of another vital question, namely, the development and improvement of the Calcutta port. Sir, Calcutta port is one of the premier ports in the country not only for import but also for export purposes particularly of our raw materials of the kind I have just indicated. Calcutta and another subsidiary port further down the river Hooghly will be of immense importance to strengthen our economy. I would, therefore, invite the attention of the Government to this urgent and pressing problem so that our export programme can be expanded and materialised by providing suitable outlets by way of a subsidiary port near about Calcutta.

Coming now to the question of food, I submit, Sir, that so far as West Bengal is concerned, the food question has assumed serious proportions. I do not desire to raise a note of panic or alarm: I concede that there is no reason for panic. Why do I say so? I say that there is no reason for panic at the moment because both the Central Government and the State Government are fully aware of the developing situation and the Central Government has undertaken to provide West Bengal with all its needs in the matter of wheat and rice. At the same time it will be necessary to draw pointed attention to the situation in West Bengal and, with your leave, Sir, I will take this opportunity of inviting the attention of the House to some of the salient features of the situation today. Sir, I am speaking on the basis of some figures which have been supplied from West Bengal, somewhat in an authoritative manner. By calculation of the stock position, it is perfectly clear that the deficit amounts to 266.6 thousand tons so far

as rice is concerned. Taking into account the yield of Aman crop in 1957, it is 394.5 thousand tons, and the expected total net yield in 1957 of all kinds of paddy, allowing for seed and wastage, amounts to 3948.6 thousand tons. The consumption requirements are estimated to be 4215.2 thousand tons. Now, Sir, West Bengal's annual requirements from the Centre are, therefore, not less than four lakh tons in terms of rice, in addition to about 40,000 tons of wheat monthly. If the supply of this amount of foodgrains is guaranteed by the Centre to West Bengal, we take it that there will be no reason for panic or alarm, and prospective hoarders should take warning that they will come to grief when all these stocks from the Centre are placed in the market.

Coming to the question of hoarding, there has been some amount of hoarding in West Bengal. That has been recognised by the West Bengal Government who are tackling the problem in right earnest. May I appeal to the Central Government to induce the hoarders to bring out their stocks in the open market by offering suitable prices? That, I understand, was one of the methods adopted by the great Food Minister of India, the late Mr. Kidwai, who, as if by the wave of a magic wand, solved the food problem, while at the same time discontinuing the system of rationing and control. We in Bengal, who came face to face with a devastating famine in 1943, the dreadful memories of which still rankle in our hearts, were thankful to the Government of India for tiding over the food crisis in 1951 and 1952. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, two minutes more. We again feel worried and perturbed. And we feel that if the Food Minister goes down to West Bengal and can induce the hoarders to bring out their stocks the apprehended crisis will never materialise. That is the hope we are entertaining today. And I take this opportunity of bringing this matter pointedly to his notice, so that immediate steps can be taken to bring about the desired result.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to associate myself with the Motion of Thanks so ably moved by my honourable friend, Pandit Algu Rai Shastri. The Address, to my mind, is very short and sweet. It deals with stark realities that are existing in the country. No doubt the Address has been hammered by several critics as smacking of a ring of formality, a spell of unreality, and that it does not enthuse sufficient inspiration in the minds of the nation and the people. The critics are men of experience, learning, and have great social service to their credit. I cannot assail their criticism. But if the realities are to be taken into consideration, then we have to think whether the President's Address gives an impression of a ring of formality or its tone is sober. It has to be judged from the various paragraphs which deal with the questions in the country. It is a small Address containing eight pages—there are thirty paragraphs. It may not appear as a sort of an election speech or propaganda speech by the constitutional Head. But it gives a clear picture as to how the country's situation is. According to some critics, it may not have given the full picture of the economic conditions prevailing in the country. But all the same, it deals at large with the various problems that face the country. One of the serious problems which has been dealt with—though very shortly because the matter is nothing but a sort of an indication of the policy of the Government—is the food situation in the country. The President's Address very rightly remarked that though it is not alarming, still it is serious. It is of grave concern. The economy in the country is also not very safe. All these are stark realities which the country and the leaders of society as we are in this august House will have to face. This august House and also the several Houses in the States have given their approval to the Second Five Year Plan. It has been approved and it is already working, though its first year of progress may be

very slow for several reasons beyond the control of the Government. However, the food situation in the country indicates, as the statistics given by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture show, that there is a steady increase in the production and as such they have sounded a note of cautious optimism, though it may not have been appreciated by several critics, as well as several people in the country, because of the rising trend of prices. The rising trend of prices during the last two or three months clearly go to show that the food situation is not satisfactory. I do not venture to say that it is deteriorating, but as somebody has remarked, the food situation appears to be a little grave because of the lack of purchasing power of the consumer. In regard to food production there are three factors. One is the producer; the other is the non-producer; and the third is the Government. The producer in this country is mainly the agriculturist. And it is time to think seriously whether the Union Parliament—if it wants to justify the existence and to show that this is a democratic House and also to justify that this is not a museum of political fossils but it is a real body which gives the lead to the nation—should have to seriously think whether in this country agriculture is to be given the pride of place ahead of industry, because it is the main industry of the nation. There is a clear distinction between agriculture and industry. And as it has been said by an eminent economist, there cannot be better industry unless there is an improved agriculture. An improved agricul-

12 **Noonture** needs several factors to be considered before we assail the producer in the country. Fortunately in this House very many speakers who preceded me have sponsored the cause of the producer, though the producer was not so much in the picture. The producers in this country can be divided into three categories: those who have got less than 2 acres of land—they form the bulk of 55 per cent. of the

agriculturists; secondly, those who have got less than 1 acre of land—they are 32 per cent.; the rest are 13 per cent. who have got the majority of land in this country, who are considered to be not active producers, not tillers of the soil, but who are what I may style as the landlords. Several State Governments have tackled the problem of land tenures and land reforms, but one thing remains that in spite of the tenancy legislation no corresponding liability is imposed upon the tiller of the soil to give an average minimum yield to the nation. The law may have been made in favour of the tenants, but the tenant does not know the corresponding responsibility that he has to grow more in the interests of the nation. All men are eaters of food, and very few of us are producers of food, and if we look from this angle then it remains to be seen whether the producer gets the necessary incentive to produce more. Sir, from my little experience of the rural areas—I myself am an agriculturist—I can say that growing of food is not a paying proposition to the agriculturists unless and until the prices of foodgrains are guaranteed. Ours is a marginal production, and we have to see whether this marginal production is to be stepped up to the point of self-sufficiency, in which case we have to see whether the producer needs any protection, whether guarantees can be given as regards the prices, whether parity of prices can be maintained for foodgrains *vis-a-vis* industrial products. If all these factors are not seriously taken into consideration, then, Sir, poverty in this country will not be liquidated, and unless and until we take the food problem as the vital problem of the nation, unless and until it is considered as the vital problem of the nation, I think we will be day by day disappointed in our attempts to relieve the food situation. The food situation is becoming grave because our fast expanding money economy has put more money in the pocket of the people. I have no quarrel with it because the country needs to give relief to persons who are not well

placed in life. But this money economy has played havoc among the rank and file of the various producers in agriculture, because after all in India even now more than 75 per cent. of the people depend upon agriculture, and if there is a great disparity in income between industrial labour and agricultural labour, the agricultural labour has no incentive, the small holder has no incentive to produce more. Besides, growing grain, as I said, is not a paying proposition and so the balance is tilted in favour of "cash crops". Various State Governments have also abolished the "Grow More Food" Acts. Especially in Bombay there was an Act called the "Grow More Food" Act of 1952. It laid down certain restriction on the grower to assign more land for food production. That restriction having been removed now, the farmer is an individualist in his crop planning, and he does not care what crop the country needs but he cares more for whether the crop is a paying or economical proposition. It is a natural human tendency that unless and until the business is remunerative nobody follows it seriously. The agriculturist faces this question in that way.

Sir, the other day our revered Prime Minister made a nationwide appeal to the people that India should follow co-operative farming. Sir, co-operative farming still remains a dead letter practically though there have been several eminent persons who have advocated the cause of co-operative farming. Dr. Trilok Singh in this book "Poverty and Social Change" advocated the cause of co-operative farming very ably. Captain S. P. Mohite from Bombay State, who is a Development Commissioner, has given much thought to it. The other day Shri R. K. Patil who led the Indian delegation to China advocated it. But it remains a dream. Serious thought must be given to co-operative farming. I do not venture to call the Indian farmer as an incorrigible individualist, though he follows agriculture on individualist lines. The choice will be between collective

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.]
farming, co-operative farming and whatever pattern we may desire to adopt according to our conditions. India will not go the way the Russians have gone. We do not want curtailment of individual freedom at the cost of national experiment in following collectivisation. Our problem is, we have to create a new life and inspiration in the producer and give him sufficient incentive to produce more food which is the country's vital need. Unless and until that incentive is guaranteed in the form of prices it is not possible to overcome this overwhelming problem. Government has given no doubt certain protection as far as the cotton crop is concerned, but there comes the export policy of the Government. When the export quotas are fixed the grower is never consulted, and when the whole product goes out of his hands to the middleman, and from the middleman to the big merchant, and from the big merchant to the mills, the agriculturist does not get a proper return for his toil. So, Sir, the export policy will have to be revised.

Sir, I need not dilate on the food problem very much, but it is the burning problem of the day, and unless and until we adopt some pattern which is akin to the Chinese pattern, which is based on voluntary co-operation, it cannot be solved. I should not venture to call it compulsion because co-operation and compulsion, experts say, do not go hand in hand. But if the country's need is taken into consideration and if the leaders feel that co-operative farming is going to produce more, then it does not matter if a gentle compulsion is imposed on the producers. After all the producers are a part and parcel of the nation, they may be the bulk, but unless and until they themselves are brought into adopting more scientific and improved methods of agriculture, production will not keep pace with the rising population which is increasing every year by leaps and bounds, and the increase is estimated at 50 lakhs per year. The increasing popu-

lation needs more food, and the statistics given by the Ministry of Food do not show more than one per cent. increase in production, taking the figures of 1953-54 and 1956-57. If that is the pace of production, I am afraid, whether we will ever be able to cope with the situation which appears to have gone out of our hands. Unless and until we rush food immediately to the several markets from the import quota or otherwise, it is not possible for us to alleviate the situation immediately.

Sir, with these words I resume my seat.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all please allow me to seek your indulgence and of those Members who are not in a position to follow Hindi properly for submitting my views in this House in Hindi.

चेयरमैन महोदय, राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण जहां तक मैं समझता हूं, वह मात्र एक शिष्टाचार नहीं है, मैं उसे सिर्फ एक रस्मी चीज नहीं समझता। मैं समझता हूं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में गत का सिंहावलोकन, बीती हुई बातों का जिक्र और भविष्य के सम्बन्ध में दिशा-निर्देश होना चाहिये। उसके साथ ही साथ राष्ट्रपति का जो गरिमापूर्ण पद है उसे देखते हुए देश को उस से प्रेरणा भी मिलनी चाहिये। मैं यह मानता हूं कि राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण और प्रधान मंत्री का अभिभाषण एक तरह का नहीं हो सकता। प्रधान मंत्री के अभिभाषण में ज्यादा विवादस्पद बातें हो सकती हैं। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में भी कम से कम उन तीन बातों का जिक्र तो होना चाहिये। इन तीन दृष्टियों से जब मैं देखता हूं तो मुझे निराशा होती है। इस अभिभाषण से मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि न तो इसमें गत का पूर्ण सिंहावलोकन है, न उसका पूरा जिक्र है, और न भविष्य के सम्बन्ध में कोई विशेष दिशा-निर्देश है। जहां तक प्रेरणा का प्रश्न है, वह तो उठता नहीं है। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है जब यहां के

मेरे कुछ मित्र न मालूम कहां से इस भाषण में प्रेरणा पाते हैं। इस भाषण में प्रेरणा का तो हम नितान्त अभाव पाते हैं।

मैं यह जानता हूँ कि देश के सामने जो समस्याएँ हैं उन सबका समाधान तुरन्त नहीं हो सकता। सब समस्याओं का समाधान तात्कालिक नहीं होता है। बहुत सी ऐसी समस्याएँ होती हैं जिनका समाधान समय सापेक्ष होता है, वक्त तलब होता है, सब मसले तुरन्त हल नहीं हो सकते। कुछ मसलों को हल करने के लिये समय या वक्त को जरूरत होती है, इंतजार करना पड़ता है, परिस्थिति अनुकूल देखनी पड़ती है, और ऐसी समस्याएँ भी होती हैं जो समस्याएँ राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर ही तय की जा सकती हैं या उनका हल निकाला जा सकता है। जब तक जनता और सरकार पूर्ण रूप से मिल कर उन समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं कर पातीं तब तक कोई एक पार्टी, कोई एक दल या कोई एक सरकार उन समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं कर सकती। इसलिये समस्याओं के भिन्न-भिन्न स्तर हैं, यह मुझे मालूम है, लेकिन आज राष्ट्रपति के इस अभिभाषण को पढ़ने के बाद यह पता नहीं चलता है कि कौनसी हमारी राष्ट्रीय समस्याएँ हैं, और कौनसी ऐसी समस्याएँ हैं जिनका हल सरकार के हाथ में है। उन समस्याओं का स्पष्ट चित्र हमारे सामने नहीं आता है। जहाँ तक प्रश्न है भिन्न-भिन्न विषयों के जिक्र और गत के सिंहावनोकन का, उस दृष्टि से भी यह अभिभाषण अधूरा लगता है।

श्रीमन्, सबसे बड़ी चीज जो अभी हाल में हमारे मुँह में हुई है वह है ग्राम चुनाव, जनरल इलेक्शन, जो अभी-अभी समाप्त हुआ है। राष्ट्रपति का यह अभिभाषण प्रत्येक वर्ष के साधारण अभिभाषण की तरह नहीं है, इस का विशेष महत्व है। संसद् के एक सत्र के समाप्त होने के बाद दूसरे सत्र के प्रारम्भ में यह भाषण दिया

गया है। एक तरह से पांच वर्ष की, और पांच वर्ष की ही नहीं, हमारी आजादी मिलने के बाद से आज तक की घटनाओं का थोड़ा बहुत संक्षिप्त चित्र इसमें होना चाहिये था, और आगे के लिये भी इसमें उसके आधार पर बातें होनी चाहिये थीं। लेकिन जो बातें कही गई हैं वे बिल्कुल गोलमटोल हैं, उनमें कोई दिशा-निर्देश नहीं है। मालूम होता है हम स्टेटिक हैं, एक ही जगह पर खड़े हैं, चल नहीं पा रहे हैं। चारों ओर हमारी नज़र घूमती है लेकिन हम आगे पैर नहीं बढ़ा रहे हैं। पैर भी अगर बढ़ाते हैं तो वह हमें आगे कहीं ले नहीं जाता है। चलना कई तरह का होता है। एक चलने में हम दूरी तय करते हैं और एक चलने में हम वृत्त के चारों ओर, परिधि पर चक्कर मारते हैं। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि हमारा जो चलना है उसमें हम उसी वृत्त पर, परिधि पर चारों ओर चक्कर लगा रहे हैं जो हमें कहीं नहीं ले जाता। वह हमें परिधि के अन्दर महदूद रखता है, सीमित रखता है।

इतना बड़ा चुनाव हुआ, इस चुनाव के बारे में जिस प्रकार अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से इसमें चर्चा की गई है उससे मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ, आश्चर्य हुआ। चुनाव एक साधारण चीज नहीं है। देश के इतिहास में, देश के जीवन में चुनाव का बड़ा महत्व है और इस चुनाव में जो जो फ़ोर्सेज रिलीज़ हुई, जो जो शक्तियाँ उद्भूत हुईं उन शक्तियों की वजह से चुनाव किस सतह पर गया, किस स्तर पर गया, उससे हमारे राजनीतिक जीवन का जो पता चला उस के लिये हम या हमारी सरकार क्या करना चाहती है इसका कोई उल्लेख नहीं हुआ है। मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि चुनाव का जो स्तर इस बार नीचे गिरा उसके लिये कौन जिम्मेदार है, किस अनुपात में कौन पार्टी, कौन दल, कौन व्यक्ति जिम्मेदार है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि इस बार जो चुनाव हुआ है

[श्री गंगा शरण सिंह]

उसके नतीजों से मालूम होता है कि प्रायः अधिकांश प्रान्तों में, अधिकांश जगहों में चुनाव के समय डिफरेंट इश्यूज थे, अलग-अलग मसले थे। मुख्य मसले स्पष्ट रूप में सामने नहीं आये। सच पूछिये तो ये चुनाव इस देश में मुख्यतः राजनीतिक आधार पर, राजनीतिक कार्यक्रम पर या और किसी ऊँचे दर्जे पर नहीं लड़े गये। भिन्न-भिन्न प्रान्तों में भिन्न भिन्न परिस्थितियाँ थीं। भिन्न भिन्न प्रान्तों में अलग अलग छोटी छोटी बातों का जिक्र हुआ, उसी के आधार पर चुनाव लड़े गये। यहाँ पर बड़ी बड़ी ऊँची बातें हुईं, ऊँची ऊँची, लम्बी लम्बी बातें, सिद्धान्त की बातें, नैतिकता की बातें हुईं लेकिन चुनाव के मैदान में जाने के बाद हम किम मन्तव्य पर छतरे? मैं जानता हूँ कि बहुत लोगों को उतरने के लिये बाध्य होना पड़ा। आज जो हमारे यहाँ की आबोहवा है, जो परिस्थितियाँ हैं, जो वायुमंडल है, वह इस स्तर का हो गया है कि चुनाव जीतने के लिये बहुतों को न चाहने पर भी शायद उस स्तर पर उतरना पड़ता है। और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रश्न किसी एक पार्टी का प्रश्न नहीं है। यह प्रश्न आज राष्ट्र का प्रश्न हो गया है, देश का प्रश्न हो गया है। मैं पूरी जिम्मेदारी के साथ अपनी तरफ से कह सकता हूँ कि इस स्तर को ऊँचा उठाने के लिये, इस सतह को ऊँचा उठाने के लिये, देश को ऊँचा उठाने के लिये, मैं और मेरे साथी, जो भी कदम इस सम्बन्ध में उठाया जाय, उस में साथ देने के लिये, मदद देने के लिये सदा तैयार हूँ। मुझे इस चुनाव में जो कुछ तजुर्बा हुआ उससे कभी कभी मेरे मन में यह प्रश्न उठा कि क्या हम एक देश हैं, क्या हम एक राष्ट्र हैं? कहीं जाति के नाम पर, कहीं धर्म के नाम पर, कहीं मजहब के नाम पर, कहीं दूसरी चीजों के नाम पर, अधिकांश चुनाव लड़े गये।

आज हमारा और सबका सबसे पहला

कत्तव्य यह है कि हम देश को राष्ट्रीयता का पाठ पढ़ाये। आज हमारी राष्ट्रीयता छिन्न भिन्न है क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि हमारा देश आदर्श परिस्थितियों में, आइडियल कंडीशंस में आजाद नहीं हुआ है, देश का अंग भंग हो गया, देश छिन्न-भिन्न हो कर स्वतंत्र हुआ। साथ ही एक बहुत बड़े महायुद्ध के बाद हमारा देश आजाद हुआ और जैसा कि हर महायुद्ध में होता है, उस महायुद्ध में भी सारे संसार का नैतिक स्तर नीचे गिर गया। नैतिक स्तर नीचे गिर जाता है तो मनुष्य और मनुष्यत्व की कीमत भी गिर जाती है, मनुष्यत्व नीचे दर्जे पर आ जाता है। और चूँकि महायुद्ध के बाद देश को आजादी मिली है इसलिये भी हमारे मनुष्यत्व का कम हो जाना स्वाभाविक लगता है। लेकिन उसके बाद भी जो यह स्तर नीचे ही गिरता जा रहा है, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार क्या करने जा रही है इस स्तर को ऊँचा उठाने के लिये। उस का कोई जिक्र नहीं हुआ है राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में—न उसका पर्यवेक्षण, है, न उसका सिंहावलोकन। यह ठीक है कि निराशा की बात नहीं होनी चाहिये, लेकिन जख्म पर परदा डालने से, छिपाने से, जख्म अच्छा नहीं होता, जरूरत पड़ी तो आपरेशन करना चाहिये, इलाज करना चाहिये, दवा दारू करना चाहिये। कितनी बड़ी चीज हुई है जिसने देश को हिला दिया है, जिसने राष्ट्र की नींव को हिला दिया है, देश के राष्ट्रीय जीवन को हिला दिया है। मुझे आश्चर्य होता है जब मैं देखता हूँ कि इस बात का राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जिक्र भी नहीं है। फिर भी मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहूँगा कि देश में राष्ट्रीयता को प्रतिष्ठित करने के लिये और देश की एकता को कायम रखने के लिये सरकार कदम उठाये और वह कदम ऐसा उठाये जो किसी दल विशेष का व्यक्तिगत प्रश्न न हो। आज हमारे देश में जो खतरा है वह कई दृष्टियों से है, बाहर

कहीं से है कि नहीं और है तो कितना है, उसका मुझे पता नहीं। सरकार को इसका पता है, प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री को इसका पता है। लेकिन मुझे जो इस देश में घूमने का थोड़ा बहुत मौका मिलता है तो मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ आंतरिक खतरा भी कम नहीं है। इसके कारण हमारे देश में जो मुख्य चीज है वह गौण बन गई है और गौण चीज मुख्य बन गई है। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि हम लोगों का ध्यान मुख्य चीज की तरफ तो नहीं जाता, गौण चीज की तरफ जाता है। आज कोयला सोना और सोना कोयला बन गया है। इस समय देश के सामने सबसे पहला प्रश्न देश की राष्ट्रीयता को बनाने का, उसको सुरक्षित करने और देश के स्तर को ऊँचा करने का है। इन चीजों की तरफ मैं सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

इसके बाद जो सबसे पहली समस्या आती है वह है आदमी को जीवित रखने का प्रश्न। सबसे पहले आदमी हवा चाहता है, पानी चाहता है, भोजन चाहता है, वस्त्र चाहता है और इस तरह आवश्यकताओं की एक परम्परा है, एक कड़ी है। कबल इसके कि मैं अन्न का प्रश्न लूँ, एक चीज की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। मुझे अपने राजनैतिक कार्यों के सिलसिले में, अन्य लोगों की ही तरह, भिन्न-भिन्न प्रांतों में जाना पड़ता है। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि हम लोग यहाँ बहुत आराम से बैठे हुए हैं, हमारी सुरक्षा का सारा प्रबन्ध है, हमारे आराम का सारा प्रबन्ध है, लेकिन देश के कई प्रांतों में, जैसे मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान और बिहार तथा अन्य प्रांतों में कुछ ऐसी जगहें हैं जहाँ आज, जहाँ तक कि मुझे व्यक्तिगत तजुर्बा है, रात में लोग बाहर सड़क पर नहीं चल सकते, जहाँ अकेले बस्ती से बाहर लोग अपना घर नहीं बना सकते। कल ही जहाँ से मैं आया हूँ वहाँ बहुत से देहात के रहने वाले कसबों में आ

कर बस रहे हैं, शहरों में रह रहे हैं। आज देहात में उनका जीवन सुरक्षित नहीं है। आज ऐसा मालूम होता है जैसे हमारे यहाँ कोई राज्य ही नहीं है, जैसे कोई हमारी रक्षा करने वाला नहीं है। और प्रांतों में भी ऐसा होगा, लेकिन इन तीन प्रांतों मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान और बिहार का मेरा निज का अनुभव है जहाँ ऐसी परिस्थिति है। फिर भी इस अभिभाषण में इस तरह का कोई उल्लेख नहीं है कि हमारी क्या परिस्थिति है और क्या हमारी सरकार ने किया है। मैं जानता हूँ कि चेष्टा की गई है, लेकिन जिस तरह की चेष्टा की गई है उससे इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। इस समस्या का समाधान बड़े पैमाने पर और बड़े स्तर पर करना होगा। जब हमारे नागरिक की जान खतरे में हो जाय, जब हमारा नागरिक यह समझने लगे कि देश के किसी कोने में वह मकान नहीं बना सकता, जब हमारा नागरिक यह समझने लग जाय कि रात में हम सड़क पर नहीं चल सकते, हम सुरक्षित नहीं हैं, कहीं हमारा जाना, आना या रहना सुरक्षित नहीं है तो डेमोक्रेसी के, प्रजातंत्र के और हमारे सारे सिद्धान्तों के क्या मानी रह जाते हैं, उनका क्या अर्थ रह जाता है? अगर उसका जीवन ही सुरक्षित नहीं है, अगर वह जी ही नहीं सकता है, अगर उस के माल की हिफाजत नहीं हो सकती है तो बाकी जितनी सिद्धान्त की बातें हैं वे बेकार साबित होती हैं। इसलिये सबसे पहले मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहूँगा। आपने अखबार में पढ़ा होगा कि जो डाका डालने वाले लोग हैं वे आज क्या करते हैं। एक पहाड़ी पर डकैतों ने यज्ञ किया और उस यज्ञ में लोग शामिल हुए और बड़े पैमाने पर शामिल हुए। आपने शायद सुना होगा कि खुले आम किसी डकैत की शादी होने वाली है और उस शादी में सैकड़ों आदमी इनवाइट हो कर, निमंत्रित हो कर जायेंगे। अखबारों में यह खबर छपी है कि अमृक डाकू की शादी होने वाली

[श्री गंगा शरण सिंह]

है और उस शादी में सैकड़ों आदमी विवाह कराने जायेंगे। इसी प्रकार एक पहाड़ी पर किसी डाकू ने यज्ञ किया और उसमें बहुत से आदमी शामिल हुए। यह क्या हो रहा है? हमारे देश में यह क्या हो रहा है? मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार का ध्यान मैं इसकी तरफ आकर्षित करूँ। जिन्दा रहना हमारे लिये सबसे ज्यादा जरूरी है। आज देश का जीवन खतरे में पड़ गया है। आज ऐसी अवस्था हो गई है कि हमारा नागरिक सुरक्षित नहीं है। जब तक नागरिक यह नहीं समझेगा कि उसको जिन्दा रहना है और उसको जिन्दा रहने का अधिकार है तब तक चाहे राष्ट्रपति जी आह्वान करें, चाहे हमारे लोकप्रिय प्रधान मंत्री जी आह्वान करें, वह उस आह्वान का उत्तर कहां से देगा? जब उसके हृदय में भय हो, जब उसका जीवन खतरे में हो, जब उसका अस्तित्व खतरे में हो तब ऐसे आह्वान का जवाब वह कैसे दे सकता है? आज की परिस्थिति में यह आह्वान पत्थर पर पड़ कर चूर-चूर हो जायगा और इसका कोई उत्तर नहीं मिलेगा। इसलिये ऐसे आह्वान के लिये पहले जमीन तैयार करनी चाहिये, पहले वातावरण तैयार करना चाहिये। आज हमारे देश में जो एक असहायता और असमर्थता की भावना हो गई है, उस भावना को पहले दूर करना चाहिये।

आज हमारे देश में अधिकांश पढ़े-लिखे लोग ही नहीं बल्कि देहात की अनपढ़ जनता भी यह अनुभव करती है कि हमारे देश में ऐसी समस्याएं हैं शायद जिनका समाधान हो नहीं सकता। हमारे देश में जो बड़े से बड़े अनीश्वरवादी हैं वे भी आज भाग्य का भरोसा लेने लगे हैं। उनको ईश्वर में विश्वास नहीं है, वे ईश्वर को नहीं मानते हैं, देवी-देवताओं को नहीं मानते हैं, लेकिन आज देश में जो परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है उसके कारण वे भी भाग्य को मानने लगे हैं। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ है कि

आज हमारे देश में इनीशिएटिव की कमी हो गई है। आज आम जनता में इनीशिएटिव नहीं है। हम चाहे यहां खुश हो लें कि कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट एरियाज में या नेशनल एक्सटेंशन सर्विसेज के एरियाज या क्षेत्रों में बहुत काम हो रहा है और उसके आंवड़े हमारे पास आ जायें, लेकिन मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि केवल नीलोखेरी और कुक्षेत्र में काम होने में सारे देश में काम नहीं हो जायगा। आप देश के और भागों में चलिये और देखिये कि क्या हो रहा है। जो सब कुछ हो रहा है वह देखिये लेकिन देखना यह भी है कि उससे भवना क्या पैदा हो रही है कि सरकार के टकसाल में पैसा बनता है, अधिक से अधिक जितना ले सको ले लो। जो लोग पहले बिल और वाउचर का नाम भी नहीं जानते थे, वे आज उसको पैसा कमाने का साधन समझने लगे हैं। मुझें ताज्जुब हो गया जब एक साहब ने यह कहा कि पहले जमाने में जाली नोट बना करते थे और उससे पैसा पैदा होता था, लेकिन नोट बनाने में जेल जाने का खतरा था। आज आसानी से पैसा हो जाता है बिल बनाने से। इसलिये अब बहुत से लोग नोट बनाने के स्थान पर बिल बनाने लगे हैं। यह परिस्थिति है। जो कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट प्रोजेक्ट के एरियाज हैं उनमें देखिये कि लोगों को क्या प्रेरणा मिल रही है। वे समझते हैं कि सरकार से पैसा लेना चाहिये और उन्हें स्वयं कोई प्रयत्न नहीं करना है। जहां सरकार यह तय करती है कि इतना हिस्सा जनता को देना चाहिये, मैं सबकी बात नहीं कहता, लेकिन अधिकांश जगहों पर कहीं किसी के नाम पर, कहीं किसी के नाम पर सिर्फ कागज पर पैसा जनता से आता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट प्रोजेक्ट और नेशनल एक्सटेंशन एरियाज में जहां ऐसी कंडीशन है, ऐसी शर्त है कि इतना हिस्सा जनता दे वहां इस बात की जांच की जाये कि सचमुच कितना हिस्सा पब्लिक से आया है—हिस्सा वास्तव में आया है

या सिर्फ कागज पर आया है। आज कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट प्रोजेक्ट और नेशनल एक्सटेंशन सर्विसेज से कोई प्रेरणा मिलने के बजाय ऐसा मालूम होता है कि कुछ लोगों के लिये नाजायज फायदा उठाने का यह एक जरिया हो गया है। (*Time bell rings.*) जो चीज अच्छाई के लिये बनी, वह गलत रास्ते पर ले जाई जा रही है। मुझे संस्कृत की एक कहावत याद आती है कि रचना करने चले थे गणेश की और रच दिया बानर। कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट प्रोजेक्ट से मुझे को यही पता चलता है कि बजाय गणेश के बानर की रचना हमने कर दी है।

जहां तक फूड का, खाद्यान्न का सवाल है, इस अभिभाषण के पढ़ने से ऐसा लगता है कि सिर्फ बिहार और यू० पी० के कुछ हिस्सों में यह समस्या है। लेकिन आप और हम सब जानते हैं कि आज जहां तक अन्न का सवाल है, खाद्यान्न का प्रश्न है, वह सम्पूर्ण देश की सबसे विकट समस्या हो कर हमारे सामने खड़ा है। यह सवाल इतना आसान नहीं है, इतना सिम्पल नहीं है, इतना छोटा नहीं है, जितना राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण से पता चलता है।

इतने थोड़े समय में मैं आप से सारी बातें कह नहीं सकता। समय हो गया है और इसलिये मैं आप से क्षमा चाहता हूं। लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि जो दो-तीन बातें मैंने आप के सामने रखी हैं और जिनका राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जिक्र नहीं है उन पर आप विशेष रूप से ध्यान दें। वे आज राष्ट्र की तात्कालिक ज्वलंत समस्याएं हैं, और यदि उनका समाधान नहीं किया गया तो हमारा राष्ट्र टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायगा। धन्यवाद।

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I read the speech of the President with considerable attention and care, but I was wondering whether it was a catalogue of events which had appeared in the newspapers

for the last so many months or a faint policy statement of the new Government that has been set in after the so-called fair and proper elections. Now, Sir, the speech of the President is naturally expected to give an indication of the future policy of the Government. It may not be a catalogue of all that they are promising us, but it ought to be, at least, a small indication as to what the Government are proposing to do.

Now, Sir, the point that has to be considered is what policy we are going to adumbrate and how the so-called free and fair elections took place in this country. I will tell you a few samples. Certain members of the Congress Party managed to secure the indelible ink and started putting it on fingers of the people in the villages paying them moneys also and telling them to go and vote, because that is a mark which can be distinguished. By the time these people went to the election booth, they were all turned out, because indelible ink is placed on the finger of the man who goes to the booth for exercising his vote. That is one method which was adopted by our friends. The other method of election, which was free, was that in narrow villages, from where people had to come and vote, carts and cars were placed to blockade the road—an event which prevented virtually many villagers from coming to the booth and exercising their votes. And the third important event which this free election gave us was that the police officials went to the various villages under the pretext of protecting the Ministers who went there as candidates, and they were frightened out of their existence, which enabled them not to come anywhere near the booth. This is how we had a free and fair....

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are ways of protesting against these elections.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, this is another way of protesting against all indecent actions that have taken place in this country.

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

Then, Sir, I come to the position with regard to our food which we find in our President's speech. What is this food problem? This is something like that Circus which is named after an Englishman, Connaught Circus. We start from a place and go round and come back to the same place. For the past five years this food problem has been tackled by our Government. They have said that they have already solved the problem, and there will be a time when we will not know what to do with the surplus food in this country and how it is going to be given away to others. But what do we find? We are mortgaging our assets lock, stock and barrel to foreigners in order to feed our own people. How is it that is happening? There is a cry that our foreign exchange is dwindling. Naturally, our foreign exchange will dwindle because our present Finance Minister, who was Minister for Commerce and Industry, gave import licences to the extent of Rs. 500 crores. When he left that office and became Finance Minister, he has had to equate it with foreign exchange. When that is the position, what is the method that we have to adopt in order to supplement our foreign exchange? No country in the world will ever survive by importing food to feed its people, if it cannot have enough materials to export from that country. I know very well that Britain is deficient in food, but they have got a highly industrialised economy and they dump their goods on other countries with a view to getting raw materials and food from them. But what have we to export? We can export only our human beings for slavery to other countries. People everywhere are becoming politically conscious and are struggling for national independence. But are we really nationalistic? We have to go into the root of our trouble. What is our trouble? The trouble is that we are in this Commonwealth. What is the Commonwealth? There is nothing in common and there is no wealth for you. The linking of your rupee to the sterling is your basic trouble. Why should your rupee which is to be backed up

by the sweat and labour of 360 millions of your people be tied down to the sterling of a puny nation? You must give your own value to your rupee. Every transaction in this country, whether it is import or export, is tied down to the British economy through the sterling, and you lose roughly about Rs. 50 crores every year.

The food prices are increasing. Why are they increasing? The prices are increasing because the Nasik Press is turning out too many notes. We have got more money than we can match with our production. When that money goes to the public, naturally prices go up. There is nothing surprising about the food prices going up. The increased note circulation must be equated by labour, by work, by more activities in our country. I tell you that food production can be increased only by common endeavour. Our food production must be increased by co-operative endeavour. There was what is called a well subsidy. The Government used to give Rs. 500 per well. Of this, some share used to go to the Congress Members of the Legislatures, some to the Tehsildars and some to the Deputy Tehsildars, and only about Rs. 200 used to go to the person concerned. A person can never dig a well for that amount. As my friend there was saying, human character—our character—must be reformed, and you are doing everything possible to destroy the ancient culture and character of every Indian in the country. You are neither fish, flesh nor red herring. You have created a situation in the country by which every honest man is made dishonest, every decent man is made indecent, and every proper man is made improper. You have created a situation by which....

KAZI KARIMUDDIN (Bombay):
You have created that situation.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am following the parliamentary method of addressing you. I cannot address this Member or that Member. We have to go into the fundamentals of our position and we have to see how our people

are to be regimented, galvanised, for producing more food. This Government is a party Government. You do not consult the Opposition on every issue of importance. Today, you are more or less a totalitarian State. You are exploiting the past name of the Congress which Mahatma Gandhi asked you to dissolve. You have not done so. You are trading on that position. You go to the electorate and say, "Vote for the Congress". The Congress means what? So long as this thing goes on, no Opposition can spring up in this country.

There is a planned method of developing the country, but that is not to be. You are tied down to the apron strings of the British damsel who refuses to release you from her clutches. If you want to see that economically you become independent, you create a value, a self-respecting value, for your own rupee. This alone will enable you to conserve your wealth. Plug all the foreign profits which are drained away from this country, as that is a drain on our foreign exchange. The import and export business of this country, you Indianise. I will not say 'nationalise it', because I know what has happened to your nationalisation of the insurance business. Sir, we had an insurance business which was built up by patriotic pioneers in the country over 100 years. Now in one year you have destroyed this business. Rs. 70 crores is the loss in business compared with the figures of the previous year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You said that you wanted to give some positive suggestions.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I can give positive suggestions only after I have thoroughly exposed their present policies. You do not tamper with things like that. Before you adumbrate your policies, consult the representatives of the other groups also. When you take people into your confidence, there will be more hearty co-operation, co-operation of a fundamental nature, co-operation which will contribute to the prosperity of the

country. Now, the Communists are trying to nationalise the tea industry. I know how the tea industry is virtually in the hands of the Britishers in this country. I know how much money is being taken away from the country. What is the fun of your political independence if you cannot use it? It should be properly implemented in such a way that your political independence is used for the benefit of Indians. Nowhere in the world have I seen a country's import and export trade being controlled by foreigners. You can see that only here. Nowhere in the world have I seen the interests of the nationals being subordinated to the interests of the foreigners. We see it only here. Take the question of giving advertisements of the Government to foreign agencies, and Dr. Keskar refuses to agree to the suggestion made by us. Take the people into your confidence and you will find that things are not as you find them to be.

Now, Sir, we have got two Ordinances which were promulgated. The life insurance employees were clamouring that they must be given an equitable wage. Government refused, and they went to the court. The High Court was in favour of the employees. Hardly had the ink dried on the judgment than the Government came out with an Ordinance. An Ordinance.....

KAZI KARIMUDDIN: Sir, can anybody drink water in the House?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: An Ordinance came out telling that that particular section affecting the employees is amended. There was another law court decision regarding workers compensation in the event of retrenchment or total closure of a business firm. Hardly the ink on the paper dried, there was another Ordinance. What does it indicate? Does it indicate the rule of law in this country or the rule of dictatorship? Does it indicate that with regard to the interests which are pertaining to Government, which is a people's Government, there must be one particular law and with regard

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]
to the interests of individuals, there must be another particular law? Is it a position that anybody can accept? Should they not give some consideration and respect for judgments issued by learned men who are appointed as Judges by you in courts? Should you not give respect to courts, but I am not surprised because my friend the Finance Minister has been going round in the country and talking: "The courts are against me, the Constitution is against me, and all of you are against me and I want to run the Government as I please". When that is the attitude prevalent in the high Ministerial circles, how is it possible for you to create a situation whereby people can well develop a democratic concept. (*Time bell rings*) and co-operate with the endeavours of the Government and make their Plans successful?

Being a disciplined man, I obey your orders and sit down.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the beginning I had not any intention to speak on this Address of the President but having been here since yesterday, I find that there are certain matters which have not been dealt with by a number of people.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I am speaking on this only as an independent person because I represent nobody. I am a nominated Member, but having been in Bombay for sixty years in different capacities either as a teacher or professor or a lawyer and as a person participating in numerous institutions, I may say that in Maharashtra and Bombay I know thousands of people; and, therefore, I am only voicing what people, when I speak to them, say about the composite State of Bombay.

I do not want really to open up the discussions upon the report of the States Reorganisation Commission. That is done. After that there are now 13 unilingual States created. Whatever the learned gentlemen that drafted the report might have said,

this is an accomplished fact that out of 14 States, 13 are unilingual and the only State which is composite so far as languages are concerned is the State of Bombay. Now, many people in Gujarat are not satisfied with the composite State stretching from Kutch right down to Nagpur and again right down to Kolhapur. Similarly, numerous Maharashtrians are not pleased with the prospect of their being yoked together with the different people. They want a Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as capital. These are the different view-points and I am going to say why people feel like this and whether their feelings and views should not be considered by those in authority. That is the question.

As regards the composite State, the persons in high places have been telling us that this may be a bitter pill, but it has to be swallowed because of the great benefits that such a composite State will confer and because of the requirements of unity and security of the whole of India. So far as I know, these are the only two grounds that are put forward and trotted out in season and out of season for such a composite State. Now, the Maharashtrians feel that they have been seriously discriminated against. They also feel that insult has been added to injury. Whether they are right or wrong is not the question. There is a large body of people feeling like that and it is for the authorities to consider their position—the position of the people and their own position. Let us look into these matters. I have often tried to put forward this view of our leaders before the people—high and low, rich and poor, but even the lowest and most illiterate people are not willing to listen to this. They say that this is a camouflage. They are not satisfied about the honesty of these two or three purposes that are put forward. There is something else which they are not putting forward plainly. That is what they feel. They say that if really composite States are such good things, why Andhra was separated from Madras. Madras would have been an ideal example of :

multi-lingual State with four different languages. There are now four States—Andhra is separated from Madras, there is Kerala and again now Mysore, and parts of Bombay also have been added to it. So we can't satisfy them. Let the Congressmen dare go and address them. Nobody will listen to them. I am telling you that in Bombay there are *wadis*.....

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Bombay): Who told you? I have addressed so many meetings in Maharashtra.

(Interruptions.)

DR. P. V. KANE: I am talking of Bombay first. I will come to Maharashtra later. I say that in Bombay there are *wadis* or wards. There they have put down plates 'No Congressman should come to address'. Barbers and *dhobis* have put down this. Remember, rightly or wrongly they feel 'Why should Maharashtra be selected if it is such a good thing'? They ask another question, apart from Andhra. With a great deal of fanfare—popular memory is brief but you may remember that—there was a kite-flying that Bihar and Bengal should be joined together. What happened? Of course, everybody said 'Yes, it is a very good idea'. The first bye-election went against the Congress and the Chief Minister of Bengal took an opportunity of that and he torpedoed the whole idea and slid back. Then, they ask another question. If Parliament thought in their wisdom that a composite State was the best when they were deciding the fate of Maharashtra and Gujarat, why did they not impose a composite State of Bihar and Bengal? It was the same Parliament and they could have done it. If they can, without consulting the people who were principally affected, without anything being placed before them, jump at once to this, why did they not take another jump? There is no answer. Let anybody answer this after me. There is no answer. It is something which is secret and which they are not able to say. The feeling is that true things are not brought out. So,

you must take care of that. These are questions asked not only from Congressmen—of course, they will always be asked, particularly, in Bombay and even in Maharashtra. These are the questions asked. If it is good for Bombay—and people from Bihar and Bengal must have joined in passing this—why did they not do it for themselves? Probably, because as the great poet Kalidas says:

महदपि वरदुःखं शीतलं सम्यगाहुः ।

It was only the Maharastrians who were affected and so they did not bother about it, but what about themselves? There must have been at least 100 representatives from Bihar and Bengal, if not more, in the Lok Sabha.

I am not sure how many, perhaps more; but then our leaders tell us that this is not the proper method. In Bombay there were riots and there were riots also in Gujarat. Violence is very bad. I admit that and everybody admits that, but then there is the democratic method. We are told that there is only this democratic method. There is no referendum or calling back—it is not a method—but the only method is to throw out the ruling party at the time of new elections. That is the only method, so far as I see, provided in the Constitution. Very good. There were the elections and in the principal part of Maharashtra, from Khandesh right down to Kolhapur, the Congress suffered a terrific defeat. It was fought on this very Samyukta Maharashtra issue, and in certain districts of that part of Maharashtra, not a single Congress candidate was elected and some had to forfeit their deposits. Congressmen who had worked for years and years in this House lost their deposits. Is there any other method that can show the feelings of the people? This is the only method. Then came the municipal elections of Bombay. What happened there? The Congress which was denominating for about 19 years,—I may not be quite correct about the years—for many years, has been defeated and it is now a minority party

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

there. What does it show? So far as Bombay city is concerned, the verdict of the people is that they want Samyukta Maharashtra. The elections were fought only on that issue. Now, are you prepared—that is the question asked of the leaders—to accept this verdict or not? You will find that this thing has been by-passed in the President's Address. In paragraph 13, there is a reference simply, "Consequent on the reorganisation of the State, Advisory Committees have been set up" and so on. What is Government's position about this sensitive point? That is not shown anywhere and, therefore, this question has to be raised. This is democracy and it means Government of the people, by the people and for the people, either literate or illiterate, high or low, everybody. That is the verdict so far as Bombay city is concerned; the verdict given is also against the Congress so far as a large portion of the old Maharashtra is concerned, almost the whole of Maharashtra.

My point is, what are you going to do? You cannot always be abusing people and calling them names, hurling at them words such as linguism, provincialism, casteism and all that. That has been repeated *ad nauseum*. In reply, we would say that there is corruption, there is inefficiency and so on. It is no use merely abusing each other. We must find out how to build up, out of this particular rout, co-operation. So far as I can see, there is no stir in the persons who are in authority; they seem to take it complacently. That is what appears to me, an observer who belongs to no party. The Congress Members from Maharashtra and other places may say something in private meetings but in this House they dare not say what I am saying.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Dr. P. V. KANE: Even if they feel what I am saying, they are bound by the party discipline. Therefore, I

have to raise this particular question in my individual capacity. One more question that people ask is this: If a composite State was such a good thing, why did Government, in the original Bill, have three States, Gujarat, Bombay City and Maharashtra? That was Government's own idea and somehow or other this was given up and a new surprise was sprung on us. This was Government's own idea and at that time they were not led by considerations of linguism or provincialism or anything of that kind. They did so in their wisdom and this was changed later on. So, don't abuse people by calling them names and say that they have been affected by linguism. You have yourself been affected. If you do not accede to public opinion, you will be exemplifying what Lord Acton said, "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely". That may be the thing that we will have to say about you. I was once called in joke as a *desha drohi*. I said, "I am a thorough Maharashtraian but I do not want you at all" and he said, "You are a *desha drohi*". If this epithet applies to me, it would apply to all the great people who put forward that old Bill having three States. So, there is no use abusing each other. You must try to find out what the other man feels and then act.

As my time is short. I shall mention one or two matters and then sit down. Do not suppose that anybody has the monopoly of wisdom in the first place, and do not suppose that because you are in power today, you will be in power for five years more or after five years. Our Constitution provides for the throwing out of this Government. There is no sedition in saying that this Government is bad and that it must be thrown out. There is no sedition because that is provided for in the Constitution itself. It is not like the British Government saying, "It is a Government established by law and whoever shall create disaffection is to be charged with sedition and convicted". That is not the law now. We can always preach that this Govern-

ment is bad on account of these things and that, therefore, it ought to be thrown out. You have to consider this particular issue. I may give one good example. The Constitution allows us perfect freedom of expression and perfect freedom of press. All that the Government can do, and very often it does, is to call upon the pressmen, owners, editors, and others—to haul them up—and ask them to deposit a certain sum of money. Apart from this, they can always write anything that they like. Therefore, you cannot keep this sore festering all the time. You must make a good gesture and you must try to conciliate people who have been very much wounded by the action of those in authority. I will give you one example. Now, in the last Great War, Britain won by the drive, the courage and the resourcefulness of Churchill. The moment the War ended, the populace thought that Churchill was good for a war but for the problems of peace, after the devastating Great War, he was useless and so they threw him out. They threw out the Conservatives and brought in Labour. That lesson has to be remembered here also. Even the British Government which was so powerful, on account of the agitation in Bengal about partition, had to bring the King and get the partition cancelled and annulled in 1911. So, do not suppose that these things are settled facts, unalterable facts. Nothing is unalterable in the world and the sooner it is altered, if it is really festering, the better it is.

Next, I come to Belgaum city. Here also, the only Samyukta Maharashtra candidate won against a candidate of the Congress. These people came here and they were told by persons in authority that Zonal Councils were going to be set up and that they should place their case before those Councils. In spite of this, the Chief Minister of Mysore says that Belgaum is part of Mysore and that it shall remain so. If it had been a court of law, that man would have been hauled up for contempt of court but there is no contempt of the Zonal

Council and, therefore, he can say whatever he likes. My only submission is this: Remember that these things are there. You want co-operation and you want concerted efforts by each and everyone. You want concerted effort by which the energies of all people will be directed in the channels of prosperity, food production, industrialisation and so on, but as long as this festering thing is there in the case of three crores of people, in the case of many of them at least, it will not do good. It is no use preaching to them also and asking them to forget whatever has been done as whatever has been done cannot be undone. They say that it must be done and such things have been done. If you want real co-operation, then you must try to co-operate. A person has a right to vote even if he finds some persons wrong because you have given the right to every man over 21 years provided he is not a mad man. There may be anything in his mind, rotten eggs or potatoes, that does not matter; but you have given him a right to vote and he is entitled to vote as he thinks fit. If he has done so, you must not grumble and call him names. You must try to understand his position and take such measures as will bring him round to the great cause for which we have girded up our loins. Merely girding up our loins will not do; you must have the co-operation of the others also.

I do not think I should take more time; it is nearly up and I do not want the bell to be rung. With these remarks, I pray to those in authority to do the right thing. It is not my individual idea. I have spoken with hundreds, perhaps thousands, in Bombay city and also outside because I am connected with hundreds of people outside also as my clients, comrades and so on. This I P.M. is the thing that matters.

They say, "we have been discriminated; we have been insulted and we are called names when others are more deserving of those names". Sir, this is all that I have to say.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the President's Address has been dominated, as far as our internal affairs are concerned, by the food situation in the country, and in the short time at my disposal I would also like to say a few words on this subject. The President's Address says in regard to the food position as follows:

"While food production has increased, and the increases have been maintained,.... we have a considerable way to go before our country becomes fully self-sufficient in food. Intensive efforts have increased food production and improved crop prospects."

Sir, in order to understand the Government's food policy we have to go back to some years. Soon after the country attained independence and the Congress Government assumed power they realised that the food problem has to be given very serious consideration and for this purpose they appointed senior most Ministers to be in charge of this portfolio. The first Minister was our present President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. He was followed by Shri Jairamdas Daulatram and then by Mr. Munshi. All these big Ministers could not be very successful as far as food production was concerned. Eventually, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai was put in charge of this portfolio and his imagination, ability and push proved that this problem was not insoluble, but that if this question could be tackled with imagination and foresight, it could be solved. But it was the misfortune of the country that Shri Kidwai is not with us and we have fallen into the same position. Now, Sir, we rely more and more on statistics than on the realities of the situation. When the First Five Year Plan was brought into being, the main emphasis was laid on food production and quite rightly too and we had the river valley projects, dams, hydro-electric schemes, community projects and so on with a view to increasing food production in the country. Now, if we see the statistics of the various State Governments and also of the Centre about the acreage

brought under cultivation and if we go deep into this matter we will find that according to the calculations given by the various State Governments and the Centre the acreage brought under cultivation is many times more than the total cultivable area in India. In spite of that what have we been seeing? We have been seeing that as far as this food problem is concerned, we are far away from meeting all our requirements. Not only that, but some of the Government spokesmen, responsible for this matter, have been saying that the First Five Year Plan had been successful in increasing food production in the country to a very great extent; they were even planning as to how best the extra food could be exported so that we would be able to get our hard-pressed foreign exchange more easily. But in fact the position has been just the reverse. Soon after the Congress Government assumed power it was forecast that by 1952-53 the country would be self-sufficient in the matter of food. Then came the First Five Year Plan and we were assured that more food had been produced. And, as I said, if we analyse the statistics of the various States and the Centre we will find that more acreage has been brought under cultivation than what is actually available in India. The Second Five Year Plan, of course, lays emphasis on industrialisation. Originally, it was estimated that under the Second Plan there would be a 25 per cent. increase in food production but the Prime Minister insisted that a 25 per cent. increase was not sufficient and that it should be something like 40 per cent. Last year, at the Food Ministers' Conference at Mussoorie they wanted more funds in order to ensure a 40 per cent. increase but the Prime Minister put his foot down saying that not a single pie would be given but that the 40 per cent. increase would have to be achieved. Sir, it is not as if by a magic wand these things could be achieved.

Sir, if we examine the various measures taken for this food production, we see that for the Grow More

Food campaigns and other things, lakhs and lakhs, I should say, crores and crores of rupees have been given to the various States. Various amounts have been advanced to them for the purpose of bringing more acreage under cultivation but all this money has not been properly utilised, and if we go into this question more deeply we will see that large sums of money were advanced for developing mechanised farming but that money was spent on other purposes; similarly for wells some money was advanced but it was not spent for that purpose. Therefore, it is quite natural that the situation in regard to food production should be what it is.

Now, what is the present position? We have been told by the Food Ministry that the production has actually increased, and in the statement which the Food Minister made here, very cleverly only the average production has been shown but if we go into the figures of actual production, we will see that actually the food production has been on the decline. Sir, in the month of March a White Paper was issued by the Food Ministry in which the figures of actual production were given and here I would like to quote a few figures which they had given. According to that White Paper, in 1953-54 the production of foodgrains was 68 million tons; in 1954-55 it was 66·5 million tons. From 68 million tons it came down to 66·5 million tons. Then, in 1955-56 it came down to 63·4 million tons. These figures show that actually for the last so many years the food production has been on the decline. It is true that in the year 1956-57, food production has slightly risen from the previous two years. Now, if we take the question of rice, we have employed many methods of higher production, fertilizers, Japanese method of cultivation, etc. But in the case of rice also, the crop yield from the year 1953-54 is only 3 million more—which can hardly be an increase whatsoever. In addition to this, if we again see the statistics of the Food Ministry, we will see that availability of foodgrains *per capita* does not show

any rise, while demand *per capita* is increasing, because the population is growing. Then, also, the capacity to eat more is increasing. And, therefore, *per capita* availability of foodgrains does not show any rise whatsoever, as compared to the demand *per capita* which is increasing every day. It is, therefore, unfortunate that food production continues to be the weakest spot in our planning.

The President's reference to food production does not take into account the full gravity of the present situation. The target of self-sufficiency, therefore, is as far as ever. It is also ironical that the facts and figures show that there is something radically wrong with the Government's appraisal of the food situation. They insist on claiming that there is increase in production. In that case, people are entitled to ask why scarcity has begun to manifest itself in several parts of the country? In our country there are several parts which are generally surplus. Take the case of Rajasthan. The Bikaner division or the former Bikaner State has always been surplus and the prices, as far as Rajasthan was concerned, were the lowest in the former Bikaner State. Now, in the Bikaner division of Rajasthan, that part which is the granary of Rajasthan, the prices have soared so high that it has gone beyond the means of a very large number of people. It cannot be understood why this is all happening. It is not only in one or two places. Well, we know, we have just been told by several of our friends about the situation in Bengal and Bihar. But in the other parts which are generally surplus areas, we understand that the prices have soared very high. The Government have taken certain steps. In the last session and previous session also, when the food situation was getting out of control and the Food Minister was cornered during Question Hour or otherwise, he said he was taking steps to see that the prices would come down. The banks were asked not to advance money and other steps were taken. But all these steps have proved futile. When the Food Minister made a state-

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

ment in this House the other day to clear his position, we had expected some positive indication of Government's ability to deal with the problem of rising food prices, but the Food Minister's statement brings us only cold comfort. Whatever may be the position, actually the stark fact remains that food has become very dear. It has become scarce. It is getting beyond the means of a very large section of the people to buy food and in some parts of the country the situation is getting even beyond control, and it becomes apparent that the Food Ministry is unequal to the task that they are expected to perform. In short, the Minister for Food and Agriculture has been more at pains in putting a gloss over unpleasant facts than in suggesting remedial actions. To a certain extent it is heartening—and we are thankful to him for this—that in his statement he has said that he is making certain arrangements to rush food supplies to scarcity areas and also to tighten up distribution of stocks. But this does not give us the right appraisal of the food situation. He has also in his statement said that he is appointing a high-powered committee. It cannot be understood. On the one hand, he does not think the situation is as bad. On the other hand, he is thinking of appointing a high-powered committee. What will this high-powered committee do, if the situation is not very serious? So, from the very beginning up till now, if we go into the food policy adopted by the Government, and the facts and figures which they have produced from time to time, and the facts and figures given in the statement of the Food Minister presented to the House two days ago, it will show that the Government have not been able to cope with the situation. Not only that, the task is far too big for them. And, therefore, if the country has to be saved and the people have to have confidence in the Government, some drastic steps have to be taken. The Government have also to see that their policy on food has to be changed drastically before the situation goes

out of their control. From this it appears to me and to many of the people who think likewise that in regard to the food policy, the Government's policy has not been a success and much remains to be done.

I would now only—in view of the shortness of time—say one or two words in regard to foreign policy. Sir, it is admitted on all hands that because of the personality of our Prime Minister, as far as the other countries are concerned, the foreign policy has met with some success, and it is a matter of pride that the voice of our country is heard in the comity of nations. But in regard to the foreign policy, as far as it relates to our national interests, we have not been able to appreciate during the last seven or eight years that we have met with any success. Take the question of Pakistan. Take the question of the people of Indian origin in Ceylon or in South Africa, or our sphere of influence in Nepal or in Tibet. Take even the case of the French possessions which have been handed over to us. Even now there is bitterness on this score. It has not met with success, and something has to be done about safeguarding our national interests.

Eventually, Sir, one word about Goa. Much has been said about this question by other Members, but I would only submit one or two remarks. I have also read the statement of the Prime Minister made in the Lok Sabha yesterday in the papers. The more we read that statement and the views of the Government the more it goes beyond our comprehension as to where the Government stands so far as this question of Goa and our national interests and our foreign policy are concerned. The more we think about it the more we feel that this international phobia has caught hold of us to such a degree that we are even afraid of our own shadow to tackle with the national interests in our foreign policy. The position of Portugal is absolutely clear. They have made their position so

clear. They say that "you treat us either as your neighbours, or fight with us and turn us out because you are a much bigger nation, or just ignore us. Beyond these three positions we are not going to listen to you. You choose whichever you like". Their position has been made so clear that there is no ambiguity about it whatsoever. Even then we are hesitating and vacillating and we do not know what international consequences may follow if we assert our right. In the last session in the month of March the Prime Minister said that before long he would take some steps by which this problem would be solved and he would also take the Opposition into confidence. Speaking in this House he moderated his statement to say that the hon. Members may not expect something miraculous to happen but some steps will be taken. Since then nothing has happened, though during all these past years, every year, the President's Address has been making mention of Goa. This year for some reason or other no mention is made of Goa. Naturally, hon. Members are very anxious that in view of the declared policy of Portugal on this issue and in spite of the promises made by the Prime Minister nothing really has been done. Now the Prime Minister says in the Lok Sabha that within this month he will do something, he will consult the Opposition and steps will be taken in consonance with our policy. We fail to understand what is the Government's foreign policy as far as our national interests are concerned. If that is so in regard to Goa, we can see that in the near future or in the foreseeable future we can never get back our territory, which is Goa, if this policy is followed. Therefore, Sir, I would submit that in regard to our national interests the foreign policy of the Government has been defective and it has not been in our interest.

With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (मुम्बई) :
उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे बहुत संतोष हो

रहा है कि अलगू राय शास्त्री जी ने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव रखा है, उस का समर्थन करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

यह तो बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि इस चुनाव में कांग्रेस अच्छी तरह से जीत गई और केन्द्र में और केरल के अतिरिक्त, दूसरे सारे प्रदेशों में कांग्रेस को हुकूमत कायम हुई। परन्तु एक प्रान्त में कम्युनिस्टों का, जो लोकशाही पर भरोसा नहीं रखते, राज शुरू हुआ। यह खतरा हमें ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। एक प्रदेश कम्युनिस्टों के हाथ में गया यह ही केवल खतरा नहीं है। खतरा यह है कि लोगों के मन में अभी यह सन्देह आ गया है कि शायद अगले चुनाव में और प्रदेशों में भी कम्युनिस्टों की जीत हो जायगी। खतरा यह है कि कांग्रेस के बाद कम्युनिस्टों की हुकूमत आ जायगी, ऐसी सायकालाजी देश में तैयार हो रही है। उपसभापति महोदय, देश के हित के लिये डिमोक्रेसी के रक्षण के लिये, यह सायकालाजी एक बड़ी खतरनाक चीज है। हमें इसीलिये सावधान रहना चाहिये, सोचना चाहिये और यह सायकालाजी बदलने के लिये कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

एक तरफ यह धोखा दिखाई देता है। दूसरी तरफ देश की हालत ऐसी हो रही है कि जिस का कम्युनिस्ट और दूसरे उग्रदल के लोग फायदा उठा सकते हैं। देखिये, जीवनोपयोगी वस्तुओं के भाव बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और गरीब मजदूर, किसान और मध्यम श्रेणी के लोगों की आमदनी जैसी की जैसी कायम है। हमारी खरीदने की शक्ति दिन पर दिन कम हो रही है और खर्च बढ़ रहा है। इस हालत में गरीब लोगों के दिल में निराशा पैदा होगी, यह तो मामूली बात है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और दूसरे उग्रदल के लोग यह निराशा की भावना बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते हैं, तब हम क्या करें? यह भी सोचने की बात है। मेरे खयाल से गवर्न-

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

मेट को इस तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये क्योंकि जब तक गवर्नमेंट अनाज और दूसरी जीवोपयोगी वस्तुओं के भाव नियंत्रित नहीं कर सकेंगे और गरीब लोगों को सहारा नहीं दे सकेंगी तब तक जनता के मन में जो निराशा फैली हुई है वह नष्ट नहीं होगी।

उपसभापति महोदय, हमारे राष्ट्र-नेता, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इस बारे में कहा है कि हमें जनता के जीवन की समझ होनी चाहिये, जनता से अधिकतर सम्पर्क रखना चाहिये। उन्होंने और भी कहा है कि किसी सरकार के मंत्री और दूसरे कार्य-कर्त्ताओं को आराम और ऐश से नहीं रहना चाहिये। यह बात तो सही है और अच्छी भी है लेकिन मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि सरकार के जो बड़े-बड़े अफसर होते हैं, उन की तनख्वाह और अल-उसेज ब्रिटिश हुकूमत में जैसे थे वैसे ही रह गये हैं। इतना ही नहीं बल्कि हर एक रीति से बढ़ रहे हैं। हमारा उद्देश्य समाजवादी समाज का निर्माण करना है। परन्तु एक तरफ से आम गरीब जनता भूखी और नंगी रहेगी और दूसरी तरफ सरकार के बड़े अफसर और पूंजी वाले बड़े ऐश में रहेंगे—यह परिस्थिति सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न से अलग सी चीज मालूम होती है। हमें इस तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये।

हमारे देश की हालत यह है कि ज्यादातर लोग स्लम्स में रहने वाले हैं। पंडित जी बार-बार कहते हैं कि स्लम्स क्लियरेंस का काम जोर से होना चाहिये। इसका मायने यह होता है कि सारे देश का जीवन-मान बढ़ाना चाहिए। पंचान्नवे फीसदी लोग जो स्लम्स में रहते हैं, उन की हालत सुधारनी चाहिये। स्लम्स शहर में ही होते हैं, ऐसा नहीं है। हमारे गांवों में बहुत सारे लोग गंदगी में रहते हैं और वहीं गुजारा करते हैं। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आप को गौर कराना चाहता हूं कि गंदी बस्तियां जो हैं वह खाली दिल्ली में नहीं,

कलकत्ता, बम्बई वगैरा में भी हैं। जहां जहां स्लम्स हैं उन जगहों पर सरकार को हालत सुधारने के लिये कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

हमारे जो दलित भाई बान्धव हैं, उन की हालत देखिये। अभी तक उन की बस्तियां गांव के बाहर गंदी जगहों में ही रही हैं। गवर्नमेंट ने वाकायदा अस्पृश्यता नष्ट की है, परन्तु लोगों के दिलों में अस्पृश्यता कायम है, विशेष कर के गांवों में यह अस्पृश्यता हर एक रूप से दिखाई देती है। शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शिड्यूल्ड कमीशन की रिपोर्ट हर साल देखिये, उस में कई कहानियां दी जाती हैं जो मानवता के विरुद्ध हैं, जिनको पढ़ कर आप का दिल दुखी होगा। मुझे पता है आप के दिल में हमारे लिये बड़ी सहानुभूति है। आप हमारी अच्छाई करना चाहते हैं परन्तु कितनी दिक्कतें मार्ग में पड़ी हैं, इस का ख्याल भी आप को करना चाहिये। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि जब तक हमारी आर्थिक हालत नहीं सुधरती तब तक हमारा समाज आगे नहीं बढ़ सकेगा। इस के लिये मैं एक दो बातें आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। हरिजन भाइयों को जमीन मिलनी चाहिये और जमीन सुधारने के लिये तकावी, लोन्स और फ्रंटलाइजर्स वगैरह मुफ्त मिलने चाहियें। हमारे लोगों को कानूनी ऐड मुफ्त मिलनी चाहिये। बड़ी-बड़ी अधिक नौकरियां और बज्जीफ्रा और ज्यादा विदेशी छात्रवृत्ति मिलनी चाहिये। उन में से योग्य व्यक्तियों को राजदूत और राज्यपाल बनाने की भी कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे अपने शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के भाइयों को यह कहना है कि वे सरकार के सब कार्यों में सहयोग दें। हमारे देश का एक कठिन प्रश्न जातिभेद का है। यह भेद हमें भूलना चाहिये। इस चुनाव में बहुत सारी जगहों में मतदाताओं को जातिवाद ने ही आकर्षित किया था। यह बात अच्छी नहीं है। यह हमारे देश के लिये एक तखरा है। अस्पृश्य भाइयों को अब अपनी यह

भावना निकालनी चाहिये और स्पृश्य भाइयों की सहानुभूति मिला कर अपनी जिन्दगी सुधारनी चाहिये। अब अस्पृश्यता कायदे से सम्पूर्ण रूप में नहीं मिट गई। वह कायम है, स्पृश्य और अस्पृश्य भाइयों के मन में। स्पृश्य भाइयों की अपने मन से भावना निकाल कर अस्पृश्यता विरोधी आन्दोलन को सफल बनाना चाहिये। इस में देश का भला है और अस्पृश्यों का भी भला है।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. P. TAMTA in the Chair)]

मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि हमारे बहुत से भाई लोग इस स्पृश्य और अस्पृश्य की आंदोलन में शामिल होते हैं और अपना लक्ष्य उस कार्य के लिये केन्द्रित नहीं करते, जिससे हमारे समाज को फायदा हो। ऐसा एक आन्दोलन कुछ महीने पहले बम्बई में हुआ था और वह अभी तक जारी है। वह आन्दोलन विशाल द्विभाषिक बम्बई राज्य के विरुद्ध चल रहा है। एक दलित भाई के नाते मैं बता देना चाहता हूं कि द्विभाषिक राज्य ही हमारे जैसे अस्पृश्यों के लिये अच्छा है। हमारी हालत इस राज्य में सुधर सकती है, और गुजराती और मराठी लोगों के सहयोग से हम इस राज्य में सुरक्षा के साथ रह सकेंगे और हमारी तरक्की भी बढ़ जायेगी। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि बम्बई में जो द्विभाषिक राज्य कायम हुआ है उस में हमारे कांग्रेसी भाई चुनाव में कामयाब हो गये हैं और सब लोग भाई-भाई की तरह काम कर रहे हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि हमारे दलित भाइयों की हालत इस द्विभाषी राज्य में सुधर जायेगी और वे लोग तरक्की करेंगे। इसलिये द्विभाषिक राज्य का जो प्रयोग वहां चल रहा है, उस को यशस्वी करने के लिये हमें पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

अभी हमारे काणे साहब ने जो बातें कहीं, जिस भावना और जिस भाव से कहीं, उस से मुझे प्रसन्नता नहीं हुई। मेरा अपना

खयाल यह है कि हमारे जो विरोधी पक्ष के नेता श्री अशोक मेहता और श्री कृपलानी हैं, उन्होंने ने उन्हीं की सपोर्ट की है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि हमारे दलित भाइयों की द्विभाषी राज्य में हालत सुधर जायेगी और वे दिन प्रति दिन तरक्की करेंगे।

डा० आर० बी० गौड़ (आंध्र प्रदेश) : क्या अलग अलग स्टेट होने पर तरक्की नहीं होगी ?

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : अलग अलग स्टेट होने पर हमारा भला नहीं है। द्विभाषी राज्य में ही हमारे लोगों की तरक्की हो सकती है।

हमारे जो अस्पृश्य नेता संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का समर्थन कर रहे हैं उन को मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हमारे पूज्य नेता डा० अम्बेडकर महाराष्ट्र का एक संयुक्त राज्य नहीं चाहते थे। वे चाहते थे कि महाराष्ट्र के लिये चार छोटे छोटे राज्य हों।

डा० आर० बी० गौड़ : आप ने डा० अम्बेडकर को क्यों छोड़ दिया ?

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : उन को मतभेद से छोड़ दिया, लेकिन उन की जो अच्छी बातें हैं उन को बताने में कोई नुकसान नहीं है। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि डा० अम्बेडकर महाराष्ट्र का एक संयुक्त राज्य नहीं चाहते थे। वे चाहते थे कि महाराष्ट्र के लिये चार छोटे छोटे राज्य हों। उन्होंने जो योजना देश के सामने रखी थी, उस का चित्र संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र से बिल्कुल अलग था। डा० अम्बेडकर चाहते थे कि महाराष्ट्र के जो पिछड़े हुए भाग हैं उन की प्रगति के लिये एक छोटा सा राज्य कायम करना अधिक उचित है। ऐसे ही छोटे राज्य कायम करने से ही उन की प्रगति और विकास हो सकता है। परन्तु मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि डा० अम्बेडकर साहब के अनुयायी

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

आज उन का आदेश और उन का खयाल भूल गये हैं। मुझे बड़ा दुःख है कि वे अनुयायी आज हिन्दू महासभा और जनसंघ जैसे प्रगतिगामी और कम्युनल संगठनों के साथ हाथ मिला कर काम कर रहे हैं। शायद उस सहकार्य का नतीजा यह हो जायेगा कि शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों के लिये जो कार्य बम्बई प्रान्त में हो रहा है, उस को धोखा पहुंच जायेगा और हमारा नुकसान हो जायेगा। इसलिये मैं उन से अपील करना चाहता हूं कि पार्लियामेंट ने जो बहुमत से तय किया है और विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों ने भी इस चीज को सफल बनाने में जो योग दिया है, अब उस में किसी प्रकार का बदलाव नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। इस समय बम्बई में जो द्विभाषिक राज्य का प्रयोग चल रहा है, उस को यशस्वी बनाने के लिये कोशिश करना हम सब लोगों के लिये और सारे देश के हित में है।

DR. R. B. GOUR: On a point of order, Sir, I think the hon. Member is reading his speech. This is not allowed.

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: Not reading.

मैं आप को यह बता देना चाहता हूं कि हम कम्युनिस्टों के चक्कर में नहीं पड़ना चाहते हैं। मैं कभी कभी बोलता हूं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने समिति का नारा लगा कर हमारे दलित वर्ग और हरिजन लोगों को अपनी तरफ खींच लिया। इस पार्टी के लोग बड़ी-बड़ी लम्बी-चौड़ी बातें करते हैं। गरीब दलित वर्ग के लोग इन के बहकावे में आ जाते हैं। हम लोगों के दांत खाने के अलग हैं और दिखाने के अलग हैं।

डा० आर० बी० गौड़ : पांच वर्ष पहले आप के कौन से दांत थे ?

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मैं ने उन को आज खोला है। हम लोग कम्युनिस्टों के चक्कर में पड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के पास दलित वर्ग और आदिवासियों के लिये कोई रचनात्मक कार्यक्रम नहीं है। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति में कम्युनिस्टों का ज्यादा प्रभाव है, इसलिये कुछ लोग फैंडेशन से उस में आ गये हैं। मैं यहां पर आप को बता देना चाहता हूं कि जो लोग आ गये हैं, उन की पहले कम्युनिस्टों से दोस्ती नहीं थी। जो लोग कम्युनिस्टों के इस चक्कर में पड़ कर उन के जाल में फंस गये हैं, या भूल से चले गये हैं, मैं उन से फिर अपील करता हूं कि वे वापस लौट आयें। जिस तरह कांग्रेस पार्टी के पास हमारे दलित वर्ग के लिये काफी रचनात्मक कार्यक्रम है, उस तरह से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के पास कोई भी रचनात्मक कार्यक्रम नहीं है। ये लोग तो केवल मारपीट और हिंसा में ही ज्यादा विश्वास रखते हैं।

डा० आर० बी० गौड़ : आप ने पांच वर्ष पहले क्या किया था ?

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : तीन वर्ष पहले मेरा और स्वर्गीय डाक्टर अम्बेडकर साहब का मतभेद हो गया था और मैं कांग्रेस में शामिल हो गया। मेरा उन से कुछ बातों में मतभेद था। उन की जो अच्छी बातें हैं, उन को मैं अभी भी मानता हूं। उन की जो कार्य-प्रणाली थी, वह रचनात्मक नहीं थी। इसी कारण से मैं कांग्रेस में शामिल हुआ। मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू, जोकि एक बड़े भारी डेमोक्रेसी के मानने वाले हैं, उन के नेतृत्व में हमारे समाज का भला होगा और वह दिन प्रति दिन तरक्की करेगा। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी एक ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिन में जातीयता की भावना बिल्कुल नहीं है। मुझे पूर्ण आशा है कि हमारे दलित-वर्ग, हरिजनों और आदिवासियों का उन के नेतृत्व में भला होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आर० पी० रामदा) : अब आप समाप्त कीजिये ।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मैं एक-दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा । इसलिये मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि हमारी जाति के लिये, हरिजनों लिये, इस सरकार द्वारा, पार्लियामेंट द्वारा जो कुछ भी किया गया है और आगे किया जायेगा, उस के लिये मैं धन्यवाद देता हूं । प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में हमारे वर्ग के लोगों की भलाई के लिये बहुत सा कार्य किया गया और उस के लिये बहुत अधिक धनराशि रखी गई । प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत प्रान्तों और केन्द्र द्वारा हरिजनों के लिये २० करोड़ रुपया रखा गया था और अब द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में ६१ करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है । जिस कोऑपरेशन और सहयोग द्वारा आज हरिजनों का उद्धार किया जा रहा है, वह भविष्य में और भी अधिक रहेगा, यह मेरी उम्मीद है । मुझे एक बात और कहनी है और वह यह है कि जिस तरह आप ने सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड बनाया है, उसी तरह से आप हरिजनों के लिये, आदिवासियों की भलाई के लिये अलग मंत्रालय या डिपार्टमेंट बना दीजिये जिस से कि इन लोगों की भलाई का काम इस विभाग द्वारा हुआ करेगा । अगर आप ने ऐसा किया तो इन दलित-वर्ग के लोगों की हालत बहुत जल्दी सुधर जायेगी । हमारे भारत दलित सेवक संघ द्वारा जो शिविर १९५५ में हुआ था, उस में जो प्रस्ताव पास हुए, वह अमल में लाने के लिये मैं सरकार की सहायता चाहता हूं ।

मुझे संतोष है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो भाषण दिया है वह सब तरह से अच्छा है । इस सम्बन्ध में, मैं ने जो हाउस के सामने सुझाव रखे हैं, मुझे आशा है, सरकार उन पर पूरी तरह से ध्यान देगी और अमल करेगी । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इतना कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं ।

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I listened to the President's Address with great respect, but with very mixed feelings and certainly, without enthusiasm. I have listened to the several speeches that have been made in this House also with mixed feelings. There is one point about the food situation in which I find myself in complete agreement with all that has fallen from the lips of Dr. Gour. I think he put the case extremely well and I do hope that the Government will take serious steps to consider the situation. It is all right to be told by the Deputy Minister for Food that production has increased by 25.9 per cent. and the yield per acre has increased by 11 per cent., and rice, wheat and coarse grains also show an increase in production. But the unfortunate fact remains that the prices go higher and higher, food has still to be imported and various parts of the country are practically in famine conditions. This is a very serious matter. The one relieving feature in the Government's policy is the statement which I find towards the end of the statement of the Deputy Minister for Food that a high-powered committee is going to be appointed to investigate into these conditions and to suggest measures. Well, Sir, we are very familiar with the appointment of committees and commissions. Sometimes, they are appointed merely to kill time; sometimes, they are appointed with a very serious purpose, and I do hope that the intention of the Government falls in the second category on this occasion. Recently, we had the example of the Commission which was appointed to enquire into the Mahbubnagar accident, and we know that the Government has not accepted their suggestions. That is rather unfortunate, because when a committee or a commission is appointed, one has a right to expect that the proper persons have been appointed and that the work has been properly done, and the public have a right to expect that the Government will accept their recommendations. Anyway, I hope, that this high-powered committee

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]
will not meet the same fate as the Commission in connection with the Mahbubnagar accident.

Well, Sir, there is a very passing reference in the President's Address to the problem of Suez Canal. I find that there is almost a note of optimism; certainly of complacency. I regret to say that there is no justification for this complacency. We still find that the situation is tense; we still find that France, still on the war path, has not accepted the conditions laid down by President Nasser; we still find the position of Israel very weak, and President Nasser is not going to extend to Israel the same consideration which he has been extending to other countries, and that is a very serious situation. Any day it may flare up into a huge conflagration. I do hope, Sir, that when our Prime Minister visits Cairo and will have a talk with President Nasser, he will impress on him the importance of recognising Israel as a political entity. It is no use keeping that wound alive all the time. After all Israel has come into existence. It is not a powerful country, though an extremely intelligent country, and therefore it has a right to live like good neighbours with the surrounding Arab States.

Well, Sir, the position in Kashmir also has got to be considered. There is a very passing reference to the report of Mr. Jarring. It is a very very sore point with us. We are very bitter about Kashmir, and we find on the authority of Mr. Bevan that the Pakistanis are still more bitter against India in connection with Kashmir. There does not seem to be any common platform from which the question could be discussed, and that is a very unfortunate state of affairs. The only hopeful thing is that both the parties seem to be sincere, and I am absolutely certain that India is sincere that whatever happens, the question will not be decided at the point of the sword. That is a very hopeful sign, because after all the Pakistanis till yesterday were our

brothers. But this continuous suspicion, continuous quarrelling and this atmosphere are all very disquieting. It puts India in the wrong; it puts Pakistan in the wrong. Therefore, something has got to be done about it.

Now, it seems to me, Sir, that the only possible point of approach is the suggestion which came from the Prime Minister some time ago—may be a year ago or two years ago—to accept the present position or the status quo, or in other words, to accept the partition of Kashmir on the present lines as a practical solution. I know that there are many in India who do not accept that suggestion, and I am perfectly certain that there will be a howl of protest in Pakistan against it, but Kashmir is no more a mere Indian question or a mere Pakistani question. It has become an international question, because both the blocs look upon Kashmir as a convenient halting place or a jumping place, and therefore they too are interested in what happens to Kashmir. And I am perfectly certain that if a person with a suave personality, who has the confidence of both the blocs, sets about bringing about a reconciliation between our Government and Pakistan, there is a way open. I have reasons to believe that this solution will be acceptable to the two blocs, and they can easily put pressure on both the Governments to accept the position. That seems to me, Sir, to be the only way out of the difficulty. After all, under pressure of circumstances we had to accept the vivisection of our own country as a matter of practical politics. Kashmir comparatively is a smaller question than India, and therefore, the division of Kashmir should not be considered to be an impossible proposition, and that is the only way in which a certain amount of good feeling can be brought about between our two Governments and our two peoples.

There is also a very passing reference in paragraph 13—I would call it even an innocuous reference—to the reorganisation of States. But I find

that the occasion has been taken by my friends on the Opposition side to rake up the question of Bombay State, and a very powerful plea has been put forward that as a result of the recent elections the Samyukta Maharashtra should be brought into existence with Bombay City as its capital and that Mahagujarat should also be brought into existence. Well, Sir, this question, I regret to say, has been opened again. We know what an enormous amount of trouble we had. Coming from Bombay, as I do, I know how strained the feelings had become. For centuries and more the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians had lived together literally like brothers. Why this sudden animosity came about is a mystery to me, though I can say that it was more the creation . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: You ask the Government about it.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: It was more the creation of what my friend, Dr. Gour, calls people who are politically conscious. I do not know what his definition of 'political consciousness' is. If I am able to understand or interpret it, it means the consciousness of people who want to be Chief Ministers, Ministers and Deputy Ministers. It is easy enough to exploit this position and to persuade the rank and file, even the *dhobis* and the barbers, to whom my friend, Dr. Kane, referred. It is possible to excite their feelings . . . (*Interruption*). Well, they are in a way, but it all depends on how you lead them. They expect a wise leadership.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): And they might be masters in the future also.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Well, might be; why not?

Well, Sir, now what I am suggesting is this that this reference to the recent elections, I am afraid, is a little out of question. After all this question was determined by Parliament. The only unfortunate thing is that

elections took place a little too early, before there was time for the passions to cool down. Anyway, one thing is certain that during the last several months we have had perfect peace in all parts of the present Bombay State. And this continuously keeping alive the wound does not do good to any one. We are all proud of saying that we are Indian nationals. Well, if we are Indians first and Indians last, why should there be a sense of separateness between the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians? There is hardly a village in Maharashtra where you do not find Gujaratis. There is hardly a village in Gujarat where you do not find Maharashtrians. They have lived together and worked together. This sort of sense of separation is a very artificial creation, though I do not deny that it exists. It does exist. Well, Sir, if this incapacity of the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis to live together is a reality, which I deny, then it is a negation of our Indian nationalism, and it is from that broader standpoint of Indian nationalism that I would appeal to all Indians, whatever the partly they may belong to, to give a chance to the present Bombay State to function successfully. If in course of time you find that it does not function successfully, and if the Gujaratis feel that they are exploited by the Maharashtrians, or if the Maharashtrians feel that they are exploited by the Gujaratis, surely there will be time enough to reconsider the whole question, but do not take it for granted. I am perfectly certain that this feeling does not exist except amongst the people who are "politically conscious".

A good deal has been made of the recent elections. Reference has been made to it by my friend, Dr. Kane. The feeling that he expressed—I do not know the exact word that he used—was . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: The major part.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: . . . that Vidarbha or Marathwada is not so

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]
important as the rest of Maharashtra. The caste system has done enough harm to Indians in general. We do not want this caste system that one part of Maharashtra is of the Brahmin caste and the rest are not, that Vidarbha and Marathwada are not as important as the rest of Maharashtra. This is an unfortunate state of affairs. Vidarbha has declared itself very strongly. Marathwada has done so. A large portion of Gujarat has declared itself for this. We need not make too much of these elections. They may represent a certain passing mood. If they represent a permanent mood, there will be time enough to reconsider the whole position. I heard the speech of Dr. Kane with very great respect. It was certainly not the speech of a politician. It was the speech of a scholar, an experienced and wise man, whose leadership ordinarily I would accept, but I listened to him with a sense of disappointment that even he should allow himself to be dominated by this idea that Samyukta Maharashtra should come into existence. Well, Sir, if numbers mean anything, it seems to me that the majority—I say it with a sense of responsibility—of the citizens of Bombay has not voted for Samyukta Maharashtra.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What about the municipal elections?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: The total number of voters came to 30 per cent. and all the 30 per cent. were not for Samyukta Maharashtra, because the Congress Party, may be in a minority, is still there. Anyway 70 per cent. of the people did not vote. Why did they not vote? Because the people felt that things were all right. There is no particular fear of the Maharashtrians in the minds of the Gujaratis and no particular fear of the Gujaratis in the minds of the Maharashtrians. They have worked together and lived together . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: Because many people did not vote in the elections,

does it mean that they do not want the Parliament and the Government?

PROF. A. R. WADIA: That means that they are not anti-anything. It means that they are satisfied with things as they are. If they were dissatisfied, certainly they would have voted one way or the other. Bombay City is at peace. Let us leave it in peace. If at any time in the future there is need to reconsider the position, that opportunity can be taken up. Nothing is final. Dr. Kane said very correctly that nothing was final. If the present state of things does not function satisfactorily, then it is open to Parliament to undo the work that was done six months ago. I do submit this in the name of Indian nationalism, in the name of peace, in the name of goodwill between Maharashtrians and Gujaratis. We are all living in peace at the present moment. Let us live in peace. Do not disturb our friendliness, our love towards one another. We together have built up the City of Bombay, and we are proud of it. That is the thing that I would like to emphasise in this connection.

There is a little point to which I would like to refer and that is Government by Ordinances. I am inclined to agree with the criticism made by Mr. Rajah. Government by Ordinances is not democratic government. One great bulwark of the democratic system of government is the respect in which the judgments of the High Courts and the Supreme Court are held. If the government were to do so only when it suits them, I am afraid that the very foundations of democracy will be shaken. However distasteful and inconvenient the decision of the Supreme Court was in this connection, I do wish that the Government had shown the magnanimity to accept it. If they found it necessary to change that position, they could have taken advantage of the ordinary process of legislation after giving the employees an opportunity to represent their case instead of cutting short the whole thing by passing an Ordinance. No doubt,

within six months they will come and say, "The Ordinance has expired and you must ratify it." And, of course, it will be ratified. This is a most unfortunate state of affairs.

Well, Sir, as I have said before, I listened to the President's Address with mixed feelings. Anyway, I am thankful to the President for the very modest and moderate way in which he has worded his Address. We are very grateful to him for giving us an opportunity to expound our views on some of the most important questions that face us.

श्री गोरक्षजी विजय शर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपसभ अध्यक्ष महोदय, आम चुनाव के बाद संसद् के समक्ष राष्ट्रपति का भाषण देना रिवाज और नियम के अनुसार जरूरी था, उससे हमें गवर्नमेंट की नीति का पता चलता है और यदि हम उससे सहमत हैं तो उसके लिये हमको धन्यवाद देना भी रिवाज और नियम के अनुसार उचित है ।

यद्यपि शासनतंत्र में त्रुटियां हो सकती हैं लेकिन जब कुल मिला कर सम्पूर्ण परिस्थिति पर विचार करते हैं तो हमें यह मालूम पड़ता है कि देश के लिये गवर्नमेंट की नीतियां सामान्यतः ठीक हैं और इसी लिये आज इस पार्टी को इतने भारी बहुमत से देश में सफलता मिली है। इस समय कुल मिला कर गवर्नमेंट की नीतियां ठीक हैं और राष्ट्रपति का जो भाषण हुआ है, वह मेरे ख्याल से आज की परिस्थिति में बहुत कुछ उपयुक्त है ।

• इस अभिभाषण पर विरोधी पक्ष से जो आलोचनाएँ हुई हैं, मुझे भय है कि उन में से बहुत सारी आलोचनाएँ केवल पार्टीबाजी की दृष्टि से की गई हैं, ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ । हमारे देश में कुछ अन्न की कठिनाई हुई है, हमारे देश में इस समय कुछ आर्थिक कठिनाइयाँ हैं, जिस से पंचवर्षीय योजना को कामयाब करने में कुछ मुश्किलात आ रही है, देश का औद्योगीकरण करने में कुछ मुश्किलात आ रही हैं । लेकिन इन सब कठिनाइयों का—जो

कि सारे देश की कठिनाइयाँ हैं अपनी पार्टी के लाभ के लिये इस्तेमाल करना और जिन विषयों में सब का सहयोग मिलना चाहिये, उन विषयों में भी गवर्नमेंट की आलोचना करना सिवाय पार्टीबाजी के और कुछ नहीं है ।

दूसरे हाउस में बोलते हुए आचार्य कृपलानी ने कुछ मजाक सा उड़ाया था कि इस भाषण में कम से कम यह बात है कि विदेश नीति को एक गौणता दे दी गई है और वैदेशिक नीति की चर्चा इस में ज्यादा नहीं है । मेरे ख्याल से यह एक मुनासिब बात की थी कि आज जो देश के ज्वलन्त प्रश्न हैं उन पर राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में ज्यादा रोशनी डाली और जो दूसरे सवाल हैं उनको पीछे रखा । फिर भी ऐसा नहीं है कि वैदेशिक मामलों के जो जरूरी मामले थे उनको राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने छुआ न हो, जैसे मिडिल-ईस्ट का सवाल है, यारिंग मिशन का सवाल है, डिसआरामेंट का सवाल है, विश्व शान्ति का सवाल है, इन सब सवालों का उसमें कुछ न कुछ जिक्र है । यह जरूर है और यह मुनासिब बात है कि हमारे देश की जो मुश्किलात हैं, हमारे देश के जो सवाल हैं, उनको राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में प्राथमिकता दी गई है और इस चीज की भी जब ऐसे जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति आलोचना करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह आलोचना सिर्फ कांग्रेस का मजाक उड़ाने के लिये की गई है, उस में कोई सच्चाई या कोई औचित्य का ध्यान नहीं रखा गया है । वैसे देखा जाय तो वैदेशिक मामलों के बारे में जो कुछ राष्ट्रपति ने कहा है वह मुनासिब है । आज संसार में शान्ति की बड़ी सख्त जरूरत है, सारा संसार एक ज्वालामुखी के मुख पर मौजूद है और किस वक्त यह ज्वालामुखी भभक उठे कहां नहीं जा सकता । इसलिये इन सब मामलों में जो भी हमारा गवर्नमेंट की नीति रही है, चाहे उसका मजाक उड़ा लिया जाय और उसकी आलोचना भी हो, लेकिन वह ठीक रही है । पंचशील का सवाल ऐसा नहीं है

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

कि अगर रूस पंचशील पर नहीं चला इस लिये हमारे लिये कोई शर्म की बात है। सिर्फ इस लिये कि पंचशील का जिक्र नहीं है आप उस अभिभाषण का मजाक नहीं उड़ा सकते। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि आज भी पंचशील का उसूल अपनी जगह पर कायम है, और सही और मुनासिब है। अगर उसे रूस नहीं मान सकता और हंगरी में उसने जुल्म और ज्यादातिया की तो उसमें हिन्दुस्तान के लिये शरमाने की बात कोई भी नहीं है। गोआ और काश्मीर के मामले में भी जो नीति हमारी गवर्नमेंट की है वह विल्कुल मुनासिब है। इसलिये मैं ऐसा मसला कोई भी नहीं देखता कि जो आलोचना के काबिल हो।

पंचवर्षीय योजना और देश की आर्थिक परिस्थिति, ये दोनों सवालालात हमारे देश के लिये बहुत जरूरी हैं। ख़ास परिस्थिति के बारे में यहाँ काफी कहा गया है। इसको सुधारने में हम सब लोगों को मिल कर काम करने की जरूरत है, चाहे कोई किसी भी पार्टी का हो, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि अनाज का जो संकट है वह पहले से अनाज की कमी होने के कारण पैदा हुआ। यद्यपि पहले से इस साल पैदावार कुछ ज्यादा हुई है लेकिन इन्फ्लेशन होने की वजह से लोगों की पर्चेजिंग पावर कम हो गयी है, इसलिये लोगों को कठिनाई हो रही है और भाव बढ़े हुए हैं। यह दरअसल ताज्जुब की बात है कि मुल्क में इस साल पहले साल की अपेक्षा ज्यादा अनाज पैदा हुआ है, जैसा कि आंकड़ों से मालूम होता है। लेकिन हमारे फूड के डिप्टी मिनिस्टर ने जो स्टेटमेंट इस विषय में दिया उससे हमको दरअसल और साफ साफ पता इस बात का नहीं चलता कि ख़ास स्थिति कैसी है। अगर दरअसल में उत्पादन कम हुआ है तो साफ मान लेना चाहिये और उसमें वृद्धि करने के लिये अन्य पार्टियों का सहयोग लेने की हम को जरूरत है। तो इस प्रकार का एंटीइन्फ्लेशन गवर्नमेंट का होना चाहिये।

दूसरे हाउस में बोलते हुए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पं० नेहरू जी ने इस बात पर अफ़सोस प्रकट किया था कि कई राज्य आज भी ऐसे हैं जो प्लानिंग कमीशन द्वारा किये गये सीलिंग और लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म के उपायों पर अमल नहीं कर रहे हैं। दरअसल यह अफ़सोस की बात है। कुछ हमारा कांस्टिट्यूशन ऐसा है कि इन गवर्नमेंटों को कुछ विशेष कहा नहीं जा सकता क्योंकि एग्रीकल्चर का मसला एक प्रान्तीय विषय है, प्रान्तीय सबजेक्ट है। आज इस बात की भीजरूरत है कि कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग के जरिये से हम खेती की तरक्की करें। कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग पर नेहरू जी ने जोर दिया है, प्लानिंग कमीशन ने भी जोर दिया है। मेरा ख़याल है कि कमीशन की योजना में यह है कि हरजिले में दो चार नमूने के कोआपरेटिव फार्म कायम होने चाहिये। जब तक हर एक राज्य में लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म ठीक से नहीं होगा तब तक बुनियादी तौर पर हम ख़ास के सवाल को हल नहीं कर सकते।

आज हमारे देश में विनोबा जी पैदल घूम रहे हैं सिर्फ इसलिये कि जमीन के सवाल को हल कर सकें और शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से हल कर सकें। यह जमीन की क्रांति कहिये या भू-क्रांति कहिये, लैंड रिफ़ॉर्म या जमीन का बंटवारा कहिये, ये सब ग्राम-दान के जरिये से विनोबा जी कर रहे हैं। हमको एक गांव को एक यूनिट मान कर सारे ग्राम को एक एंटीग्रैटेड प्लान के अनुसार खेती की तरक्की के लिये प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये। हर राज्य सरकार को इस विषय पर ध्यान देना चाहिये। हमारे बहुत से भाई इस हाउस में हैं जो शक जाहिर करते हैं कि कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग हिन्दुस्तान के लायक नहीं है, वे बहुत गलती में हैं। हिन्दुस्तान हो या कोई देश हो, कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग बहुत जरूरी है। मुझे याद है, बहुत वर्ष पहले मैं एक दफा सेवाग्राम गया था। महात्मा गांधी अपने खास खास कार्यकर्त्तारों से वहाँ परामर्श किया करते थे। तो उन्होंने कोआपरेटिव

फार्मिंग का भी जिक्र किया और कहा कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में अहिंसात्मक समाज-रचना को सफल बनाना है तो यहां के किसानों को खेती कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग के जरिये से करनी चाहिये। आज विनोबा जी ने घन और धरती बंट के रहेगी, इसका नारा शुरू किया है। मेरा खयाल है कि यह बहुत मुनासिब चीज है, ईश्वरीय व्यवस्था है।

श्री बी० बी० शर्मा : विनोबा जी ने नहीं किया है।

श्री गोरीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : उनके सब जलूसों में यही नारे लगते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जमीन जो है किसी की बपीती नहीं है, ईश्वर की व्यवस्था है। वह मुल्क जिसको अनाज की जरूरत है, जहां भूमिहीन या भूखे मनुष्य हैं वहां भूमि के ऊपर या सम्पत्ति के ऊपर व्यक्तिगत एकाधिकार को तसलीम नहीं किया जा सकता और यह चीज बंटकर रहेगी। आज यह और जरूरी है, जब कि हम कोआपरेटिव तरीके से खेती करने जा रहे हैं।

कुछ समय पहले पार्लियामेंट का एक डेलीगेशन चाइना गया था। रशिया में तो मैं नहीं गया हूँ, लेकिन वहां चाइना में मैंने देखा कि कोआपरेटिव ढंग से वहां बड़ी सफलतापूर्वक खेती हो रही है। तो हमारे मुल्क में कोआपरेटिव ढंग से खेती क्यों नहीं हो सकती और क्यों नहीं होनी चाहिये? अगर हम सब लोग सारे देश के लिये एक सी नीति निर्धारित करे तो हमको इसके सिवाय कोई तरीका अच्छा नहीं मालूम होता कि कोआपरेटिव तौर पर खेती हमारे मुल्क में हो। तभी हम खाद्य समस्या को हल करने में कामयाब हो सकते हैं। इस हाउस में विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों ने गवर्नमेंट की अनाज सम्बन्धी नीति का मजाक उड़ाया है। इसमें विरोध कैसा? कम से कम अनाज का

मसला ऐसा है कि इसमें सब पार्टियों को चाहिये कि गवर्नमेंट को पूरा इमदाद और सहयोग दें। इस प्रश्न को पार्टी का सवाल न बना कर एक नेशनल सवाल समझा जाना चाहिये। इसमें कोई पैनिक के रूप में बात नहीं है और न इस रूप में इसको फैलाना चाहिये। जैसा कि फूड मिनिस्टर ने कहा था, अगर पैदावार में कुछ परसेंटेज कम है, तो भी अपने को निराश होने की जरूरत नहीं है। हम सब इस मुल्क में रहते हैं, अगर हमारे कोई लोग भूखें मरें, तो इसमें किसी का इंटरेस्ट नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिये सब को मिल कर इस अनाज के संकट को पार करना चाहिये। इस विषय में जां रेफ्रेस राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में हैं, वह बिल्कुल मुनासिब है।

अब रहा सवाल आर्थिक कठिनाइयों का जो कि प्लान के सम्बन्ध में हैं। उसका भी उल्लेख अभिभाषण में है कि हम पंचवर्षीय योजना को कामयाब बनावें। यह हमारे देशवासियों का कर्तव्य है। श्री फाइनस मिनिस्टर ने अपने बजट भाषण में, जो कि टैक्सेज लगाने के सम्बन्ध में था, कहा कि यह हिन्दुस्तान के लिये एक ऐतिहासिक मौका है, हमारे राष्ट्र के सामने एक ऐतिहासिक मौका है, हमारी एक अग्नि परीक्षा है जैसा कि हमने तय किया है, निश्चय किया है, हम इस देश को इंडस्ट्रियलाइज करेंगे, इस देश का औद्योगीकरण करेंगे, इसको आगे बढ़ायेंगे और उसमें अगर कोई कठिनाइयां आती हैं तो यह ऐसा मौका है कि हम मंजधार में अपने प्लान को रोक नहीं सकते। नदी की बांध धारा में हम आ गये हैं, या तो हमें आगे बढ़ना है या पीछे हटना है। बहादुराना ढंग से फाइनस मिनिस्टर साहब ने खर्च की पूर्ति के लिये टैक्स लगाये हैं, मालदार व्यक्तियों पर भी और मामूली वर्ग के व्यक्तियों पर भी। मेरा यह प्रत्यक्ष मत है कि या तो हम बहादुरों की तरह से आगे बढ़ते हैं या कायर या निकम्मे

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

आदमियों की तरह से इस प्लान को छोड़ देते हैं।

मेरे पास एक ब्लू प्रिन्ट है और इस किताब में यह दिया हुआ है कि इस प्लान पर संकट आ रहा है, इस प्लान को छोड़ देना चाहिये। बड़ी भारी दलीलें इस ब्लू प्रिन्ट में दी हुई हैं। मैं तो नहीं समझता, हम लोग इतनी जल्दी निराश हो जायें। आखिर जो मुख्य उद्देश्य है प्लान का वह हम नहीं छोड़ सकते, जैसे हैवी इंडस्ट्री के बारे में है। हमको हैवी मशीनरी और स्टील प्लांट खड़े करने हैं। और भी बहुत सारे सवाल हैं जो प्लान से सम्बन्धित हैं। इसलिये जो योजना का मुख्य भाग है, उसमें कोई कमी नहीं की जा सकती और न की जानी चाहिये। उसका मैं पूरी तरह से स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत सी पार्टियाँ हैं, जो प्लानिंग में पूरी तरह से विश्वास करती हैं। एक कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी है जो कि कम से कम एक योजनाबद्ध आर्थिक नीति में विश्वास करती है। दूसरे हाउस में कृपलानी जी ने भी कहा था कि यह प्लान कांग्रेस की ही ठेकेदारी नहीं है यह तो देश का प्लान है, सब का है। अगर यह सब का है तो किसी पार्टी को इस प्लान का मज़ाक उड़ाने या आलोचना करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। बल्कि उनको चाहिये कि इस प्लान को, जो देश की उन्नति के लिये आवश्यक है, सफल बनाने के लिये यदि कुछ कठिनाई, कुछ त्याग, कुछ बलिदान सहन करना आवश्यक हो तो सब खुशी के साथ ऐसा करें।

अतः मैं एन० ई० एस० ब्लाक्स के बारे में कुछ बहना चाहूँगा। इन ब्लाक्स में जो कार्य किया जा रहा है, वह इतना सफलतापूर्वक नहीं किया जा रहा है, जितना कि किया जाना चाहिये। मैं यह जरूर कहूँगा कि उसमें सुधार करने की आवश्यकता है। केवल हुक्म देकर हम गांव-वालों को ज्यादा

आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं इसमें मुझे सन्देह है। इसलिये कोई ज्यादा अच्छा ढंग होना चाहिये, जिसके द्वारा उन लोगों के लिये जो देहातों में रहते हैं, सब मिल कर एन० ई० एस० ब्लाक्स की मशीनरी का पूरा इस्तेमाल कर सकें। हमें अनाज की पैदावार को भी बढ़ाना चाहिये और उसमें एन० ई० एस० ब्लाक्स के हर आदमी का सहयोग लेना चाहिये। इन्हीं लोगों ही भण्ड के लिये ये ब्लाक्स हैं, इसलिये इन लोगों को पूरा सहयोग अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने में देना चाहिये।

मेरा ख्याल है कि राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण बहुत सुन्दर है। संतुलित है और स्वागत योग्य है।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I take this opportunity to thank the President for his presentation of the Address to the first Session of the Second Parliament. This Address is, Sir, devoted mostly to internal affairs, not giving much prominence to the external ones. I for one, Sir, feel that there is no need to get alarmed about the internal situation. General elections, of which there is no parallel in the world, took place very smoothly and in a very orderly manner. This shows the unity of our country and the consciousness of our people to pursue democratic form of government and a satisfaction that we have made good progress these years but this should not make us feel complacent or very smug. Of course, we have progressed and progressed much beyond our expectation, and yet when we see the statistics on the one side and the reality on the other side, we feel that there is no connection between statistics and reality. This is prominently seen as far as the food situation is concerned. Of course, the President has said that it is not an alarming state. At least we have to concede that the present food situation is critical. I am glad the Prime Minister accepted the position. I do not want

to go into this question. Prices might have risen due to inflation, due to lack of enough stocks or it may be due to hoarding or even lack of food production itself, but what I want to ask is what Government are going to do. Are they suggesting any means to tide over this emergency or not? I am not talking about long-term measures; of course, so far as long-term measures are concerned, they have got the Second Five Year Plan, the programme to increase cultivable land and to improve methods of cultivation; but what are they going to do at the moment? Are they going to do something to check these prices or not? Many suggestions have been given and I have a few more also. I think Government should immediately ban transportation of food from one State to another. If this is done immediately, food prices at least in the surplus States will go down and once they go down, Government could procure grain and distribute it to the deficit areas at fair price levels. There may be a few people who may ask, "Don't you want producers to get better prices?" I want them to but that does not mean that we should allow the producers to get better prices at the expense of others. I want Government to buy directly from the farmers during the harvest time when prices are bound to be cheap and Government can operate at better prices. Government can also release the stock when the hoarders release the grain thus relieving the pressure, and help reduce the level of the prices.

Sir, so much has been said about the Second Five Year Plan and its implementation. I agree that we have made very great strides, but I feel that we have yet to achieve what we would like to have. We could have done better and so, I want to know what the reasons for this are. Sir, public opinion has not been mobilised and the people have not been made plan-conscious. Government have got very good plans but they have not seen to it that the public is made conscious of this and they have not

taken enough care to see that the public becomes plan-minded. There are two ways of doing it. The Government machinery has still got its old bureaucratic traditions. If Government see to it that such traditions are no longer there, if the people in the Government are not bureaucratic, then people will respond better.

The President has said that the N. E. S. and the Community Development blocks have done well. I do not deny that. Rural reconstruction, of course, is the most important programme in our Plan, but the point is whether we are getting any substantial return on the money that we are spending on these blocks. That is what I want to know from Government, and before this Plan comes to be successfully implemented, I want the Government to take steps to re-orientate the public mind and make the people a little more plan-conscious.

I would like to say one or two things about the food problem. People have been saying so much about the food problem but nobody has given thought to the inter-linking of the food problem with that of the population. India is a highly populated country and I feel that unless the food problem and the population problem are inter-linked, unless we solve the population problem on a permanent basis and solve it systematically and scientifically, we will not be able to tackle the food problem on a permanent basis. Secondly, Sir, connected with the population and food problems comes the unemployment problem. Nothing has been said about this unemployment problem by our President. We see that educated and uneducated people are suffering from want of employment. I want to confine myself to the unemployment of women. Of course, you may ask, "Why confine yourself to the employment of women?" Firstly, because so far as men are concerned, there are enough champions and secondly, because women are based on a different level than men. With all this talk of equality, I feel that

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]
women cannot compete with men because of their biological and physical differences.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):
Does Dr. Seeta Parmanand agree with you?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Nobody need tell me. I sometimes express my own opinion.

We women number more than 50 per cent. of the population and out of this 50 per cent., 30 per cent. may spend their time in the houses, not contributing even a pie to the economic side of it. I feel and nobody in this House, not even the redoubtable champions of women's position in ancient India, would disagree, that if we tap the potentialities of women, life in every home could be better and happier. I want to ask the Government how they are going to tap the potential capacity of women. What kind of avenues of income are they going to show them? I am not saying that women should vie with men in every walk of life, nor would I agree if someone gets up and says, women is not fit for this work or that. I would only suggest that the Government should immediately constitute a commission to study the problem of unemployment among educated and uneducated women and provide some avenues of income for them. Sir, all these problems are inter-related with food.

After dealing with food which provides sustenance for life I come to armaments which deprive a man of his life. If our country under the able guidance of our beloved Prime Minister has contributed much to the attainment of peace in the world as a whole I feel that still there are several elements which aim at the disruption of peace. The question of disarmament has been there always but now with the advent of nuclear weapons it has become an urgent

question to be solved. Nuclear weapons, however, pose a problem before humanity, a problem which is fatal in its nature and consequences. Science which has been called by man to his aid and to be his slave has turned out to be his master. We had the nuclear weapons first and now we have the thermo-nuclear weapons. What else will come, I do not know, and there is a mad race among all the powerful nations now to produce more of these weapons and tests are going on at periodic intervals. These tests are poisoning the atmosphere of the world and this strontium which is a by-product of these test explosions is going to have a calamitous effect on humanity as a whole. It affects the people living and what is worse—as a woman and as a mother I feel very acutely—it affects the unborn. It exposes everyone on the face of the earth to all sorts of dangers; it exposes everybody to a slow and tortuous decline. Everybody knows that it is going to produce a race of deformed and diseased people, deformed in mind and deformed in body and what a burden such progeny will be to a mother, I cannot imagine. So, what I would like to impress upon the Government is that we should do something definite about it; we should do something immediately to stop these nuclear explosions. We must congratulate our Prime Minister for having realised the dangers of these explosions even as far back as 1954 and today he is rallying round him world opinion. So, the psychological moment has come, the correct time has come, for him to see that something serious is done. I would request him that when he meets the other Commonwealth Prime Ministers shortly, he should give this issue first priority and he must bring home to the other Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth the dangers to which the world is being exposed. He can also, as suggested by some of our other friends, call a conference of the Asian and African countries or he can put this to the Bandung Powers or the Colombo Powers and see that something definite is done.

One more point I would like to refer. (Time bell rings.) Just one minute, Sir. What I want to say is that the disturbed peace in the Middle East is being exploited by the Powers of the world to their advantage and I would request the Government and the Prime Minister to use their good offices to see that Middle East is not used as a pawn in the game of power politics. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to give my support to the Motion of Thanks that has been moved by any distinguished friend, Mr. Algu Rai Shastri. The President has, in the admirable Address which he gave to both Houses of Parliament, invited our attention to our immediate problems. That is the function of the President's Address, and the President has performed it admirably. He has invited our attention to our internal problems which are of an overshadowing character and he has also invited our attention to international problems.

Now, a great deal has been said about our internal problems but there is one matter to which, though no reference has been made by the President as a citizen of Uttar Pradesh and as a representative of Uttar Pradesh, like to make a direct reference.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): There is no Uttar Pradesh citizenship, only Indian citizenship.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I know. That is why I added 'as a representative of Uttar Pradesh'. The matter I have in mind is this. For the last few days, since the 10th of this month, we are having a most misconceived agitation and it is called *satyagraha*. It is being sponsored by a political party without any sense of responsibility. I am not going into the question whether the demands made by that political party are right or wrong. I have not examined those demands; they may be right or they

may be wrong, and I express no opinion on that question; but it is intolerable that in a democracy where you have a chance of wooing the electorate and turning the Government out you should resort to this ugly device of what you call *satyagraha*. I do not know, I am not a Sanskrit expert, but I would call it *duragraha*. I am prepared to concede that there are occasions in the life of an individual when it becomes his that that law is inconsistent with the law of his inner being. That is not the position here. What Dr. Lohia and the Socialist Party want today is to overthrow the Government of that State by this *satyagraha* movement. Well, they are not going to succeed in that but I would like to make an appeal to Members of the Opposition parties, responsible Members of the Opposition parties, I would appeal to the Praja Socialist Party and I would appeal to the Communist Party, because the Communist Party now is a key party which is controlling the State of Kerala, I would appeal to all of them to dissociate themselves from this movement.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: It is as bitter as Karela itself.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I wanted to make a reference to these matters because I thought it was necessary that men, who value ordered progress in the interests of the second Five Year Plan, should make their position clear in regard to an agitation of this character.

Then, as the time is limited, I will not go into details and refer at length to the food problem and other internal problems. I should reserve what I have got to say on these matters for my speech on the Finance Bill but I would invite your attention to one or two matters of an overshadowing character so far as international affairs are concerned. It is said that we attach far too much importance to international affairs. I wish it

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

were possible to lead an isolated life, but we cannot; we simply just cannot. We are 400 million people and we happen to be the second big Power in Asia. These are days of open diplomacy and these are days of United Nations and we have, therefore, whether we like it or whether we do not like it, to take an interest in the world around us.

The most important question which has been agitating the public mind recently is that of the hydrogen bomb tests. Russia, America, England, none of these three big powers is prepared to give up these tests unilaterally, though it must be conceded to the credit of the Soviet Union that it has proposed that these tests be abandoned. I was deeply distressed to read this morning that the hydrogen bomb test has actually taken place, that the British Government has held this hydrogen bomb test. I have great admiration, I have sincere affection for the great British people and it is a tribute to them that there were so many people who were against it. I think Britain would have risen in moral stature if she had taken the line, "though we have the power and the means to make these hydrogen bombs, though we have the scientific skill to make these hydrogen bombs, we unilaterally abandon these bombs." But this Britain has not done and it is a shocking thing that the site selected for these bombs should have been the Pacific, that is, in the Asian continent.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH (Rajasthan): It should be Atlantic.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Lord Cherwell, who is an eminent scientist says that people are exaggerating the effects of the radio-activity, which are fairly harmless. If it is fairly harmless why not have these tests in the English Channel? Why not have them in the Atlantic Ocean? Why reserve these tests for this harassed continent of Asia?

Let me just pass on to another problem. I am a very great admirer of the American people. I would like co-operation between this country and America to develop and grow. But I have not been able to understand all the implications of the Eisenhower Doctrine. Is it one of the incidents of that Doctrine that ancient regimes, feudal autocracies should be supported and that nationalist movements should be confused or confounded with Communism? I think the problem of Israel too deserves consideration. It was a mistake to have created Israel, but I am prepared to grant that Israel has come to stay. But what about the Arab refugees? Has the United Nations no obligation towards the Arab refugees? Can the problem of Israel or can the problem of the Middle East be solved without a four-power conference, at which the Soviet Union will also be represented? We have to be very frank about these matters. Some of the powers seem to think that it is possible for them to establish peace in this world by acquiring strength. Well, there is no end to this acquisition of strength. Then, what is it that the big powers propose to do? Do the Western powers want the Soviet Union and the other eastern democracies to come to the United States in sack cloth and ashes and say: "Oh", Sir, though we have not fought the battle and we have not fought the war, we are so awed by your might and by your greatness that we make absolute and abject surrender of ourselves to you."? Well, that is not the way of peace. The Versailles spirit led to the Second World War and all that that was meant for mankind. This spirit might lead mankind to another war. I am not a supporter of the Russian bloc. That is not my point. I am not an admirer of all that they have done in Eastern Europe. But I do think that the problems of Eastern Europe or of the Middle East or of China cannot be solved by giving atom bombs to West Germany or giving atom bombs to Formosa or South Korea or by giving military aid to Pakistan. I am

glad, therefore, that a citizen of a neutral country, who was President of the Security Council and who came to examine the Kashmir question, was able to understand that there was something in our case, that the solution of the Kashmir issue had been complicated by a change in the pattern of power blocs in our past of the world. In this country we are going to spend Rs. 59 crores more this year for our defence and we have to thank our Western friends, our American friends for this increase in our defence expenditure, because they have been giving military aid to Pakistan.

Let me also say that we should not speak in an apologetic manner about our achievements in Kashmir. The Indian sub-continent was one united continent. In this House I said the other day that there was a mystic unity about this sub-continent and we are tied to the people of Kashmir by everything that matters. (*Time bell rings.*) We have ties with it. If you will just give me a few minutes more, I will explain. I think there is a tendency on our part to over-emphasise the legal aspects of the Kashmir case. We have a very good case in law so far as Kashmir is concerned. But I maintain that we have an excellent case on moral grounds as well so far as Kashmir is concerned. Remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we have 40 million Muslims in this country. We are the third biggest Muslim country in the world today, if you would like to put it that way. First is Indonesia; second is Pakistan with 60 million and, third, India with 40 million. Can our Muslim friends here say that they have no fairness, justice and equity of treatment in everything that matters in this secular Republic of ours? If I were a Muslim, I would insist that Kashmir be a part of India, because that is the only guarantee that I would have as a member of a minority community in a secular democracy. A Muslim State in which the Muslims are in a majority, in a vast Federal Republic, can carry more weight than by representatives elected by separate or joint electorates

to Parliament: Therefore I would like to emphasise the moral aspect of the Kashmir problem. The legal aspect is quite clear. We need no arbitration for that purpose. The resolution of August 13 is there and it is a very simple one. The resolution of January 5 is a very simple one. And it is quite clear that so far as Pakistan is concerned, she has not carried out her promises. Therefore, the question of plebiscite does not arise. We never gave an undertaking to Pakistan. Our undertaking was to the people of Kashmir. Pakistan has no *locus standi*. If we ever agreed to arbitration, we would be compromising with our independence. We cannot compromise with our Independence. Is Britain prepared to submit the question of Cyprus to the arbitration of Asian countries? Is France prepared to submit the question of Algeria to arbitration? Then why should there be a special law only for us? I think the worst solution we can think of in existing circumstances is one which would unsettle settled facts. Therefore, unless it be the desire of the Western powers to create chaos, anarchy and bloodshed in this country, the best thing for them would be to let sleeping dogs lie. We should be firm about these matters. We should not be apologetic about these matters. We should not talk as if we were ourselves doubtful about the morality of what we are doing. We are on firm moral grounds, and it is because we are on firm moral grounds that I say that our Kashmir policy is basically right.

Thank you very much.

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख (मुम्बई) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बहुत खेद होता है कि राष्ट्रपति के सम्भाषण में हाल ही में बम्बई प्रदेश में जो मत प्रदर्शन हुआ उसका तजक़िरा नहीं आया है और द्विभाषिक बम्बई के निस्बत कोई सोच-विचार नहीं किया गया है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो द्विभाषिक प्रश्न आया, यह बम्बई के प्रश्न को लेकर हुआ, उसके पहले तो महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात

[श्री एन० बी० देशमुख]

अलग किये हुए थे और बम्बई की निस्वत यह था कि इसको अलग रखा जाये या महाराष्ट्र को दिया जाये । उसके बाद गोया यह द्विभाषिक राज्य का प्रश्न आया है । बम्बई ने दो मर्तबे स्पष्ट तौर पर यह मतदान किया है, एक जनरल इलेक्शन में, जिसमें कांग्रेस के १३ और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के ११ लोग आगये हैं । लेकिन इसके बावजूद जो मतदान हुआ है, वह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के पक्ष में ज्यादा रहा है बमुकाबले कांग्रेस के । इस तरह बम्बई ने पहली मर्तबे जनरल इलेक्शन में स्पष्ट रूप से संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में जाना तय किया और उसके लिये मतदान किया है । लेकिन यह मतदान होने के साथ ही उन्होंने देखा कि कांग्रेस की मेजारिटी नहीं है, इस वास्ते उसके बाद कांफ्रेंस के जो इलेक्शन हुए उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि जो कांफ्रेंस अब तक कांग्रेस के हाथ में था वह कांग्रेस के हाथ से निकल कर अब संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के लोगों के हाथ में आ गया है । उससे साफ जाहिर है कि जिस बम्बई के प्रश्न की निस्वत यह सवाल पैदा हुआ था उस बम्बई ने साफ तौर से यह निर्णय दे दिया कि वह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के ध्येय को सपोर्ट करती है, इस लिहाज से बम्बई महाराष्ट्र को मिलना चाहिए । इस सिलसिले में श्री० वाडिया साहब ने जिस खयालात का इजहार फर्माया है, वह तो मैं समझने से कासिर हूं । उन्होंने यह कहा कि बहुत से लोग वोट देने नहीं आये जिसकी वजह से यह कहा जायेगा कि ऐसे लोग जो वोट देने नहीं आये वे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में जाने के खिलाफ थे । यह तो मैं समझने से कासिर हूं । अगर ऐसा कोई फार्मूला इलेक्शन का चाक आउट कर के अस्थित्यार किया जाता, तब तो वह बात सही हो सकती है ।

श्री व्यं० कृ० डगे (मुम्बई) : यह क्यों न समझा जाय कि वह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के माफिक है ?

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : ज्यादा इसी का इमकान है कि वह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के फायदे में हो क्योंकि महाराष्ट्रियों में बहुत से अनपढ़ और मजदूर लोग हैं, उन में से वोटिंग को आने वाले कम लोग हैं । जो इनलाइटेड लोग हैं वे वोटिंग को बहुत जल्द आते हैं ।

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: It was in the labour area where the polling was rather higher.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What he is speaking about is unorganised labour.

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : प्रोफेसर वाडिया ने यह कहा कि गुजराती और महाराष्ट्री बहुत खुशी से एक जगह रहते हैं । मजदूरी तो करते हैं महाराष्ट्री और गुजराती लोग उन से पैसा कमाते रहें । यह तो एक्सप्लाइटर और एक्सप्लाइटेड का समझौता वहां बहुत अच्छा रहा, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है ।

तो बम्बई ने साफ तौर से यह निर्णय दिया है कि वह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के साथ रहना चाहता है । दूसरे इलाके जो महाराष्ट्र के हैं उसमें भी जनरल इलेक्शन में, मैं समझता हूं, काफी अच्छी मेजारिटी से उन्होंने द्विभाषी बम्बई राज्य के पक्ष में खड़े लोगों को डिफीट दी है ।

मराठवाड़ा के निस्वत एक साहब ने मुझसे यह आंकड़े लेने की कोशिश की कि भाई, मराठवाड़ा में कांग्रेस के कितने आ गये और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के कितने आ गये । लेकिन मैं अदबन अर्ज करूंगा कि मराठवाड़ा ने जब वह हैदराबाद में था, उस वक्त यह साफ तौर से बता दिया था, हैदराबाद असेम्बली में कि वह बम्बई के साथ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का समर्थन करता है । महाराष्ट्र के लोगों ने और अपोजिशन के लोगों ने इसको सपोर्ट किया लेकिन मराठवाड़ा के कांग्रेसी लोगों ने खामोश बैठ कर यह कह दिया कि चूंकि कांग्रेस का मंडेट हमको मिला है

हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते, वैसे हम आपके साथ हैं। इसलिये हम खामोश रहेंगे और वोटिंग से एक्सेटेन रहेंगे। इस तरह मराठवाड़ा के लोगों ने संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति का साथ दिया है। इसके सिवाय वहां पर मराठवाड़ा साहित्य परिषद् ने साफ तौर से एक करारदार में कह दिया है कि हम बम्बई के साथ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में रहना चाहते हैं, मराठवाड़ा ने साफ तौर पर यह जाहिर कर दिया है कि हम संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के साथ रहना चाहते हैं, हमें द्विभाषिक राज्य नहीं चाहिये। यह कहा जाता है कि जनरल इलेक्शन में कांग्रेस क्यों आ गई, इसके बारे में मैं कहूंगा कि कांग्रेस के सब कैंडिडेट्स ने वहां कहा था कि वे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति और बम्बई के साथ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के मुखालिफ नहीं हैं। तो वहां पर कांग्रेस ने द्विभाषिक राज्य के मैडेट पर अपना इलेक्शन नहीं लड़ा है। वहां कांग्रेस के ज्यादा तादाद में आने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि मराठवाड़ा द्विभाषिक राज्य के साथ है। मराठवाड़ा बम्बई और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के साथ ही है। इस सिलसिले में जो प्रदर्शन हुआ है, उससे इसका पता चलता है कि द्विभाषिक बम्बई में बम्बई और महाराष्ट्र वाले नहीं रहना चाहते हैं। इसके साथ ही साथ गुजरात को भी आप देख लीजिये, वहां भी प्रदर्शन हुए। जिस गुजरात में अब तक कांग्रेस को किसी ने अपोज नहीं किया उस गुजरात में काफी अपोजिशन हो गया है और वहां के पापुलर मिनिस्टर भी वहां बोल नहीं सके, उनके अनशन करने पर भी उनको सुनने के लिये लोग वहां जमा नहीं हुए। इससे पता चलता है कि गुजरात में भी लोग इस द्विभाषिक बम्बई में रहना नहीं चाहते हैं। तो ऐसी हालत में मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह एक ऐसा मौका है कि इसको रीकॉन्सिडर करने की जरूरत है। जिस करारदार की तरफ तवज्जो दे कर यह कहा जाता है कि पार्लियामेंट ने द्विभाषिक बम्बई मंजूर किया है, वह कितने दस्तखतों से हुआ है।

मैं समझता हूं कि जिन लोगों ने दस्तखत किये थे वे लोग गैर महाराष्ट्री और गैर गुजराती लोग ही ज्यादा थे, यू० पी० और बिहार के लोग प्रमुखतः उन में थे। तो जो यह करारदार पार्लियामेंट के सामने आया, इसमें महाराष्ट्री लोगों के ज्यादा हस्ताक्षर नहीं हैं। इसके सिवाय स्टेट लेजिस्लेचर का भी मशविरा लेना चाहिये था, वह मशविरा भी नहीं लिया गया, जो कि कायदे के मुताबिक होना चाहिये था, इस दृष्टि से वह करारदार मुनासिब नहीं है।

इसके अलावा मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि महाराष्ट्र में अपोजिशन के लोगों से कोई मशविरा इस मामले में नहीं किया गया, जिसका किया जाना जरूरी था। क्योंकि, यह रिआर्गनाइजेशन का मसला एक नेशनल मसला है, और नेशनल सवाल पर महज कांग्रेस के लोगों से मशविरा करना मुनासिब नहीं है, बल्कि मुह्तलिफ ख्यालातों के लोगों से बातचीत करके इस तरह के मामलों को तय करना चाहिये। मैं फिर कहूंगा कि इस मसले पर जल्द से जल्द फिर से गौर होना चाहिये और महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात का अलग अलग प्रान्त बनना चाहिये। इसके साथ ही साथ हमारे साथी राजभोज साहब ने अभी कहा कि द्विभाषिक राज्य में हरिजन भाई अच्छी तरह से रह सकेंगे।

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

तो मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या उनके हरिजन भाइयों को बंगाल और यू० पी० में किसी तरह की तकलीफ है। क्या वे बम्बई स्टेट में ही ज्यादा सुखी रह सकते हैं? इसलिये उनकी यह बात सही नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए इस मामले पर मुकर्रर गौर होना जरूरी है।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : हम को यह चीज पसन्द है।

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूं

[श्री एन० बी० देशमुख]

कि बम्बई और अहमदाबाद में निहत्थों की भीड़ के ऊपर जो फायरिंग की गयी थी, वह एक गलत चीज थी, उसका तजकिरा राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं है। मैं खास तौर पर अहमदाबाद की घटना के बारे में कह रहा हूँ, जहाँ छोटे-छोटे बच्चे, ३० साल से कम उम्र वाले, निहत्थे, बिना हथियार के, अपने खयालात का इजहार करने के लिये इकट्ठे हुए थे, बेदर्दी के साथ उन पर फायरिंग किया गया जो कि एक बहुत ही गलत बात थी। इस चीज का तजकिरा राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में होना चाहिये था। इस मौके पर सरकार को यह बतलाना चाहिये था कि उसकी पालिसी क्या है। जब कोई मजमा निहत्था है, बगैर आर्मस् के है तो उसको डिसपर्स करने के लिए आप आर्मस् इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं, क्या किसी खास कानून में यह चीज जायज है। जब कोई मजमा निहत्था है, कोई हथियार उसके पास नहीं है, कोई फायर आर्मस् नहीं तो उसके खिलाफ़ फोर्स कम से कम इस्तेमाल होना चाहिये। हाँ, अगर कोई मजमा हथियार लिये हुये है, उसके पास आर्मस् है तो उस समय सरकार हथियार इस्तेमाल कर सकती है। गवर्नमेंट को इस पालिसी के बारे में कुछ न कुछ इस भाषण में कहना चाहिये था।

अब इसके बाद कुछ फूड पोजीशन की निस्वत अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। सरकार की ओर से जो हमको हिंदसे दिये जाते हैं, वे बिल्कुल गलत होते हैं। अपने जिले के अनुभव के आधार पर कह रहा हूँ कि पिछले तीन सालों से हमारे यहाँ पानी न पड़ने की वजह से फसल खराब होती जा रही है और आज स्थिति ऐसी है कि वहाँ पर एक महीने के लिए भी अनाज नहीं है। फिर भी सरकार का ओर से जो हिंदसे दिये जाते हैं उसमें यह बतलाया जाता है कि वहाँ पर काफी अनाज है। सरकार की ओर से हमारे जिले के जो हिंदसे दिये गये हैं, उसमें यह बतलाया गया है

कि इस साल वहाँ पर रुपये में १०, १२ आना भर पैदावार हुई है, जब कि वहाँ पर केवल एक महीने के लिए ही अनाज है। मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि महज हिंदसे के ख्याल पर हम अपना पेट नहीं भर सकते हैं। इसके लिए जरूरी है कि किसानों की पैदावार, बढ़ाने के लिए हर तरह की सुविधा दी जानी चाहिये, सिंचाई के साधन बढ़ाये जाने चाहिये। जिन स्थानों में अनाज की कमी हो गई है, वहाँ पर सरकार को फेयर प्राइस की दुकानें खोलनी चाहिये। बाज लोगों की ओर से यह कहा जाता है कि पैसा ज्यादा होने की वजह से निर्र में इजाफा हुआ है, यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है। आज लोगों के पास खरीदने के लिए पैसा नहीं है, उन्हें काम देना चाहिये। जब आप गरीब लोगों को काम देंगे तब ही वे आपकी फेयर प्राइस शाख से अनाज खरीद सकेंगे।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got still 16 names before me and I think some hon. Ministers also will be intervening. So, the House will sit till six o'clock and each Member will take 10 minutes. Otherwise, it will not be possible to conclude the debate.

مولانا ایم - فاروقی (اب پردیس):

جناب ذیبتی چیرمین صاحب - یہ جو ایک رسم ہے کہ جب پریسڈنٹ کا ایڈریس آنے اس پر گفتگو کی جائے اس کے ساتھ ساتھ یہ بھی ایک رسم ہو گئی ہے کہ جر میجر ایڈریس پارتی ہے وہ عام طور پر پریسڈنٹ کے ایڈریس پر اس کی اس پالیسی کی - جو اس میں سامنے لائی گئی ہے - ہر چیز کی تصریف کرے اور اس کی ہر چیز کو سوائے - اس طریقے پر بالمقابل یہ بھی ایک رسم ہے کہ ایڈریشن کی سیٹوں میں جو لوگ بیٹھے ہیں وہ

اس ایڈریس کی مخالفت کریں -
چنانچہ اس اصول پر یہ چیز چل رہی
ہے لیکن میں آپ سے یہ عرض کرنا
چاہتا ہوں کہ کسی ایڈریس یا کسی
پالیسی کے ایک ایک نقطہ
ایک ایک شوشہ ایک ایک حرف
یا ایک ایک سطر کی تصریف
کرنا - ملک نے کسی ایڈمنسٹریشن
یا کسی اس پالیسی کے بارے میں -
جو ہندوستان میں چلائی جا رہی ہو -
یہ کہنا کہ اس میں ایسی کوئی بات
نہیں ہے ایسا کوئی شوشہ یا کوئی
نقطہ نہیں نکلتا اور اس میں کوئی
چیز ایسی نہیں ہے جو کہ قابل اعتراض
ہو یہ بالکل غلط ہے اور اس طریقہ سے
یہ چیز بھی بالکل غلط ہے - کہ جتنی
چیزیں میجسٹریٹی پارٹی کی طرف
سے ہوں - جتنی چیزیں ان لوگوں کی
طرف سے ہوں جن کے ہاتھ میں اسوقت
حکومت کی باگ دہی ہے وہ سب بری
ہیں - یہ ضرور ہے کہ پریسیڈنٹ کا
ایڈریس جو آپ کے سامنے پیش کیا
گیا ہے اس میں زیادہ تر باتیں جو
ہوئی چاہئیں وہ ہیں ضرور ہیں اور
تھیک حالت میں ہیں - اور ایسی
ہیں کہ ان کے اوپر کوئی اعتراض نہ
ہو سکتا -

ہندوستان نے ان پانچ برسوں میں
کتنی ترقی کی ہے وہ اس میں ظاہر
کیا گیا ہے - کوئی شخص اس سے
انکار نہیں کر سکتا کہ ہندوستان
نے ترقی کی ہے چاہے وہ کسی بھی
ایڈمنسٹریشن کے ماتحت ہوئی ہو

کسی وقت بھی ان کاموں کا معائنہ کیا
جا سکتا ہے - آپ نے کل الگو رائے شاستری
جی کے بیان میں یہ بات سنی ہوگی
کہ کس طرح سے انڈسٹری میں صنعت
میں ہمارا ملک ترقی کر رہا ہے اور
دونوں پالیسیوں کے بارے میں یعنی
ہماری اندرونی پالیسی کے بارے میں
یا بیرونی پالیسی کے بارے میں آپ نے
بہت - صاحبوں کی تقریریں سنی
ہوں -

آپ سب لوگوں کو معلوم ہے کہ ہمارا
ملک سنہ ۱۹۴۷ میں آزاد ہوا ہے -
آزادی حاصل کرنے کے بعد اس کو کتنی
مشکلوں کا سامنا کرنا پڑا اس چیز کو
آپ سب لوگ اچھی طرح جانتے ہیں -
ہمارے ملک کے سامنے کئی طرح کی
مصیبتیں آئیں - ریفیوجیز کا مسئلہ
پیش آیا - دنگے فساد ہوئے اور کئی
طرح کی چیزیں ہوئی - ہمارے ملک
کے خلاف بے پناہ پروپیگنڈا کیا گیا -
اس کے بعد طرح طرح کے کلچرہ طرح
طرح کے تعصب اور طرح طرح کی
مذہبی چیزیں جو ہمیں قیوہہ دو
سو سالوں کی غلامی میں ملی تھیں
جو ہندوستان کی سر زمین اور آسمان
میں چکر لگتے رہے تھیں ملک کے
سامنے آئیں - لاکھوں کی تعداد میں
لوگ اس ملک سے دوسرے ملک میں
گئے اور وہاں سے یہاں آئے - کتنا خون
خراہ ہوا یہ سب باتیں آپ سب
صاحبان روز سہتے ہیں - اور آپ لوگوں

[مولانا ایم - فاروقی]

کو یہ بھی معلوم ہوگا کہ اب بھی ہمارے ملک میں رفیوجیز برابر آتے جا رہے ہیں۔ ان چیزوں کے باوجود اگر آپ ہندوستان کا مقابلہ کسی ایشیا کے ملک کے ساتھ کریں تو آپ کو اندازہ ہوگا کہ ان مشکلات کے باوجود بھی ہندوستان نے واقعی کتنی ترقی کی ہے۔ ہندوستان کے مقابلہ میں ایشیا کے جو ملک آزاد ہوئے ہیں آج ان کی اقتصادی حالت ان کی مالی حالت ہندوستان کے مقابلہ میں کیسی ہے۔ یہ سب آپ سب صاحبان اچھی طرح سے جانتے ہیں۔ ہماری گورنمنٹ نے آزادی کے بعد جو ترقی کی ہے وہ قابل تعریف ہے اور دنیا کے جو بڑے بڑے لیڈر یہاں تشریف لائے ان سب نے اس کی تعریف کی ہے۔ اس کے برعکس آپ ایشیا کے دوسرے ملکوں کو دیکھیں کہ وہاں پر کیا حالت ہے اور اُن دن ان کی گورنمنٹیں بدلتی رہتی ہیں۔ کسی ایک پارٹی کی گورنمنٹ اچھی طرح سے چلنے نہیں پاتی۔ آپ پاکستان ہی کو دیکھ لیں، انڈونیشیا کو دیکھ لیں یا مالدیپس۔ وہاں کے ملکوں کو دیکھ لیں۔ وہاں پر روز گورنمنٹ اور پارٹیاں بدلتی رہتی ہیں۔ ایشیا میں خاص طور سے آج کل ایک طرح سے ملینٹری کا رول قائم ہے۔ ان ملکوں کے لوگوں کے لئے پارٹی بدلنا کوئی نئی بات نہیں رہ گئی ہے۔ لیکن پارٹیاں اس طریقہ پر بدلیں کہ اس سے خوتریزی ہو، بد امنی ہو، کھانے

پہنے کی تکلیف ہو ایسی کیفیت ہندوستان میں نہیں ہے۔ کسی ملک میں جو حال میں آزاد ہوا ہے وہ کیفیت نہیں ہے جو ہندوستان میں ہے کہ آج ہم امن کے ساتھ اور راحت کے ساتھ زندگی بسر کر رہے ہیں۔

وہ گھبراہٹ کہ یہ اجڑا ہوا ہندوستان تھا جو کہ سیلکڑوں برسوں کی تکلیف کے بعد ہمیں ملا تھا۔ اس میں ظاہر ہے کہ بیکاری تھی فاقے تھے کیونکہ ہر چیز ہم سے لی جا چکی تھی ہماری مالی حالت حد سے زیادہ خراب ہو چکی تھی۔ ایسی صورت میں سات آٹھ برس میں جو کچھ کیا گیا ہے وہ یقیناً قابل تعریف ہے۔ لیکن اگر ہم یہ کہیں کہ اسوقت جو ہمارے اوپر مصیبتیں ہیں جو تکلیفیں ہیں وہ کچھ کم ہیں تو یہ بالکل غلط بات ہوگی۔ اسوقت خاص طور پر جو ہمارے سامنے بھگت ہے اس کو یقیناً ہم کچھ قابل اعتراض سمجھتے ہیں اور شاید دوسرے موقعوں پر ہم کہیں بھی کہ یہ جو ٹیکس اتنے زیادہ لگے ہیں ان سے متوسط زندگی برباد ہو رہی ہے۔ میرے خیال میں متوسط لوگوں کی مالی حالت پر ان ٹیکسوں کا غیر معمولی اثر پڑے گا کیونکہ روزمرہ کی جو ضرورت کی چیزیں ہیں ان کی قیمتوں میں اضافہ ہوگا۔ یہ ضرور غور طلب ہے اور اس پر ہمیں غور کرنا چاہیے۔ یہ کوئی سرانے کی بات نہیں ہے۔

گزشتہ زمانہ میں جو ری آرگنائزیشن کمیشن بنایا گیا ممکن ہے وہ صحیح ہو یا غلط لیکن بہر حال ایک وقت تھا جب ہندوستان کے لوگوں کی مانگ تھی لوگ اس تلاش میں تھے کہ کسی نہ کسی طریقہ پر ہندوستان کی آب و ہوا میں وہ اپنا الگ صوبہ بنائیں اور اس کے لئے ہم نے ری آرگنائزیشن کمیشن بنایا۔ یہ دوسری بات ہے کہ اس کے بعد اس میں بہت سی خرابیاں پیدا ہوئیں بہت سی بربادیاں ہوئیں اور بہت سی تکلیفیں ہوئیں اور ایڈمنسٹریشن کا کام چلانے کے لئے گولیاں چلیں۔ یہ بھی ایک قابل اعتراض بات ہے اور اس کو کسی طرح سراہا نہیں جا سکتا کہ گولیاں چلائی جائیں۔ یہ بھی نہیں سراہا جا سکتا کہ فارن حکومت یعنی انگریزی حکومت کے زمانہ میں جو ہوا کرتا تھا وہی چیزیں آج بھی کی جائیں۔ لیکن اس کے ساتھ ساتھ یہ بھی نہیں سراہا جا سکتا کہ ہندوستان کے نظام کو ہندوستان کے اس کو اور ہندوستان کے قانون کو بالکل ٹھکرا دیا جائے۔ اس کو تو بہر حال ایک مضبوط حکومت کے طور پر قائم رکھنا ہی ہوگا اور اس کے لئے بعض وقت گولی چلانے کی ضرورت بھی پڑ سکتی ہے۔ اس طرح آپ دونوں طبقہ کے لوگوں کو پوری طور پر برا نہیں کہہ سکتے۔ پھر بھی واقعات قابل اعتراض ہیں۔

جہاں تک غلا کا مسئلہ ہے یہ غور کے قابل ہے جیسا کہ ہمارے فوڈ منسٹر صاحب نے بھی کہا ہے جو غلہ کے اعداد و شمار پھر کئے گئے ہیں ان کے بارے میں میرا یہ کہنا ہے کہ آپ چاہے دیہاتوں میں جائیں چاہے شہروں میں جائیں عملی طور پر وہ نہیں ہیں جو آپ کے آفیسر نے آپ کے سامنے پیش کئے ہیں۔ وہاں اس سے کہیں زیادہ بدنما چیزیں نظر آتی ہیں جتنی خوشنما چیزیں آپ کو اپنے کاغذات میں نظر آتی ہیں۔ ان تمام چیزوں کو سامنے رکھ کر میں یہ نہیں کہہ سکتا کہ جو اس وقت حکومت کی پالیسی ہے وہ اس حد تک کامیاب ہے کہ اس پر کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہو سکتا۔ لیکن جس کے سر پر کوئی ذمہ داری ہوتی ہے اس کے لئے اس ذمہ داری کو سمجھنا بہت مشکل کام ہوتا ہے اور بڑی دقتیں اس میں پیش آتی ہیں اور یہ چیز آپ کو بہر حال محسوس کرنا چاہئے ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں پریسڈیڈنٹ کے ایڈریس کے سلسلہ میں اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کرتا ہوں۔

†[भौलाना एम० फूल्के (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, यह जो एक
रस्म है कि जब प्रेजीडेंट का एड्रेस आये, उस
पर गुप्तगू की जाये, इसीके साथ साथ यह भी
एक रस्म है कि जो मेजरिटी पार्टी
है वह आम तौर पर प्रेजीडेंट के एड्रेस पर उसकी
उस पालिसी की जो इससे सामने लाई गई है
हर चीज की तारीफ करे और उसकी हर चीज
को सराहे। इसी तरीके पर बिल मुकाबिल

†Hindi transliteration.

[मौलाना एम० फारूकी]

यह भी एक रस्म है कि अप्रैल/जून को सेंटों में जो लोग बैठे हैं, वह इस एड्रेस को मुवाफक करें। चुनाव इस उसूल पर यह चीज चल रही है। लेकिन मैं आपसे यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि किसी एड्रेस या किमी पालिसी को एक एक वृत्त, एक एक शोशे, एक एक हरफ या एक एक सतर को तारीफ करना; मुल्क के किनी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन या किसी उंस पालिसी के बारे में, जो हिन्दुस्तान में चलाई जा रही हो, यह कहना कि इसमें ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है, ऐसा कोई शोशा या कोई नुकता नहीं निकलता और इसमें कोई चीज ऐसी नहीं है जो कि काबिले एतराज हो, यह बिलकुल गलत है। और इसी तरीके से यह चीज भी बिलकुल गलत है कि जितनी चीजें मेजरिटी पार्टी की तरफ से हों, जितनी चीजें उन लोगों की तरफ से हों, जिनके हाथ में इस वक्त हुकूमत की बागडोर है, वह सब बुरी है। यह जरूरी है कि प्रेजिडेंट का एड्रेस जो आपके सामने पेश किया गया है, उसमें ज्यादातर बातें जो होनी चाहियें, वह हैं, जरूर हैं, और ठीक हालत में हैं, और ऐसी हैं कि उनके ऊपर कोई एतराज नहीं हो सकता।

हिन्दुस्तान ने इन पांच बरसों में कितनी तरक्की की है वह इसमें जाहिर किया गया है। कोई शक्ल इस से इनकार नहीं कर सकता कि हिन्दुस्तान ने तरक्की की है, चाहे वह किसी भी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के मातहत हुई हो। किसी वकन भी उन कामों का मुआयना किया जा सकता है। आपने कल अलगूराय शास्त्री जी के ब्यान में यह बात सुनी होगी कि किस तरह से इन्डस्ट्री में, सन्नत में हमारा मुल्क तरक्की कर रहा है और दोनों पालिसियों के बारे में यानी हमारी अन्दरूनी पालिसी के बारे में या बैरूनी पालिसी के बारे में आपने बहुत से साहिबों की तकरीरें सुनी होंगी।

आप सब लोगों को मालूम है कि हमारा मुल्क सन् १९४७ में आजाद हुआ है।

आजादी हासिल करने के बाद इसको कितनी मुश्किलों का सामना करना पड़ा, इस चीज को आप सब लोग अच्छी तरह जानते हैं। हमारे मुल्क के सामने कई तरह की मुभावतें आईं, रिप्यूजीज का मसला पेश आया, दंगे-फसाद हुए और कई तरह की चीजें हुईं। हमारे मुल्क के खिलाफ बेपनाह प्रोपेगंडा किया गया। इसके बाद तरह तरह के कलवर, तरह तरह के तहस्सुब और तहर तरह की मुजहबी चीजें जो हमें डेढ़-दो सौ सालों की गुलामी में मिली थी, जो हिन्दुस्तान की सरजमीन और आपमान में चक्कर काट रही थीं, मुल्क के सामने आईं। लाखों की तादाद में लोग इस मुल्क से दूसरे मुल्क में गये और वहां से यहां आये। कितना खूनखराबा हुआ यह सब बातें आप सब साहिबान रोज सुनते हैं। और आप लोगों को यह भी मालूम होगा कि अब भी हमारे मुल्क में रिप्यूजीज बराबर आते जा रहे हैं। इन चीजों के बावजूद अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान का मुकाबिला किसी एशिया के मुल्क के साथ करें, तो आपको अन्दाजा होगा कि इन मुश्किलों के बावजूद भी हिन्दुस्तान ने वाकई कितनी तरक्की की है। हिन्दुस्तान के मुकाबिले में एशिया के जो मुल्क आजाद हुए हैं, आज उनकी इकतसादी हालत, उनकी माली हालत हिन्दुस्तान के मुकाबिले में कैसी है, यह सब आप सब साहिबान अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने आज दो के बाद जो तरक्की की है वह काबिले तारीफ है और दुनिया के जो बड़े बड़े लीडर यहां तशरीफ लाये, उन सबने इसकी तारीफ की है। इनके बरअकम आप एशिया के दूसरे मुल्कों को देखें कि वहां पर क्या हालत है और आगे दिन उनकी गवर्नमेंट बदलती रहती हैं। किसी एक पार्टी को गवर्नमेंट अच्छी तरह से चलने नहीं पाती। आप पाकिस्तान को को देख लें, इंडोनेशिया को देख लें या मिडिल ईस्ट के मुल्कों को देख लें, वहां पर रोज गवर्नमेंट और पार्टियाँ बदलती रहती हैं। एशिया में खास तौर से आज कल एक तरह से मिलिट्री का रूज कायम है।

इन मुल्कों के लोगों के लिए पार्टी बदलना कोई नई बात नहीं रह गई है । लेकिन पार्टियाँ इस तरीके पर बदलें कि इससे खूबजी हो, बदअमनी हो, खाने पीने की तकलीफ हो, ऐसी कैफियत हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं है । किसी मुल्क में जो हाल में आजाद हुआ है यह कैफियत नहीं है जो हिन्दुस्तान में है कि आज हम अमन के साथ और राहत के साथ जिन्दगी बसर कर रहे हैं ।

रह गया यह कि यह उजड़ा हुआ हिन्दुस्तान था जो कि सैकड़ों बरस की तकलीफ के बाद हमें मिला था । उम्में जाहिर है कि बेकारी थी, फाँके थे, क्योंकि हर चीज हमसे ली जा चुकी थी । हमारी माली हालत हद से ज्यादा खराब हो चुकी थी । ऐसी सूरत में सात आठ बरस में जो कुछ किया गया है वह यकीनन काबिले तारीफ है । लेकिन अगर हम यह कहें कि इस वक्त जो हमारे ऊपर मुपीबत है, जो तकलीफ है वह कुछ कम है तो यह बिलकुल गलत बात होगी । इस वक्त खास तौर पर जो हमारे सामने बजट है, उसको यकीनन हम कुछ काबिले एतराज समझते हैं और शायद दूसरे मौकों पर हम कहें भी कि यह जो टैक्स इतने ज्यादा लगे हैं इनसे मुतवस्सित जिन्दगी बरबाद हो रही है । मेरे ख्याल में मुतवस्सित लोगों की माली हालत पर इन टैक्सों का गैर मामूली असर पड़ेगा क्योंकि रोजमर्रा की जो जरूरत की चीजें हैं उन की कीमतों में इजाफा होगा । यह जरूर गौरतलब है और इस पर हमें गौर करना चाहिए । यह कोई सराहने की बात नहीं है ।

गुजरा जमाने में जो रियायतनाइजेशन कमीशन बनाया गया, मुमकिन है वह सही हो या गलत, लेकिन बहरहाल एक वक्त था जब हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की मांग थी, लोग इस तलाश में थे कि किसी न किसी तरीके पर हिन्दुस्तान की आबोहवा में वह अपना अलग स्वा बनायें और इसके लिए हमने रियायतनाइजेशन कमीशन बनाया, यह दूसरी बात है कि इसके बाद इसमें बहुत सी खराबियाँ

पैदा हुई, बहुत ही बरबादियाँ हुई और बहुत सी तकलीफें हुई और एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का काम चलाने के लिए गोनियाँ चली । यह भी एक काबिले एतराज बात है और इसको किसी तरह सराहा नहीं जा सकता कि गोनियाँ चलाई जाये । यह भी नहीं सराहा जा सकता कि फॉरन हुकूमत यानी अंग्रेजों हुकूमत के जमाने में जो हुआ करता था, वही चीज आज भी की जाये । लेकिन इसी के साथ साथ यह भी नहीं सराहा जा सकता कि हिन्दुस्तान के निजाय को, हिन्दुस्तान के अमन को और हिन्दुस्तान के कानून को बिलकुल ठुकरा दिया जाय । इसको तो बहरहाल एक मजबूत हुकूमत के तौर पर कायम रखना ही होगा । और इसके लिये बाज वक्त गोली चलान की जरूरत भी पड़ सकती है । इसी तरह आप दाँना तबका के लोगों को पूरी तौर पर बुरा नहीं कह सकते । फिर भी यह बाकयात काबिले एतराज है ।

जहाँ तक गल्ला का ममला है, यह गौर के काबिल है, जैसा कि हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी कहा है । जो गल्ला के आदाद वं शुमार पेश किये गये हैं उनके बारे में मेरा यह कहना है कि आप चाहें देशांतों में जायें, चाहे शहरों में जायें, अमली तौर पर वह नहीं है जो आपके आफिसर ने आपके सामने पेश किये हैं । वहाँ उससे कही ज्यादा वदनुमा चीजें नजर आती हैं जितनी खुशनुमा चीज आपको अपने कागजातों में नजर आती है, इन तमाम चीजों को सामने रख कर मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि जो इस वक्त हुकूमत की पालिसी है वह इस हद तक कामयाब है कि उस पर कोई एतराज नहीं हो सकता । लेकिन जिसके सर पर कोई जिम्मेदारी होती है, उसके लिये उस जिम्मेदारी को संभालना बहुत मुश्किल काम होता है और बड़ी दिक्कतें इसमें पेश आती हैं और यह चीज आपको बहरहाल महसूस करनी चाहिए । इन अलफाज के साथ मैं प्रेसिडेंट के एड्रेस के सिलसिला में अपने खयालात का इजहार करता हूँ]

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Sir, I won't be able to finish within ten minutes. If you give me some more time, I shall be highly obliged.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take two or three minutes more.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : माननीय उप-सभापति जी, अभी एक वर्ष नहीं हुआ है, गत अगस्त की बात है कि जब इसी सदन में और इसी पार्लियामेंट में करीब करीब एक राय से हमने द्विभाषी बम्बई राज्य का फैसला किया था। कुछ कम्युनिस्टों को छोड़ दीजिये। आपने देखा होगा कि उस वक्त प्रजा सोशलिस्ट, जन संघी, हिन्दू महासभावादी और जितने भी पक्ष के लोग इन दोनों हाउसेज में थे, उनकी राय से वह प्रस्ताव पास हुआ था। दस पांच कम्युनिस्टों को छोड़ दीजिये। प्रजा सोशलिस्टों ने तो उसमें काफी हिस्सा लिया था, यह भी आप जानते हैं। मुझे आशा थी कि फिर ६ महीने के बाद ही यहां वह मसला पेश नहीं होगा। लेकिन कुछ लोगों की आदत होती है कि कुछ एक ऐसा किस्सा बनाये रहें जिससे लोगों को बहकाते रहें और अपनी लीडरी बनाये रहें। फिर भी मैं आपका इसमें वक्त लेना नहीं चाहता और शायद मैं आज बोलता भी नहीं। परन्तु मेरे भाई देशमुख साहब ने एक तरकीब पेश की है, जिसमें यह लिखा गया है कि :

"The unanimous and express desire of the people of Maharashtra."

मैं आपको अब थोड़े में यह दिखलाना चाहूंगा कि यह यूनिमस है क्या चीज? पहली बात यह है कि महाराष्ट्र का जिक्र करते हुये आप कभी मराठवाड़ा, विदर्भ और नागपुर को भूल नहीं सकते क्योंकि मराठवाड़ा, नागपुर और, विदर्भ के बगैर संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बन नहीं सकता। जो नियम आप महाराष्ट्र के लिए सोचते हैं, उसी नियम का आप को पालन मराठवाड़ा, विदर्भ और नागपुर के बारे में करना चाहिये। महाराष्ट्र के बारे

में आप कहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र में कांग्रेस की हार हुई। परन्तु मराठवाड़ा और नागपुर में क्या हुआ? उसके बारे में आप कहते हैं कि वहां कुछ और बातें थीं। आप डेमोक्रेसी की बात करते हैं। मेरे कम्युनिस्ट दोस्त अब नये से डेमोक्रेसी के मानने वाले बने हैं और उनका प्रेम डेमोक्रेसी के लिए औरों से कुछ अधिक गुलशोर का हो सकता है। इस लिए वे डेमोक्रेसी की अधिक बातें करने हैं। परन्तु उनकी डेमोक्रेसी हिन्दुस्तान की है या किसी प्रदेश की है या किसी जिले की है या किसी गांव की है, किस तरह से डेमोक्रेसी का फैसला वे करना चाहते हैं? क्या इस बम्बई राज्य का फैसला डेमोक्रेसी से नहीं हुआ? क्या यह हिन्दुस्तान का हक नहीं है कि वह बम्बई का फैसला देश के हित में करे? देश के हित को ध्यान में रख कर पार्लियामेंट ने यह फैसला किया, फिर भी आप कहते हैं कि यह फैसला अन-डेमोक्रेटिक हुआ। इस तरह यदि आप हर सवाल पर हिन्दुस्तान के हर कोने और हर हिस्से से राय लेते रहेंगे तो कभी कोई फैसला होगा ही नहीं और इस देश में इतिफाक पैदा नहीं कर सकेंगे और आप कभी समूचे देश के हित में कोई काम नहीं कर सकेंगे। बावजूद इसके मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई असेम्बली में ३६६ सीटें हैं, जिनमें कांग्रेस ने २३७ जीती हैं और १२९ जगहें हमारे विरोधियों को मिली हैं। अब उसके हिस्सों को ले लीजिये। बम्बई की बहुत बात कही जाती है। बम्बई में २४ जगहें थी जिनमें से १३ यानी ५४ परसेंट कांग्रेस को मिली हैं और ११ सीटें विरोधियों को मिली हैं। इसके बाद चलिए मराठवाड़ा। वहां ४२ में से ३५ सीटें कांग्रेस को मिली हैं। देशमुख साहब तो चले गये हैं लेकिन मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि वहां ४२ में से ३५ जगहें कांग्रेस को मिली हैं और वे इस तरह से मिली हैं कि मराठवाड़ा में हर उम्मीदवार के खिलाफ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति का उम्मीदवार खड़ा था। यह बात नहीं है कि वहां समिति के उम्मीदवार

ने कांग्रेस का विरोध न किया हो। उसके बाद विदर्भ, नागपुर को ले लीजिये। वहां ६३ में से ५५ सीटें कांग्रेस ने जीती हैं। वहां भी हर एक कांग्रेस के उम्मीदवार के खिलाफ समिति का उम्मीदवार था। महाराष्ट्र के बारे में बात कुछ सच है। महाराष्ट्र के भी १२ जिलों में से २ जिलों में काफी मेजोरिटी मिली है। एक जिले में १२ में से १० सीटें मिली हैं और दूसरे जिले में १२ में से ७ सीटें मिली हैं और भाई कई जिलों में इस तरह से चार-चार या तीन-तीन सीटें मिली हैं। यानी आम तौर पर देखा जाय तो आपको पता चलेगा कि सारे द्विभाषिक बम्बई राज्य में—इतना ही नहीं बल्कि जितने मराठी भाषाभाषी प्रदेश हैं उनमें भी—कांग्रेस को मेजोरिटी मिली है और चुनाव ने फैसला किया है कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की जनता और वोटर्स द्विभाषिक बम्बई राज्य के पक्ष में हैं।

आप महाराष्ट्र के वोट्स को लीजिये। १९५१ में महाराष्ट्र में कांग्रेस को २७ लाख वोट्स मिले थे और इस बार २२ लाख वोट्स मिले हैं; यानी ५ लाख वोट्स महाराष्ट्र में कांग्रेस को कम मिले। फिर भी कह दिया जाये कि विरोध 'यूनानिमस' है? अब साहब आप ही कहिये कि २७ लाख और २२ लाख क्या यूनानिमिटी दिखलाते हैं? कांग्रेस को जो २२ लाख वोट मिले, उससे कौन सी 'यूनानिमस डिजायर' जाहिर होती है, यह मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं।

इसके बाद यह है कि एक नया प्रेम मेरे मित्रों को गुजरात से पैदा हो गया है। जहां कहीं संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की बात कहते हैं वहां महागुजरात को भी ले आते हैं। समझ में नहीं आता है कि किस मुह से महागुजरात की बात वे कह सकते हैं। अब जरा गुजरात का नतीजा देखिये? १३१ में से १०२ जगहें कांग्रेस को मिली हैं और सिर्फ २९ जगहें कांग्रेस विरोधियों को मिली हैं। जब आप डेमोक्रेसी का यह नियम

लगाते हैं कि जहां जिसको ज्यादा वोट्स मिले हों, वहां उसकी मानी जाय तो फिर महागुजरात वालों को वहां कितने वोट मिले हैं? उन्हें तो २९ जगहें मिली हैं और कांग्रेस को १०२ जगहें मिली हैं। इसके आतिरिक्त मराठवाडा में कांग्रेस को बहुत अधिक जगहें मिली हैं, विदर्भ में और नागपुर में कांग्रेस को अधिक जगहें मिली हैं, सिर्फ महाराष्ट्र के कुछ जिलों में कांग्रेस की हार हुई है और अगर आम तौर पर पूरा टोटल देखा जाय, तो मराठी भाषाभाषी जो २५ जिले हैं उनमें से १५ जिलों में हमारी मेजोरिटी ही चुन कर आई है, यानी किसी तरह से भी आप डेमोक्रेटिक नियम को लगाइये और सोचिये तो आपको पता चलेगा कि महाराष्ट्र ने—याने संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र ने—अपना फैसला द्विभाषिक बम्बई के पक्ष में दिया है और महागुजरात ने भी अपना फैसला इसके पक्ष में दिया है।

इसके बाद मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आप हमसे यह कहने को आते हैं कि महागुजरात परिषद् और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति एक है। मेरा कहना है कि जरा आप महागुजरात के अपने रहतुमात्रों से पूछिये तो मही, कल ही लोक सभा में महागुजरात परिषद् के चेयरमैन, श्री इंदुलाल यागिनिक का भाषण हुआ और उन्होंने वहां क्या कहा। उसको जरा सुनिये। उन्होंने पहले तो यह बात कबूल की कि: "Bombay is a Cosmopolitan city."—जिस बात के ऊपर गत वर्ष हमारे ये विरोधी भाई हमसे झगड़ते रहे—और उसके बाद आगे जा कर उन्होंने कहा: "They (the Gujaratis) cannot at the same time remain totally indifferent to the woes and feelings of their Gujarati brothers and sisters in Bombay." आगे चल करके उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि "The Maharashtra friends may conclude that the Corporation election results are decisive for incorporating

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

Bombay in Maharashtra straight-way. But I say that I differ from it."

ये श्री इन्दुलाल यागिनिक के शब्द हैं। जब आपस में ही आपका मेल नहीं है तो फिर आप हम से झगड़ने के लिये क्यों आते हैं? पहले आपस में मेल कर लीजिये, महाराष्ट्र वाले और महाराजराज वाले, तब फिर सरकार से बात करने के लिये आइयेगा। हमसे कहते हैं कि आप एक राउंड टेबिल कांफ्रेंस बुलायें। महाराज, पहले आप तो अपनी राउंड टेबिल कांफ्रेंस बुला लीजिये और तब बाद में हमारे पास राउंड टेबिल कांफ्रेंस के लिये आइयेगा। जब आप ही अपने मेल के खातिर राउंड टेबिल कांफ्रेंस नहीं बुला सकते हैं, तो फिर हमसे क्यों कहा जाता है कि इस मसले के लिये आप राउंड टेबिल कांफ्रेंस बुलायें।

अब मैं एक दूसरी बात की ओर आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। महाराष्ट्र में कांग्रेस का पराभव क्यों हुआ? महाराष्ट्र में नागरजगी का ज्यादा सवाल नहीं था। जिस वक्त यहाँ द्विभाषिक बम्बई का निर्णय हुआ, उससे पहले महाराष्ट्र में कई जगहों पर सत्याग्रह शुरू था, कई जगहों पर हड़तालें हो रही थीं, लेकिन द्विभाषिक बम्बई का निर्णय होने के बाद से महाराष्ट्र में सत्याग्रह बन्द हो गया, हड़तालें बन्द हो गई और विरोधी सभायें भी नहीं हुई। मेरे मित्रों ने जो कि आज विरोध कर रहे हैं, 30 नवम्बर तक महाराष्ट्र में एक भी सभा नहीं की और यह जाहिर नहीं किया कि वे इस बार्डिलिंगुअल स्टेट का विरोध करते हैं, यानी जनता इतनी शान्त और सन्तुष्ट थी कि इनकी हिम्मत नहीं हुई कि वहाँ वे कुछ शोरगुल कर सकें। परन्तु जब इलेक्शंस नजदीक आये, तब इन भाईयों ने षडयन्त्र रचे। उन्हें इसका डर हुआ कि अगर वे अलग-अलग खड़े होंगे तो फिर कांग्रेस के खिलाफ चुन कर आने वाले नहीं हैं। तो उन्होंने एक सरकार बनायी, जिस तरह से

१०-५ तरह तरह के जानवरों को एक जगह रख कर के सरकार बनाते हैं, उसी तरह से उन्होंने एक सरकार बनायी जिसमें कि जनमंड, हिन्दू महासभा, किसान कामगार, शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट फेडरेशन, प्रजा-समाजवादी और कम्युनिस्ट इन तमाम लोगों को रखा जिनका कि एस दूसरे से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। आप जानते हैं कि जन सच अखंड भारत वाले हैं और वे भाषावार प्रान्त रचना के विरोधी हैं। अब अगर शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट फेडरेशन को लेते हैं तो उनके नेता यहाँ थे और इसी सदन में उन्होंने भाषण दिया था कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र नहीं होना चाहिये, उसके तीन हिस्से होने चाहिये और उसके तीन राज्य होने चाहिये। यह बात डाक्टर अम्बेडकर ने कही थी। प्रजा-समाजवादी और कम्युनिस्टों में कितना प्रेम है यह तो आप जानते ही हैं। तो जिस तरह से मैनेजर के रहने पर सरकार में तमाम जानवर खेल करते हैं परन्तु अन्दर अन्दर उनके दिलों में मैनेजर के खिलाफ एक षडयन्त्र हुआ करता है उसी तरह से इन लोगों को यह डर था कि हर एक जगह पर कांग्रेस जीत कर आयेगी और हम में से किसी को मौका नहीं मिलेगा, इसीलिये उन्होंने यह षडयन्त्र किया, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र फट बनाई और इस तरह जन संधी, प्रजा-सोशलिस्ट, शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और कम्युनिस्ट आदि सब एक हुए। कभी उन्होंने यह विचार नहीं किया कि हमारा ध्येय एक है या नहीं, हमारे विचार एक हैं या नहीं, हमारे कार्यक्रम एक हैं या नहीं। उन्होंने जनता को अपना कार्यक्रम नहीं बतलाया। इन लोगों ने फिर किया क्या? कांग्रेस वाले शांति में काम ले रहे थे, लेकिन मेरे मित्रों ने महाराष्ट्र में कांग्रेस वालों की एक भी सभा नहीं होने दी, जिसमें कि उन्होंने पत्थर न फेंके हों, जिसमें कि उन्होंने धूल न फेंकी हो, जिसमें कि उन्होंने गोबर न फेंका हो। तो फिर वहाँ शांति कैसे रहे? इन्होंने कांग्रेस के नेताओं को सभाओं में गाली दी, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के लिये यह कहा कि यह महाराष्ट्र का दुश्मन है।

महाराष्ट्र का दुश्मन जवाहरलाल ? सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं कहा, उन्होंने यहां तक कहा कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के पिता पंडित मोतीलाल जी भी महाराष्ट्र के दुश्मन थे, इतना ही नहीं, उन्होंने यहां तक कहा कि जवाहरलाल जी के जो गुरु—महात्मा गांधी—थे वह भी महाराष्ट्र के दुश्मन थे। इस तरह का गंदा प्रचार महाराष्ट्र में किया गया कांग्रेस वालों की सभायें नहीं होने दीं। वहां इतनी दहशत पैदा की गई थी कि अगर कोई कहीं कांग्रेस वाला अकेला काम करता हुआ दिखाई देता था, तो उसको पीटा जाता था। इस तरह से महाराष्ट्र में दहशत का वातावरण पैदा कर दिया गया। इससे लोगों के दिलों पर इस तरह का असर हुआ कि महाराष्ट्र के बहुत से जिलों में जो होना नहीं था, वह हुआ।

संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की अहमियत तक किसी व्याख्यान में या किसी मीटिंग में नहीं बताई गई। वहां कहा क्या गया ? कहा गया फायरिंग के बारे में। इलेक्शन से फायरिंग का कोई खास सम्बन्ध नहीं था और यहां भी फायरिंग से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। यह गई-बीती बात है। मगर वहां बाजारों में, सभाओं में, इस तरह के चित्र दिखलाये गये कि लोग गोलियों से मर रहे हैं, लूट बह रहा है और इस तरह से जुलूम हो रहे हैं। मानो कांग्रेस शासन का ऐसा रूप है। इससे आप देखेंगे कि हमारे इन भाइयों का प्रचार का किस तरह का प्रोग्राम था, ढंग था। इसके बावजूद मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आप बम्बई में चलिए, महाराष्ट्र में चलिए, देखिये कि किस तरह से एक दहशत का वातावरण वहां पैदा कर रखा है। इनकी सेना कौन थी ? प्राथमिक स्कूलों के छोटे छोटे लड़के थे। वहां कांग्रेस के जो पोस्टर्स लगाये गये थे, उन पर पंडित जवाहरलाल जी का चित्र था। लड़कों को सिखलाया गया कि यह वही जवाहरलाल है, जो कि महाराष्ट्र का दुश्मन है, इसकी आंखें फोड़ी और पत्थर मार कर चित्र में बनी हुई आंखें फोड़ी गईं।

जहां इस तरह का गंदा, अशुभ प्रचार हो, वहां अगर कोई ऐसी वैसी बात हो जाय तो आपको आश्चर्य नहीं करना चाहिये। इस पर भी बम्बई स्टेट में, बम्बई के जो चार हिस्से हैं, उन तम में कांग्रेस की जीत हुई है। आप गुजरात को ले लीजिये, वहां मैं कहता हूं कि महागुजरात के नाम से २६ आदमी चुन कर आये हैं। जरा आप महागुजरात वालों से पूछियेगा कि बम्बई के बारे में उनका क्या फैसला है। मैंने अभी कहा कि श्री इंदुलाल यागनिक कहते हैं :

"We cannot be indifferent to the woes and sorrows of our Gujarati friends in Bombay."

बम्बई कार्पोरेशन के चुनाव का नतीजा आप जानते हैं।

Time bell rings

मैं एक मिनट में खत्म करता हूं। कार्पोरेशन पर १६ वर्ष से कांग्रेस का कंट्रोल रहा, परन्तु हमारी मेजोरिटी वहां कभी नहीं थी। जितने इस वक्त चुन के आए हैं, पहले इससे कम चुन कर आए हैं, कांग्रेस की तरह से जो दूसरे लोग चुन कर आते थे। उनके साथ एक तरह से समझौता कर के हम कार्पोरेशन को चलाते आए हैं। अब के वह नहीं हो रहा है, होगा नहीं ऐसा भी न समझिये। तो यह कहना कि कांग्रेस हार गई कार्पोरेशन के चुनाव में, यह गलत है। मुझे बहुत बातें कहनी थीं, उपसभापति जी, लेकिन आप मुझे समय नहीं दे रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I am about to finish. Only one minute.

तो मुझे आपसे आखिर में यह कहना है कि यहां हमारे कम्यनिस्ट भाई, जो डेमोक्रेसी के नये गागिर्ड बने हैं, उनकी बातों में न जाये। हमने डिमोक्रेटिकली यह दिखला दिया है आज सारी दुनिया को कि बम्बई राज्य के सभी हिस्से मराठवाडा, गुजरात,

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

सौराष्ट्र, सब कांग्रेस के साथ है। सौराष्ट्र में तो चार्लस के चालीस चुन कर आए हैं। हमने यह दिखला दिया है। क बम्बई राज्य जिसमें मराठो और गुजराती दोनों बोलने वाले हैं, उन्होंने सब ने बहुत बड़ी मेजोरिटी से कांग्रेस को चुन कर भेजा है। उनको बम्बई राज्य में पूरा विश्वास है और मुझे विश्वास है कि यह बम्बई द्विभाषी राज्य यशस्वी हुए बगैर नहीं रह सकता, यशस्वी होकर रहेगा।

SHRI SITARAM DAGA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am a Member from West Bengal. It is referred to in the Presidential Address about the slum clearance. As you know, Calcutta is the biggest cosmopolitan city having the largest population in the whole of India. More so, the influx of refugees have made this area more unfit for clearance by the Calcutta Corporation which has got no money at its disposal. So, if the Government of India could grant some help to the Corporation, then these areas can be cleared out quickly and the diseases which are coming off and on in Calcutta in the form of epidemics can be removed.

Secondly, I would like to bring to your notice about the area of North India where tea is the main product. As you know, the total production of tea in India is about 650 million lbs. out of which North India produces 520 million lbs. Out of this, half the quantity is common tea and the rest is quality tea. There is a very big crisis now prevailing for common tea. This common tea is gradually losing market in the foreign countries in view of Africa and other countries competing with their tea at very cheap price. There is no export duty on African tea. So, it is better that we request the Tea Board to make vigorous propaganda in our country so that we can consume to the maximum extent. The hon. the Finance Minister, while opening a centre in Bombay, remark-

ed that tea would be a national beverage. By saying 'Swadeshi' I think he meant that.

Tea, as you know, is the biggest foreign exchange earner among all commodities. So it should be seen that this industry is given just protection by the Government in all respects. The tea producers are facing a lot of difficulties to run even a small estate where so many laws and taxes relating to export, excise, road and entry have been imposed. It is difficult to run an estate without a lawyer. This has been the position for people running an industry today.

I do not like to say that the Exchequer of India should be deprived of its legitimate dues but it should be seen by the Government of India that this biggest foreign exchange earner of tea should be protected by all means. This commodity can stand competition with all the foreign countries.

In North India tea is a seasonal industry because it begins with the monsoon and ends with it. In the South, of course, they have got two monsoons and so they can run the industry or pluck tea throughout the year but in North India it is quite different.

There is another thing that I would like to bring to your notice. The International Tea Agreement has not yet been revised and it should be revised at once to regularise the export of tea from all the exporting countries on a *pro rata* basis. Thank you.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Kerala): Sir, I would like to make out only two points. One is about the food situation and the other is regarding the shipyard. Many honourable friends have dealt at length with the grave food situation that is obtaining in our country. At the same time I found few of our honourable Members have touched on the problem of agricultural reform. The food problem and agricultural reform are certainly related to each other. Without improving the agricultural situation in our country it is difficult to improve the food situation. The Deputy Chair-

man of the Planning Commission has, in the course of his speech at the Development Commissioners' meeting, stated that the Government had taken special steps to develop Community Projects with a view to increasing food production. At the same time I would like to bring to the notice of the Government through this august House that the Government have the policy of giving loans to peasants. It was brought to our notice by certain sections of peasants that the loans advanced to them through the rural credit banks, wherever they are available, are asked to be paid back within a prescribed period irrespective of the actual condition of crop production. They say that such kind of things would not be of benefit to them or to the increase of production of cereals. This is, of course, a secondary problem concerning the ceiling of possessions but since it may take a long time to bring about the actual reforms, the loans advanced through these banks should be adjusted in such a way as to facilitate the peasants to return them in instalments and they should not be asked to pay it back all of a sudden. If they are asked to pay 50 per cent. back within 6 months or a year in which the crop may or may not improve due to conditions of the season, it would not help. So the realisation of the loan should be made having in view the actual situation of the crops. I wanted to bring this before this House because three or four days before we started for Delhi certain peasants came to us and asked us to bring to the notice of the Government this particular question which affects them greatly. Under the present system of loan advances, many peasants refuse to take loans because they find it difficult to give back the loan within the prescribed period, e.g., one year.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Is it not a matter for the local Assembly?

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: But the local Government makes adjustments on

the basis of the rules and regulations framed by the Centre. The Centre says that this particular loan shall be advanced on such and such basis and payments, repayments, etc., should conform to certain standards. On this basis, the peasants find it very difficult to avail of these loans. The advance of loans should be made on a liberal basis and the peasants should be given adequate time to give back these loan amounts without further incurring any loss or difficulty. This is very necessary.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): Will not twelve months do?

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: Twelve months will not be sufficient because they want more time. Suppose the season is not all right, suppose there has been no rain and consequently drought or, in the other case, extreme rain which might wash away all crops, the peasants will not be in a position to return the loan within twelve months.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I would like to know whether there is any crop in Kerala which lasts for more than twelve months.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: No, not that. We take two or three crops. It depends upon the season and the condition of the season. If there is too much of rain, it will wash away the crops and how can anyone pay back the loan? So also, if there is not enough rain, if there is drought, how can he find resources for paying back the loan? That is the question. Let the Government look into the matter and do the needful and that is why I have brought this point before the House. It is a very urgent one.

Next comes the question of hoarding. In the course of replies given in this House and in the other by the Food Minister, we have been told that hoarders are there. Certain figures were also mentioned. This thing has been going on all round the country and Government should take particular steps to see that hoarding is unearthed. For that, public support is very necessary. In the course of the President's Address, public support

[SHRI N. C. Sekhar.]

is sought for but that sort of appeal will not work very much to the benefit of unearthing this hoarding. We were told, from West Godavari, that a bumper crop was expected, but all the while, certain elements have been very active and have been hoarding paddy to be sold later on at higher rates during the coming two lean months. Whatever appeal the President makes, the Ministers make or the Parliament makes, we know very well as a reality that there are people who can mint gold on the dead bodies of people. We had experience of this in 1943 in Bengal when people were dying of starvation in lakhs while people were minting money by selling hoarded stock in the market. Similarly, there are elements all around us who are hoarding and who are minting gold in this difficult situation. So, Government should see that this problem is tackled by organising popular support; the people are prepared but Government should see to it that such popular support is sought for. They think that if support from the public is sought something untoward will happen; nothing untoward will happen if you appeal to the people for their support. They are the persons who actually suffer from scarcity and they will see that the hoarders are unearthed. For this thing Government's support is necessary and Government can deal with this problem. Prices have increased very much but our Ministers say that the increase is not much. When the bank advance was stopped three months back, the price in our part was 10 annas per Madras measure and now it is 14½ annas per measure in Cannanore, 13 annas in Ernakulam and the rest of it. This price is going on at a rate which the people find it very difficult to meet. Secondly, there is a very wide gap between the prices of Government stocks and stocks with private merchants. How can the people meet it? Therefore, particularly from the side of Kerala—of course, scarcity is there in other parts of India too—where the scarcity is felt to a great extent, I have to say that only 45,000 tons are available

for distribution to the people. We require 45,000 tons per day whereas Government have a stock of only 45,000 tons for distribution to the people. Prices in the private markets are soaring very high and the people cannot approach anywhere near them. Due to this, they suffer for lack of food. Recently, I read in the Malayalam Press that starvation deaths have been reported from the Kurumbranad taluk in Central Malabar. We have read about starvation deaths in Eastern U.P. also. This situation is developing in every nook and corner of the country, which has not yet been brought to the notice of the Government. Even though this situation is obtaining all over India, it is of much concern to us, because Kerala is the worst suffering State on account of the shortage of paddy and rice. Government must see that every State's requirements are met from the Centre. Government must command rice from the hoarders or get rice as easily as possible from outside. I must here bring to the notice of the Government that some sort of American rice is distributed to the people, but people say that they cannot afford the prices charged. Even though Government might be getting rice on some adjustment or contract, people are asked to pay higher prices than the prices they are paying for the local rice.

In the course of his speech, my hon. friend, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour, mentioned about a mill-owner who did blackmarketing, for which his licence was cancelled. Today I was told that that particular mill-owner is in Delhi trying to bring pressure to bear upon a particular Ministry to get back his licence. Such elements are hovering round Delhi to get back their rights for doing mischief on the people. Government should see that such people are not encouraged by giving back their facilities.

I now want to mention about the shipyard. It is a big question. According to the Second Plan, Government is planning the establishment of a second shipyard but it has not yet decided as to where exactly it should be located. At the same time,

every State demands that this shipyard should be located in its own State. Andhra has got one which is a very good one where our ships are being built. Natural harbour sites are there in Kerala and in the West Coast, particularly in Kerala. We have got the Ernakulam-Cochin Harbour area. We have got 43 miles of backwater in which you can find out any favourable site for the establishment of a shipyard. (*Time bell rings.*) Similarly, we have Beypore and Belipattam in a very fine coastal area for the establishment of a shipyard. It is the demand of our State and of the entire people there that the second shipyard should be established in Kerala even though there are other States who may demand it. Some friends expressed concern that probably they were waiting to take a decision with a view to establishing the shipyard at Kandla Port. Because of the immensity of the influence of these people over Government, may be that that shipyard may be constructed there. I do not know whether it is a fact; it may be a scandal or a misnomer or something like that. All the same, in view of the economic difficulties and also in view of the intensity of the population and some other questions, it is our request to the Central Government that the second shipyard should be established in some port in Kerala which will benefit both the people there and the Centre because of the availability of cheap labour.

These are the two points that I wanted to make and I hope the Central Government will pay particular attention to them.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON). Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have asked for a few minutes not to make any speech on the foreign policy of our country but to answer some of the points raised by one of the previous speakers.

Mr. Kishen Chand yesterday criticising the Government's foreign policy was bold enough to say that we had done nothing in favour of

banning all nuclear weapons. Sir, the reason why I want to explain the position of the Government, with regard to nuclear tests and also with regard to the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, is to disabuse the minds of those who have listened to Mr. Kishen Chand and perhaps gone away with the idea that our Government have been sleeping over this very important problem. I am also surprised because Mr. Kishen Chand is a man of very versatile interests and he takes part in the debate on almost all subjects that the House discusses here, and hence one would have imagined that he would have spared at least a few moments to study what the Government do in this very important matter.

Sir, I would categorically narrate the steps that the Government have taken at a time when there was not a single country in the world which gave any attention whatsoever to this subject. At that time ours was a voice in the wilderness and today even school-children talk about nuclear weapons and how to ban nuclear weapons and it shows how our ideas have set in, if one might say so, a chain reaction in the minds of people regarding the importance of this subject. Sir, in the years between 1946 and 1951, it was India which had pressed hard for the prohibition of the use of weapons of mass destruction of all kinds, whether it is atom bomb or any other thing. In 1949 our Delegation to the United Nations moved a Resolution suggesting that the International Law Commission, which was constituted then, should draft a declaration regarding the duties of States and individuals in respect of the development of atomic energy so as to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes and to secure the elimination of atomic weapons from national armaments.

Secondly, in the sixth session of the United Nations, that is, in 1951-52, it was again our Delegation which pressed hard for consideration of this question *in camera* in the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commis-

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.]

sion. It was our suggestion again which led to the establishment of the Disarmament Commission. Then, Sir, the India Delegation at a later session pressed hard for the establishment of a permanent Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission with the atomic powers and we were all proud last year when our representative was given a hearing by this Committee although we are not one of the atomic powers. Sir, I would recommend to Mr. Kishen Chand—he is not here at the moment—to read the Prime Minister's speech which he made in the Lok Sabha in April 1954. Then, Sir, since then the ideas that we have broadcast in the international forum have been adopted and if our friends read the newspapers carefully they would know that even certain National Assemblies in Europe and elsewhere have passed resolutions banning the use of atomic weapons. Sir, all of us know of the resolution on the banning of atomic weapons which was passed in the Bandung Conference. It was rather very naive of Mr. Kishen Chand to think that by making a number of speeches we will be able to mobilise world opinion. If that were so, he should have mobilised the opinion of this House in his favour because the number of speeches that he has made should have had that effect. Sir, there is no point imagining that he has pricked the bubble of our foreign policy by making that speech, nor should anyone believe that we can change world opinion on such a vital subject as the use of atomic weapons by just making a few speeches in the international forum or by creating new groups. This also shows a lack of understanding of our policy. Sir, we have always objected to military pacts and to the formation of groups because we believe that the world should more and more develop on co-operative lines when the differences based on ideology or otherwise should yield to the common well-being and to common interests.

Lastly, I would like to say that a country's greatness or influence rests

not on the possession of atomic weapons or in creating political groups, but in strengthening its own economy and its own stability, and if Mr. Kishen Chand were here, I would make a special appeal to him that the people **who** belong to his party and those other groups, which find pleasure only in criticising the Government whether the Government is right or wrong, should pay more attention to this aspect of the question and see that they extend total co-operation to the policies of the Government because that co-operation is needed today more than at any other time in order to strengthen our country and maintain our position not only at home but also abroad.

Sir, I do not want to waste any more time of the House answering the other points raised by other speakers. Dr. Gour has raised the point of the Prime Minister's promise to consult other parties in the House with regard to Goa policy. The Prime Minister when he intervened in the other House yesterday did say that he would consult other parties and that he had not given up the idea of consulting other parties. Therefore, I have nothing more to say on the subject.

With regard to the annual song of Mr. Rajah about our being a member of the Commonwealth, it hardly deserves any notice by any of us because it is one of those things which we have heard again and again during the last five years and the House, I am sure, is of the same opinion as the Government that we should not take any hasty step which would imperil our own future. Thank you, Sir.

KAZI KARIMUDDIN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are really grateful to the President for giving an Address surveying the entire work done by the Government of India and the future programme. Some Members of this House are very much dissatisfied that there is no discussion of the details of programmes; some are

dissatisfied that many more things which were mentioned by them should have been mentioned, but all of them should be aware of article 87 of the Constitution of India in which it is laid down that he has only to inform the causes of the summoning of the Parliament and those causes are mentioned there. If they had understood what is laid down in the Constitution, there would not have been so much criticism as was done today.

Sir, I belong to Vidarbha which is now part of Maharashtra or Bombay State. There has been a criticism from the other Benches and also by Dr. Kane that there is a clear verdict for separation of Gujarat from Maharashtra, but they have forgotten one thing. There is no doubt that Vidarbha and Marathwada, when they joined this State, had joined on the clear understanding that there was to be a united Maharashtra then. But the question of Bombay city was so difficult and was so complicated that no section of the society could find a solution and the offences of arson and rioting in Bombay city showed that if Bombay was to be separated from Gujarat or if Bombay was to be separated from Maharashtra, the position would become very difficult and the city of Bombay was likely to be in the grip of anarchy as a result of disturbances which would not be in the interests of the society. We have accepted the bilingual State in the national interests. Let us discard all other arguments that have been advanced here. We accepted the bilingual State because we thought the solution of the city of Bombay was difficult. And we have shown during the elections in the area of Vidarbha and Marathwada that we really stood by the agreement or by the word we have given and we have given a verdict in favour of the bilingual State. The argument advanced by the other side that Maharashtra has voted against the bilingual State of Bombay is entirely incorrect. Maharashtra does not mean only twelve districts of the old Maharashtra. We are a part of

Maharashtra. Marathwada is also a part of Maharashtra. And if the number of Members of the Legislative Assembly is taken into consideration, the majority has voted for the bilingual State, not because it is good or bad, but because that was the only solution under the circumstances. I am really very much surprised to find that non-Maharashtrians are more interested in this problem than Maharashtrians themselves. Dr. Gour from Hyderabad has criticised the establishment of a bilingual State and the Communist Party throughout India is agitating. Now, it is very clear that during the election campaign the Communist Party used this weapon and combined with all other parties whose ideals were inconsistent with the Communist Party. Even then, Congress is voted to power. What right has anybody to say that the verdict of the electorate in the State is against the bilingual State? Therefore, my submission is that those who are interested in raising conflicts for the sake of conflict should be silenced in the national interests.

I find that the Address is silent about the law and order in the country. There is not the least doubt that violence is on the increase. We hear reports from many States that dacoit menace is increasing. One point on which I want to stress is that there is a report from Kerala that there is a recommendation or announcement that there is a commutation of death sentences by the Cabinet of Kerala. Now, an unprecedented situation has arisen in this country. Now, a Communist Government is installed as a popular Government in Kerala and it is the comprehensiveness of our Constitution that in a democratic country a Communist Government can also function and we have no ill-will against them. But if there is a commutation of sentences of death in the case of persons in whose favour there are no extenuating circumstances—mercy petition in the case of one was rejected by the President—the release of such prisoners is bound to

[Kazi Karimuddin.]

lead to anarchy. The release of prisoners against the decision of the President is bound to create a very awkward situation between the Kerala Government and the President. My submission is that under articles 161 and 162 read together, if orders are passed by the President rejecting the mercy petition, any announcement by the Cabinet of Kerala is a constitutional impropriety. Therefore, my submission is that whether a Congressman was killed by a Communist or a Communist was killed by a Congressman, it does not weigh with us. What weighs with us is that murderers in whose favour there are no extenuating circumstances should not be released. Once the mercy petition is rejected by the President, any action by the Kerala Government will be a constitutional impropriety under article 162.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You would not be justified in criticising any Government which is not represented here.

KAZI KARIMUDDIN: I only say that in the interests of law and order in the country, the President should look not to the exigencies of the moment but to the procedure laid down under article 162.

Another matter which is a matter of great agitation in this House and outside is the food problem in the country. In India, agriculture is generally based on monsoon. Now, there are many factors which are beyond the control of the Government so far as production of food is concerned. There is no doubt that in some areas due to failure of crops scarcity has been declared by the Government. And if scarcity is declared in some States, people are becoming panicky, more due to the propaganda of the political parties than the shortage of food. When the Minister-in-charge of Government gives an assurance that food will be supplied and nobody would die for

want of bread, my submission is that we must give a trial to the Government. You will be surprised to find that in Bombay there was a rumour that in the districts of Nasik and Satara, some people had died for want of bread. The Minister-in-charge of Civil Supplies got those rumour-mongering people to sit there and he phoned to the Collector and it was found that they died of illness—not for want of bread. Therefore, this is more due to the propaganda that is being carried on.

What are the concrete suggestions made by the Opposition in this direction? I fail to understand. Now, let us take it for granted that we are short of food. What does the Ministry do? They import food. There is an objection that food should not be imported. Now, there is a failure of the monsoon. Then, what are the concrete suggestions they have made for the production of this food or for bringing of food from somewhere else? The Government says that there is sufficient reserve. The Government says that some people because of the increase in national wealth—some agriculturists—have hoarded the grain. If they have hoarded the grain, Government should take immediate steps for taking those stocks which are in their possession and I have not the least doubt that the Government will take all measures for the distribution of it.

Now, Sir, another question is the question of foreign policy. It has been said repeatedly from the other side about Kashmir that it has become a part of India. I do not know how this question can be re-opened now. The report submitted by Mr. Jarring to the U.N.O. is a bundle of contradictions. Because in one breath Mr. Jarring says that in view of the new developments it has become very difficult to re-open this problem. In other words, he accepts that re-opening of the question will be a dangerous thing. Then, he says that it cannot be forgotten that regardless of the merits of the case, the Govern-

ment of India has accepted two resolutions of U.N.O. Then, thirdly, there is a proposal from him for arbitration. Arbitration on what? If there is no matter of dispute about the accession of Kashmir to India, then what is that arbitration about? Therefore, I repeat that Mr. Jarring's report is nothing but a bundle of contradictions.

Now, I have only to say that the aggressiveness of the Western powers and America, by interfering in the Suez Canal, by making an interference in the Middle East, and by making an interference in Kashmir, will clearly indicate that although those countries have been liberated politically, economically they do not want to lose hold on them and it is now (*Time bell rings.*) in the interests of India that our foreign policy should be in keeping with the ideals of socialist pattern or socialism. And we must combine with those countries whose idealism also is that there should be socialism. Without joint action, my submission is that we are nearing the danger zone. And unless all the socialist countries combine and stop the aggression of America and Western powers, my submission is that it would be difficult for our foreign policy to succeed.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON:
Which are those countries?

4 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, will the Minister not wait till the Members finish?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Home Minister is replying to you tomorrow.

THE MINISTER FOR CO-OPERATION: (DR. P. S. DESHMUKH): Sir, we had expected that the food situation in the country would loom somewhat large during the discussion on the President's Address, and when

we find that many Members did speak on it, it is only the expected that has happened. The purpose of my intervention is to correct some misapprehension and some misleading reading of facts which some of the hon. Members of this House as well as the other House have indulged in. Sir, there is no doubt that we are having some alarming reports from certain pockets especially in Eastern U.P., some portions of Bihar and West Bengal. However, this scarcity or this trouble is in very small areas, and that is due to repeated calamities. Firstly, there were floods which washed away the crops. Then there was drought which dried up all the crops that had been grown a second time, and when there was an excellent wheat crop there was dust in certain places and hailstorm in others. As a matter of fact the headlines in the Press do not portray the real situation in the country. Of course, the headlines have helped our friends who become rather glad to see calamities descending on our people, because they think that they can derive some political advantage from it. Actually, Sir, the situation in the country with respect to food is not at all so unsatisfactory as our opponents are trying to paint it.

Sir, there is also no truth in the allegation that the agricultural production has fallen. Of course, there are various ways of looking at it. If you want to look at it from a dismal point of view or a pessimistic point of view, you are welcome to do so. It is not correct in judging agricultural production to confine one's interest or attention to a particular year. The best criterion to judge whether agricultural production is making progress or not is to take the averages, and that will really give the correct picture of agricultural production in the country. In spite of the fact that these figures have been given repeatedly, I am afraid the misconception on this point does not appear to have been removed. If we look at the figures, specially the averages, it will be found, for instance, that the ave-

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.]

rage production from 1947-48 to 1951-52 was 43.2 million tons in respect of cereals and 51.78 millions tons in respect of foodgrains. What is the average of the last four years? In respect of cereals we have gone up to an average of 54.13 million tons, and the total foodgrains production has gone up to over 64 million tons. This will show the following difference in the production of the various commodities. If we take, for instance, rice, our average production in the first five years of our freedom was 21.6 million tons. We are now producing on an average 25 million tons, and thus we have produced during the last four years an average additional quantity amounting to 34 lakh tons per year. In the case of wheat the additional production per year during the last four years is 21 lakh tons. *Jowar* and *Bajra* have gone up by 32 lakh tons per year during each of the past four years. Other cereals 18 lakh tons. The total is 106 lakh tons. This is the additional production per year. In the case of gram and other pulses also we have added 18 lakh tons to the average which was produced annually in the first five years.

In the total we have produced 1,24,82,000 tons of additional foodgrains in each one of the four years beginning from 1951-52 to 1955-56. Someone will say "why have you not included 1956-57?" My reply is that if we include that, the figures are likely to increase and not likely to go down, because this year's production is going to be slightly higher than even of some of the previous years.

So, Sir, I would like to contest the proposition which some people have been making, viz., that agricultural production has diminished. Of course, if you confine yourself to a particular crop or to a particular year, it can be demonstrated that there are variations, but it is in the nature of agricultural production that there should be variations not only here

but in every country in the world. There is no country which can show a steady increase including Australia. When I saw some of their figures of average production, the average production they had reached some twenty years ago had yet to be reached by them. So, there are various factors. All the same we do not say that because of natural calamities we have produced less. We have actually produced more. Serious efforts were not wanting in the years 1949-50 and 1951-52. With all the efforts that we made we could not add even 12 lakh tons. Secondly, these figures are also much ahead of the Planning Commission's targets. In fact they are very nearly twice as much as the targets fixed by the Planning Commission. We should have produced every year under the First Year Plan a total of 59.3 million tons. As against this we produced 64 million tons, that is to say, in every year of the Plan we have produced 5 million tons more than even the targets. The targeted production was 14 per cent. We have actually produced nearly 25 per cent more than the previous five years. This is also reflected in the average production of every particular crop. Some people think that this additional production is due to larger acreage. There may be under certain circumstances some increase in acreages, but if we analyse the averages, we will find that the average production has increased. Therefore, the additional production is not attributable only to increased acreage. Sir, I claim that we have during the last four years made spectacular and unheard of and unimagined progress in respect of agricultural production, because in the case of rice as against the average production of 672 lbs., in the first five years our average is 740 lbs., *jowar* was 333, it is now 403; *bajra* was 260, it is now 288; *maize* was 560, it is now 688. *Ragi* was 597, it is now 657. Wheat was 385; it is now 677 lbs. per acre. Barley was 681; it is now 768 and small millets have gone up from 367 to 371. The increase in this case is rather small. In respect of grams also, from 458, we have gone

to 520. Tur or arhar has gone up from 526 to 667 and other dhals have gone up from 304 to 358. Some people object on the one hand that we have not imported enough; some people are angry that in spite of increased production, we are still importing. What is the exact situation so far as imports are concerned? During the first 7 years of our freedom, India was importing on an average 3 millions tons of foodgrains. The average cost per year during the first seven years on this has been 136 crores of rupees. It is the only three years—1952-53 to 1955-56—that we have not even reached the average imports of one year and spent less than what we spent per year during the first seven years. The total amount of imports during the last three years come to hardly 30 lakh tons. That is the average of the imports we were forced to have during the first seven years. Secondly, these were the only three years for a long time in the history of India that we were able to export certain quantities of food. May be, in the context of the present circumstances, some people may blame us saying, "Why did you export"? But you will remember, Sir, at that time, we were faced with the problem of lower prices, and so we wanted to help the cultivator and that was the reason why we exported some quantity, but we still got Rs. 8,28,00,000 by these exports during that period when we imported about 30 lakh tons.

This will conclusively show that the agricultural production in this country has made an immense progress. Of course, I admit and everybody will admit, that with the growing demand in the country, this is not enough. We have to produce more and we are bound to produce it. I have not a shadow of doubt that the time . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): I only want some information on this point. May I know what has been your import in the last six months?

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: During the question-time the other day, I found many hon. Members of this House blaming the Government for not importing enough because prices have somewhat risen and there are talks—somewhat exaggerated—in some places that there is a food scarcity. It is but natural that we should be on the safe side and have a larger programme of imports.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: But I would like to know what has been your import. I do not object to your importing.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: For the time being, we have contracted to import about 3·7 lakhs of tons during the next two or three years. Very probably, even these . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: What were the actual, physical, imports during the year 1957?

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: I have not got those figures, but I will give them to my hon. friend if he wants, because I do not want to make a mistake.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Have you got any figures to show what has been the actual import during the last six months?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not got the figures; he told you so.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: About 8 lakh tons since the 1st of January—I say this subject to correction, Sir.

Sir, I have dealt with this point and I feel confident that agricultural production in the country has been stepped up and is bound to go from strength to strength, because farmers have taken to better cultivation; they have taken to better methods and they have also taken to fertilizers. Unfortunately, we are hard up with fertilizers at the present moment, but they have contributed a

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.]
great deal towards larger agricultural production. Also, in regard to complaints of food scarcity, I would like to point out—because it has not been done so far—that a most liberal policy has been chalked out already by the Central Government. Wherever there is any scarcity of food or where prices are high, the State Governments can, without consulting us, start giving gratuitous relief. They can also subsidise the purchase of food if necessary and till they spend upto two crores of rupees, they need not ask us and they can go ahead and we are bound to contribute 50 per cent. of whatever expenditure or subsidy they incur. So, I would like to assure the House that, where there are certain difficulties about the food programme, the State Government is alive to the requirements. There are ample foodgrains in the country which can be rushed at any time. My friend, the Minister for Food and Agriculture, has himself gone to those areas where there were talks of a scarcity and we have assured all State Governments that all the food that they need will be given to them. So, there should be no anxiety or nervousness that we will allow a single person to die for want of food, because we have made arrangements for gratuitous relief we have arrangements for subsidies for food and there is no limit to the relief which the State Government can give, because after Rs. 2 crores, we give them larger subsidies—75 per cent. Once they spend the Rs. 2 crores and if it is necessary, for the situation to be met, that larger relief should be given, the State Governments can go ahead with it and they will be entitled to claim from us, instead of 50 per cent., 75 per cent., of the expenditure they incur on gratuitous relief. So, all this anxiety about scarcity areas and so on, should not be there. In fact, this exaggeration unnecessarily upsets everyone.

I would like to say that this food problem is of a somewhat

psychological nature. Ours is a country with a huge population of 36 crores. We have got seven crores of families, but even if one crore families feel that they may not get foodgrains and each family hoards one maund, it will overnight remove seven crore maunds from the market and it will create circumstances which will be difficult for the Government to deal with. But actually, the situation, as the production figures will show, as the import figures will show and as the stock figures will show, is not in any way unsatisfactory. I hope, therefore, that hereafter at any rate, neither the press nor the Members of Parliament and Assemblies will indulge in the somewhat loose talk that food scarcity is prevailing and starvation deaths are taking place. As has been pointed out by my friend, when you go to the particular place and ask for the names of people who have died of starvation, they speak of those who died six months ago. There was a case which was quoted by Mr. Jain in the other House, which was soon after the first elections. Mr. Shibantal Saksena pointed out that 100 people were dying per day. Mr. Kidwai went to the spot and asked for the names of those who died. It was found that the few that died had died six months previously and that had nothing to do with the food scarcity. These are the sort of things that are taking place.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I just intervene for a second? Has the hon. Minister's attention been drawn to a report in the Hindustan Times of 14th of this month by Mr. Narendra Singh Bhandari, M.L.A. that two persons in the Kumaon Hill area died of . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may ask it in the question hour.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: I have not seen these particular names, but I have not a shadow of doubt and I can safely say that these allegations are not true. Probably, the persons

may have died, but not of starvation. I have not a shadow of doubt about this.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Not only that, it is a matter for Uttar Pradesh and I know, coming from that area, that . . .

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: Certain other points have been made by the hon. Member, Pandit Algu Rai Shastri. I am afraid I cannot agree with him in regard to both of his points. He said the food scarcity was there because of cultivator's preference to cash crops. This is not correct. Some people just see some fields, they find sugar-cane growing there and therefore, they come to the conclusion that everybody is growing sugar-cane. It is not a fact. The largest acreage under sugar-cane was in the year 1951-52 when we had 48 lakh acres under sugar-cane. Although our sugar production this year is likely to be the largest in the history of India, namely, 20 lakh tons, unimagined by anybody, the acreage is not likely to be more than about 45 lakhs. That is much less than the acreage in 1951-52 when we produced hardly 15 lakh tons. Of course, the cultivator is bound to prefer a crop which will give him more money. But I do not think it has happened on a very large scale so as to endanger food production or to cause any trouble to the country as a whole.

Then, Sir, it was said that the rural people's tendency is to prefer wheat rather than coarse grains. He was probably talking about U. P. Our trouble in Karnataka and Bombay is that people won't have wheat and rice, but they want only *jowar*. That is our problem there, because even if wheat and rice is cheap, they won't take them. *Jowar* is our biggest headache, and it is due to the shortfall in *jowar* production two years ago when there was a shortfall of 3 million tons. That is causing us the largest difficulty. (*Interruption.*) And secondly, Sir, since these people want *jowar*, it is available in the

shape of *sorgum* or *mito*, as it is known in India from foreign countries. Now if we were to import it, it will cost us much more than wheat. It will probably cost Rs. 16 per md. So, Sir, it is not a question of trying to give coarse grains to the people.

Then, Sir, there was a suggestion by Dr. Gour that we should go and procure foodgrains from the market and from the people. Our experience has been unfortunate, especially when there is talk of scarcity and rising prices. If we go into the market, the prices are likely to shoot up. So that is not a very correct advice to give. So far as the other steps are concerned—bank advances etc.,—they are under consideration. We have also tightened some of the things in this respect, and I do not think anything more is necessary in that respect.

Then, Sir, Mr. Bisht has made a point stating that last year we blamed deficit financing and this year we are blaming natural calamities. The calamities are there for any one to see. In fact, it is the Members representing those areas where there are crop failures who are telling us the stories of crop failures. But we have never said that this is sufficient excuse. In fact, I would claim that in spite of these large-scale natural calamities, the fact that our food production is still at a higher level of 64 million tons is enough to show that wherever there are no calamities, we are producing much more. If it were not so, we would have by this time been completely sunk, as will be seen from the circumstances and situations in the adjoining countries. I am glad Mr. Bisht replied to Dr. Gour's contention that the Government should enter into the market so that they may be able to have larger stocks.

Then, Sir, so far as the fair price shops are concerned, more will be opened wherever it is necessary. But there are areas where fair price shops are being closed down also. But nobody refers to that. Everybody is anxious to speak about scarcities.

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.]

Then, Sir, there was a point raised by Shri Kishen Chand about warehouses. He dealt with that point somewhat elaborately asking how are the people going to use warehouses when 70 per cent., of them have just sufficient or even insufficient food for their own livelihood. Now, Sir, fortunately for us this is not so everywhere. If it were so, there would have been no markets at all. If everybody was consuming everything that he produced and there was no margin whatsoever, then there need not have been any markets whatsoever. Fortunately, there are markets and also many people who produce a little more. And we are taking up a large programme of warehouses because that is the only remedy to maintain proper prices of agricultural commodities. Secondly, warehouses are not meant merely for foodgrains. There are also other crops like cotton etc., and we have also to store seeds and fertilizers in these warehouses, if there is any room. So, I do not think his apprehension is at all correct when he says that warehouses are needless.

So, Sir, I submit that the agricultural production being what it is, the situation which exists in certain parts is due firstly to the misfortunes of the people due to floods, droughts and hailstorms. On the other hand, it is undeniable that the condition of the people is showing a considerable improvement. It is not, of course, satisfactory to us. We want to go a long way ahead, but there is no doubt that the people have larger funds in their possession. A large number of people are getting larger salaries and larger returns, and, therefore, it is bound to affect the food consumption. Since we have no controls and since it is not our desire to bring in controls, (*Interruptions.*) we must put up with the situation and try to meet the increased demands as best as we can. Sir, I do not think I should take more time of the hon. Members who are so anxious to speak. But the high prices are attributable

to the larger demand and the better condition of the people.

And lastly, Sir, I would like to say that the high prices are not really so high as to grumble about it to such an extent. They are certainly slightly higher. But if we take into account the prices of other commodities, and especially when we see that we have to raise the fertilizer price by Rs. 35 and we have to impose certain additional taxes on cement, steel and so on, I think in view of these taxation proposals, the prices cannot be regarded as too high. It is our policy that we want to care for the consumer as much as we want to care for our agricultural production, and while we are anxious that a reasonable return must be given to the agriculturists, we do not want to do it at the cost of the consumer or so as to cause him considerable hardship. Thank you, Sir.

श्री बो० बो० शर्मा : श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रपति के प्रति जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री जी ने पेश किया है, उसका समर्थन करना मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ और यह कर्तव्य इस वास्ते समझता हूँ क्योंकि उनके भाषण से मुझे विशेष सन्तोष मिला। बात यह है कि देश के जिस भाग से हम लोग आते हैं, वह भाग ऐसा है कि वहाँ अक्सर दैवी आपदायें आया करती हैं और उन अपदाओं का सामना होनेवाला डट कर किया जाता है। किन्तु अब ऐसा नहीं होता है। जब ब्रिटिश सरकार थी, तब वह हमारे साथ एक माने में द्रोह का भाव रखती थी और हमारी कोई परवाह नहीं करती थी। लेकिन जब से परमात्मा की कृपा से स्वतंत्रता हमको प्राप्त हुई है, हमको आशा है, हमको वि-वास है कि जहाँ तक मानवीय कारणों से हमारी अपदायें हैं। हमारी कठिनाइयाँ हैं, वे सब दूर हो जायेंगी। हमारी यह आशा कुछ हद तक पूर्ण भी हुई है। जहाँ तक किसी प्रकार के कृषि सम्बन्धी साधनों का सम्बन्ध है, पहले हमारे यहाँ न तो कोई नहर थी, न कोई ट्यूबवैल था और न कोई दूसरे आधुनिक

साधन थे, जिनसे हमारी खेती की उन्नति हो सके। पहले वहाँ ऐसा कुछ नहीं था, लेकिन अब यह सब होने लगा है। बिजली भी होने लगी है। हमारी तरफ रेहंड डैम प्रोजेक्ट अगर कामयाब हो जाता है, जिसके सन् १९५९ तक कामयाब होने की संभावना है, तो अवश्य वहाँ की हालत बदल जायगी। इसके अतिरिक्त वहाँ बहुत से ट्यूबवैल बन रहे हैं, बहुत सी नहरें बन रही हैं, यह सब कुछ हो रहा है। किन्तु दैवी प्रकोप, बाढ़, ड्राट यानी सूखे का जो हमारे यहाँ भय है, उसका अभी अन्त नहीं हुआ है। उसका अन्त करने के लिए भी हमारी सरकार सतत प्रयत्नशील है। लेकिन यह सब हो करके होगा क्या? अगर हमारी पैदावार दूनी हो जाय और कोमर्तें आधी हो जायें तो फायदा क्या हुआ? हम दूना पैदा करके भी अगर उसी स्थिति में रहें तो क्या लाभ है। जैसी कि अक्सर लोगों की शिकायत है, यदि अन्न तो मुफ्त बांटा जाय और सारी चीजें जो हैं उनका भाव खूब ऊंचा हो जाय तो उससे क्या लाभ। और यह शिकायत करने वाले अधिकतर वे लोग हैं जिनके पास खेती नहीं है, जिनके पास खेती का रोजगार नहीं है। हम ४ आदमी पूर्वी जिलों से आते हैं, जिसको कि पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश कहते हैं, उसके ११ जिलों में से हम ४ आदमी हैं—यों तो हम पांच मेम्बर हैं लेकिन एक मिस्टर अमोलख चन्द जी जो हैं वह तो बिहार के हैं और व्यवहारतः वह उत्तर प्रदेश से कोई ज्यादा सम्बन्ध नहीं रखते हैं—तो इस तरह से हम ४ आदमी हैं, एक श्री श्यामधर मिश्र हैं, दूसरा मैं हूँ, तोसरे श्री अलगूराय शास्त्री साहब हैं और चौथे श्री तारकेश्वर पांडे हैं। इन चार में से किसी एक ने भी कभी यह नहीं कहा है कि वहाँ की खाद्य-स्थिति ऐसी कठिन है कि लोग खाने के बिना मर रहे हैं और अभी दो महोने पहले, इलेक्शन के पहले, हमारे विरोधी दल के लायक दोस्त भी ऐसा नहीं कहते थे। यानी जब तक कि खेतों से फसल घर पर नहीं आई थी, तब तक यह बात नहीं थी।

तब तक ये हमारे लायक दोस्त ऐसा कभी नहीं कहते थे कि वहाँ अन्नाभाव है यानी अन्न की कमी है, लेकिन इलेक्शन हो जाने पर जब हार गये हैं, जब कि यहाँ की गवर्नमेंट कांग्रेस के हाथ में आ गई है और जब कि फसल भी खेतों से कट कर घरों में आने लगी है तब अन्न गायब हो गया है। अब उन्होंने यह शोर मचाना शुरू कर दिया है। याद रखिये कि खेतों से अन्न चैन के महीने में या फागुन के महीने में कट कर घरों में आने लगता है। यानी जब कि गरीब से गरीब मजदूर भी १० सेर अन्न अपने घरों में रख लेता है तब भुखमरी होने लगी है, हमारे लायक दोस्तों के खयाल में। यह कहां तक संभव है, यह कैसी हास्यास्पद बात है कि इलेक्शन के जमाने में, माघ के महीने में जब कि कोई फसल नहीं कटी थी, तब तो हमारे विरोधी दल के लायक दोस्तों ने यह आवाज नहीं उठाई कि अन्नाभाव है, लेकिन जब कि फसल कट कर के खेतों में से घरों में आ गई है और गरीब से गरीब आदमी के घर में भी १० सेर गल्ला आ गया है—ऐसे समय में तो वे इधर उधर से खेतों में से बीन कर भी १० सेर या ५ सेर गल्ला इकट्ठा कर लेते हैं—तब अन्नाभाव हो गया है और प्रोफेसर शिवनलाल सक्सेना—जो कि एक बड़े नेता हैं—यह कहने की हिम्मत करते हैं कि लाखों लोग खाने के बिना मर रहे हैं। यह कितना गलत और नितांत निन्दनीय प्रचार है। यह बात मैं आप सब लोगों के सामने रखता हूँ और इस पर आप स्वयं ही विचार कर सकते हैं। यह क्यों किया जा रहा है? इसकी भी वजह है। इसकी वजह यह है कि अब सब लोगों के पास गल्ला आ गया है और कृषकों को, बेचारे कृषकों को, अब आमदनी का जरिया चाहिये, उनको पैसे चाहियें। चाहे छोटे कृषक हों या बड़े कृषक हों सब को पैसे चाहियें। हमारे एक कृषक नवाब छतारी साहब भी हैं उनकी तो दूसरी बात है, जो बहुत से बड़े बड़े फार्म वाले हैं उनकी और बात है, उनकी बात मैं नहीं करता। हमारे यह जो सरदार सुरजीत सिंह मजीठिया साहब

[श्री बी० बी० शर्मा]

हैं उनके भाई हमारे यहां सरदारनगर में हैं, जो कि मिलानगर हैं उनकी बात मैं नहीं करता लेकिन जो छोटे किसान हैं, जो कि २०, २५ या ५-१० एकड़ की खेती रखते हैं उनकी बात मैं करता हूं। तो अब सब को मालगुजारी देनी है, सब को कुछ न कुछ विवाह शादी में और न्यूता-हकारों में खर्च करने के लिये पैसे की जरूरत है। अब गल्ला तो उनके पास आ गया है लेकिन उसमें से कुछ बेचना है। अब ये जो हमारे विरोधी दल के लायक दोस्त हैं वे समझते हैं कि इन लोगों ने कांग्रेस को वोट दे कर के हमारे साथ बेईमानी की है, क्योंकि यही वर्ग है जो कि कांग्रेस का सपोर्टर है, इन्होंने ही कांग्रेस को पावर में रखा है, लिहाजा इनकी कमर तोड़ देनी चाहिये और इन लोगों ने कहा कि ऐसा शोर करो कि सरकार गल्ला दौड़ा दौड़ा कर भेजे और उससे बाजार को डम्प करे, जिससे कि उसकी कीमत बहुत सस्ती हो जाय और जब गल्ले का दाम गिर जायगा तो इनको कुछ नहीं मिलेगा और ये दरिद्र के दरिद्र ही रह जायेंगे। इसी वास्ते यह सब शोर मचाया जाता है। केवल यही एक मनोवृत्ति उसके पीछे है। यह एक पोलिटिक्स मनोवृत्ति है। जो मध्य श्रेणी के किसान हैं, कृषक हैं, वे हमेशा मेन्टली और पोलिटिकली कंजर-वेटिव रहे हैं। दुनिया में, हर जगह, जो भी एग्रीकलचरिस्ट क्लास है, वह कंजरवेटिव होता है, चाहे वह रूस हो, चाहे वह इंग्लैंड हो, चाहे वह कहीं का हो, वह कंजरवेटिव होता है। कंजरवेटिव होने के माने यह होते हैं कि वह यह नहीं चाहता कि इंकिलाब जिदाबाद रोज होता रहे, यह चीज उसके कानों में बड़ी खटकती है, रोजाना सरकार बदलती रहे यह भी उसको खटकता है। वह चाहता है कि कुछ दिन जो उसे अपनी खेती करनी है वह उसे करने दी जाये। चुनाव, वह चाहता है कि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट यहां रहे, अग्रेज चले गये और अब यहां कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट हुई है तो वह यह चाहता है कि हमेशा कायम

रहे। यह उसकी मनोवृत्ति है।

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: You represent the forces of conservatism?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Not only that. I hope, history must have told you that it is a fact that everywhere in the world agriculturists as a class are conservative. I hope so.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: That I know. You also represent the forces of conservatism?

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Certainly not the forward type which jumps into the well and hangs itself by the nearest tree.

तो इस मनोवृत्ति से इन लोगों ने यह प्रचार शुरू किया है जिससे कि कांग्रेस के सपोर्टरों की कमर टूट जाय। और किसी चीज के लिये एजिटेशन नहीं है। यह नहीं कि सीमेंट का भाव गिराओ, इसके लिये कोई एजिटेशन नहीं है। यह नहीं कि कपड़े का भाव गिराओ, क्योंकि इस तरह के एजिटेशन से उनके जो सपोर्टर हैं, लेबरर्स हैं, वे रिएक्ट करेंगे। वहां वह आतंक नहीं फैलाया जाता, चाहे दुनिया में कोई और चीज कितनी भी महंगी होती जाय; लेकिन इन कृषकों की कमर तोड़ने के लिये अन्न का भाव कम कराना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि उसके ऊपर नियंत्रण हो। वे तो चाहते हैं कि अन्न का भाव इतना गिरे कि उन्हें मुफ्त में मिलने लगे जिससे कि वे भी खायें और दूसरों को भी खिलायें और मुफ्त खिलायें तब कहीं उनकी बचत है वरना उनके लिये कोई उपाय नहीं, उनके लिये कोई बचत नहीं।

गवर्नमेंट भी इस बारे में दोषी है। गवर्नमेंट का दोष इस मामले में यह है कि हर चीज के भाव पर नियंत्रण होता है, जैसे कि कपड़े के भाव पर नियंत्रण होता है, इस तरह से कि कितना कैपीटल लगा है, उस पर कितना लेबर का कास्ट है, कितना कस्ट आफ प्रो-डक्शन है, कितना मुनाफा चाहिये, इन सब

बातों को ले कर के उसके भाव का नियंत्रण किया जाता है, लेकिन किसी गवर्नमेंट ने कभी यह सोचा तक नहीं कि खेती जो हो रही है, उसका भाव भी निर्धारित किया जाये। खेती जो करता है, उस पर कितनी आफतें हैं, वह बेचारा समझ भी नहीं पाता है कि उसकी पैदावार उसके घर पर आयेगी भी या नहीं। उसके ऊपर न मालूम क्या क्या आफतें आयेंगी, क्या क्या दैवी प्रकोप होंगे, इन सब बातों का खतरा उठा कर भी वह अपना लागत लगा कर के खेती करता है। इन खतरों के बावजूद भी अगर कुछ गल्ला उसके घर पर आता है तो उसके लिये कम से कम कुछ इंतजाम होना चाहिये कि उसका कुछ दाम उसे मिले, मगर इसके लिये कोई नियम नहीं है। सब चीजों के लिये फेयर प्राइस है लेकिन एग्री-कल्चरल प्राइयूस के लिये फेयर प्राइस होने की कोई ज़रूरत नहीं है क्योंकि इस क्लास को तो सदा ही मरना है। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट को यह याद रखना चाहिये कि इसी काम पर ज्यादातर लोग लगे हुए हैं। इसी वर्ग की स्थिति के आधार पर आप की सारी व्यवस्थायें कामयाब या नाकामयाब होगी और अगर यह वर्ग किसी दिन दुर्गति को प्राप्त हुआ, तो सब समाप्त हो जायगा, जैसा कि हो रहा है और यह स्वाभाविक है क्योंकि दैवी प्रकोप उसके लिये, राष्ट्र प्रकोप उसके लिये, राज्य का प्रकोप उसके लिये—राज्य के माने गवर्नमेंट का प्रकोप—और उसके साथ साथ ये नित्य नये नये टैक्सेशन जिनका भार इन्हीं लोगों पर पड़ता है, चाहे वह कपड़े पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी हो या किसी चीज पर हो। एक्साइज ड्यूटी कपड़े वाले कोई अपने घर से नहीं देते हैं जो कंज्यूमर्स हैं उनके सिर पर वह पड़ती है। चाहे कोई भी ड्यूटी हो, कस्टम ड्यूटी हो या कोई ड्यूटी हो, वह धीरे धीरे नोचे को ट्रिकिल डाउन होती है और वह बेचारे एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट पर ही पड़ती है। इन सब बोझों को उठाने के अलावा और कोई रास्ता नहीं है और वह वैचारा दरिद्र पर दरिद्र होता चला जा रहा है।

(Time bell rings.)

मैं आपको बतलाता हूँ कि नैनीताल के जिले में किचा एक स्थान है, जिसको मेरे लायक दोस्त विष्ट जी जानते हैं। वहां १२ ६० मन गेहूँ, ६ ६० मन चना, ७ ६० ८ ६० मन गुड़ आपको आज भी मिल सकता है, दो चार, दस-पांच गाड़ी या बैगन जितना आप चाहें। लेकिन किसान को किसी को पर्वाह नहीं है। पर्वाह इस बात की है, शहर में खूब पेट भर कर बढ़िया खायें, खूब अच्छे अच्छे कपड़े पहनें, अच्छे महलों में रहें और दो-दो करोड़, दस-दस करोड़ की इमारतें बनाते जायें। लेकिन जो किसान अपना खून बहाकर अन्न उत्पादन करता है, उसके बढ़ावे के लिए न तो गवर्नमेंट तैयार है क्योंकि हमारे लायक दोस्त गवर्नमेंट को चैन से नहीं रहने देते और चाहते हैं कि देश किसी तरह से बर्बाद हो, उसकी दुर्गति हो, ताकि उनकी बनती जाय।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when we are considering the Address of our President, we are considering it under two, serious events that have come before us. One is the heavy budget which has perplexed and confused most of the minds—at least it has done mine. The other is the hydrogen bomb test that took place yesterday and about which there was talk in the British Parliament and which has appeared in the papers today.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: So you consider this budget as a hydrogen bomb?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is not on the same plane but certainly it is a budget which will have to be considered very seriously in all its aspects but at present I am not dealing with it. I am just referring to these two events. Now coming to the Motion proposed by my friend Shri Algu Rai Shastri, let me mention that I could not follow the whole of it as it was very highly

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

Sanskritised Hindi. So I lend my support in general to the Motion of Thanks. In the same connection, Dr. Anup Singh supported the Motion and gave a very lucid exposition on our foreign relations, but again he made a suggestion that there should be a conference of Asian and African countries against these nuclear tests and so on. I thought the hon. Deputy Minister for External Affairs would say something about that definite proposal which was also supported by the Communist Party Member Dr. Gour. I say that I don't agree with that proposal, but I would suggest, and very emphatically suggest, that there should be a conference of all countries of Europe, even of South America and of Asia and Africa to raise a protest against these nuclear tests and all the other tests concerning atomic and hydrogen bombs. It is very urgent and I am sure that the hon. the Prime Minister, when he goes to the Commonwealth Conference, will certainly suggest to the Commonwealth Members to give their early and immediate attention to this very important problem because it is not a problem of one country but of the whole world, of the whole humanity; and those who are manufacturing these bombs, I am afraid, will have to be the victims if that evil day comes in.

I would dispose of the question of foreign policy by saying in general that the Parliament as well as the country approves of the foreign policy of the Government of India. Regarding the domestic policy, the problem that has loomed large is the economic situation with particular reference to the food prices. I had in mind to read some quotations from the Eastern Economist of 10th May and also from the speech of Shri V. T. Krishnamachari recently made at Mussorie regarding certain facts, certain statistics as well as certain suggestions, but as I have very limited time at my disposal and I have to put in one or two concrete suggestions regarding other matters, I would only say that one fact is very clear that

notwithstanding the increase of food production, as is pointed out, the condition in the country is rather very uncertain so far as prices are concerned. I do not take into consideration the scarcity areas. Much has been said about it and it is only in certain parts, but certainly the price problem is really something which deserves consideration.

My own analysis is this. No doubt things have improved but the impetus that was for the Grow More Food campaign during the early years of the First Plan is lacking today. There is water, there is land but that water is not being used. So far as improvement of quality is concerned, sufficient effort is not being made. So far as minor irrigation projects are concerned necessary attention is not being given to them with the result that though we could have much improved, in view of the indifference towards these things, we have not improved. I would like to remind the agricultural Ministries of the States and the Government of India that we are committed to have 40 per cent. increase if not 100 per cent. as in certain speeches it was suggested by our Prime Minister. So, it is very necessary that they do give attention to the increase of food production. Certainly, nobody wants that there should be food imports unless the contingency or emergency arises. We want to use our foreign exchange for other and better things. So, I would just leave that topic saying that in regard to certain suggestions that have been made, they must be given attention to and this price problem should not be treated with complacency.

Now, I do support the Motion and I say that in general the domestic and foreign policies have been very satisfactory but I do feel that a very serious omission has been made regarding two matters. One of them is this. After this election we are sitting for the first time, that is, the new Parliament, and this Address is something more than an annual Address with the result that when for the second time

this largest democracy has come in successfully, there are certain things that we have to consider, namely, how our masters behaved during the elections. Sir, I had the privilege of going round the States of Madras, Mysore and Andhra and my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister for External Affairs, has also travelled in these States. It is neither the occasion nor is it proper, Sir, to go into the details of our experience, but I can tell you one thing, Sir, that we were grieved to learn that this election in most cases was fought either on the caste basis or on the communal basis or on a selfish interest basis. On occasions, we were asked not to condemn casteism and communalism. We, of course, wanted certain principles to succeed and we did what we considered best but what I am driving at is this. What have we done to educate our masters? There is a provision in the Constitution, article 45 in the Directive Principles of State Policy, which directs that within ten years there should be compulsory and free education.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): You mean to say that the educated classes are free from casteism? They are the worst offenders.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You kindly listen to me. There should be not only compulsory and free education but that education should be of a character which creates national and human feelings. These are the two things that we should concentrate on. If our Government does not concentrate on these two things, viz. free and compulsory education and national character, I am afraid we will have to face a very serious situation when we come to the next General Election.

Now, the other problem that I wanted to bring before the House was regarding technical education. We are thinking of finances; we are thinking of deficit finances and of more taxation; but have you ever thought of technical personnel? That is a greater

bottleneck than the finances that we have at our disposal. The policy of the Government so far regarding technical education has been that whoever from the public was forthcoming, he should contribute to the extent of one-third and the Government would contribute two-thirds of the cost for setting up a polytechnique, a technical institution or an engineering college, but on account of the paucity of funds the All-India Technical Education Council has had to change this principle and make it 50: 50. I think the whole of the Second Five Year Plan will come to grief if the Government does not take up the matter of the technical education very seriously and train thousands and thousands of students in technical studies. In Germany today, about 95 per cent. of the people go in for technical training. In China too, we have seen, the great impetus is given to technical training. Here we produce graduates from the Universities. If we have no funds, let us stop these Universities from producing such graduates. For humanity, ten per cent. is enough to preserve culture, history, philosophy and literature. The rest of the funds should be diverted towards technical education. Let our Government see that we provide all the amenities so that our industrialisation programme, our plan to advance our country during the next five years really goes ahead and some good results come in, otherwise the earnest desire to advance the country will not be realised.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there would not have been any reason or any scope for me to speak this afternoon but for one single point. One does not carry coal to New castle and there is no point in my re-stressing the fact that this House feels grateful indeed for the very forthright, matter-of fact, simple and unostentatious but, at the same time, decent and dignified Address of the President. Most of the details by way of criticism that have been raised by the Opposition have

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]
 been adequately met by those who spoke in support of Pandit Algu Rai Shastri's Motion.

I would address myself only on one point and that even at the risk of disturbing a hornet's nest. Reference has, again and again, been made to the question of reconsideration of the recent reorganisation of States. I have not been surprised by the arguments that have been advanced by Members of the Opposition, but I have indeed been taken aback by what fell from the lips of such an arudite scholar, such a person of mellowed experience and wisdom, as Mahamahopadhyaya Kane, who is, so to speak, a *guru* in the line of my own special field of studies. I would like to place before the House one aspect of this case and that is much more fundamental than what has been happening in the course of the last one year and a half. I would not even try to discuss all the tragic things that took place from one end of India to the other since I do not want to open up wounds that are not yet very old. But, as a student of Indian history and sociology, I have often felt deeply disturbed by certain social symptoms that threw themselves up on the surface in course of the last one year and a half, and this, we must not forget, after well-nigh one decade of our national independence: symptoms of casteism, symptoms of tribalism, symptoms of regionalism—all symptoms that have been sought to be clothed under the more dignified phrase of linguistic and cultural considerations. It has often amazed me—I do not know to whom I am addressing these words for I find not only a depleted House but all but empty Opposition Benches—I have often been amazed to find that those who call themselves progressivists, even leftists, in politics, economics and in social affairs, have, unwittingly perhaps, been loudest in fanning and fostering these social symptoms of a historically and sociologically back-

ward social organisation. Nationalism is universally recognised to be of higher socio-political value than casteism, tribalism or regionalism. Yet, a considerable section of our people, I am sorry to say, including Congressmen, after more than half a century of knowledge and experience, of national ideology and action, chose to think and act in terms of the characteristics of a backward social organisation, for good or for evil, for what destiny of India, I do not know. The ruling party has, for the time being, bowed down to the popular will. Perhaps it is good that it did so. There is certainly wisdom in recognising objective facts, in facing realities which have so often been alluded to in this House, even by such a person as Dr. Kane. There is wisdom indeed in facing realities and accepting them as such, and perhaps we have shown wisdom in accepting the people's verdict.

But let us recognise, at least 5 P.M. for once that there is also some wisdom is holding aloft ideals and ideologies of higher social values, of nationalism, of universalism, of internationalism, if I may venture to say so, before the people and exhorting them from time to time to rise up to them. We are here not merely to follow but also to give some lead to the country, to create new values, higher values, and certainly nationalism is a higher value than tribalism or regionalism.

I would like to mention one more point and emphasise one apparent contradiction in the arguments advanced by progressivists and leftists in Indian politics. They are, true to their logic, true to their ideals and ideologies—and it is indeed a matter of gratification—on the side of progressive nationalisation of the sources of production, of large-scale mechanisation of the methods of production and of industrialisation. All this means—I suppose not only academically speaking but also pragmatically and practically—more and more of social mobility,

more and more of social integration. That is why we are going in for it. May I pose a question before all those who think in terms of socialism and communism? The question is this. Do tribalism, casteism and regionalism go together with large-scale industrialisation, with mechanisation of the sources of production and so on and so forth? I would beg of them to ponder over this academic question. I know very few Members in this House are perhaps interested in an academic question, but let me pose it in all seriousness since academic questions in the last analysis impinge on practical problems. I have been too long a serious student of sociology, even of Marxist sociology—and let me be frank in my confession: I have so far failed to see the logical relationship between regionalism on the one hand and nationalisation, large-scale industrialisation and mechanisation, on the other. I would, therefore, make a very fervent and passionate appeal to our friends in opposition not to try to make political capital out of social symptoms that are backward looking, retrograde and reactionary, and which pull us backward in history.

Unity in diversity is a very attractive slogan and I have seen in Bengal in the course of the last one year and a half how so many of even our knowing people tread to appeal to the writings of Tagore and fish out the various enunciations of unity in diversity from his writings. A good but only half-true ideology was flared up before the people and most of them were misled. We must not forget that there is as much danger in over-emphasising diversity that raises sharp-edged fences all round, that raises insurmountable walls between people and people, between State and State on the one hand, and rigid and mechanical unity, dead uniformity on the other. Economic and political integration, does not subsist in a vacuum. It can become reality only in a society which is essentially mobile, which is socially integrated. No plea of regional language and culture can

save us from the black peril of disunity and disharmony that have often visited Indian history, not of the distant past even. Let us not play with fire, this is my passionate appeal. Thank you, Sir.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति महोदय, श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री के प्रस्ताव पर जो बहस हुई है, उसमें भाग लेते हुये हमारे एक सोशलिस्ट मित्र ने यहां तक कहा है कि राष्ट्रपति जी का जो भाषण है उसमें न हमारे पिछले हालात ही ठीक बताये गये हैं, न भविष्य के बारे में ही कुछ कहा गया है, और न उससे हमें कोई प्रेरणा हो मिलती है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि इस प्रकार के शब्द उन्होंने कैसे कहे हैं। अगर हम उस भाषण को अच्छी तरह पढ़ें तो हमें यह पता चलेगा कि वह बिल्कुल सत्यता के आधार पर है, सही हालात के आधार पर है और उसमें वही बात बताई गई है जो कि जरूरी थीं और जिन को ज्यादा अहमियत देने का इस वक्त मौका था। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में यह बताया है कि हमारी जो उन्नति हुई है वह चहुंमुखी हुई है। चहुंमुखी उन्नति किस प्रकार हुई है, इसके बारे में कुछ थोड़ा सा विश्लेषण मैं आगे चल कर करूंगा। लेकिन पहले यह जो आज फूड समस्या के ऊपर ज्यादा बहस चली है, उसके बारे में कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। एक एग्री-कल्चरिस्ट के नाते, एक कृषक के नाते, मेरा भी काश्त से बहुत कुछ सम्बन्ध है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि खाद्यान्नों की पैदावार में पहले से बहुत ज्यादा उन्नति हुई है और यह ऐसी उन्नति नहीं हुई है कि महज वैसे ही पैदावार बढ़ गई हो, बल्कि एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट की ओर से जो व्यवस्था की गई है और उसके साथ ही जो उन्होंने दूसरे तरीके अख्तियार किये हैं, जैसे अच्छे बीज व खाद का देना, चावल के लिए जापानी पद्धति का प्रचार इत्यादि, इन सब बातों से पैदावार बढ़ी है। सब से बड़ी बात जो पैदावार की उन्नति में सहायक हुई है वह है सेंट्रल ट्रैक्टर

[श्री राम सहाय]

आगनाइजेशन के जरिए से करीब साढ़े १५ लाख एकड़ जमीन को आबाद करना या उसको जोतना। जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया, इस प्रकार उन्नति के साधन उपलब्ध किये गये, जिनसे शीघ्रता से पैदावार में उन्नति की जा सकी और की गई। साथ ही इसके जो लांग टर्म प्लान है, जिसके अन्तर्गत हमारे डैम इत्यादि बन रहे हैं, उनके सम्पूर्ण हो जाने से और भी देश के खाद्यान्न की उन्नति होगी और वे एक ही नहीं हैं बल्कि कई हैं, जैसे हीराकुड, दामोदर वेली, तुंगभद्रा, भाखरा-नंगल, नागार्जुन, चम्बल, रिहड़, कोना इत्यादि। इस तरह से जितने डैम बन रहे हैं, उनमें से बहुतों में काम शुरू हो गया है, बहुतों में बहुत कुछ होना बाकी है और बहुत से मुकम्मल होने वाले हैं। जब वे सब मुकम्मल हो जायेंगे तो हमारे खाद्यान्न की जो हालत होगी, वह मैं समझता हूँ कि इतनी अच्छी होगी कि हम अपनी आवश्यकता की पूर्ति कर के ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक्सपोर्ट भी कर सकेंगे। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि किसी भी काम को करने के लिए हम कितनी ही जल्दी करें, कितनी ही कोशिश करें, लेकिन उसमें कुछ समय अवश्य लगता है। हमारे एग्री-कल्चर डिपार्टमेंट की तरफ से जितने साधन जुटाये गये हैं, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि इतनी जल्दी इससे ज्यादा और साधन जुटाये नहीं जा सकते थे। यह ख्याल करना कि शासन की ओर से कोई कमी की जा रही है बिल्कुल ठीक नहीं है। यह बात अवश्य है कि हमारे यहां हमेशा ही बहुत अर्से से बाहर से अनाज आता रहा है और जब एक अर्से से बाहर से आता रहा है, तो उसकी पूर्ति एक साथ करना बहुत ही दुश्वार है, बहुत ही मुश्किल है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इन सब बातों से हमें खास तौर पर यह नतीजा निकालना चाहिये कि जो कुछ भी उन्नति की जा रही है और जो कुछ भी उन्नति भविष्य में होगी उससे निश्चय ही खेती के मामले में हम स्वावलम्बी बन जायेंगे, इसमें कोई शुबहा नहीं है।

अभी कुछ थोड़ी सी बात फारेन एक्सचेंज के सम्बन्ध में, विदेशी विनियम के सम्बन्ध में, भी कही गई और इसके बारे में राष्ट्रपति ने भी अपने भाषण में जिक्र किया है। इसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक बात अर्ज करनी है। मैं शासन से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम किसी देश से कुछ सहायता लेते हैं तो हमें इस बात पर अवश्य विचार करना चाहिये कि उसका सही इरादा क्या है और किस मकसद से या किस लक्ष्य को सामने रख कर के वह हमें मदद दे रहा है। कहा जाता है कि अमेरिका एक तरफ तो हमें इसलिये मदद दे रहा है कि हम अच्छे अच्छे साधन जुटा करके, अच्छे अच्छे कार्य करके, अपने देश की उन्नति करें और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स सप्लाई कर रहा है और वह इसलिये कर रहा है—बजाहिर ऐसा ही मालूम होता है—कि हम अच्छे अच्छे साधन जुटाने के बजाय अपना ज्यादातर पैसा डिफेंस पर खर्च करें, जैसा कि बहुत बड़ी तादाद में हमें खर्च करना पड़ रहा है। तो यह एक ऐसा सीरियस मसला है जिस पर कि बहुत ही गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करने की आवश्यकता है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान की इस प्रकार की मदद किसी न किसी दिन खतरे की चीज बन सकती है। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बारे में—अमेरिका के सम्बन्ध में जो दो बातें निवेदन की हैं और जो उदाहरण दिया है कि उनका क्या इरादा है, उनका क्या लक्ष्य है, इन सब बातों पर और जिन पर कि अभी बहुत कुछ प्रकाश डाला गया है—शासन बहुत अच्छी तरह से विचार करे।

जैसा कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने बताया है, हम चहुँमुखी उन्नति कर रहे हैं। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है, कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि हम चहुँमुखी उन्नति कर रहे हैं। हम किसी भी मसले को ले लें, चाहे हम तालीम को, एजुकेशन को ले लें, हम देखेंगे कि हम निश्चय ही बहुत कुछ उन्नति कर रहे हैं। अभी पालिटिकल

के सम्बन्ध में और इंजीनियरिंग कालेजों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ बातें हमारे अकबर अली स. ह. ने फरमाईं। इसमें कोई श्रुद्धा नहीं है कि उसमें बहुत कुछ तरक्की की जरूरत है। बहुत कुछ उन्नति की जरूरत है। लेकिन इस जमाने में जो कुछ किया जा रहा है वह बहुत कुछ है। मैं भी कुछ थोड़ा सा ऐसे इंडस्ट्रियल से सम्बन्ध रखता हूं, मुझे भी इसका कुछ अनुभव है। मैं यह देखता हूं कि जो सबसे बड़ी दिक्कत हमारे सामने आती है वह यह है कि हमें ट्रेन्ड आदमी, उस काम को सिखाने के लिये नहीं मिलते हैं। जैसा कि अभी कहा गया, हमारे देश में पॉलिटेक्निक कई जगह खुल गये हैं, हर एक स्टेट में कुछ न कुछ खुले हैं लेकिन मैंने यह देखा है कि वहां ट्रेन्ड आदमियों के न होने की वजह से, ट्रेन्ड स्टाफ के न मिलने की वजह से, वहां के लड़कों में अ. तोष है और वहां का कार्य सुचारु रूप से नहीं चल रहा है।

(Time bell rings.)

हम जिस चीज को भी लें, कल कारखानों, को लें, इंडस्ट्रीज को लें, बड़ी बड़ी मशीनरीं ज. को लें, रेल के इंजन आदि बन ने के कारखानों को लें या हवाई जहाज आदि बन ने के कारखानों को लें, हर एक में बाहर के बड़े-बड़े एक्सपर्ट्स से सहायता लेनी पड़ती है। उस तरह के पर्याप्त आदमी नहीं मिलते हैं, जिस तरह के आदमियों की आवश्यकता है, यहां तक कि लेबर, मजदूर, भी ट्रेन्ड नहीं मिलते हैं। अतः यदि इन सारी मुश्किलों को सामने रख कर हम अपनी हालत का विश्लेषण करेंगे और उसकी विवेचना करेंगे, तभी हम सही नतीजे पर पहुंच पायेंगे।

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address, which has been tabled by my friend, Mr. Algu Rai Shastri. I would only draw the pointed attention of the House to one factor in the Address and that is that in regard to our Second Five Year Plan the President has felt that there

is difficulty and the economic situation in the country is pretty serious. The Government under these circumstances was faced with two alternatives. One was either to slow down or to expand the period of the Five Year Plan; and the other was to accept the challenge and face the difficulties with determination. I congratulate the Government on the choice of the latter alternative. We are determined to see that our Plan goes through whatever the difficulties we have to face and it is as it ought to be, because a nation cannot hope to go forward unless the nation possesses that grim determination. The method which has been indicated by our President for seeing it through, apart from other methods, is that we should try to save as much as we can and we should try to cut down all wasteful expenditure. The President has also hinted that we should pass through some period of austerity so that we may be able to see the Plan through. I welcome all these suggestions and I would only pray that the Government should take all steps to see that all wasteful expenditure are curtailed and the Government should also see that people get full confidence in the administration, because there is a feeling in the public mind that the money which is spent for the execution of the Plan is not spent in the manner whereby the ordinary man may feel that the whole amount is fully utilised. Our Services have a great role to play and that role is that they should in a spirit of dedication try to see that the taxpayer's money is utilised to the last pie. Unless that is done, there is no enthusiasm, no inspiration on the part of the public. And we are sorry to say that our Services have not yet reached that standard whereby everybody would feel that whatever money the Government has set apart for a particular purpose is spent in that direction. I would, therefore, appeal to the Government to devise means and methods to see that the tone of administration improves, that the public servant's conduct is above suspicion

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]
and that every pie which the taxpayer has to pay with a lot of difficulty is spent properly.

The other point which I would like to place before the House is that while dealing with the subject of States reorganisation, the problem of Punjab was solved to the satisfaction of all concerned. I have only to draw the attention of the Government to one thing that so far as the language question in Punjab is concerned, it seems that there is a considerable section of the public which feels that that problem has not been satisfactorily settled. The Arya Samajists are thinking of launching a *satyagraha* unless some of their demands are properly considered by the Government. I would only suggest to the Central Government that whatever good has been done by evolving the regional formula and by dividing the Punjab into two regions, Hindi speaking area and Punjabi speaking area, they should try to maintain it. Nothing should be allowed to happen which may in any circumstances try to undo the very good thing which the Government have done. It is entirely for the Centre to get into touch with those people who think rightly or wrongly that some injustice has been done to Hindi so far as the language problem of Punjab is concerned. I am quite sure that, if our Central leaders move in the matter, which I hope they would do very quickly, reason will then prevail on both sides and the communal atmosphere which for the moment has vanished in Punjab to a large extent will be kept under control. Otherwise some small omission at this juncture may undo the very good thing which has been done for the solution of the problem.

The only other point to which I would draw the pointed attention of this House is that in the matter of reorganisation of States, when I spoke previously, I drew attention even then to one factor, and that was that

the smaller amalgamating units should be properly dealt with by the greater units in which they were merging. That sentiment is at this moment brought to the notice of the House again because in the very nature of things the smaller units always have an apprehension that they are not getting very fair treatment at the hands of the greater units. The greater units should try to show more mananimity to the services of these smaller States and more magnanimity sometimes to the sentiments of those people who have merged with them. I would, therefore, request the Centre to draw the attention of the Punjab Government to the position of seniority and the position of responsibility which ought to be given to the Services from PEPSU which has merged with Punjab.

So far as the foreign policy of the Government is concerned, Sir, by and large, every section of the House is in support of that policy, and I would only say that the very urgent problem of the banning of the nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons is engaging the attention of the Government, and the suggestion which was mooted by Dr. Anup Singh of calling a conference I should think, should engage the attention of the Government very seriously, and some effort must be made in that direction so that this menace to humanity is removed. Otherwise, all the good work which has been done by several countries stands to be set at naught by those nations who in any case are not trying to heed to the voice of humanity.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to extend my hearty support to the Motion of Thanks. The President's Address gives a realistic picture of the conditions prevailing now in our country. He has rightly and timely mentioned the factors and difficulties which are likely to imperil the implementation of the Second Five Year Plan. He has appealed to us to tighten our belts in order to see the Second Five Year Plan a success by

achieving self-sufficiency in the field of agriculture as well as of industry.

Sir, on this occasion I would like to confine my observations only to the agricultural field. How to achieve self-sufficiency in the field of agriculture on a permanent basis? This is a very serious problem. In fact the attention of our First Five Year Plan was mainly focussed on agriculture, and we have embarked on major irrigation and power projects. In spite of this I may humbly submit that we were unable to achieve much success in nearing self-sufficiency of food. Agriculture is the biggest industry in our country. Nearly 5 crore acres of land are under cultivation. I think there is no other country in the world which possesses cultivable land of this magnitude. But the profession of agriculture is not an industry with our people. To them it is a *dharma* or a way of life. They will not take it as an industry, and I am afraid that the Government also is not treating this on that footing. We have often pleaded that adequate credit and other facilities should be provided to the *kisan*, but our efforts in this connection have not succeeded. Moreover, let us analyse and assess how far we could achieve our objects in the First Five Year Plan. Land reforms as the Planning Commission itself had admitted, were not introduced in each and every State. We intend to introduce or to impose optimum or maximum holding but it has not been done in every State. The result is that the rich peasantry in our country is very much in suspense. They do not know still where they stand. Because of this uncertainty they are lacking enthusiasm, there is lack of incentive and impetus. Resultantly, the required capital is not flowing into the field of agriculture because of this suspense. As regards the small cultivators, we have not been able to provide them with credit facilities. Moreover, we could not still enhance their position as to enable them to adopt all the modern methods which are necessary to improve the technique of cultivation

in this country. As regards the tenants, we are still unable to provide enough protection to their rights. We also could not guarantee living wages to the landless agricultural labourer. Because of this suspense I may say that in the whole agricultural field a sort of uncertainty is prevailing, and people are not feeling enough incentive to improve the methods of agriculture. In all other respects we often plead for adoption of modern methods, but in matters of agriculture we want to go back to the olden and obsolete methods. It cannot be done like that. If we want to improve our agriculture, we must introduce better modern methods, and better seeds and better manure must be provided to the cultivators.

Coming to the question of food and food prices, I do not want to dilate very much upon this, because it has been referred to at length. But I want to impress one thing here that the scarcity of food is mainly due to failure of crops. Since three years the country has been facing drought conditions in some places and excess rain in some other places, and as a result, the food crops are failing regularly. The figures show that there is a steady increase in food production. But in my opinion the sources of obtaining these figures are still the ill-paid *patwaris* who have got their own conventional and traditional ways of keeping records. Therefore, we cannot rely very much upon these records. As a permanent solution to this question, I want to put before the House that before every season Government must fix some prices which must be remunerative for the cultivators, and subsequently Government should evolve some agency for procurement also. In that case only, we can check up this illicit hoarding. I am confident that Government will successfully deal with this scarcity of food and in course of time, it will be able to check up the soaring of the prices also.

[Shri S. Channa Reddy.]

Then, I want to mention something about the economic situation in the rural side. Whatever may be the rate of our progress, whatever may be the increase in our *per capita* income, the condition of rural people, economically, has not shown any signs of progress. The reason for this is for the economists to explain—why, in spite of the increase of *per capita* income and in spite of the overall progress in every field, the rural side is presenting a deplorable picture. In my humble opinion, it is because, there is a great pressure on the agriculturist and unless this pressure is diverted to some other occupations, the purchasing power of the agriculturist and the village artisan and other people cannot be improved. For this, I fervently appeal to the Government to open centres for imparting technical and vocational training to the country youth at every centre of the National Extension Block. Much is said about the National Extension Schemes and the Community Projects. But these projects also are not achieving any sizable success in enhancing the purchasing power of the villagers.

Lastly, I would like to mention about the administration. I am pained to say that our administrative set-up is not keeping pace with the day-to-day development of our country. They are moving in the same gear of bureaucratic set up, and in different States, the systems are different. In the Andhra Pradesh Totenham system, which dates back to the days of the East India Company is still followed and they take pride in saying that it has stood the test of time. It is high time that our Central Government evolved a common type of administrative system for the entire country to dispose of the business at all levels. Moreover, I regret to say, we are unable to end corruption. On the other hand, it is increasing daily by leaps and bounds. Unless we give some sort of relief to the common man, unless we make him contented by ending corruption and red-tapism, I

feel the confidence of the people will not be regained and retained in the ruling party.

With these few words, Sir, I again support the Motion of Thanks. Thank you.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is said that the President's Address should give us an inspiring account of the things that have happened in the past, the things that are happening now and that will happen in future also. But critics forget that the President's Address is normally meant to give us an indication of the legislative programme of the Government. In his Address, the President has well surveyed the political, economic and social development of our country since we met last. All these spheres he has covered in his Address, but one thing he has not. He has not mentioned anything about the political morale of the country which is very essential for the advancement of our nation. Though the President has not touched that point, yet, our Chairman, in his address thanking the Members for the felicitations offered to him on his re-election as the Vice-President of our country, made us understand that a country with no political morale is sure to be doomed. Sir, self-discipline, self-knowledge and self-control are the three things that lead to progress.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU) in the Chair.]

We as Members of Parliament, are the real representatives of dumb-millions, our country-men. It is our duty to see that there is no fall in the political morale of the country and try to recover what we have lost. We have to admit, Sir, that there is a progress decline in the political morale of our country today, I am sure, we the Members of Parliament—the representatives of our nation—will try to recover the lost morale.

Sir, the President, in his Address, has dealt with the food problem of

our country. The food problem, no doubt, is not grave, let me say, but it is quite unsatisfactory. I have travelled throughout India, from Kanya Kumari to Jullundur, from Bombay to Calcutta and to other parts, but let me tell you the problem of food about which so much is spoken, is not grave, but it is unsatisfactory. The only thing that I have to say is that prices have gone up—50 to 70 per cent. Prices have soared up and in the self-sufficient State which is called the granary of the South, the price of rice has gone up. A Madras measure is today costing Rs. 1-4-0 or Rs. 1-8-0. Our late lamented Food Minister, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, did a great service to our country by abolishing controls. He made India a self-sufficient country. He never went to foreign countries with a begging bowl for alms to feed his countrymen. Imports were not encouraged. Everything was well settled. But what has become of the same policy which was originated by Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai and pursued by the Government? Today, we are having one of his disciples, one of his devotees, as the Food Minister. I am confident that the Food Minister will rise equal to the occasion and see that the food problem is solved. What is freedom, what is *swaraj* to the common man? Let Rama rule or Ravana rule. What he wants is food, he wants clothes to cover his body and he wants a house to live in. I am quite confident that our Food Minister will do his best and see that India is self-sufficient in regard to food.

Sir, there was a lot of talk, a lot of criticism, from some Members of the House and, especially, from an hon. Member, my friend, Mr. Rajah, who came out with a vehement attack on the foreign policy of India. In his criticism, Sir, he wants that India should come out of the Commonwealth. Outside this House a reference was made to the Commonwealth of Nations as a den of imperialists. Sir, I agree with my friends when they say that the Commonwealth of Nations

was a den of imperialists. But it was so some time back or a decade ago. Now, the things have changed. Now, most of the democratic countries are Members of the Commonwealth of Nations. Ghana is admitted as a Member. Because India is a Member of the Commonwealth of Nations today, it acts as a great brake to the imperialist and revolutionary activities of the imperialist countries there. It is India, Sir, which cried a halt to the activities of Britain in Egypt. It was India, Sir, which solved the problem of Egypt, the problem of the Middle East, because it happened to be a Member of the Commonwealth of Nations. Sir, our country is represented by one who is called Rasool-u-Salam by the Arab countries, and the Christians say that he is the incarnation of Christ; Muslims call him the Prophet of peace. And let me say, Sir, that he is the incarnation of Vishnu. He is there to relieve the misery not only of India, but of the whole world. With such a man there India's foreign policy is quite safe. I think that it will be a folly on our part to walk out of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Sir, I will just say one thing more. There is a feeling in the South that it is completely neglected by the North. There is a movement there which has gone deep, and parties have been formed which are known as the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam and the Dravida Kazhagam and they are propagating that the South is neglected and ignored by the North. I suggest, Sir, that in order to remove all these misunderstandings, that have been existing there, it would be advisable for our Government to have its summer capital in the South. Sir, you know that during the summer days it is practically impossible for us to meet here during the months of May and June, and it will not be in the interest of the Government machinery also to work in Delhi in these hot days. Therefore, why should not the Government as a gesture of friendship and love for the South, shift its capital during the summer either to

[Shri D. A. Mirza.]

Hyderabad or to Bangalore? I think that will clear all the misunderstanding that exists today between the North and the South. No doubt, Sir, the D.M.K. Party may not be a powerful party now, but let me tell you that it is a dangerous party. Although in minority it is a powerful minority today. And I will not be surprised if it becomes a great rival to the Congress in the next general elections. To avoid all that, Sir, I think it will be in the interest of the Government and in the interest of our country as a whole if we have a second capital somewhere in the South, say, either in Hyderabad or in Bangalore.

Then, Sir, there is only one thing more. Our President has done a great service to us by not speaking about Kashmir very much. Sir, in season and out of season, and during the Budget session and whenever the internal policy of India was discussed or the international policy of India was discussed, this Kashmir issue used to figure most here. Kashmir has become a nightmare to us. Sir, the people know that Kashmir is an integral part of India, Kashmir is India and India is Kashmir, where is the question of discussing Kashmir at all? Therefore, Sir, the President has done a great service by not speaking about Kashmir so much. I would, therefore, appeal to the Members of this House to refrain from speaking on Kashmir for some time. When Kashmir is India, where is the question of our discussing it? Then the people may think that there is something fishy about it. Ignore it, whatever may the foreign powers say. Kashmir is ours. I do not think it is advisable for us to speak about Kashmir in season and out of season, as a subject of controversy.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the fag end of the day I do not want to inflict a long speech on the friend Members of the House. I will, therefore, take only a

few minutes to make a few salient points.

Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks that has been moved by Pandit Algu Rai Shastri. This is, Sir, a unique occasion when this Parliament is going to debate about this Motion. Ordinarily, in a democratic country the Head of the State addresses Parliament only once a year. This year we have two such occasions. This year we are also celebrating the centenary of the great revolution that took place in 1857. The President in his Address mentions about this as under:

"We meet here today one hundred years after the great rising which began in Meerut and spread over considerable parts of India. That was the first major challenge to foreign rule and it threw up notable figures, famous in India's history.

Sir, our country is an ancient one. There are no doubt, also other ancient countries in the world, such as Egypt, Greece and Rome, but their past civilisation is dead and gone, and that is not so with our country. But, Sir, when I look back upon the course of Indian history, it seems to me that though our national spirit was not dead, yet it was lying dormant. At the time of the 1857 revolution, society had gone very conservative. It was divided into several watertight artificial compartments. There is a very good book that has been just published by the Publication Division of the Government of India, I mean the book on 1857 by Dr. Sen. It gives us a very good picture of the society and the state of the country that existed at that time. Sardar K. M. Panikkar, in his famous book "Asia under Western Dominance", has stated that this stagnation and conservatism came into India with the landing of Vasco da Gama at Calicut nearly 500 years from today. Whatever may be the date, it is for the historians to decide, but the fact remains that when the people of India began their 1857 struggle, they were not only fighting against the foreign rule, but they were also fighting against the forces of conservatism.

and the forces of casteism and lethargy that had taken hold of the country. Normally Sir, when we discuss the Address, we discuss about the then existing state of affairs, and it is right too. But on occasions like this we should take a panoramic view of history and see what we were 100 years before, what we are today, and what we want to be. The President in his Address has appealed to the Members of Parliament to rise to the occasion. It is in this context of historic development of our country that we, Members of Parliament, should realise our responsibility and do our utmost to help our country in its forward march.

Sir, there is yet another factor. Ten years ago our country became independent and soon after that we gave ourselves a Constitution. That is the Constitution that we have today, a democratic, republican, Constitution. Since then we have had two general elections. This is a very big event in the history of the world. We are now classed as the biggest democracy in the world. Members speaking from that side of the House as well as from this side have referred to the general elections that have just been completed. But we must bear one thing in mind, and that is that we should not be complacent about the situation that we see in this country. Members have said that by holding two general elections in the country we have laid firm foundations of a democratic society. I am prepared to agree that we have laid the foundations of a democratic society, but we do not know whether the foundations have been firmly laid. The foundations are not yet firm. Yet, fissiparous tendencies, separatist tendencies, are strong in the country. The results of the last general elections bear eloquent testimony to this. Whatever be the parties to which we belong, whether we are Communists, Congressmen, Socialists, Hindu Mahasabha people or anything else, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is guilty of giving rise to these forces. Now, that the elections are over, and we are sitting here in this

calm and dispassionate atmosphere, we must seriously think of where we are taking the country to. As Mr. Akbar Ali Khan said unless and until we do something to educate our masters, the fate of democracy in India is not safe.

We all talk of planning. It is good that we should talk about planning, but planning does not merely consist of the construction of big roads, bridges, hospitals, factories, etc. Planning is essentially planning to reconstruct human conduct, to reconstruct society. Man is more important than machines, and in our planning we must never forget that we must plan for proper type of society. The problem today is to safeguard the independence, integrity and unity of the country. Everything that helps in safeguarding the integrity of India, the unity of India, is good. Everything that goes against this is bad. Therefore, all these separatist tendencies that are working in the country, whether it is parochialism, whether it be communalism, whether it be casteism, must be rooted out. A year ago, when I was speaking in this House, I drew the attention of the Government to the fact that we must do something in that direction. Within a few months, the hon. the Home Minister and the Prime Minister also talked of this that we must pass some sort of legislation to deal with these communal and separatist forces. I think that the time has now come when we must seriously consider about this.

Now, I have to talk about four more subjects. They are the food problem, the housing problem, our Budget and the water and industrial problem of Rajasthan.

THE MINISTER FOR REHABILITATION AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA): Take the last one first.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: The food problem has been dealt with at length, and therefore I will not say anything about it. As Khannaji said, I would

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

take the last one first and I will just say a few words about all these points. First, I will take up the Budget. I am not an expert on financial matters and I cannot give any lengthy discourse on the problems that the Budget has presented before us. I would just like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have committed ourselves to the successful implementation of the Second Five Year Plan. Those of us who are familiar with the history of Soviet Russia know that during the first two or three Five Year Plans Soviet Russia had to undergo tremendous hardships. In order that our children and we ourselves live a better life, it is essential that some extra taxes should be imposed, but there is one aspect to which attention has been drawn by Members and to which I draw attention and that is that earning is important but spending is also equally important. Today the people will not mind the taxes that are being imposed provided Government avoids wasteful expenditure and checks corruption. Attention has been drawn to this problem of corruption by Members in this House. We hear about corruption outside also. There is wasteful expenditure also. Therefore, so far as the Budget is concerned, I would like to say that you must be careful about the expenditure side also and you should not think that you need not be careful about the expenditure side. If you are not careful about the expenditure side, people would certainly grudge the extra taxation that is levied upon them. Not only that, they would also grudge the legitimate taxes that they should pay, because when people pay taxes, they expect that you would make good use of the money.

Another thing that I would like to say in this connection is that there is a lot of speculation going on in our society. We have pledged ourselves to a socialistic society, and I cannot understand a socialistic society and speculation existing side by side. No-

where in the world have we seen a socialistic society encouraging speculation. Today, we talk about the food shortage. How is it there? It is because of the speculators. Therefore, if we call ours a socialistic society, then we must discourage speculation or rather ban it, because this sort of double thinking, speculation on the one side giving rise to capitalistic tendencies and the Government thinking in terms of socialism on the other will not lead us anywhere.

Then I come to housing. I would like to make a few suggestions about it. One is that we must make more of indigenous materials. Nowadays we are making a liberal use of steel and cement, while we can certainly do away with these things. How to do it? How to do this is for engineers and technicians to say, but as a layman I offer this suggestion that in order to relieve the housing problem and to save foreign exchange, we must make less and less use of cement and steel and more and more use of lime and other indigenous materials. Another thing about the housing problem is that we are building so many palatial buildings. Look around Delhi. Many palatial buildings have gone up. But there are so many buildings lying vacant in the countryside. There are the old palaces of the Maharajahs. Certainly, some of the offices can be shifted from Delhi to these places. But as a matter of fact there is a struggle between bureaucracy and democracy. We may decide that some of the offices should be located in the countryside, but the officers do not like to go there. They have got many amenities in Delhi, educational facilities for their children, etc. For one excuse or the other they do not want to go from Delhi. This is a problem which we will have to consider.

Then, I come to the water problem of Rajasthan. We are all taking about food but water comes before food. Members of this House may not

have any idea of the conditions in Rajasthan. There are villages where people have to go some 20 miles to fetch water. You may not provide water for their irrigation, but certainly the Central Government which has got the welfare of the people at heart must provide them with drinking water. How can the Central Government help? Recently, the Central Government dug a tube well. It is a very good tube well. It gives 61,000 gallons per hour, but it is not possible for private parties to dig such wells. I would therefore, appeal to the Central Government to step in and dig such wells and then hand them over to the State Government. It is not within the financial resources of the State Government even. This water problem of Rajasthan, especially in Jaisalmer, Bikaner and other areas, is a very acute one and I hope the Central Government will do the needful.

Then, about the industrial problem of Rajasthan I have already spoken. There are a lot of minerals available in Rajasthan and we can tackle this problem. Rajasthan is a backward State. It is said that the . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): May I enquire from my hon. friend as to what happened to the Paniwallah Maharaj discovering plenty of water in Rajasthan?

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: I am glad Mr. Saksena has drawn my attention to the Paniwallah Maharaj. If I may say so, he was a big hoax and he could not do anything. As a matter of fact, Government spent a lot of money on him for nothing. Sir, I do not want to take much time of the House. Rajasthan is a backward State. We say that the strength of a chain is determined by its weakest link. Rajasthan is the weakest link in the country, and the Centre should come to its help in the interests of India as a whole. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): The Government will reply to the debate on Monday. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 20th May 1957.